U.S. Congress

Appendix

The Success of True West Magazine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, when a new magazine succeeds, it is big news in the publishing world; someone has beaten the odds. When the successful magazine is published outside New York or the larger cities on the eastern seaboard, it is even more remarkable. But there has never been anything like True West—a regional magazine published in Austin, Tex. True West is successful even in the East.

True West is published in an old two-story frame house in Austin by Joe Small, a young man with new ideas. Such outstanding writers as Walter Prescott Webb, J. Frank Dobie, and Fred Gipson are among the contributors. A friend has remarked that while many publishers start with a million dollars, and go broke, Joe Small started broke, and hopes to wind up with a million dollars.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent article, written by Hart Stilwell, on the success of True West magazine, which appeared in a recent issue of Texas Parade.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRUE WEST GOES EAST

(By Hart Stilwell)

Early this year the magazine True West published in Austin, Tex., by Joe Small, went East.

That is, the magazine went on newsstands from coast to coast, becoming the first magazine published in Texas to attempt this feat.

There are some other firsts about True West.

It is the first western dedicated to telling the true story of the old West.

And it is the first slick western, in contrast to the pulp paper of the typical western.

Joe Small in his magazine ventures—and this is not the first—has amazed the publishing world in many ways. He has moved contrary to most of the approved procedures.

But what he has done more than anything else is this: He has proved that in our highly industrialized, concentrated, and competitive society, the little man can still compete successfully with the giants.

But in order to do that, the little man must have some rare qualities—qualities of the true rugged individualist—that serve as a substitute for cash.

In fact, Joe Small is in the process of reversing a saying in the magazine field that has taken on significant meaning in recent years.

The saying is that you start a magazine with a million dollars and go broke.

Joe Small started with peanuts and is well on the way toward building a magazine property that might be worth a million dollars.

And he has built in while such giants in the magazine field as Collier's, Woman's Home Companion, and the American magazine were fading out of the picture.

You ask Joe Small to explain what has happened, and Joe is likely to grin and say, "It's just that promise I made to those chickens way back there when I was a boy. A man likes to keep his promises, even if they are made to chickens. I've tried to keep mine."

Of course the story of Joe's rise in the magazine field is infinitely more complex than that. Still the story of his promise to the chickens is typical of him and might well be told as a starting point toward analyzing his character and ability.

That promise to the chickens was made way back, about 34 years ago, when the Small family lived on a farm near Caldwell. When Joe was 9 or 10 he had already become a dedicated person—when he grew up he was going to publish a magazine.

The boy began telling everybody about his plans, and finally he noticed that nobody would listen any more. Even his kindly mother grew weary of it.

"Yes, yes, son—of course," she would say, in answer to Joe's speech about publishing a magazine.

"She said it about the way she would have said, 'Yes, yes, son—of course you're going to be President,' " Joe said.

Well, the boy was determined to have an audience, so he went out in the yard and climbed on a fence and began explaining his plans to the chickens.

And he had a way of holding his audience—he used corn. Whenever the chickens showed any sign of losing interest and wandering away, Joe would toss out some more corn.

He's been doing that ever since—holding his reading audience by tossing out a little corn at critical moments. The corn is paying off.

Joe began selling articles to magazines when he was only 14. When he was 20 and a freshman in the University of Texas he sold a magazine article for $25. That was in 1935, when $25 was a lot of money.

Joe's roommate, Eugene Arrington, was tremendously impressed by the sale, and was much more impressed when Joe explained that he was going to start a magazine.

"Gene was reading a book," Joe says, "when I began telling him about my plans to start Southern Sportsman. Before I got through he closed the book. He never opened it again. We pooled our money, a total of $125, quite college, and started Southern Sportsman."

The times were against Joe, even though he demonstrated at the age of 20 ingenuity and enterprise and ideas that were certain to bring success eventually. In particular he began developing an uncanny knack of "hoss trading," as he calls it—trading advertising space for merchandise, then selling the merchandise.

When Joe couldn't pay his secretary, Elizabeth Berry, he solved the problem by marrying her. She has been his partner ever since, and continues as the other half of the Small Publications, with the three boys, Robert, Joe, Jr., and Jim, taking a hand now and then.

After a hitch in the Army in the last war, Joe returned to his home in Austin and began building up a nest egg writing for magazines, while Elizabeth worked. Finally he bought the defunct Western Sportsman, correctly figuring that the West was due for an outdoor boom ahead of the South, and revived it.

He was carrying out his promise to the chickens again.

For years Western Sportsman was published out of the small home in Austin, a feat that other magazine publishers would not believe. It was pretty much a family project, and the two, or occasionally three, office workers Joe hired could hardly move in the one room that served as publishing headquarters.

But Joe knew that the way to go broke in publishing a magazine was to start spending a lot of money for what he considered extras.

Finally, when Western Sportsman became pretty well established and was making a living for the family—much of that living through hoss trading—Joe rented an old two story frame house and moved his magazine headquarters there.

Western Sportsman was doing all right. But it had certain limitations that bothered Joe, and he began dreaming of another magazine, one that he could promote more.

And one day when he walked into the office of a banker the light struck—the idea crystallized.

The banker took a magazine off his desk and hid it, remarking, "I wish somebody would publish a western magazine that a man didn't have to hide."

Why not do that?

So the idea of a western filled with true stories of the Old West and printed on slick paper began churning in Joe's mind. And what better title was there than the simple "True West"?

Joe Small started Southern Sportsman with $125, started Western Sportsman with $5,000, and started True West with $7,300, about half of which he borrowed.

Spurred on by the enthusiasm of his friends and coworkers, Joe started True West a "little too big," as he puts it now, and had to sort of suck in his horns to keep from going bankrupt.

But he finally whittled his costs to fit his intake, then he began building and True West began taking hold.

Sure, it was a little magazine venture as magazines go. Joe started with a press run of about 50,000, and the increase was painfully slow for a time. But by the beginning of 1958 he was printing more than 100,000 copies, and True West was definitely taking hold.

The magazine is a bimonthly, and people kept urging Joe to make it a monthly.

Joe decided to take a step in that direction, but not the step people expected. He knew the value of keeping each issue of the magazine on the news stands 2 months instead of 1 month.

So in 1958 he brought out Frontier Times, which is simply True West with a different

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

title. It fills the gap—and it also stays on the news stands 2 months instead of 1.

Then came the big step—the bid for national distribution, instead of cautiously nursing the distribution in the central and western parts of the country.

And by the middle of 1958 the big national distributing companies, which had previously looked upon True West with scorn, definitely became interested. Joe made a deal with the Kable News Co., which ranks near the top.

And in the spring of this year True West hit the newsstands of the entire Nation with a total circulation of 240,000, a jump of 100 percent in the press run, and it was a dolled up True West with a four-color cover and an additional 16 pages and stories of the old west by such outstanding writers as J. Frank Dobie and Fred Gipson.

So True West has gone big time—and Joe Small is keeping his promise to the chickens.

It isn't easy to explain the success of Joe Small, mainly because many of the things he does seem to run contrary to sound business procedure.

Imagine a dignified top executive of a company in New York getting a letter that starts, "Howdy, Podner, you ole polecat."'

Joe does that—part of tossing corn to the chickens. His letters and promotion material in general are utterly fantasic in the minds of the conventional businessman.

But, surprisingly, they produce exceptional results.

"There's too much of the stuffed shirt in business," Joe explains. "I like to get down to a hoss tradin' basis."

And he does, which trading kept him alive in the lean years.

Then Joe has ideas. He's always bursting with them—and this is still a land in which a man with ideas can move forward.

Another factor is Joe's uncanny ability to get things done for a fraction of what others would spend on the job. His publishing headquarters in Austin illustrates the point.

A visiting big shot magazine executive from New York commented on the ramshackle old frame building.

"How can you maintain prestige in that place?" the man asked.

"The surest way I know for a magazine to lose prestige," Joe replied, "is to cease publication."

Joe can practically publish his magazine for what an office layout in New York would cost. Let others have the prestige—and fold, he says.

But probably Joe's greatest asset in the publishing business is his ability to judge what the public—or a certain segment of the public—wants and to give the public that.

And in the process his folksy, often downright corny approach to his readers somehow brings them right into the family and makes much more than mere readers out of them. They respond by becoming ardent, sometimes almost rabid, supporters.

"Hi there, ole Podner—I see you're a hittin' some rough goin' so here's my old dirty dollar bill to keep that howlin' wolf away from your door."

Incredible as it may seem, the Joe Small mail is crammed every day with just such stuff.

And Joe dishes it right back, with "Farewell, ole podner * * * we've cried and we've struggled * * *" and so on.

Still True West itself, with Fred Gipson as editor and Walter Webb as historical adviser, is far from corn. It does a bang up job of telling a lot about the Old West that ought to be told—and it's told in a solid way.

Joe Small may dish out the corn—but there's good commonsense behind every business move he makes.

On Preserving the Wild

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 26, 1959

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix to the RECORD portions of an excellent address "On Preserving the Wild" which was delivered at the 24th North American Wildlife Conference in New York City on March 4, 1959, by Mr. David Brower, executive director of the Sierra Club.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON PRESERVING THE WILD

(Excerpts from statement by David R. Brower, executive director, Sierra Club, before the 24th North American Wildlife Conference, Statler-Hilton Hotel, New York City, March 4, 1959)

In this century the world has used up, and has lost forever, more natural resources than has all previous history. And there are now alive, with an unprecedented appetite for resources, 10 percent of all the men who ever lived on this earth. Twenty-five billion people in the long million years since the dawn of man. Two and a half billion since Yellowstone National Park was created, people using up more resources, including space, than all the rest, and at greater speed. Yes, using up all the resources available to mankind except the resource of restraint.

While the ushers pass out the sackcloth and ashes, contemplate these figures. But please don't take time to check my arithmetic. It comes from a good source, but the accuracy of the source doesn't really matter. Time is running out. Whatever the time left, we can do better with it than we are doing. I agree with Allen Morgan, who says about wild open spaces that "what we save in the next few years is all that will ever be saved."

The important opportunity is to accept the fact that we are confronted with a problem the likes of which our predecessors hardly dreamed of; that it is a problem that man created and that men can solve, but not by reaching for a tranquilizer and curling up with the slick magazine that reassures us, with charts and diagrams in three colors, that science will save us—science, unaided by people.

If you feel the need, about now, for a draft of fresh air, be assured that I do, too, and that is what I'm here to talk about—about wildness—and wilderness where the best of wildness lives. Wilderness is fairly close to the best place of all in which to find a draft of fresh air, in which to take stock, in which to find yourself, discover the you that so many distractions have kept you away from so long that the life you lead is not your own.

What about wilderness? What is it? Where is how much of it? For whom and why? And if so, how can we keep some for a still more crowded world than ours, a world that will probably need the raw materials of wilderness more than we think we do, and that will need the spiritual resources ever so much more than we do?

We could easily devote an hour's discussion to each of these questions. But let me assure any of you who is tempted to rush for the exit that I shall limit myself instead to no more than a few minutes' musing on all the questions put together. * * *

Mrs. Malaprop might have said that wilderness is a place where the hand of man has not set foot. But she didn't. She has not heard of the kind of wilderness, as a concept, that we are talking about. Not that it's exactly a new concept. The prophet Isaiah seems to have had it in mind when he wrote what was translated as "Woe unto them that join house to house, that lay field to field, 'till there be no place, that they may be placed alone in the midst of the earth." * * *

Moses found opportunity for his people in wilderness—wilderness much of which was turned to desert before the Sermon on the Mount admonished man to consider the lilies of the field—the natural field, I assume—and how they were arrayed. That wilderness was subsequently utterly stripped of its verdure by man, including the exploitation of the cedars of Lebanon, which went down to the sea in ships.

To compress the history of wilderness into a few lines: The Middle Ages, and nothing. Then the Renaissance, and Conrad Gesner finding reason for the admiration of mountains. Then very little until William Blake worried about those dark Satanic Mills. More recently Olmsted, Emerson, Thoreau, and Muir. Finally the explosion of man across the earth, and here, in the United States, wilderness vanishing with such velocity that we knew, inescapably, that man alone was responsible for the loss. The 1920's and the Forest Service trying hard, under the leadership of Aldo Leopold and Robert Marshall, to define wilderness in terms of what should not happen in wilderness. In 1930 Robert Marshall defining it in terms of what man should find in wilderness, ought to find, had to find if the spirit that has stood him upright was not to perish in an overcivilized lukewarm world.

Marshall used the word wilderness "to denote a region which contains no permanent inhabitants, possesses no possibility of conveyance by mechanical means, and is sufficiently spacious that a person crossing it must have the experience of sleeping out." Survival in it, he said, is up to you. Find environment in it; don't bring one with you.

This idea of wilderness, new though it is, is now quite widely accepted. It isn't yet underwritten by Federal law, but it does appear, strangely, in an international treaty on nature protection and wildlife preservation in the Western Hemisphere which was signed by the United States 17 years ago. In this treaty wilderness is defined as "a region under public control characterized by primitive conditions of flora, fauna, transportation, and habitation wherein there is no provision for the passage of motorized transportation and all commercial developments are excluded."

Let me add one more definition and then move on. This one comes from the wilderness bill: "A wilderness, in contrast with those areas where man and his own works dominate the landscape, is hereby recognized as an area where the earth and its community of life are untrammeled by man, where man himself is a visitor who does not remain." This is a lot of detail about definition. Why? Because when someone is about to be tempted to cash in on a priceless heirloom rather than work a little harder for the money instead, it is high time that he look hard at that heirloom, find out what it means to him, whether he should let it slip away or pass it on to his son instead, as it was passed on to him.

My analogy isn't very good, for wilderness goes far beyond being a mere heirloom. There is no sentimentality about wilderness.

As Howard Zahniser, of the Wilderness Society, has put it: "We work for wilderness preservation not primarily for the right of a minority to have the kind of fun it prefers, but rather to insure for everyone the perpetuation of areas where human enjoyment and the apprehension of the interrelations of the whole community of life are possible, and to preserve for all the freedom of choosing to know the primeval if they so wish."

And we need work hard, with a sense of urgency. The wilderness we now have is all the wilderness we shall ever have in America. There is little left—less than one-third acre per person in the United States if you count all the wilderness that has any administrative protection in our national parks and forests and wildlife refuges and on Indian lands. One-third acre per person today; less per person as our population expands still further; all of it subject to being struck out by the Administrator's pen.

So wilderness can no longer be abundant enough for every man to walk on it. But, after all, only the small child must handle a thing to know it; adults need only look. Those in between need a little of both. So some people will be able to walk on it and most of them will be the better for it. Some may wish to but never make it—especially when the bulk of our wilderness is far to the west as it is from you. Some people may not care to go there at all. But their sons may wish to. And wilderness must be there or the world's a cage.

I say all this about wilderness because it is the essence of the wilds we need around us. Since it lives but once, there should be ample opportunity to review the death sentence so many people in the chambers of commercialism would like to inflict upon wilderness.

Many of us feel that wilderness should have an automatic stay of execution, and that Congress should provide it.

Hence the wilderness bill—the proposal to establish a national wilderness preservation system.

Reintroduction of the remarkable wilderness bill in the 86th Congress is an occasion for looking at the hurdles which many interests are hurriedly trying to place in front of it—almost all of them apparently manufactured at the same source. Here is a look through the eyes of an observer who believes this legislation to be of vital importance.

Several months ago the New York Times commented editorially that the bill was running into opposition that its mild terms did not deserve. The revised bill is, if anything, milder still; the opposition more vociferous.

A recurrent allegation is that wilderness is only for the selfish, rugged, single-interest minority. Wilderness advocates may well reply that the black pot is seeing its own black reflection in a shiny kettle, for the allegation comes from a series of single-interest groups—lumber, mining, oil, cattle, sheep, and road- and dam-building interests—who dislike barriers to what they may hope to develop for their own single use in the remaining fragment of wilderness.

There is a recurrent attempt also to depict the proposed Wilderness Council as a monster, and then to be frightened by the creature so depicted. The Council actually could collect and disseminate information and make recommendations, but would have no administrative authority. In short, opponents are attributing monstrous powers to a Council which has no power.

Finally, the opponents attempt to assign the consideration of permanent protection of wilderness to a temporary group, the National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, that was not created to protect anything, but rather to study and recommend.

Wilderness protection must not be delayed. If you will remember your first-aid course, you will remember these priorities: Breathing, bleeding, shock. It does little good if a patient is bleeding to death to sit down and study objectively what kind of bandage will be needed on the wound. You get in there and stop the bleeding. Otherwise you'll have nothing to bandage but a corpse.

The best way to help the Commission in its study is to keep some living wilderness for it to count upon. The wilderness bill can check the bleeding.

For all the opposition furor, there is an amazing body of public opinion supporting the wilderness bill and its provision for an automatic congressional stay of execution of moves to obliterate designated wilderness. That opinion was represented in a 50-to-1 ratio of letters sent to the Senate Interior Committee for inclusion in the record of last fall's field hearings on the bill.

Support comes from no hastily organized battalion of rugged hikers, no wilderness lobby; it reflects broad public concern about direction. It reflects growing conviction that "the Nation does not exist to serve its economy"; that there must be more public participation in the treatment of the single heritage of land that must serve all the generations (hence the added role for Congress in wilderness protection and military withdrawals), and that to leave these things to the experts is to resort to absentee citizenship.

It also reflects the dawning realization that growth without end is soon monstrous, then malignant, and finally, lethal—that an economy based upon incessant growth may well turn out, in the long run, to have been a chain-letter economy, in which we pick up the handsome early returns, and either our children or theirs find the mailbox empty, their resources having been expended by us.

I was trying to make this point in Berkeley a short time ago and a question came up from the floor: Could we afford to do anything less than keep growing incessantly inasmuch as that was what the Russians were doing? While I struggled ineptly with a reply a conservationist chemist came to my rescue. "You've heard of the game of 'chicken,' haven't you?" he asked. "It's sort of a Russian roulette on wheels. Two juveniles head directly toward each other at high speed on the highway, and the first one who turns to avert the crash is chicken. We frown on such behavior in adolescents, but we seem to accept it as national policy."

Supporters of wilderness—and of the restraint that is inherent in preserving it—also like civilization. They like it well enough not to want it to take too many steps, with the bland leading the bland, down the road paved with good inventions, on which there may be no turning.

Whoever should look for the words, "Wilderness Lobby" on the door of some office near Capitol Hill would be looking in the wrong direction. He should look instead at the land—all the land the country is ever going to have for all the U.S. citizens ever to be born—and the rapidity with which many of its nonrenewable resources have been used up for so few. (He should resist reiterating "Science will save us" until he has counted the ever-more-perplex problems the saving has already brought us.) And he should look at a few recent books that cannot be isolated from a common concern about an uncommon threat to civilization: Brown's "The Challenge of Man's Future"; Galbraith's "The Affluent Society"; Packard's "Hidden Persuaders"; Whyte's "The Organization Man" and "The Exploding Metropolis"; Keats' "The Insolent Chariots"; Huxley's "Brave New World Revisited"; Gary's "The Roots of Heaven"; Callison's "America's Natural Resources"; and Leopold's "A Sand County Almanac." The list ends too soon and is almost humorously disparate. Yet it has a common denominator of substantial uneasiness about what we are letting happen to us, about things that are forcing us into a corner where we must choose to live with less or not at all, witnessing instead, in that last blinding flash, the final glimpse of struggle between economies seeking to out-exploit one another.

The connection between the ability of civilization to protect wildness and the ability for civilization to survive is not so tenuous as we might wish. It is worth energetic scrutiny, and at length. For the kind of thinking that motivates the grab for what's left on the bottom of the barrel—the pitiful fragment of resources in the remaining wilderness—is the kind of thinking that has lost this country friends it cannot afford to lose. The ultimate in selfishness is evidenced in those opponents of wilderness preservation who have demanded an open door for exploiting wilderness while they slam another door in the face of friends needed overseas and north of the border. Don't import oil, wool, plywood, lead, zinc, the opponents say, whatever such restriction may do to the economy of our friends. Don't import them because we have more than enough of our own. And concurrently opponents urge that nothing interfere with their looking for still more of their own—anywhere in the public's dedicated wilderness.

The international economic and political difficulties the wilderness opponents would thus aggravate are serious. The difficulties may not stem from their opposition to wilderness, but there is certainly guilt by association. They stem from what could be called a philosophy of last things first.

It has remained for a physicist to single out the biological peril. As Dr. J. A. Rush put it: "When man obliterates wilderness, he repudiates the evolutionary force that put him on this planet. In a deeply terrifying sense, man is on his own."

As a handy example, I have beside me as I write a small object, about the size of the letter "o," which the evolutionary force has built. Within it is embodied a direct living connection all the way back through all the aeons to the very first appearance of life on this planet. Against that space of time man's life span is insignificant, his kin is barely significant, the entire duration of mankind is hardly noticeable. The object, of course, is a seed. Packed in a fragment of its space is all the know-how needed to perpetuate redwoods on earth, even if every other seed and existing redwood were to be wiped out. Included in that know-how is the ability, should a once-in-a-century flood bury the base of the mature tree in silt, to activate the pushing of new roots—out through bark two feet thick, and out at just the right level below the new surface of soil in which the tree now stands.

I know of no research to determine in just what gene area this particular know-how exists, or what its biochemical formula is. Fortunately, no scientist has to know this. But the tree has to know it to survive, and it does know it. Man did not have to steady the Teacher's hand when it found out, or when all the other forms of life found out how to perpetuate themselves, through good times and bad, in the wilderness they are designed to live in together, in equilibrium.

Does man dare be so arrogant as to assume that he must take it upon himself to steady the omnipotent force, throughout the land, even to the last 2 percent of wilderness? Perhaps Dr. Rush had some question like this in mind when he spoke of wilderness, the evolutionary force, and the terrifying prospect if man tries to stay on this planet without it. And Thoreau, too, when he wrote: "In wildness is the preservation of the world."

The wilderness bill is a needed step toward the recognition of this truth. Not just any

bill, but a strong one, recognizing as national policy that wilderness is where you find it and keep it. There is little left to find, and scant time remaining in which to resolve to keep some of that little—to rescue it from the raw materialism which threatens not only wilderness but survival, too.

A Republican Challenge: Keeping Ours the Party of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me last week before the Wayne County Republican Central Committee, at Detroit, Mich.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A REPUBLICAN CHALLENGE: KEEPING OURS THE PARTY OF FREEDOM

(By THOMAS H. KUCHEL, U.S. Senator from California, before Wayne County Republican Central Committee dinner, Detroit, Mich., April 2, 1959)

I am honored by your invitation to speak to my fellow Republicans in this great city of Detroit. Your magnificent State of Michigan and her people, over a century ago, helped to create the forward-looking Republican Party as a political instrument devoted to the liberty of man. Today, Republicans in this modern era face an equal challenge to keep our party the forward-looking advocate of human freedom at a time when that noble concept all too often is destroyed by slavery as in Tibet and East Berlin.

A few weeks ago I told my fellow Republicans in California that the strength of the traditionally American two-party system is pretty much of a question of what we Republicans, in and out of Government, now do and now say. Nobody in his right mind wants innumerable splinter parties with their invariably weak coalition governments. God forbid that we shall ever have in this country the one-party system of Communist Russia. Yet, the sad fact is that we were hurt in the last election. I can speak with some knowledge of Republican damage in 1958. We suffered a political holocaust in California. I am glad to say we are taking forward steps to rebuild our party. To begin with, I think there is a little less cannibalism among our members now. Republicans of varying shades of political ideologies saw first-hand how disagreement over a few columns of the Republican temple gave the Democrats sufficient enthusiasm to succeed in demolishing the whole thing.

The Republican Party is big enough and it ought to be strong enough to have some divergence of views among its membership. Indeed, from such divergence should come the stimulus to produce more constructive public policy. I suggest to my fellow partisans in Michigan that the less fighting you do among yourselves the better. It will give us that much more time to devote to the development of constructive policies for our States, and for the Nation, to which the wise and honest may repair.

One enterprising and provocative bit of political philosophy in the economic field came the other day from a Democratic Member of the House of Representatives who frankly alleged that he could balance the whole Federal budget, if people would only listen to him.

"What we ought to do," he said, "is get all this money that's in savings accounts all over the country out into circulation. I believe the answer to all our financial troubles is in getting that money into circulation. It doesn't do anybody but the bankers any good where it is now. I say let's spend it, live the golden life. What's the sense of just piling it up?"

"Does it bother you," he asked rhetorically, a few weeks earlier, "that our Nation now has a debt of $280 billion? It doesn't bother me. What I want to know is, who does the Government owe this money to? That's a question I've never been able to get anybody to answer."

Well, let me answer. Our $280 billion debt bothers any American who thinks about our Nation's future. Our Federal Government borrowed another $12 billion last year. That's not merely bothersome, it's worrisome. It's deadly serious. And I assume that it is bothersome and worrisome and serious to the people of Michigan to reflect upon the evil fiscal situation which has befallen your State government.

By the way, I understand your Governor is available for his party's presidential nomination next year. I am told that he points with pride to the good things which may have come to the people of Michigan this last decade but, with equal vigor, directs an accusing finger at Republicans in your State legislature and elsewhere and charges them with every single bad thing which in that period may have affronted your Commmonwealth. I am not here to pass judgment on your State's political gains or losses. That is not my business as a Californian. But I can say that during the long years of Republican success in California our party gave the people of my State constructive forward-looking government. It tried, if you let me say so, to determine what course was best for all the people along the lines of the old textbook maxim: "The greatest good for the greatest number." That is the approach which has been vindicated at the ballot box. The Republican Party has been successful in the past. It will be successful in the future, in California, across the Nation, and—I hope—in your own great State in next week's elections.

Republicans, we have an excellent record of accomplishment on the homefront. We abandoned wartime wage controls and price controls when some of our Democratic colleagues were demanding that they be continued in peacetime. We scrapped the unfair excess profits tax on business over partisan opposition. We reduced individual income taxes by 10 percent and we cut most excise taxes in half. We adopted a $33-billion interstate highway construction program. We overcame bitter opposition to enact the first civil rights legislation since Lincoln's time. We fulfilled our national platform pledges for Alaskan statehood and Hawaiian statehood on the basis of bipartisan support. White House foreign policy, these last 6 years, has been approved by a bipartisan majority on every rollcall in the Senate. The farm problem is still a mess because a few Republicans and a lot of Democrats love high rigid price supports. As a symbol of progress by free men, the President's atomic peace ship was authorized. And the courageous leadership of our President, in the Middle East, in Asia, in Africa, in Europe, and in the Americas, unquestionably has contributed greatly to deterring aggression and to preventing war.

The tragically difficult recommendations which the President has been required to make to the Congress find their origins in the events which marked the close of World War II. At that time, the United States, in accordance with our traditional practice, began to demobilize our Armed Forces and to turn again to peacetime pursuits. We devotedly believed that with the creation of the United Nations we could look hopefully forward to an era of peace with justice in our conflict-weary world. We undertook through the Marshall plan generously to assist in rebuilding war-ravaged nations, whether they were allies of ours or not, in what will stand as one of the great unselfish acts of any government, anywhere, and at any time.

How soon the disillusionment came. Historic, freedom-loving European nations began to disappear, as, one by one, they went down the Communist drain. We began in chagrin to realize that the Soviet Union never had any intention of honoring its treaty obligations, but to the contrary, it was bent on pursuing the program laid down by Marx and Lenin with the single objective of communizing the world.

As these foreboding breaches of faith were occurring, the American State Department said:

"The instability of peace the world over is due, in large measure, to deliberate Soviet policy and actions, and to wholesale Soviet violations of basic agreements. Because of the U.S.S.R.'s record in ignoring its international pledges, the faith of the world in Soviet signatures has been badly shattered. Whether it be the Yalta Agreement, or a treaty of friendship, the U.S.S.R. has chosen to ignore its sworn commitments whenever it found such actions advantageous for its own purposes."

And, Mr. Dulles thereafter said: "It is now the policy of the United States not to exchange U.S. performance for Communist promises."

It is significant to recall that while America was rushing to return to a peacetime economy, the Soviet Union never did demobilize its own vast military forces but, to the contrary, maintained approximately 175 Russian divisions which was the Red army strength at the end of World War II. And, during the intervening years, these military resources have been greatly increased in their effectiveness through modern weapons, modern training, and improved leadership. Similarly, the Soviet has added to the strength of its Air Force. It has amassed a fleet of over 400 submarines, far in excess of Hitler's undersea fleet in the beginning of World War II. At the same time, the Kremlin strengthened its hold on the Soviet industrial machine, it sequestered the scientific brains available to it for the single purpose of producing a nuclear arsenal of ballistic missiles, international in scope, bringing the American continents within their range.

Your great Senator Arthur Vandenberg led this Nation into a clearer recognition of its modern responsibilities when, a little over a decade ago, he introduced the justly famed Vandenberg resolution which successfully led our Nation to a new landmark of American diplomacy. The U.S. Senate adopted your great Senator's proposal which "advised the President to seek security for the free world through U.S. support of mutual defense arrangements, to operate within the United Nations Charter, but outside the Security Council veto. It also advised the President to attempt to strengthen the charter through curbs on the veto, itself, and by providing a United Nations police force together with the regulation and reduction of armaments under dependable guarantee against violation." Vandenberg papers.)

Those continue to be sound and solid policies for the United States to follow. The Senate, on June 11, 1948, overwhelmingly

adopted the Vandenberg resolution, and on that splendid foundation, the American doctrine of collective security formally replaced the outworn policy of pre-World War II isolation.

It is particularly appropriate to recall that resolution tonight as our President and our country join in celebrating a monumentally successful decade of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, an outstanding example of our country's membership in effective security pacts under the Vandenberg resolution. Prior to NATO, 17 sovereign nations were engulfed by the Soviet, as I say, one by one. Since NATO, no nation in the Atlantic community has either lost her independence nor has been attacked. There is the strong proof of its effectiveness. NATO is a modern adaptation of the old American colonial cry: "In union there is strength." The member states of NATO standing together, solemnly agreeing that an attack on one will be deemed an attack on all, brought Soviet destruction of free states in Europe to a close.

When Red aggression against Korea came, America once again was required to mobilize its military strength to combat Communist imperialism which broke out within our defense perimeter, this time in Asia. The actions of the Soviets from and after Korea have imposed new requirements on the people of our country and our Government, as the acknowledged leader of the free world. It is now unhappily necessary, for the first time in our history, to maintain a large military establishment in time of peace. There appears to be little, if any, possibility of relief from this costly necessity so long as the Kremlin maintains its present course toward world domination.

The American people are dedicated to peace. The American Government has most earnestly striven to attain peace with justice in the world. The President's proposal at Geneva in 1955 for a nuclear disarmament on the basis of an adequate mutual inspection gave hope to every peace-loving human being as a real possibility of the beginning of a new era. The President's open sky aerial inspection was almost summarily rejected by the Soviet. Since that time, at London, at Geneva, and elsewhere, American representatives together with those of our NATO allies have tried, and tried, and tried to find a mutually acceptable formula by which disarmament could be honorably agreed upon and, thereafter, effectively assured. Our Government continues, most earnestly, to find an honorable prescription which the Soviets might accept.

Meanwhile, the difficulty over Berlin continues. Our position, and that of our allies, the British and French, has been made clear to Mr. Khrushchev, both in the public utterances by our heads of state, and in the private statements made to him by Prime Minister Macmillan and others. God knows what the true feelings of the Soviet leader are, but we do know that it is Mr. Khrushchev, and he alone, who lays down the Soviet line, aided and abetted, it is unquestionably true, by thoroughly competent staff personnel and by the most skilled propagandists. The President once again has indicated his own availability for a summit conference, contingent upon the effectively logical proviso of a prior meeting of foreign ministers, which would clear the chaff from the wheat, and would specify in clear language the decisions necessary to be rendered by the heads of state.

And the Soviets continue to zig and zag. After belligerently indicating that world war III was inexorably on its way over Berlin, Mr. Khrushchev now tells a press conference that the "notion" that he had given the West an ultimatum to get out of Berlin by May 27 was "an unscrupulous interpretation of our position."

Our Government is faced with the problem of determining how best to design and build a military defense establishment capable of responding to the hazards of conflict whatever the size of the conflicts may be. The solution is found in the doctrine of deterrence and in the continuing application of the principle of collective security. An unerring adherence to this doctrine and to this principle is the indispensable partner of our peace-inspired diplomacy, most particularly if that diplomacy is to receive deserved consideration by Moscow, where there is a wholesale respect for military strength.

The people of our country, regardless of party, are prepared to underwrite whatever the cost of an adequate defense may be, and the cost of its concomitant, our mutual security program. In the field of defense, professional military skills must be the basis on which initial estimates for each branch of the services are made. And then, the professional military members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff give their collective estimate. From there, civilian heads of the Pentagon pass their judgment, and, finally, the President makes his recommendations to the Congress.

As a lay U.S. Senator, and neither as a partisan nor as a self-styled global strategist, I am glad to tell you that I shall support the President in his military recommendations which he has made to the Congress for the sole and single reason of deterring or, if necessary, of combating any aggression against us, and of preserving the freedoms which we know.

I do not quarrel for a moment with the right of a Member of Congress, or, for that matter, of any citizen, to disagree with the President in matters of defense or anything else. But I trust they will not quarrel with me when I discard their opinions in this field as inaccurate and when I determine, once again, on the basis of the record, to vote for the Eisenhower proposals for America's defense.

And now, some who earlier were using rather inflammatory language in speaking of our Defense Department have conceded, however belatedly and reluctantly, that our strength and our planning are adequate for our country's safety. Indeed, there have just been made public some excerpts from the testimony of our military Chiefs of Staff two of whom say that we have too many nuclear weapons rather than too few.

May we not recall that, in World War II, President Roosevelt made Dwight Eisenhower supreme commander over all military personnel in the European theater. After World War II, he took over the military responsibilities of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. As President, he'll be guiding us down the road for another 2 years. We can gratefully salute his almost entire lifetime of dedictated devotion to the people of the United States.

Republicans, be proud of the accomplishments under the Republican label that have taken place in our Nation's Capital. We came into being in the 1850's as the American party of freedom. We intend to keep it the party of freedom in its second century of existence.

Michigan: Sportsman's Paradise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT McNAMARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, few States in the Nation can match Michigan as a year-around paradise for lovers of sports and recreation.

This aspect of Michigan, coupled with the State's industrial power, provides the foundation for Michigan's greatness.

An article in the Detroit Times of Saturday, March 28, described the sports and recreation assets of Michigan. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRUTH ABOUT MICHIGAN: FEW PEERS IN SPORTS, RECREATION

(By Edgar Hayes)

"All work and no play" applies as much to the executive, the professional man and the factory worker as anyone else.

Daily hundreds of doctors tell thousands of patients (or about to be patients) "Get more exercise, develop a hobby, enjoy more outdoor living."

At one time this advice could be heeded only by the well-to-do. Now the best facilities for sports, recreation, and exercise are available to all.

With the shorter workweek becoming increasingly more popular, recreation facilities are assuming greater importance.

When an owner decides to buy or establish a factory he makes a careful study of the facilities to keep his employes and executives busy during their nonworking hours.

Recreation has now become a year-round proposition.

Winter sports have boomed in the last decade, far beyond the wildest dreams of those who own and promote winter resorts.

Out of season vacations at one time were the luxury of the wealthy who could go to Florida or some other sunshine climate.

Now skiing, skating, ice fishing and tobogganing have given the resort owners a 12-month business and the enthusiast a year-round full program of events.

Lucky is the State that can offer a year-round schedule.

Few States can match and none surpass Michigan in this respect. Winter wonderland or water wonderland, Michigan is tops.

If you have a big bankroll there are fine, exclusive clubs and lodges.

If you have more modest resources there are fine motels, hotels, and resorts.

If your financial problem is acute but your love of the outdoors keen, there are hundreds of grand camping sites which provide excellent vacation possibilities for a very few dollars.

Name a sport, recreation, or exercise and Michigan is the ideal spot for it.

IF YOU LIKE TO FISH

Michigan has about 12,000 lakes, almost all well stocked with fish. There are 33,000 miles of streams, some of them world famous for trout.

Great Lakes fishing provides all the thrills and excitement usually associated with deep-sea fishing.

Many of these lakes freeze over during the winter, ideal for ice fishing. Michigan has about 1,800,000 anglers wetting lines during the seasons.

IF YOU LIKE TO HUNT

Shooters come from all over the Nation to hunt deer and bear in Michigan's woods and prairies. More than 1 million take to the forests each fall.

The bird season is popular and good hunting can be found within an hour's drive of any spot in the State.

The new Mackinac Bridge opened that vast territory to hunters and fishermen, many of whom shunned the long wait at the straits.

IF YOU LIKE SWIMMING AND BOATING

The lakes, both inland and Great Lakes, provide the best possible swimming and boating.

The Great Lakes give Michigan the world's longest shoreland (except for Australia), almost every foot of it grand beach for bathing and sunning. The lakes are ideal for swimming.

Any sailor will tell you the Great Lakes are a paradise for those who love the leisurely sport.

Only one State in the Union, New York, has more powerboats registered than Michigan. And none has more fine waterways for the enjoyment of those who own these craft.

DO YOU LIKE GOLF?

Michigan has hundreds of courses, some like Oakland Hills, Meadowbrook, Birmingham CC, world famous. No matter where you locate in Michigan or where you go for a vacation you're always within a few miles of a good course.

MAYBE YOU'RE A SPECTATOR

No matter what your sport is, you'll find a major league team representing it in Michigan. At all times you are within a couple of hours' drive of Detroit, Ann Arbor, and East Lansing, site of huge stadiums for all sports.

Detroit and New York are the only cities in the world with major league teams in all sports, baseball, football, hockey, and basketball.

Summed up, all this means if you believe as most people do that a happy, active work is a better one, Michigan is perfect for employees.

So good are the opportunities for outdoor activities that Michigan leads the Nation in issuing hunting and fishing licenses, maybe a quarter of a million more than California, often mistakenly called the ideal vacation land. That title belongs to Michigan.

America's Gravest Crisis and Our Response

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have always felt that the American people have the will and courage to surmount the gravest crises if they know the facts and what they must do to insure the triumph of their cause.

One of our great religious leaders resigned several years ago as rector of Washington's largest Episcopal parish, in order to devote his full time and energy to providing such facts and alerting the free world to what he believes is its greatest threat—the challenge of atheistic communism.

He is Dr. Charles Wesley Lowry, chairman of the Foundation for Religious Action in the Social and Civil Order, an organization which is trying to unite men and women of all religious faiths in a great spiritual counteroffensive against communism.

Last month, Dr. Lowry delivered at Wake Forest a forceful and inspiring address setting forth the issues we face in this life-or-death struggle between freedom and slavery. He called on America to respond to this greatest challenge in a way which will be worthy of the dreams on which our Nation was founded, and he stated magnificently how we must have a "will to greatness" in this hour of crisis.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that his great message be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA'S GRAVEST CRISIS AND OUR RESPONSE

(An address by Charles Wesley Lowry, Ph. D. (Oxon.), delivered to the student body of Wake Forest College, Winston-Salem, N.C., on March 17, 1959)

The dominant memorial in our Nation's Capital is the severely simple yet magnificently towering granite shaft called the Washington Monument. It commemorates one who is known in history and to us all as "the Father of his Country."

This matchless title indicates that the lines fell to George Washington in a time of crisis. For 7 years he was first in war—slow, slugging, indeterminate, painful, Revolutionary War, fought under the most trying and vexatious circumstances. The winning of American independence was a victory, above all, of patience, fortitude, wisdom, manliness embodied superbly in a character—the character of Washington.

In 1783 we became a free people. The next 15 years were the testing time for peace, order, and nationhood. First we had to get a Constitution; then we had to try it out and see whether the novel and pioneering experiment in self-government would work. By the unanimous instinct and decision of his peers Washington was made President of the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia in 1787. By a similar instinct the first presidential electors of the American people made him President of the young Republic. For 8 years he kept to the helm, guiding, testing, seasoning the new ship of state.

Then, by his own free volition, this extraordinary man and patriot, his honor immaculate, his character of disinterestedness untarnished, stepped aside, leaving office and power to other Americans, likewise freely chosen by the people.

Thus George Washington became "first in peace" and in a second manner "the Father of his Country." His successor, John Adams, served one term and then with the election in 1800 of Thomas Jefferson, America was launched upon the 19th century, the age of peace, expansion, and progress on a world scale.

Early, however, in the seventh decade of this century a terrible storm broke and descended in fury upon the Nation that had fastened upon it the eyes of a hard and skeptical world. On the 11th of February 1861 a tall, gaunt figure stood on the rear platform of a train to say farewell to his friends and fellow citizens of Springfield, Ill. "I now leave, not knowing when or whether ever I may return, with a task before me greater than that which rested upon Washington." Two days later in Columbus, Ohio, the same man, Abraham Lincoln, said: "I cannot but know what you all know; that without a name, perhaps without reason why I should have a name, there has fallen upon me a task such as did not rest even upon the Father of his Country."

There followed 4 years of ferocious war—war and carnage and shedding of blood and pouring out of treasure such as the world had not witnessed up to that time; a war that is today recognized as in a real sense the dress rehearsal of world war and total war.

Our Nation was saved. I, as a descendant of men who fought heroically to divide the Nation, acknowledge this with humility and thanksgiving. Deep scars were left, and some of them are still with us. But the United States is one and will remain one. Together despite all sectional tensions we will solve the problems that history has placed on her domestic agenda for this Nation.

Today, 2 years less than a century since Lincoln traveled to Washington to be inaugurated President of the United States, we are engaged in another civil war. This time it is not a war within America. The scene is no one nation but the world. The struggle we are engaged in is a planetary civil war.

The stakes are higher, the issues are more momentous, the crisis is graver than in 1776 or 1787 or 1861. Today the question is our survival. The issue is whether we shall remain a free people in a free world, or whether a new form of slavery shall become worldwide.

In 1858 Lincoln, though he was a prudent man and an intuitive politician, never a firebrand, had spoken prophetically of the future of Negro slavery. "'A house divided against itself cannot stand.' I believe this Government cannot endure permanently half slave and half free. I do not expect the Union to be dissolved; I do not expect the house to fall; but I do expect it will cease to be divided. It will become all one thing, or all the other."

Today, exactly 100 years later, we are asked to believe that a world made one by the miraculous annihilation of time and space can exist indefinitely half free and half slave. We are even invited jauntily by our adversary to engage in a competition of social systems, to see which one is better.

Such talk is highly unreal, as unreal as the oratory of men before America's Civil War, who considered that proslavery and antislavery forces could coexist peacefully for an indefinite time.

It will work out the same in our day. The world will not stand still. Indeed it is only too evident that it is doing anything but stand still. It is characterized by very rapid motion, and this motion sooner or later will speed mankind toward freedom or carry it backward to slavery based on technology.

This is what I mean by saying that the present crisis is the gravest in our history or in the world's history. The issues are survival and slavery. If our only choice is slavery, it were better not to survive.

Fortunately this is not the case, and I believe that we as a people must determine that we will survive, that we will use our incomparable wealth and power to be a leader nation, and that we will defeat the men who design a world made one in subjection and bondage.

This will not be easy, for we are up against two things that are powerful. One is an idea: the idea of communism." Communism is a construct with two faces; one a bloody, brutal, cruel, cynical reality; the other a fair, shining, splendid ideal in which selfishness is overcome and all men are at last equal and truly free. With this dual social personality, the Communist is able to appear to the unwary as Dr. Jekyll, while he acts in real relationships like the criminal Mr. Hyde. Thus he is able to make the most of two worlds, until found out by those whom he enslaves.

The second thing we are up against is the energy and vitality of the Russian people. This is a great and gifted people. It has been made strong and ambitious because it has suffered much and expected little over the centuries. Today a part of the long-submerged Russian peasant masses has clambered to the top of the social pyramid. Opportunities have widened for others. The result is a drive, vigor, passion, and restless energy alike in scientific technology and in unconventional diplomacy such as the world has never before seen.

In the path of these new barbarians galvanized and directed by the Communist ideology is the United States of America. We and we alone block the march of the Soviets to world conquest and world rule. We are less ambitious and less vital than we were, because we have been very successful materially and have entered the luxury arc of the cycle of a great civilization. This vastly increases our peril, for it means that we have powerful foes both within and without.

Yet man is free as an individual, and freedom is still the form and privilege of our national existence. This means that we are not shut up to an inevitable fate. We are free to respond, decide, act, fight with moral weapons, and win, if we choose.

What shall our response be, to this gravest crisis in the history of America and the world? By this I mean our mental and spiritual response, not the particular means we shall use to achieve the end of victory in the least frigid cold war in history. The means exist and can be found, if we have the will.

This brings us back to the all-important question of our responses as Americans and the response of our great and mighty civilization. Three factors are primary in this response, if it is to be vital, affirmative, and persisting.

The first is faith in God. We talk a good deal about faith and about religion in modern America. We have more church members proportionately than ever before in our history. Statistics on church building are astonishing—almost overpowering. But are we not neglecting the most important thing—God and His grace and power? God and His divine will and purpose for history in our time?

If we look back to the times of Washington and Lincoln, we cannot miss the religious quality of their response. They could not see the future; it was veiled from their eyes, as it is from ours. But this did not weaken them or lead to any failure of nerve or will. On the contrary, they put their whole trust in God and committed the future to Him. We must do the same. God is greater than atomic energy or Soviet technology or 650 million Chinese. Our times are in His hand. His will shall not fail. We can say with the early Christians and with our Founding Fathers: "The Lord God omnipotent reigneth."

This is the first duty of the churches in America today—to lead and teach Americans to believe in God and to love Him and serve Him for His sake.

The words of Washington in his first inaugural address can incite and help us do this very thing: "No people can be bound to acknowledge and adore the invisible hand, which conducts the affairs of men, more than the people of the United States. Every step, by which they have advanced to the character of an independent Nation, seems to have been distinguished by some token of providential agency."

Secondly, our response must be one of realism. The great believers in God have not been fatalists. They have not kept to their tents in the day of battle, saying "Let the Lord do it." On the contrary, they have been men like Moses, St. Paul, Mahomet, St. Francis, Martin Luther, Ignatius Loyola, Cromwell, George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, William E. Gladstone, Stonewall Jackson, Abraham Lincoln, and Woodrow Wilson. The great figures in religion, in war, and in statecraft have been realists, men and women having a strong sense of what is, and a high respect for facts.

This is certainly our second greatest need as Americans in this gravest of all our crises. We need to shake hands with what faces us, walk around it, get acquainted with it, and adjust our lives accordingly. In war we do this. What we have so far failed to accept is the fact that cold war is not peace, but war. It must be fought, with appropriate and effective weapons, and must be won. Otherwise, we may not survive, and if we survive it will be as slaves.

The third factor in a vital response to the present crisis is what I like to call a will to greatness. This, I believe is the meaning of America. Our forefathers considered that the temple of liberty and social peace they built on these shores was no common edifice. They thought of it as something momentous for all mankind. In Washington's own words, "the preservation of the sacred fire of liberty, and the destiny of the republican model of government, are justly considered as deeply, perhaps as finally staked on the experiment to the hands of the American people."

As Washington and his colleagues felt, so all true Americans have felt. In the great crises of our past this sense of universal value and will to greatness nerved the efforts of Americans and held them to their best. It is the one motive that can renew our souls and make us ready today for sacrifice and selfless dedication.

Yes, a nation too has a soul. It is a spiritual reality. It is more than commerce and machines and highways and heavens filled with airborne argosies. It is an idea, an aspiration, a loyalty, a rising above individual self, an affirmation of life, or other human selves, and of God.

"And what shall it profit a nation, if it shall gain the whole world and lose its own soul?"

That is the central point. Our true greatness is of the mind and soul, and it concerns others. It involves the whole world which is in a vast and exciting transition. With this world our destiny is wrapped up. As soon as we truly realize this and become self-reconciled in the knowledge of our marvelous destiny, there will be no problem about the response of American civilization to the challenge either of Communist totalitarianism or of worldwide social revolution.

That response will be so real and so vibrant and so dynamic and so irresistable that the world once again will be turned upside down—or, shall we not say? turned right side up.

Has Anyone Mentioned the U.N.?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial by Norman Cousins entitled "Has Anyone Mentioned the U.N.?" which appeared in a recent edition of the Saturday Review.

This editorial urges that the offices of the U.N. be utilized in attempting to resolve the Berlin crisis. I believe this is a sound and sensible suggestion and have also urged that the Berlin summit conference be held within the framework of the U.N. with the Secretary-General, Dag Hammarskjold, participating in these deliberations. I hope that this editorial will receive the serious attention of all of the Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAS ANYONE MENTIONED THE U.N.?

The Senate Preparedness Committee has been listening to testimony about the nature of the Berlin crisis. The high point of the hearings came when Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, Army Chief of Staff, warned the Congress against expecting military victory as the result of a nuclear war over Berlin.

The decisive part of a nuclear war, General Taylor said, could come quickly, but "it might take 100 years to end the desolation and to restore some form of order."

"In my judgment," General Taylor said, "any dogmatic prediction of what will take place after an initial nuclear exchange is beyond the human capability. However, there is no reason to believe that peace is going to ensue at once, except, perhaps, the peace of the dead."

Having made it clear that a military showdown over Berlin could not exclude the possibility of nuclear war, and having dramatized the fact that victory in a nuclear war is a proposterous concept, General Taylor proceeded to declare that the United States must be prepared to wage nuclear war, if necessary, to maintain its forces in Berlin.

It was up to the Soviet leaders, he said, to back down and thus prevent the danger of a nuclear showdown over Berlin. There was a clear inference that the Soviet leaders were not so foolish or irresponsible as to go through with their plans to withdraw from Berlin and turn the problem over to the East Germans. After all, he intimated, the Russians understood the meaning of a nuclear war.

Meanwhile, Premier Nikita Khrushchev, who precipitated the crisis with his demands, has warned the United States to back down on the Berlin issue. He has expressed the hope that the United States would not be so irresponsible as to risk war over Berlin. As for the Soviet Union, he added, it is determined to go through with its plans. If nuclear war is to be averted, it is up to the United States to do the averting.

It is plain, therefore, that both the United States and the Soviet Union believe it would be monstrous and irresponsible if a war were to break out over Berlin. And each side is calling on the other side to be wise enough and responsible enough to prevent the nuclear war by backing down. But each declares its own readiness to let fly with the bombs rather than alter its position. In short, if wisdom is to prevail, each side expects the other one to furnish it. We say, in effect: "We're ready to launch a nuclear war because we can't possibly change our stand, but surely you can't be so stupid not to see that your failure to change your own stand will result in annihilation of all concerned." And the Russians, almost to the comma, are saying the same thing to us.

It becomes plain, therefore, that both sides are ready to go to war, agreeing with each other that if they should do so Berlin and all its people would be pulverized into a radioactive rubble pile in a matter of hours, with the rest of the world likely to follow in a matter of days. In short, military measures cannot possibly provide victory, but it is only the other fellow who is expected to know this.

That the fully sovereign state should be capable of this kind of logic is no surprise. It is in the nature of unfettered sovereignty to see no answer except force or the threat of force. But what is surprising is that the human beings who inhabit the planet are not splitting the sky with their indignation over the kind of ghastly nonsense that can put a torch to the world itself. A Dreyfus case can animate and arouse a whole civilization; a Hall murder case will cause excited debate from Kobe to Kalamazoo; a pyromaniac in Utah can produce concerned headlines in Tennessee. But the possible murder of a whole civilization, with pain that would

pursue men for generations to come—all this the world can take in its stride.

And no aspect of the current crisis over Berlin is more significant or tragic than the fact that the one world agency created to prevent war has hardly even been mentioned. The United Nations, which makes its appeal for the support of the world's people on the basis of its ability to keep the peace, has yet to be regarded as a factor in a possible resolution of the German situation. The problem of Berlin is inseparable from the problem of Germany. The problem of Germany is inseparable from the problem of world peace. The United Nations is the world agency charged with world peace. The United Nations, therefore, is the proper means, rather than nuclear war, or the threat of nuclear war, for attempting to resolve the Berlin crisis.

The Berlin crisis, however, gives dramatic visibility to the fact that the United Nations was never given the authority to tell the large states what to do. But if this is the case, must the world be consigned indefinitely to the peril of unanimous consent? Why shouldn't the United Nations have the power to tell the large states what to do? How else is peace to be created and maintained? If, for example, the large states insist on making and testing the weapons that can destroy all states, themselves included, then it clearly becomes the obligation of the world organization to step in and define a basis for sanity and security.

Far better to have the U.N., with all its weaknesses, wrestle with the problem of Berlin than to have the major nations attempt to resolve it with all their strength. And if we ask, how can the large states be expected to propose or accept this kind of authority, the answer is that they probably won't. But the ultimate authority and power reside with the citizens—at least in a free society. Therefore, this now becomes the first order of business for free citizens everywhere.

Man's natural habitat is now threatened. The fully sovereign nations cannot deal with that threat. The U.N. might, if enough people believe it should.

George Killion: Bay Area Profile

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to know George Killion for more than 20 years. My first contact with him came when I was an assemblyman in the California State Legislature and he was one of Governor Olson's secretaries.

Sheer ability, determination, and a genial personality are among his many fine characteristics.

I think that Hugh Russell Fraser in the March 26, 1959, issue of the San Francisco Daily Commercial News has done an outstanding service in selecting George Killion as the subject for his "Bay Area Profile":

BAY AREA PROFILE

(By Hugh Russell Fraser)

So many people have tried to analyze George Killion—to find out what makes him "tick"—that I decided to take a hand at it myself.

As president of the longest steamship line in the world, the American President Lines, he has been somewhat of a mystery.

In fact, he is the only man in all recorded history, so far as I know, who has entered the select circle of a major business success by the back door of politics.

That alone puts him in a class by himself.

Also, who ever heard of a man entering a strange, new business—new to him—by starting at the top.

George Killion did.

But the story doesn't end there. When President Truman appointed him to head the then Government-owned American President Lines, many a top APL executive wasn't the least bit worried or surprised. "He won't be here long," was the consensus.

In fact, one APL staffer was working on a song to be titled "Watch the Presidents Go By!" Several executives, knowing nothing about the steamship business, had come and gone, and nobody expected any different result on the appointment of Killion. The prophets, however, were in for a jolt.

In going to see him to get a clue to his success, I knew it was improbable I would get it by just talking to him.

Sure enough, the first inkling of the answer came not by anything he said—for as a matter of fact he seemed to be trying to throw me off the track by interviewing me instead of my interviewing him—but the first valuable clue came from a piece of paper he handed me and then started to take back. He remarked there was nothing of any value, just a newspaper clipping of a news story he had written when a newsman back in 1927. However, I insisted on reading it and so he let me borrow it.

THE CLUE

There, about the 10th paragraph down, I found the clue. And suddenly, the man's amazing success became as clear as crystal to me.

The newspaper clipping, now yellowed with age, was from his days as a reporter for the San Diego Sun. He was covering the departure of the then unknown Charles A. Lindbergh in his little Ryan monoplane for St. Louis on the first leg of the historic flight to Paris.

This Killion-written story in the San Diego Sun started off ordinarily enough: "Capt. Charles A. Lindbergh, who hopes to be the first to blaze the air trail across the Atlantic from New York to Paris, took off for St. Louis from Rockwell Field at 3:45 o'clock yesterday afternoon while a crowd of several hundred people cheered him on his way."

Then Killion described exactly what Lindbergh said before he took off, exactly what letters he carried to distinguished people, spelling out all the names. Then he gave an exact, almost minute description of his route to St. Louis, noting that he would be flying "14 miles south of Prescott, Ariz., thence over New Mexico about 10 miles south of Gallup. Then out over the northern tip of Oklahoma and straight over Kansas. * * * Today his course will carry him 10 miles south of Wichita, Kans., and about 50 miles north of Emporia, and about 11 o'clock he hopes to fly over Jefferson City."

You never saw such detail in your life. Not only did Reporter Killion describe the route to St. Louis in blueprint fashion, but he went on for 10 more paragraphs to outline the route to Paris, stating exactly where at what time Lindbergh expected to be flying over Ireland, and how his route would take him 10 miles south of Plymouth, England, all this followed by a technical discussion of the risk the flier was taking in not carrying pontoons, and how empty gasoline tanks might be used to keep him afloat in case of disaster, etc.

THOROUGH

In all my 40 years of newspaper experience, I never saw a more thoroughgoing story in my life.

So here was the secret of the man—thoroughness.

It shouted at me from every page.

In every task he undertakes he insists on knowing as much as possible about it. This I now knew.

Ordinary knowledge won't do. He must have extraordinary knowledge.

"When the boss turns up missing," said one of his colleagues, "we know where to look for him. He is probably down in the engine room, checking on something." In his mania for thoroughness, I discovered Killion has a double-edged technique. This I got not from anything he said, but from a close examination of his result-getting APL methods.

First, search for ways to hold down costs.

Second search for ways to get more cargo.

And underlying both objectives, the frank recognition that, while there are a surprising number of cost items that can be cut, there are some that actually have to be increased to bring in more cargo. It is as simple as that.

The man is a born salesman. But salesmanship alone does not explain his success. The fun he gets out of examining a thousand facets of the same problem explains his remarkable buoyancy. He never seems to be working. He seems to be exploring.

No wonder he reads a book or two a night, mostly in the field of history. (When he heard Tom Wheeler was reading my book on Andrew Jackson, he said he was going to borrow it. He'll probably read it in 2 hours.)

Of course, speed of reading has little to do with his amazing talent for thoroughness, but the way he has applied the latter as the key to success is shown at every step of what would be otherwise a mysterious career.

Let's start at the beginning.

FIRST JOB

George Leonard Killion was born at Steamboat Springs, Colo., April 15, 1901. His first job worth mentioning was as a reporter for the San Diego Sun. There he covered the waterfront, subsequently met Lindbergh, then an airmail pilot, who taught him to fly.

His preparation for all this was rather curious. As a lad of 15 he worked in the gold mines of Nevada and California. In fact, one of the mines he worked in is still operating—the Empire, as it is called, and is one of California's largest gold producers.

Those who say today that Killion "has a way with money" (and I heard the remark on Montgomery Street) might remember he first dug it out of the earth. The amount of formal education he had was not much. He studied law for a year at the University of Southern California and then a year in a business course at the University of California. Most of his real education at this time he got from reading.

The first brilliant thing he did at this time was to observe one day a stunning looking brunette on a beach near San Diego. He thought up reasons on the spot for getting acquainted with Grace Harris, and led her to the altar on Christmas Day 1922.

From the job on the San Diego Sun he went to others on the Los Angeles Examiner, the San Diego Independent, and finally the Sacramento Union. Then he opened a public relations office in the capital, and soon became legislative consultant for Safeway Stores in Oakland. This led to meeting California's future Governor Olson, then a State senator. The two became good friends and when Olson stepped into the executive mansion, he named Killion finance director.

PRUNED

Olson told Killion he wanted the budget balanced. Killion took him at his word. While the bureaucrats howled, Killion pruned and pruned.

He made a thorough-going study of every phase of the State's business. When he found, for example, the State was paying $3 to $7.50 a thousand for surety bonds, he cut the maximum to $2.50 a thousand.

He did such a good job in cutting expenses that the $80 deficit he encountered when he took office changed to a $100 surplus when he left office. Never before in California's history has such a record been made. Yet he also expanded services the State needed.

No wonder on several occasions he has been boomed for California's Governor. In Washington, D.C., the then Petroleum Administrator for War, Ralph Davies, was so impressed he insisted on getting him for his assistant. This was Killion's first national break. In 1944 he became treasurer of the Democratic National Committee.

It was the time of the Truman-Dewey campaign, about as tough an assignment as one could have. But Killion raised the money to help put Truman over.

Prior to this, of course, and unrelated to it, the American President Lines (the former Dollar Steamship Line) had been taken over by the Government. The owners were not able to repay a $7 million loan.

This sad state of affairs, however, was reversed during World War II. Then there was such a sudden upsurge of business that the Government recovered its money, whereupon R. Stanley Dollar, son of the late Capt. Robert Dollar, waged a long legal fight to regain control. Things were going from bad to worse when APL President Henry F. Grady resigned to become an ambassador. So Truman was getting ready to nominate Davies for the post when Davies demurred and suggested George Killion. Knowing something of Killion's thoroughness, Truman agreed immediately, although not without the amused observation that he would be accused of handing out a political plum to a former Democratic national treasurer. Of course, he knew he was actually doing nothing of the kind, but in shipping circles on the west coast the appointment was construed as one more example of "that bungler in the White House."

BEGUN TO HUM

However, when George Killion walked into the APL's president's office on August 12, 1947, things began to hum. And I don't mean maybe. At that time Killion knew as much about running a steamship line as I do about running an electronics firm. But he decided to learn—and fast.

He knew he was walking into a mess, and that it would take thorough knowledge, in addition to his own demonstrated financial acumen, to reverse a decided downward trend. Morale of its 4,000 employees was at a low ebb. Key executives were quitting to establish rival lines. The appointment of Killion looked to them like the last straw. This man, who came in by the back door of politics, would really put the finishing touch to the whole debacle. Or so they thought.

The first thing Killion insisted on was a new look at industrial relations. Strikes were the big threat. When Pacific Maritime Association negotiators and union leaders glared at each other during the 92-day strike, Killion made an exhaustive survey of previous maritime tieups. He did it himself. Then he tossed his statistics at the 16 other steamship operators. "We are paying a higher price for labor peace at the end of strikes than would have been necessary before the walkouts. We can get terms by settling first," he announced.

Several other operators saw the light, came to his side when they couldn't controvert his statistics. Together they reorganized the association, decided to settle beefs before they grew into issues, and began signing 3-year contracts. There was peace until 1952 when the die-hards again gained control of the group. A minor dispute over wages led to a 60-day tieup. When it was all over, Killion was proved more right than ever. It is difficult to argue with thoroughgoing statistics.

CURIOSITY

Meanwhile, Killion was dipping into what others considered the routine affairs of the company. He appeared to have an insatiable curiosity. Nor was he satisfied with pat answers. He talked directly with skippers, first officers, and pursers when their ships were in port. Soon he was showing them how to cut costs in fuel, supplies, port fees, overtime. At the same time he was expanding sales items that would make the line more attractive and interesting to shippers and passengers alike. These smart tactics began to pay off. Cargoes increased.

Bucking the tradition that nobody works in downtown San Francisco on a Saturday, Killion was at work early in the morning. He didn't insist that his staffers be there, too, but when they weren't he had a habit of calling them at home—on business. Finally, they all took the hint and came down to work. One staffer, off the record, blew up; "God damn these politicians," he exclaimed. "They are supposed to lay down on the job, and look at this ——— 5 days a week and now 6."

But there was more to come. Killion hadn't started yet. Said one vice president: "When he had us there New Year's Eve and New Year's Day, working and not celebrating, that did it. Nobody doubted any longer he meant business."

Killion is not the kind to take credit for anything, however. Even the settlement of the long legal fight with Dollar over the ownership of the company is usually credited to him. Killion denies it. "Giannini did it," he says. He called me in one day and said: "Why don't you work out a compromise between the Government and Stanley Dollar? If this suit goes on, a great San Francisco institution will be impaired beyond recovery."

A MEETING

So Giannini arranged a meeting between Dollar and Killion. The next step, of course, was a meeting between Dollar and the Attorney General of the United States, J. Howard McGrath.

Dollar said he would be damned if he was going to ask for such an interview. After all, he might be turned down. No; he wasn't going to take that risk.

At this point Killion had an idea. He wrote out a wire for Dollar to send to the Attorney General. Then he wrote out a wire for the Attorney General to send to Dollar agreeing to the meeting. He persuaded McGrath to send such a wire if Dollar sent his telegram.

This prearranged exchange of wires, rigged by Killion, did the trick. The two men met and agreed to a 50–50 compromise, later ratified by the Secretary of Commerce. And thus ended the long lawsuit.

The company was reorganized. Ralph Davies became chairman of the board and George Killion president.

Killion's tenure was now secure. He made it more so by continuing to pick able assistants.

Some of the outstanding ones he inherited from the old Dollar Line, the most notable being former Chicago ace newspaper man, Gene Hoffman. From the Atlantic coast he picked up a man who is probably the world's top passenger traffic manager, J. M. Diggs. Killion's present special assistant, Jack Berryman, was in the Orient when Killion sent for him. To get an able man, he will go halfway around the world, if necessary. Picking an efficient staff is a Killion trait.

ROMANCE

Killion himself, for all his cold appraisal of statistics, is fully conscious of the romance of his job. "We sail," he says, "some glamorous routes. Think of ports like Singapore, Calcutta, Alexandria, Naples—yes, and of attractions like Bali, Fujiyama, Taj Mahal and the Valley of the Pharoahs. All on our shipping lanes—indeed, with 90,000 miles of trade routes, we do business in more languages, more currencies, more religions than any other steamship line on earth."

It is not surprising that the newly formed World Trade Club chose Killion as its first president. An enthusiast for world trade, he will talk with anyone who will help it along. He sees the new club, located in the sumptuous quarters of the World Trade Center in the Ferry Building, as a focal point for all those interested in world trade and global good will.

"Members will come from the ranks of industry, trade, government, labor and the professions," he says. "We are all bound together by mutual interests. The motto of the new club is 'World Peace Through World Trade.'"

The more I observed George Killion the more I was convinced he gets a lot of fun out of his job. Perhaps that is back of his passion for thoroughness. He seems to thrive on problems—and, what is more uncanny, getting answers to them.

What Changes in Demand for Milk May Be Expected?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, recently it was my privilege to address the Midwest Milk Marketing Conference, at Madison, Wis. My subject was the impact of the St. Lawrence Waterway upon the economy of the Midwest.

At that meeting Louis F. Herrmann, head of the dairy section marketing organization and costs branch of the marketing research division, of this city, addressed the conference. The subject of his address was "What Changes in Demand May We Expect in the Future in Relation to Milk?"

His was a very illuminating address which is well worth reading. I ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT CHANGES IN DEMAND MAY WE EXPECT?

Ask different kinds of economists to tell you how demand for milk may change in the next 10 years and you can expect to receive answers that differ according to the specialization of the people you ask. A price analyst would base his answer primarily on incomes and the elasticity of demand. He probably would make some assumptions about any changes in future price patterns and then fall back on what he knows about the influence of changes in personal income on consumption. A specialist in market development would stress the influence of promotional activities, with reference to advertising budgets, mass media, point of sale materials, and so on. Another student of factors affecting demand might base his analysis on what he knows about the way consuming habits vary within the population.

To be practical, I would concede that each point of view would contribute something to our understanding and ability to foresee

what may happen in the next decade. Yet this morning I should like to center attention on the population aspects of the problem. When I was invited to talk to you it was suggested that it might be useful and interesting to discuss demand from the population point of view. The idea intrigued me.

You may have heard expressions of an optimistic outlook for milk, based on the increasing numbers of babies born every year. You may have heard it said that increasing proportions of people over 65 years old would bring heavier milk consumption, since this age group consumes more than those between 25 and 65. You may have heard that consumption of dairy products is higher in the West, and that population out there is increasing faster than in the rest of the country. Let's look at the facts. I think you will find them as interesting as I did, when I began digging into them for this talk.

Four features of population growth and composition may have a bearing on what milk consumption is likely to be by 1970. The first is total population; second, composition of the population by age; third, the geographic distribution; and fourth, degree of urbanization.

We might detour for a moment and consider the way in which population developments may have an effect upon milk producers and the dairy industry. Obviously, changes in the total numbers of people have an important bearing on total consumption of milk. Total population determines in some measure whether dairy farmers and milk distributors will have an expanding market or a stationary one. Next, changes in the composition of the population by age and sex also may affect total consumption. Finally, the distribution of population among regions and whether on farms, in cities or in suburbs affects the kind of a market structure that will be required within any given total demand for milk.

Now to return to the trends in population and their effect on demand.

The total population of the United States is now about 176 million. It is growing at a rate of almost 3½ million persons a year. Changes in this rate of growth, and consequently, the expected size of the total population by 1970, depend on birth rates, mortality, and migration to and from the United States. None of these rates can be predicted accurately, although they vary only within narrow limits. The Bureau of the Census recognizes the uncertainty. It suggests that by 1970 the population may be 203 million, 208 million, or 214 million—or it might even be somewhat larger or smaller than these figures. Taking the 208 million figure, it represents an increase of 18 percent.

Eighteen percent more mouths to feed, everything else remaining unchanged, would mean that in a little more than 10 years dairy farmers would need to turn out 147 billion pounds of milk a year, as compared with the 125 billion pounds produced last year. That is, everything else remaining unchanged except that the 7 billion pounds that moved under Government programs last year is figured as moving through commercial channels by 1970.

It may be that the figure of 147 billion pounds of milk is as dependable a figure as we are likely to get for expected demand by 1970. But if one has to give odds, it would be necessary to take in a range, just as the Census Bureau does in making forecasts of population. Furthermore, where the population forecasts show a range of about 6 or 7 percent, I would want a range of 10 percent or more to have the same degree of confidence about the expected demand for milk.

Among the things that are assumed unchanged in the 147-billion-pound calculation are the rates of per capita consumption. It would be astonishing if these rates did remain unchanged for the next 10 years, and quite a contrast with the past 10. In the past 10 years, butter declined 15 percent, on a per capita basis, but cheese rose 22 percent. Consumption of nonfat dry milk doubled, and cottage cheese rose 80 percent. Overall, with some other offsetting changes, per capita consumption declined only 3 percent from 1948 to 1958. This suggests that total demand for milk probably will be governed more by changes in total population numbers than by changes in eating habits.

Suppose we divide the population into groups according to age, and place of residence. Then some interesting changes appear.

In the age categories, the Census forecasts show an increase in the numbers of persons 65 years of age and older—4½ to 5 million more than today. There is more uncertainty about the persons under 18 years of age. By 1970, children may be a lower percentage of total population than today.

These age shifts would have a small effect on total demand. Under 15, nearly everyone drinks milk, and daily consumption by those who do use some milk is higher than in later years. The proportion of persons using milk drops by half after the midteens—earlier for girls and later for boys. Altogether, the small shift in age makeup of the population by 1970 seems likely to tip per capita consumption downward.

Another factor which would tend to change the U.S. average per capita consumption is geographic location. For example, the southern region now has about 31 percent of the population of the country. This proportion will drop to about 29.5 percent by 1970. In 1955, the consumption of dairy products per person in the southern region was about 16 percent lower than the U.S. average. With relatively fewer people in this area, the national average per capita consumption would rise. Taking account of all the interregional shifts expected by 19970, these alone would tend to raise per capita consumption by about 2½ pounds.

The fact that consumption is now very low in the South brings up a question about the assumption that rates within regions will remain unchanged. Households with annual incomes of less than $3,000 in 1955 made up nearly 50 percent of all households in the South, and their consumption of milk was well below average for the region. Families with incomes over $3,000 had approximately 50 percent higher rates of consumption. There is reason to expect substantial improvement of incomes with increasing industrialization of this region, and the effect of this on milk consumption should be very beneficial.

One other factor to be considered in the changing population picture is the shift from rural farm residence to urban and suburban. Farm population is declining. Rates of milk consumption are high on farms—more than 40 percent higher than the U.S. average (about two-third of it being home produced). A rough estimate of projected populations among urban, rural nonfarm and farm categories could be made assuming that farm population may remain about constant. If the increase in population by 1970 is divided proportionately among urban and rural nonfarm places, the result would be a decline in average per capita consumption of about 7 pounds.

One must conclude that of the four features of population growth and composition that I have talked about, change in total population far outweighs all the others as a factor for change in the demand for milk in the next decade. The composition of the population by age and the degree of urbanization portend very slight declines in per capita consumption, possibly 1 percent. Changes in the geographic distribution of population might tend to raise the total but by less than enough to offset the age and urbanization factor.

The 30 million, more or less, additional people to be fed by 1970 will not be found in equal proportions in all parts of the country. In the Northeast, 6 million additional persons will amount to a 14 percent increase. Eight million additional in the north central region represents an increase of 15 percent. The South, on the other hand, will increase only 13 percent. The biggest change will be in the West where 9 million additional persons will raise the population by 32 percent from its present level. These figures tell us something about demand and some of the shifts that will take place in dairy marketing.

The people on the west coast, who are facing the biggest adjustment, have already begun to consider the changes that will need to be made in their region. In California, the needs for fresh milk for the growing population have already curtailed the output of manufactured dairy products sharply. Simmons and Bressler expect population pressure to crowd dairying out of some of the more important dairy areas in California and to force the development of dairying in the northern part of the State, particularly in the Sacramento Valley. Similar developments throughout the western region will mean an increasing reliance on the Midwest for manufactured dairy products.

An analysis by Snodgrass and French of interregional competition in dairying suggested that production in the East and South may decline, relatively at least, thus expanding further the demand for manufactured products, if not for fluid milk, from Minnesota and Wisconsin. These changes would have significant effects on prices if efficiency in milk production should not continue to increase as rapidly as in recent years. If, on the supply side, there should be difficulties in going from 125 billion pounds a year to 147 billion pounds a year over the next 10 years, then the rising population and the associated demand for milk might be expected to bring about a more satisfactory price level relatively early in the decade.

Welcome to the Most Reverend John J. Wright, New Bishop of Pittsburgh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 17, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, we in Pittsburgh, Allegheny County, and western Pennsylvania heartily welcome the Most Reverend John J. Wright, D.D., as the new bishop of Pittsburgh.

Bishop Wright comes to us after a distinguished career in our sister Commonwealth of Massachusetts. The Diocese of Pittsburgh, the second largest in the United States, is honored, and the whole community will benefit by the addition of the high level and dedicated service of Bishop Wright.

Bishop Wright has given a distinguished address at his first public appearance at the Pittsburgh Press Club on March 30, 1959, and was warmly received by the local officials and representatives of our newspapers, radio, television, and various civic organizations.

I submit to the Congress Bishop Wright's address:

THE COMMON GOOD

(Address before the Press Club of Pittsburgh, Pa., by the Most Reverend John J. Wright, D.D., bishop of Pittsburgh)

THE NEED FOR NEW EMPHASIS ON ITS NATURE AND CLAIMS

In a society divided as ours so often is—divided horizontally by lines of class, creed, and color within national communities, divided vertically by lines of race, nationality, and conflicting interests in the world community—the press and the pulpit share a kindred duty of helping form an enlightened public opinion that will ultimately favor the forces which reconcile and unite divided mankind.

On every press and every pulpit, whatever its legitimate, conscientious, and necessary partisan commitments, the needs of the hour impose a sense of responsibility toward the promotion of those values which unite men and groups. An example of the way that good men are pitted against one another at the moment, and of the most likely way out of the resultant tragic divisiveness in the community, will perhaps illustrate the task I suggest that press and pulpit share.

One of the most basic questions in all social philosophy is this: Does society exist for each one of us, or does each one of us exist for society? Which, if either, of two goods provides the criterion of right or wrong, of morality and legality: the good which the individual needs and seeks for himself, or the good which the state requires and seeks for itself?

It is largely by their answers to these questions that many in our generation aline themselves to the left or to the right on the social, economic, and political questions which agitate our times. Moral and legal philosophies at the moment tend to polarize around one or the other of seemingly contrary and sometimes conflicting goods: the good of the individual and the good of the collectivity. Those who are preoccupied with the primacy of individual good tend to take their stand or find themselves accounted with the parties of the right in our era of state socialism. Those who opt for the collective good, and consequently give place of primacy to the rights of the state, turn up in our day in the ranks of the left.

Unfortunately the social philosophies to the left and those to the right have polarized at their extremes, with a consequent antagonism, bitter in its sharpness, between those in both camps who might normally be reasonable moderates. This antagonism is reflected in the spirit of suspicion with which men approach one another who disagree, however slightly, on social legislation. It is reflected also in the intemperate name-calling by which men of conservative instinct or judgment find themselves dismissed as Fascists or reactionaries, while those of more liberal impulse or adventurous vision find themselves decried as revolutionaries or anarchists.

Hence, it comes to pass, to the very great hurt, I repeat, of all concerned, that upright men find themselves unable to meet with one another on questions of either public or personal good, while they appear compelled to associate with evil companions almost fatally acquitted in the pursuit of good: individual good in the case of the political conservative, the collective good in the case of the social liberal. Conscientious citizens find themselves discredited because they sought to liberalize where a broader, more generous mood in social legislation was clearly necessary, or to conserve where a more cautious or critical spirit was the manifest need of the hour. And so, high-minded, so-called liberals are too often associated in popular opinion, if not always in fact, with actual or potential traitors; while great-hearted conservatives are frequently distressed to find themselves tarred with the same stick as bigots, misanthropes, and the hard-of-heart generally.

What to do? How find a formula which can reconcile goods which are apparently in conflict, a formula under which we can rally to the service of America and of civilization the spiritual energies and intellectual resources which are now dissipated by polarized divisions disastrous alike to personal interest and to collective well-being.

What to do? The time-tested philosophy of Christendom, blending the hope of Hebrew prophecy, the wisdom of green speculation, the sanity of Roman law, and the charity of Christian revelation, had a phrase which provides the saving word. That philosophy spoke of a third good, a good wider than that of the individual and more warm than that of the collectivity; a good with richly personal elements, yet truly public in its nature. That third good, conciliating and unifying, is more humane than the mere good of the State; it is more generous than the mere good of the mere individual. It is, to repeat, both personal and public, though not merely individual on the one hand nor merely political on the other. It is what the scholastic philosophers of Christendom and the Founding Fathers of America called the common good. Perhaps it is time to seek a reaffirmation of its nature and its claims.

What is this common good devotion to which would rally in collaborative effort generous conservatives and thoughtful liberals? It may be briefly and summarily identified as the cultural, economic, political, and spiritual heritage which is shared by the group, as opposed to the heritage particular to any individuals within the group. It is difficult to analyze the elements of this heritage, impossible to do so in a half hour. But every now and again someone speaks out above the general din of dissident individual voices and utters ideals common to us all, words expressive of our heritage of common good. When such a one so speaks, his individual characteristics fade out completely; his words sum up a good that all deeply cherish; only the utterance is his alone, that and perhaps the beauty of the particular words by which he gives expression to the common thought.

For example, Abraham Lincoln was a Republican; he lived in a specific period of American history; he presents strongly individualistic traits; he was a partisan of the northern cause in the War Between the States; it is difficult sometimes to appreciate that millions of sincere Americans profoundly disliked some of his ideas, deplored many of his policies, distrusted him personally. But when he spoke at the second inaugural and at Gettysburg he spoke for us all; for all Americans, for our citizens in every epoch, every political party, every part of the country. There is no American who does not sense that the very stuff of our national common good—all its elements, its spiritual fiber, and its political pattern are woven into the things that Lincoln said at Gettysburg.

Woodrow Wilson was a Democrat. He, too, lived in a particular period of our national history and a specific phase of our emergence into the international community. He had marked individual traits, many of which his friends found amiable, others of which his critics found distasteful. Whole areas of his political philosophy were unacceptable to millions of his fellow citizens, and some of his policies provoked the resentment of many. Yet in his public pronouncements he frequently transcended the inevitable limitations of himself, his times, and his political context. There is no one in this land who does not feel the tug of a common chord which runs through the hearts of us all when he reads the magnanimous phrasing of Wilson's declaration of war against the German Government and not the German people; or the exalted address to the Military Academy at West Point in which Wilson summarized so many of the elements of our common good and linked them, as the common good must always be linked, to the benign purposes of God and to the secrets of God's providence. Do you remember his words?

"America came into existence for a particular reason. When you look about upon these beautiful hills and up this stately stream, and then let your imagination run over the whole body of this great country from which you youngsters are drawn, far and wide, you remember that while it had aboriginal inhabitants, while there were people living here, there was no civilization which we displaced. It was as if in the providence of God a continent had been kept unused and waiting for a peaceful people who loved liberty and the rights of men more than they loved anything else, to come and set up an unselfish commonwealth. It is a very extraordinary thing. You are so familiar with American * * * history that it does not seem strange to you, but it is a very strange history, nonetheless. There is none like it in the whole annals of mankind—of men gathering out of every civilized nation in the world on an unused continent and building up a polity exactly to suit themselves, not under the domination of any ruling dynasty or of the ambitions of any royal family; doing what they pleased with their own life on a free space of land which God had made rich with every resource which was necessary for the civilization they meant to build upon it."

So the common good is all the heritage from the past and all the hope for the future which good men share under God. Common to many, it is therefore public; perfective of the individual, it remains somehow personal. It calls the individual out of himself to share things with the general community, but it puts the resources of the general community at the service of the things closest to the personality of the individual. That is what Cicero meant when he defined the common good, the res publica, in terms of a nation's altars and hearths, of the spiritual and domestic values which center about these and which serve personality: in aris et focis est res publica.

It was out of this concept of the common good that our forefathers derived their notion of the great object of the state's existence. Hence, their fine old phrase "the common weal," a phrase perpetuated in the name by which they designated their civil communities, not by the cold, collective name so dear to the totalitarian, "the state," nor with any name of special interest or partisan emphasis as "the duchy" or "the realm," but "the commonwealth" as in "the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania."

It is the concept behind warm words like "mutual" in the preambles of so many State constitutions, and in other phrases so frequent in the texts of our basic laws, as that which provides "that all shall be governed by certain laws for the common good."

It is the good which is preserved and promoted by the nurse who braves individual infection in order to serve the common good; by the scientist who forfeits individual convenience in order to increase that good; by the parent who foregoes individual advantage in order to rear future citizens to enhance that good; by the saint who renounces individual pleasure in order to sanctify the common good; by the soldier who disciplines individual preference in order to defend the common good; by the party or regime or even the National State which abdicates particular claims or prerogatives in order to conciliate those who share a common good.

It is the good which King St. Louis of France loved when he subordinated both the instincts of self and the claims of his state

to a higher common good shared with others. Perhaps you remember the incident; one thinks of it with wistful admiration as he reads the daily news. His counselors unanimously rebuked St. Louis for excessive generosity in giving to the English King land which the French had regained from British conquest. King St. Louis did not concede the English claims and he could easily have vindicated his own by force, but still he freely yielded the land. He said: "My lords, the land that I give him I give not because I am under obligation either to him or to his heirs, but so that there may be mutual love between my children and his. And it seems to me that I am making good use of what I give him, since it makes us join hands in common love who were at odds."

It is the good which another Catholic saint meant when he lamented those frozen words "mine" and "thine"—frigida ista verba meum et tuum—and rejoiced in the warm word "nostra": the things that are ours.

The common good: it is the mutual bond of all who love the good, the true, and the beautiful; who seek good things, not evil; who seek the private good of persons and the collective good of the state, but the good of both in and under and through the supreme good, which is God. It is the good which God gives us all in order to keep us together, as opposed to the good that He gives us each to keep to ourselves. It is the good before, on due occasion, both individual and state are obliged to bow: the common good.

Out of a reaffirmation of the reality and claims of the common good there would come many results greatly to be desired. A quickened appreciation of the common good would turn the tide against the wreckless setting of class against class, the irresponsible incitement of group against group. It would coordinate anew the interests and the efforts of labor plus management, tradesmen plus intellectuals, statesmen plus generals, as against the present so frequent pitting of good men against the other good men in the conflicts of labor versus management, intellectuals versus tradesmen, statesmen versus generals within the same nation and presumably seeking the same common good.

Such an appreciation of the common good which unites, as against—or, rather, as above—all particular or factional or partisan goods which divide would make possible the vital center for which certain political philosophers are pleading; a vital center which can exist only when honorable moderates of right and left prefer working with each other in behalf of the common good to working with extremists of their own respective camps, extremists who seek only the particular good after which their side aspires. Thus, the present polarized condition of society would be eased and social conservatives, anxious to preserve the heritage out of the past, would have a common ground on which to meet and work with social liberals anxious to enlarge the hope of the future. The common good includes, in the phrase of Scripture, "nova et vetera": the old heritage beloved by conservatives and the new hopes cherished by liberals.

A clearer concept of the reality and the claims of the common good will hasten general acceptance of plans for a better international order, an order which will conserve the values of the established nations, but be enriched by other, perhaps more basic and more humane supranational values, as little by little the peoples of the divided nations come to appreciate how much, how very much of our heritage out of the past and our hope for the future are shared within other nations by millions who seek the true common good of mankind.

Finally, a new emphasis on the nature of the common good will reorient the minds of men toward other goods, higher goods which transcend mere private advantage or even temporal common weal. The longer men meditate the nature and the notion of the common good, the more surely will they come to understand that there is no true good so secular, so of the earth and earthly, but what it comes from God and has been hallowed by His Christ so that, by its consecrated use, it can be a means to heaven. There is no common good, no truly human heritage or valid hope of any people which lies outside God's providence and which is not bound up with His purposes. There is no valid good which is not somehow predestined, however natural it be in itself, to find its place in the supernatural order which God has revealed and through which all things created are finally brought back to Him.

Problems of Civil Defense in Event of a Nuclear War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, there has been much public concern with problems of civil defense in case of a nuclear war. Present-day nuclear bombs have more than a million times the explosive power of the blockbuster, the largest bomb used during World War II, in addition to dangers of fallout. In the light of this public concern I believe that my recent exchange of correspondence with the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization on the question of our civil defense program would make for greater understanding of how civil defense affects our security.

I ask unanimous consent that the correspondence be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 6, 1959.

OFFICE OF CIVIL AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION,
17th and Pennsylvania Avenue NW.,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: Section IX of the Rockefeller Report on the Problems of U.S. Defense dealt with civil defense problems. Among the observations and recommendations made by the report were the following:

"In the age of the ballistic missile the known capability of a society to withstand attack will become an increasingly important deterrent.

"Difficulty does not mean impotence, however, while it may be impossible to protect the population against the blast and heat of an atomic explosion, protection against radioactive fallout and other contamination appears to be much more feasible. Equally important is increased understanding on the part of our people about the effects of modern weapons. This will enable us to respond with discipline and effectiveness to a surprise attack and it will discourage such a move because an aggressor would no longer be able to gamble that a sudden attack might disorganize our society.

"It is impossible to state certain general principles in relation to the development of any civil defense program:

"'1. Civil defense must be considered as part of the overall U.S. strategic posture. It must be faced forthrightly. It should be part of our defense planning and included in our overall strategic plans. Cadres charged with supervising civil defense activitives, both in possible preattack and the postattack phase, must be developed and trained immediately. The expense involved should be in addition to existing military outlays.

"'2. The American people need to be told more clearly the dimensions of the damage that would be inflicted on us by a sudden attack and about the measures to reduce its effects. Any civil defense program must have as a prerequisite a program of public information supported by the Federal Government and carried through at all levels.

"'3. A civil defense program should be integrated with the construction program needed for the normal development of our expanding population and economy.'

"It would be too costly to disperse existing industrial installations but tax incentives could be provided for the location of new facilities away from main concentrations.

"The main feature to note with respect to civil defense is that it is overdue. It does not make sense for the free world to engage in a major military effort without at the same time protecting its most important resources: its civilian population."

I would very much appreciate the comments of your office regarding these obvervations and your plans and proposals to effectuate the several recommendations cited.

While the Gaither report in 1957 has not yet been released publicly, nevertheless certain of its recommendations have been reliably reported in the press, among them the following:

A civil defense shelter program at a cost of around $5 billion annually for 4 to 5 years. These shelters would be designed to save lives against the perils of radioactive fallout and only incidentally to help the Nation's industry recuperate after an enemy attack.

As you will recall the Gaither report was the result of recommendations for a shelter program presented by the Federal Civil Defense Administration to the President in the Spring of 1957.

I would very much appreciate your comments regarding the aforementioned recommendation.

Sincerely,

JACOB K. JAVITS.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE
OF THE PRESIDENT,
Washington, D.C., March 13, 1959.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: Thank you for your inquiry of March 6, 1959, in which you asked for comments on certain recommendations of the Rockefeller report on the problems of U.S. defense.

In general, I may say that this report represents a thoughtful analysis of an extremely important problem. I find myself in substantial agreement with its conclusions. As you will note from the enclosed statement of the national policy on shelters, issued on May 7, 1958, our own staff studies and analyses have led us to substantially the same conclusions.

With respect to the specific principles which you quote in your letter of March 6, please note that—in somewhat different words—the President in his promulgation of the national plan for civil defense and defense mobilization supported the concept of civil defense as part of the overall U.S. strategic posture when he said: "Civil defense and defense mobilization are vital parts of the Nation's total defense."

The responsibility for supervising civil defense activities, under the national plan, is clearly assigned to (and in fact inherent in the responsibilities of) the chief execu-

tives of all levels of government, assisted by their civil defense staffs. An important implementing measure to strengthen these State and local staffs will, I hope, be provided in the appropriation for fiscal year 1960 to permit carrying out the administrative support provisions of Public Law 85–606.

This fact, of course, underscores the importance of assuring continuity of Government at all levels in order to provide leadership, direction, and service in the event of attack. We have been working in close cooperation with the Council of State Governments, the American Municipal Association, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, and the National Association of County Officials and have received gratifying support of our recommended program for continuity of Government.

The second principle referred to in the Rockefeller report is concerned with the important requirement of a public information program. The importance of public information in a civil defense program can hardly be exaggerated. As you will note, the first element of the action program in the enclosure on shelter policy concerns itself with this important area of activity.

In 1956, the Federal Civil Defense Administration had the benefit of the advice of a panel composed largely—but not entirely—of social scientists, who had the following comment:

"We share a firm conviction that the American people do not have nearly enough knowledge of the consequences of a successful nuclear attack. We recognize that there have been widely held and voiced opinions that necessary information has been withheld from them on grounds of security. We have satisfied ourselves that sufficient information has been made available to them—but it has not been successfully conveyed to them and incorporated in their feelings and actions. Thus the information has not become knowledge, and this, in our opinion, is the crux of the problem.

* * * * *

"In our opinion, the keystone of the program is knowledge, not merely information made available, but information—both frightening and hopeful—so successfully conveyed as to become useful knowledge, translated into plans, procedures, and the capability for constructive action. It has been wisely said, we think, that courage is based on knowledge of the grounds of fear and hope."

In my view, the undertaking is as difficult as it is vital. It will require a many-pronged attack. We are currently devoting a substantial share of our resources to reaching a growing segment of the American people. In addition to the usual mass-media efforts (radio, TV, magazines, newspapers, etc.), we have recently distributed approximately 36 million wallet cards, which contain simple instructions for preparedness and for proper reaction to warning signals, and over 3 million pamphlets entitled "What You Should Know About the National Plan for Civil and Defense Mobilization." A few months ago the Boy Scouts of America distributed to virtually each household in America (a total of 42 million copies) our "Handbook for Emergencies."

We have also distributed over 6,000 radiological defense training kits to high schools throughout the country and plan an additional distribution of 9,000 kits by the end of the present fiscal year. These will serve the double purpose of familiarizing high school students with the radiation phenomenon and placing, on a fairly well distributed basis throughout the country, instruments that could be used in the event of emergency by science teachers who are familiar with them.

As a part of its emergency assignment, the U.S. Office of Education is initiating a nationwide adult education program on the hazards of nuclear attack and on effective defensive measures and preparations. This will be a substantial undertaking and will require increased financial support over the next 2 years.

As you will note in the enclosed "National Policy on Shelters," the third principle cited in the Rockefeller report—that the program should be integrated with normal construction development—is included in our program. The Federal Government will itself set the example in its new construction by incorporating fallout shelters in appropriate civilian Federal buildings.

With respect to the cited recommendation from the Gaither report, as reported in the press, the enclosed policy statement makes it clear that we do not contemplate a massive federally financed shelter construction program. There is so much fallout protection in the United States to be had for only minor modification cost in private homes, apartments, commercial and industrial buildings, and in other places that I believe is not unreasonable to call upon our citizens to undertake these modest expenditures.

I appreciate very much this evidence of your interest in our program and stand ready at any time to furnish additional information should you require it.

Sincerely,

LEO A. HOEGH.

The Story of Cooperation in Boulevard Village, Kansas City, Mo.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 18, 1959

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I should like to report a success story on a housing project in Kansas City, Mo. This project had failed under rental operation. A housing cooperative purchased the project and has achieved remarkable results with mutual home ownership by the residents.

I. SUMMARY OF COOPERATIVE ACHIEVEMENTS

There are striking contrasts in every aspect of this project "before" and "after" cooperative ownership. These may be summarized as follows:

First. The success of cooperative ownership and the prompt payment of mortgage and other obligations, in contrast with the previous failure as a rental project where repeated defaults led to foreclosure.

Second. The achievement of full occupancy under cooperative ownership, in contrast with substantial vacancies under rental operation.

Third. The improvement and excellent maintenance of the housing under cooperative ownership, in contrast with its previous state of disrepair.

Fourth. The reduction in monthly housing costs by more than 20 percent under cooperative ownership in contrast to charges under rental operation.

Fifth. The new spirit of neighborliness and the stimulation of community and recreational activities under cooperative ownership, in contrast with previous attitudes where renters were strangers to each other.

II. DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT UNDER RENTAL OPERATION

The project was originally financed with an FHA-insured mortgage under section 608. It was completed in 1950 and contained 192 apartments in 48 buildings of 2-story height. After its initial period of operation, it became involved in serious financial difficulties. Vacancies increased to a point where only about 60 percent of the apartments were occupied. With reduced income, the properties fell into a state of disrepair. The owners failed to meet their mortgage payments and FHA was compelled to acquire the property by foreclosure late in 1956.

After FHA acquired the property, it made a survey of its physical condition. FHA determined that extensive repairs and improvements were necessary which would cost more than $75,000. These included repairing steps, walks, roofs and downspouts; refinishing all buildings and halls, replacing hot water heaters and improvements in grading and landscaping.

Normally, when FHA acquires a project through foreclosure, it makes these repairs and then advertises the property for sale through public bids. The purchaser then tries again to make the project into a successful rental operation. Ordinarily, the purchaser makes a downpayment of about 5 percent and FHA accepts a 95 percent purchase money mortgage, payable over a period of 40 years. In such cases there is, of course, the hazard that a project, having once failed as a rental project, may again face a failure during the 40-year mortgage period. If this should occur and the project ceases to be a profitable operation, the purchaser would not be likely to invest additional money to keep the project and meet mortgage obligations, particularly since he makes only a limited equity investment in the purchase.

Instead of following this normal course, FHA responded to requests to convert the Kansas City project to cooperative ownership. Let us now examine the results achieved under cooperative ownership.

III. RESULTS ACHIEVED UNDER COOPERATIVE OWNERSHIP

In March of 1957 a program was launched to achieve cooperative ownership. The cooperative program was aided by the FCH Company, Inc., a subsidiary of the Foundation for Cooperative Housing—a nonprofit organization with headquarters in New York and Washington. As part of the cooperative purchase program, the coperative and its advisers undertook the responsibility for directing the management and improvement of the project prior to the passage of title. It carried out a program for necessary repairs and improvements. In addition to the improvements originally contemplated by FHA, some basements of the walkout type were fixed up for use as community meeting, recreational and

hobby rooms by the members. Play areas were provided for the children. The residents began to serve on committees and participate in programs to improve the livability of the community. In these ways the project has now been physically transformed into an attractive community typified by the bright new colors in exterior painting.

Occupancy increased steadily as the program continued, so that when the cooperative took title in February of 1958, after 51 percent of the apartments had been purchased by residents, occupancy had reached 95 percent. Since that time full occupancy had been achieved. Today 80 percent of the residents are cooperative owners. By the end of this year it is expected that almost all residents will be members of the cooperative, sharing in the ownership of their homes.

As to rents prior to cooperative ownership, tenants paid $80 a month for a typical 2-bedroom apartment. The monthly carrying charges under cooperative ownership are now only $62 for such a 2-bedroom apartment. On a typical 3-bedroom apartment, monthly charges were reduced from $94.50 to $72 under cooperative ownership. These lower carrying charges were made possible because of the following favorable factors:

First. The cooperative purchased the property under a 40-year mortgage of $1,100,000 with level payments of $4,770 per month for principal and interest. This reduced monthly carrying charges for each member. Under cooperative ownership it is recognized that the homeowners take better care of property, so that such long-term mortgages are appropriate and justified.

Second. The operation of the project on a nonprofit basis eliminated profits and other charges that the former landlord had to include in the rents.

Third. Cooperative owners do some of their own work, such as interior decorating to suit their own tastes.

Fourth. Vacancy and collection losses are largely eliminated.

Even though the monthly payments by the members were lower, they included substantial reserves. Thus, an operating reserve of 3 percent of all income is set aside as a protection against contingencies. In addition, a reserve for replacement is provided so that moneys will be on hand to make necessary replacements of roofs, hot water heaters, and other things in the buildings by the time their useful life expires.

Under the cooperative ownership all mortgage and other financial obligations have been fully met each month, with payments having been made on time for principal and interest on the mortgage, taxes, insurance, replacements, and other reserves.

Besides this record of financial responsibility, the physical properties now constitute a sound mortgage security. This is not only due to the fact that they have been repaired and improved, but also because the apartments are now fully occupied.

IV. COOPERATIVE FINANCING TO HELP MEMBERS WITH THEIR DOWNPAYMENTS

Many of the tenants and other persons who wanted to become cooperative purchasers did not have enough money to make the required cash investment of $560 for a 1-bedroom apartment, 690 for a 2-bedroom apartment, and $840 for a 3-bedroom apartment. With the approval of FHA, a plan was developed under which purchasers obtained financing from the cooperative for the payment of the balance of their downpayment in monthly installments over a period of 3 years. The notes executed by the purchasers were deposited by the cooperative as security for its supplemental note of $55,000 delivered to FHA. This supplemental note represented the balance of the payment on the purchase price and closing adjustments.

The supplemental note to FHA was to be paid off by the cooperative within 3 years. During the first year a total of $27,551 has been paid to FHA on this note, so that the balance has now been reduced to $27,449. At this rate the FHA supplemental note will be fully retired in 2 years instead of the prescribed period of 3 years.

Payments on this supplemental note are derived from collections on the notes of the cooperative members. They have been completing their downpayments by meeting the monthly installments on their notes when due. This was facilitated because the amount of the monthly payments on their individual notes equals the savings which the members enjoy under cooperative ownership. Thus, on a 2-bedroom apartment, where the member formerly paid a rent of $80, he now pays $18 less each month. This sum of $18 is the monthly payment on the note of the member. In about 3 years, when the member has completed building up his cash investment of $690 on his 2-bedroom apartment, monthly payments will be only $62.

V. NEW COMMUNITY SPIRIT AND ACTIVITIES OF MEMBERS

The cooperative community now has a new spirit of neighborliness. Members are active in many clubs and recreational functions for children of all ages and adults. To express this change in attitude, the name of the development was changed to Boulevard Village. Instead of referring to their residence as the Van Brunt project, cooperative owners now say they live in the village. It is no longer a project. It is a community of friendly neighbors.

Before the cooperative took title to the project, it held a meeting of its members to elect a board of directors from among the membership living in the village. This elected board of directors has full control at all times of the program and activities of the cooperative. Membership meetings are held frequently. In addition, members of the cooperative serve on various committees, such as house and grounds, membership, publications, and social. A monthly newspaper, the Boulevard Villager, is published by and for the residents of the village. Reading through this community newspaper, one is impressed by the growing spirit of neighborliness and group endeavor that characterizes this entire program.

VI. RECOGNITION BY FHA AND RESIDENTS OF CONTRIBUTION MADE BY COOPERATIVE TO BETTER COMMUNITY LIVING

The cooperative members have a sense of pride in their community and its accomplishments and are fully aware of their responsibilities. This attitude on the part of the members was eloquently set forth in a letter to Mr. Norman P. Mason—then Commissioner of FHA and now Administrator of HHFA—signed by the board of directors of the cooperative at the time they took title to the property. I quote that letter in full, as it represents a direct expression from the people who participated in the transformation of this community from a rental project to a community of cooperative homeowners:

BOULEVARD VILLAGE, INC.,
Kansas City, Mo., February 20, 1958.

The Honorable NORMAN P. MASON,
Commissioner, Federal Housing Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MASON: As members of the board of directors elected by the membership of Boulevard Village, Inc., we are writing to express our sincere appreciation and gratitude for your notable accomplishment in achieving cooperative ownership for our housing development in Kansas City with all of the benefits for the people which this entails.

By common admission, this project was deficient in construction, in a state of disrepair, and generally unattractive. As a result, occupancy had fallen to a point below 60 percent. The Government had been compelled to foreclose on the property which faced an uncertain and hazardous future.

Through conversion to cooperative ownership and the use of income to make much-needed improvements, Boulevard Village has been transformed into an attractive community. Major construction deficiencies have been corrected and repairs made. Exteriors of the buildings have been repainted in attractive colors, along with the repainting of halls and interiors.

Even more significant than the physical transformation of the properties, there has been a change in the character of the community and its occupancy. The rate of occupancy has been steadily increasing until we are now above the 90-percent level and shortly expect to achieve full occupancy. A majority of the dwellings are occupied by members of the cooperative corporation which owns the property and we look forward soon to occupancy solely by cooperative owners. Above all, we and other members of this community are proud to live here and count ourselves as owners responsible for the future improvement and development of our community.

There is a new spirit of neighborliness which accompanied our cooperative efforts. Many of the residents have served on committees to promote the welfare and improvement of our community. We have held social functions for people who had been strangers. Our members have developed a sense of belonging to a community which is their own. We are making plans for other cooperative activities, including a nursery school, teenage and adult recreational rooms, playgrounds, and buying clubs.

We are making this report to you about our activities and progress because you have

made this program possible. On behalf of all of the members of our cooperative, may we express our everlasting gratitude for your leadership, initiative, and foresight in enabling us to achieve cooperative ownership of this housing community.

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT LE HEW,
President.
REUBEN D. SINEX,
Vice President.
B. R. DEYDEN,
Secretary.
NEIL THORNBURG,
Treasurer.
FRIEDA PROVINCE,
Assistant Secretary.
JOSEPHINE KLEIN,
Assistant Secretary.
GLENN L. ANDERSON,
Assistant Treasurer.

Equally significant is the reply sent by Mr. Mason to the president of the cooperative. I quote that reply in full as showing a recognition and appreciation by FHA of the contribution which cooperatives can make to better housing:

MARCH 6, 1958.

Mr. ROBERT LE HEW,
President, Boulevard Village, Inc.,
Kansas City, Mo.

DEAR MR. LE HEW: I want to thank you for the fine expression of appreciation contained in the letter signed by you and the other six members of the board of directors of Boulevard Village.

We all had our moments of concern during the pioneering days of your project. However, we had no doubts that the cooperative technique would serve a good purpose here, since it has so well proven its worth in cooperative housing elsewhere. The question is always present, Will people make the proper use of it, and will there be good leadership which will develop good communities?

Judging from all reports I have received, your group has risen to the occasion and is giving a good account of itself. We thank you again for your letter and assure you it is a real pleasure to have been of service to you. One of the jobs of the FHA is to help people help themselves. In this, both your group and FHA can take pride in Boulevard Village.

May you long enjoy your community of cooperative homes.

Sincerely yours,

NORMAN P. MASON,
Commissioner.

VII. CONCLUSION

It is gratifying to observe an agency of government which was prepared to take leadership in encouraging cooperative ownership of a distressed property. FHA's action made sense as a matter of good business, since a property which was in grave financial difficulties was converted into a sound investment. The mortgage of the cooperative is adequately secured by improved properties which are occupied by cooperative homeowners. The record of prompt fulfillment of mortgage and other obligations demonstrates the business wisdom of the transaction. Moreover, the properties were sold by FHA for the full market value as appraised by FHA, so no subsidies were involved.

FHA's action also made good sense as a matter of public policy, since cooperative ownership provided better homes for less money. It also produced a community with a wholesome environment for families with children, who participate as friendly neighbors in many educational and recreational activities in their village.

The National Archivist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, the National Archivist is the custodian of the past. He preserves the records that spell out the history of our country.

Evan Hill has written about the great work done by the National Archivist and the department of government he heads in an article that appeared in the Saturday Review.

A condensation of this article was publish in the Reader's Digest of March 1959, which I extend as part of these remarks and commend to your reading:

STRONGBOX FOR THE NATION'S HISTORY—THE RECORDS OF THE PAST SERVE THE NEEDS OF THE PRESENT AND FUTURE

(By Evan Hill)

(Condensed from Saturday Review)

Here, behind 6½-ton bronze doors, protected by concrete and steel from heat and cold, dampness and sunlight, the collected experience of a Nation is preserved for the ages.

Here you can see the three great charters of the United States: the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. Here are the original 507 bound volumes, firmly quill-penned from 1774 to 1789, that record the birth struggles of a Nation; the Treaty of Paris, which formally ended the American Revolution; Admiral Perry's reports on the opening of Japan; Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation.

Here are Gen. George Custer's last report before the Little Big Horn massacre; the receipt for the Alaska Purchase; the Japanese and German surrender documents which ended the fighting in World War II.

This is our inspiring National Archives Building, whose huge limestone columns reach high above Constitution Avenue in Washington, D.C. Here Dr. Wayne C. Grover, Archivist of the United States, and a staff of 250 guard a priceless heritage—the permanently valuable documents of almost every U.S. agency that ever existed. In the building's 196 air-conditioned, humidity-controlled stack areas, filed in hundreds of thousands of specially designed boxes and thousands of rows of steel shelving, are the letters of Presidents and Kings, the hopes of Senators, the worries of our consuls abroad.

But the great building is far from being a dead-storage loft. This strongbox for the Nation's history is constantly used. Each year the National Archives answers more than 400,000 questions.

When the U.S. Coast Guard wanted to study air and ice conditions that threaten navigation in the Bering Sea, it went to the Archives to read through half a century in the logs of U.S. vessels that have plied the Arctic. General Eisenhower's weather experts pored over thousands of Weather Bureau records in the National Archives to suggest dates for the Normandy invasion. In 1944 when Pentagon planners were preparing for General MacArthur's return to the Philippines, they were able to study the islands from 150 Spanish-made maps taken from Spain in 1898. Some were so finely detailed, even tracing jungle trails, that for certain areas they were superior to any other maps available.

Almost half of the Archives' aid goes to ordinary citizens. Daily it supplies records—passenger lists, census takers' information sheets, masses of corresponednce—to at least 100 individuals who just walk in seeking information. In a single year it may receive as many as 10,000 requests for proof of age or citizenship. Recently an 80-year-old Swedish-born South Dakota farmer decided to renew his application for social security benefits. For months he had been trying to prove that he was a U.S. citizen, but in the records of the Immigration Service and his district court he simply did not exist. Finally he wrote the Department of the Interior, which sent his letter to the National Archives. There a young archivist found documents attached to the old man's turn-of-the-century homestead application that proved he had been naturalized for more than 60 years. His social security check now arrives regularly.

In California a 29-year-old Japanese-American wanted to go to college, but could not produce a high-school diploma. Interned during World War II in a west coast relocation center, he had completed his secondary education in a school that no longer existed. The National Archives searched the files of the defunct War Relocation Authority, mailed him a transcript of his record.

Thanks to the work of Herman R. Friis, Chief Archivist in charge of cartographic records, a San Diego sea captain was able to prove to a court's satisfaction that he was not guilty of navigating from outdated charts when his ship rammed an offshore freighter. The skipper was returned to his command.

It was not always so easy to find Federal documents that suddenly became vital. For more than a century and a half the majority of the Government's noncurrent records were scattered helter-skelter, often stored inaccessibly in musty, damp cellars or dusty garrets. Thieves mutilated valuable papers to get at rare stamps or the autographs of the Nation's heroes. One Government official blithely sold 400 tons of Federal records to a junk dealer because he needed office space. Finally, after a succession of Presidents had warned about the slovenly care, President Herbert Hoover laid the cornerstone for the $9 million National Archives building.

Even before the building was completed, records by the ton began arriving from the War Department, the General Land Office, the Census Bureau, the Veterans' Administration from hundreds of almost forgotten dead-storage rooms. And experts faced up to the prodigious task of sorting, discarding, fumigating, and cataloging the Nation's history—a process that still goes on.

The winnowing of the valuable wheat from the chaff of bureaucracy is done by specialists in the inner workings of specific Government agencies, who discard routine housekeeping records, cull out papers duplicated elsewhere. They place some documents on "disposal schedules"—to be destroyed after time has made them of no further interest. Always the goal is to preserve material that shows how Federal policy was formed, that may be of value to scholars and historians.

The United States accumulates about 4 million cubic feet of Federal records each year. Of this, only 20 percent is of any permanent value; the rest is eventually destroyed. But even with such severe winnowing there is always the problem of space. Although microfilm could be an answer, the Archives has on file only about 75,000 rolls of such film—less than 1 percent of the building's volume. Storage space is less expensive than microfilming, so only selected documents are filmed: fragile papers that would crumble with handling, documents in frequent demand by libraries and universities, records such as original census schedules that are in constant use and take up immense space. Microfilm of some of the Nation's most valuable records has been shipped to secret storage areas as insurance against

a disaster that might destroy the originals in Washington.

Most of the half-million Americans who visit the Archives building each year are sightseers, come to view the great charters of U.S. freedom in the domed Exhibition Hall, and to wander through the sweeping corridor gallery lined with parchment and paper treasures. But, while they look, other Americans in search rooms and stack areas throughout the huge building are seeking the answers to questions that cannot be answered any other place in the world.

Among the most frequent users of the Archives are professional searchers hired by industry and individuals on personal quests. Petroleum companies are constantly exploring the records to validate land titles before they lease and drill. A Wisconsin construction company studied regional snowfall depths for the last 50 years so it would know just how strong to construct house roofs. A worried citizen called before a loyalty board was cleared when he proved through World War I Government employment records that the board had confused him with another man of the same name.

When the State of Ohio was planning the Ohio Turnpike, highway engineers knew that the proposed route cut across a region pocked with abandoned mine shafts. No one knew exactly where they were, however, for they had been sealed years earlier by WPA workers. If the shafts could not be pinpointed, the area would have to be detoured—there could be no risk of collapse. The Archives produced microfilmed records of the WPA project.

Scholars and authors flock to the Archives to authenticate historical settings, or to refresh memories. Carl Sandburg probed through Civil War photos in the famous Matthew Brady collection for his volume, "Storm Over the Land." Margaret Landon spent more than a month in the Archives, reading 1862–67 Siamese consular records to get background for "Anna and the King of Siam."

A writer wanted to pinpoint the 1849 burial date of Edgar Allan Poe. Literary historians agreed that the day had been gloomy, but split on whether it was October 8 or 9. The National Archives reported Baltimore weather was sunny on October 9, overcast the previous day. The controversy was settled.

Many movie producers use the Archives to guarantee the historical accuracy of their films. In the vaults are miles of film ranging from World War II movies captured from Germany and Japan to shots of Orville Wright flying Army trials at Fort Myer in 1908.

Dr. Grover and his assistants operate their trust as the memory of a nation, a library for scholars, and an inspiration for intelligent citizenship. They give meaning to the inscription at the building's Pennsylvania Avenue entrance: "What Is Past Is Prologue."

Equal Pay for Comparable Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Mrs. Ruby Poole, national chairman of legislation, National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, on S. 3145, which I joined in cosponsoring. The support of this national organization is a matter of particular interest and deserves consideration.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY MRS. RUBY POOLE, NATIONAL CHAIRMAN OF LEGISLATION, ON FEDERAL EQUAL PAY BILLS

The National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, organized in 3,355 clubs in the 49 States, Hawaii, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico, with a membership of almost 175,000 business and professional women, supports in its national legislation platform, equal pay for comparable work.

The national legislative steering committee has studied the bills introduced in the House and has voted in favor of H.R. 3866 introduced by Mr. KEARNS of Pennsylvania, and all other bills identical to it, including S. 3145 introduced in the Senate by Senators COOPER, CASE, JAVITS, and PROUTY.

Our members hope that hearings will be held on bills to prohibit discrimination on account of sex by employers having employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce and to provide procedures for assisting employees in collecting lost wages. We believe that all of the equal pay bills that have been introduced in the House, and those other than S. 3145 that will be introduced in the Senate, require the favorable attention of the House or Senate subcommittee, charged with the responsibility for such hearings.

Alumnus of Harvard Business School Finds Senatorial Campaign a Rich Adventure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PRESCOTT BUSH
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, in the Harvard Business School Bulletin for February 1959, one of the alumni of the school wrote a story concerning the campaign of Senator HUGH SCOTT, of Pennsylvania. I found it to be not only an entertaining story, but a highly instructive one. I believe it will be of interest to all who read the RECORD and all who are interested in what is involved in a senatorial campaign. I ask unanimous consent that the article, which is entitled "I Go Into Politics," and which was written by Thomas H. Nimick, Jr., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I GO INTO POLITICS

(By Thomas H. Nimick, Jr., 1950, assistant to senior vice president, the Shenango Furnace Co.)

Propelled by one of the speakers at the 50th anniversary conference, I went into politics last fall. For 6 weeks I traveled all over the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, careened at top speed from strategy conferences to plant gates, from beauty contests to taverns as an advance man in HUGH SCOTT's successful campaign for the U.S. Senate. Out of it I gained a sense of real satisfaction, a firsthand education in an unfamiliar field, and an exciting, refreshing—if tiring—experience.

I almost felt that Dean David was looking right at me last September when he said: "The prime necessity for the businessman today is * * * creativity in his dangerously neglected social and political functions." A business friend of mine—David Gile—had come to the conference with me and we both stirred uneasily in our seats when we heard this admonition. Only recently we had been asked to join the Scott campaign and were then actively considering what we should do.

The whole business was unsettling, to say the least. Political campaigning was a total enigma to me. In fact, the whole arena of politics was so foreign that I did not even know how to judge the performers. Not by inheritance, environment nor experience was I qualified to make any political judgments. My only attribute seemed to be that I was willing to be educated.

Furthermore, I had to worry over several factors in making my decision:

1. The philosophy and stature of the man and his cause;

2. The need for my services and my ability to perform;

3. The change in my present, and possibly future, way of life—family, business, and civic, as well as political.

How did a neophyte like me come to be asked in the first place? Frankly, I am not entirely clear on this point. I first met HUGH SCOTT through a passive relationship that he had established with a group of younger businessmen during the preprimary in January. (A preprimary is not an election by the public at large, but a nomination by the party chairmen and other leaders.) SCOTT had been touring the State to become better acquainted with the various groups of people and their problems and to sound out his political strength before actually declaring himself available for the nomination.

When he visited Pittsburgh, we arranged a luncheon for him and put together a group which was to become the Western Pennsylvania Businessmen for HUGH SCOTT. This committee was mainly a "stand up and be counted" movement to stimulate publicity and grassroots support; subsequently, all the members became associated with the Citizens for Scott-McGonigle. Through these meetings Dave Gile and I developed a speaking acquaintance with the candidate, but the setup was hardly an introduction to practical politics.

After SCOTT won his spot on the party ticket and endorsement in the primary election in May, a series of planning sessions were held. Each one was more gloomy than the last; everyone agreed that unless major shifts took place, SCOTT would be defeated in the general elections come November. Every national survey by magazines and newspapers, except one, definitely was predicting that he would lose.

Late in August, some members of the citizens committee suggested that Mr. SCOTT could make good use of "advance men" with his staff, and Dave Gile and I were approached for the job. The duties of the advance man, at this time, seemed to be relatively simple: we were to check out plans which had already been concretely established by the State committe staff in great detail by going out into the field and clearing them with the various local officials. But why Dave and me? True, we knew Mr. SCOTT through the preprimary acquaintance, and both admired him and his cause, but what did we personally know of practical politics? Were there not better qualified men?

A FLAVOR OF FRESHNESS

Undoubtedly there were. However, it might be that businessmen could adopt their

methods to campaigning—and, anyway, there was nothing to lose since HUGH SCOTT did not have a competent advance man previously assigned to his staff. The citizens committee believed that it was worth a try to have business techniques applied to a political campaign. Furthermore, enthusiastic and optimistic amateurs can be a real asset because they lend a flavor of freshness to a campaign which has great popular appeal. The 1952 Eisenhower crusade is a prime example.

At any rate, the Scott group approached the Pittsburgh Citizens for Scott-McGonigle, after securing the approval of the Allegheny County Republican Committee, with a view to improving the planning of the campaign. Up to that time, the citizens had been primarily concerned with the important but uncreative mechanics of registration drives, fund-raising and poll-watching on election day. Dave met with the group of citizens and made his decision to join up. The committee concluded that I should make the same decision, but, unfortunately, at that particular time I was on the Shenango collective-bargaining team at the Dover, Ohio, plant—a most demanding assignment which temporarily excluded all other considerations.

The Saturday I returned, Dave phoned and in our conversation reminded me of Dean David's warning remarks at the business school conference about businessmen and their neglect of their political function. He pointed out that a chance was now available to resolve this problem by joining him in this assignment.

My initial reaction was: "This is it." However, upon serious reflection, I asked myself: "What is this job that I am getting into; what are the objectives, the mechanics, the people? What will it do to my business, home, and community life? And how much do I know about HUGH SCOTT?"

When judging a man and his group one has to review an entire framework of value, beginning with belief in God and country. Once you decide that these overall beliefs transcend any political party, and are coincident with the principles of the candidate, you can then analyze the character and political shadings of the man himself.

SCOTT was the Republican choice, but as we have often found, Republicans and/or Democrats can wear many and varicolored coats. When I looked up SCOTT's biography, however, I found that he is quite a fellow. Professionally he holds a senior partnership in a well regarded Philadelphia law firm, and is a former chairman of the criminal law committee of the Pennsylvania Bar Association. As an author in the legal profession, he has written "Scott on Bailments," a widely quoted treatise. A good family man, he is a lay reader in his church, and, in general, a solid citizen.

Politically, he is well liked by all varieties of religious, ethnic, business, and professional groups because of his hard work and fair approach in handling their problems. He is a moderate Republican when the human element is involved, but puts "Mr. Scrooge" to shame when doling out the taxpayers' dollars. He had been national chairman and is general counsel for the Republican Party. An early supporter of Eisenhower for President, he was chairman of the headquarters staff for his election in the 1952 and 1956 campaigns, but still reserves the right to disagree with him, and does so on many occasions; e.g., the distressed area redevelopment loans which would ultimately increase Federal revenues.

As a Member of Congress for 16 years, he became most influential in foreign policy affairs and judiciary matters. He was on the Rules Committee, represented the United States at UNESCO, and is one of the very few Congressmen who had voluntarily served in both World War II (all theaters) and the Korean conflict.

SCOTT has a strong dedication to principles, but does not stubbornly and dogmatically sacrifice long-term strategy by refusing to compromise on short-term tactics. His one theme song has been that his vote is not owned by any group or any one. He is known as a man of real intellect, an enthusiast about promoting and strengthening the free-enterprise system.

But how about my usefulness in a major campaign like this one? It was a moot question as to whether Dave and I would be acceptable to the State chairman and his staff. There were five candidates from each party being elected by a statewide vote, all campaigning across the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and they were programed from their State headquarters in Harrisburg. As advance men we would be members of the staff of one candidate in the Republican camp. Although volunteers, we would be on the same level as any of the paid members. But with no background, or experience—amateurs entering a contest during the "big push"—would we be welcome to a professional crew that had been working for many years, day in and day out? The compelling fact was, however, that no competent person was on top to fill this crucial role of advance man to SCOTT.

Finally, there were the personal considerations. How could I possibly carry water on both shoulders for a period of 6 weeks? I would have to execute the duties and responsibilities of my business position, as well as performing adequately my new political assignment. This was a tough question to answer, especially as I was not certain exactly what campaigning would involve.

JUMPING—BUT NOT THE TRACKS

Yet, these were not the only areas to be considered: I had to look at my family and civic activities, too. My wife would have to resign herself to the fact that we would not have any spare time for social events apart from those connected with furthering the political fortunes of HUGH SCOTT. Also, in all likelihood, I would be traveling every weekend since the most advantageous arrangement would be to leave the office Friday and return Tuesday. Dave Gile and I could thus leap-frog each other, and carry out the whole political assignment between us in a way that would permit us to do our regular jobs as well. So Florence would have to be understanding about this sudden change in our lives.

Finally, the annual United Fund drive and the budget meetings of the Community Chest were just getting underway. A group of volunteers working for a charitable or professional organization is going to be effective only if each member bears his portion of the routine tasks, plus going those extra steps to supply the creative ideas and enthusiasm for the various projects. I would be unable to do either one for the period of the campaign. Ultimately, I decided that service in politics was simply more important for that particular period of time, so I announced my inclination to my friends on these various committees and boards. When I first made the proposal, they were all sure that I had jumped the tracks.

Then there was the matter of paying the bills. Neither the State committee nor SCOTT himself could promise any remuneration or even reimbursements for expenses. If I could not personally locate someone who was willing to help out with some cash, this could be rather serious. So I called on a few of my older friends, and several of them were more than anxious to help. Here was somebody taking on a job which their own consciences had always urged them to do. They agreed that this was a case of "young men for action—old men for counsel."

NO PARLOR LOUDMOUTH HE

Finally, there were a few very subjective considerations. I had been a great one for making statements that we all should give more of ourselves to political thinking and action. Now I was up against it. What was I to be—a hypocritical parlor loudmouth who concurred with the "old chestnut" that "America's chief weakness is that our most intelligent men are trying to operate in spite of the Government instead of helping to manage it" but did nothing about it or a genuine political entrepreneur? Basically, I was convinced that all the doubts I had about accepting the challenge were devices for avoiding change in a very comfortable pattern of life. Also, I was caught by the thrill of entering a new area to try out one's past experiences and abilities in an almost limitless field—the total voting population of Pennsylvania—against the limiting adversary—time. The whole project looked exciting, interesting, and important.

So I said "Yes," and Dave and I were off into the arena to campaign. The arena was the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania: 350 miles long, 150 miles wide, 12 million population—of whom 6 million could vote but only 4.2 million probably would bother to get to the polls in an off-year election. The political campaigning entities are the 67 counties each with a Republican county chairman. If the county is Republican, the total facilities of the courthouse and local dignitaries would be available.

Each of these counties varies in many aspects—religion, industry, agriculture, central cities, highway, rail or water transportation, civil rights, disaster economies, area redevelopment, and so on. Sixteen years as a Congressman, plus his previous traveling had equipped SCOTT with a working knowledge of most of these problems, but he was runing for the Senate and also had to have a thorough knowledge of foreign affairs and national issues.

But understanding of these problems is not enough to get oneself elected. To communicate with the interested voters, the most important political asset is a convincing, appealing, intelligent personality. How is this to be achieved, and by whom? What is the structure of a campaign?

As I mentioned previously, each statewide candidate came under the nominal guidance of the State committee program director. However, the basic and detailed scheduling is coordinated through the efforts of the various county chairmen and the candidate's personal staff. Aside from SCOTT himself, the campaign manager and treasurer was the leader of the team. In the nerve center, manned night and day, we had two executive secretaries who were supplemented by anyone happening to be in the headquarters at the time. Then there were various specialists—like the press release men, public relations specialist, legislative assistant, campaign scheduler, photographer, and advance men—that made up the 25 members of our circle.

BEATING GUMS AND DRUMS

Our job was to expose our product as effectively and efficiently as his excellent mind and health would allow, and our basic pieces of equipment were the telephone and the coffee pot. A format was developed which squeezed the utmost from every minute of every day and put across his name, face and viewpoint to as many of the opposing camp's voters as would open their eyes. Given a limited amount of time and dollars, our neophytic political sense developed an efficiency code that every penny and every minute should pay off in converted voters or guiding compatible ones to the polls.

SCOTT as a Congressman had not had the chance to become as well known statewide as his opponent who was the Governor; therefore, first, the name was emphasized. The second phase was to establish him as the Governor's opposition and, lastly, in time only, to drum the philosophy and platform. This strategy was substantiated by the New

York Times which had a full-page article predicting a Democratic landslide which would smother HUGH SCOTT because neither his name nor his record were known.

The procedure used for retailing our merchandise seems deceptively simple; a map of Pennsylvania showing the 67 counties was spotted with the dates of accepted speaking engagements. Adjacent county chairmen were contacted to coordinate appearances for the same or following day in the areas of their choice. Once the calendar-geographical problem was solved so that we did not exhaust the candidate with nonproductive traveling, the details of the actual visit were pinned down with the local people.

OILING UP THE MACHINE

The county chairmen vary all the way from the aged incumbent courthouse payroller in a highly agrarian area to the young aggressive businessman in an industrialized but economically distressed section. Most of them are congenial fellows who were anxious to work out an effective program. Nevertheless, we had to sell some on the idea that HUGH SCOTT would appear on the appointed day and hour, would meet schedule commitments and could hold press conferences and TV interviews without previous rehearsals or briefings. Over the years, not many party leaders had been so talented and conscientious. As the word spread and our enthusiasm caught on, county chairmen became less and less reticent. But still it was tricky to work out visits which corresponded both with what we thought made sense and what he did. One man was convinced, for example, that the only way to campaign effectively was to go from tavern to tavern all day long.

The final result of our efforts might look like this:

A TYPICAL DAY

(Prefaced by speaking appearance the day before which ended at 1 a.m.)

4:45 a.m., reveille.

6 a.m., Budd Manufacturing Co., plant-gate handshake, 1,700 men.

7 a.m., visit with commuters at PTC trolley and bus terminal.

8 a.m., breakfast with associates for skull session.

9:30 a.m., opening of headquarters for Fred Gartner, congressional candidate from Sixth District (SCOTT's own) and Tobias Goldberg, candidate for the State legislature.

11 a.m., office appointment, congressional affairs.

12 noon, leave for Drexel Hill—Mrs. Scott joins group.

12:30 p.m., luncheon speech, Women's Republican Club of Delaware County.

1:30 p.m., leave for Lebanon via Pennsylvania Turnpike.

2:30 p.m., arrive Citizens for Scott-McGonigle headquarters.

3:30 p.m., Bethlehem Steel Co. plant-gate handshake.

4:15 p.m., Lebanon Daily News interview.

4:45 p.m., Radio Station WCBR, 15-minute speech.

5 p.m., Radio Station WCBR, 15-minute tape-recorded interview with Hy White.

5:30 p.m., State Senator Thomas Ehrgood's house, meet president of Young Republican Club of Lebanon.

6 p.m., YMCA 100th anniversary dinner.

8 p.m., Lincoln Republican Club, speech plus question and answer period.

8:45 p.m., leave for Harrisburg.

9:35 p.m., arrive TV station with motorcycle escort.

10 p.m., WTPA-TV "Capitol Correspondents," half-hour panel show.

11 p.m., leave for Philadelphia and be ready for another such day.

That kind of day requires physical stamina, certainly, but the grueling mental gymnastics are at least as horrendous. SCOTT had to be aware of all pertinent issues of the day: Matsu and Quemoy have now faded from memory but were headlines then, as were the road programs, synagogue bombings, cinder scandals, and so on. Interspersed with all this, of course, are all the flash crises: What about the press release concerning civil rights? Don't forget to follow up those pending congressional appointments to the military service academies. How can we anticipate the next political accusation of the opposition? Why can't the Republicans show more enthusiasm in East Weston?

Then you never know what untoward event is going to upset your plans. During one plant visit we came across a local committeeman who must have been raised in the Haymarket Square days of the riots. He had called his friend the local police captain and persuaded him to send five squad cars fully armed to the scene. Fortunately we arrived before SCOTT and persuaded this terror-stricken little man that we were not saber rattlers, and please would he call off the commandos?

GIVING THE OPPOSITION THE GATE

We put great store in the plant visits, and arranged as many as possible. Held in the cold pre-dawn with only the candidate and two associates present, we definitely avoided the fanfare which might develop if the management was forewarned. After many of these informal "meet your candidate" affairs, the opposition became concerned. A Republican mayor of one town told us that the later plant visit of the opposition candidate was publicized, ostentatious, and lacked only the bray of Sicilian donkeys to make it complete.

Our total equipment for these tours consisted of a bus, station wagon with sound equipment and the personnel vehicle which carried the candidate and his wife (whose charm was a major asset throughout), campaign assistant, press man, photographer and driver-advance man, plus baggage. This group of people traveled more than 10,000 miles through Penn's Woods by plane, train and taxi.

Meanwhile, back at the office, another type of campaign is being waged. The candidate is being exposed by mail, matches, and mannequins; volunteers of the citizens groups are addressing over a hundred thousand pieces of literature featuring the candidate, plus an equal number handed out at many factories and on street corners; assorted ethnic groups are getting out special mailings which they sponsored; several professional associations have books of matches printed and produced films to show at their meetings.

To make all this work, the group has to function tirelessly, with single-minded dedication to the goal of success, coupled with perception and controlled sensitivity to the whims and desires of the others.

To adjust suddenly to the new and completely novel life of politics was easier for me than the decision to make the transition. I suppose I found it difficult to decide because I was tied down by the inherent assumptions about politics and the practice thereof held by most businessmen:

1. Dishonesty—moral, intellectual and/or criminal—must exist in a politicians life.

2. A man must compromise his principles if he is to be a successful politician.

3. No matter what one's individual ideals and objectives may be, they must be sacrificed to the consensus of the group.

4. It is not right to inflict the inevitable economic insecurity and possible domestic dislocations on one's family.

5. If a man is a success in his corporate career and civic responsibilities he has fulfilled his obligation to society.

6. Public promotion of individuals is vulgar.

7. If a man is successful in a business career, an appointive public office might be available to him.

8. Politics is set on a lower moral and intellectual level than business.

These preconceptions may be true to a degree, but to accept them in full is like believing that all businessmen are "robber barons." I have three schoolmates who are now also freshmen in the U.S. Congress. These men, one Republican and two Democrats, do not appear to be two-headed monsters who will shred the moral fiber of our civilization. Any of them, however, might make sincere, dedicated and directed efforts to rearrange our economic and social structure. It is up to the businessman to make sure that his views are represented and considered by these people.

TOO MANY ARMCHAIR POLITICIANS

He should sound off not only in the directors' meetings as the professional manager but also in the community hall as the citizen holding an elective post. Unfortunately, only a few do so; the rest keep themselves isolated from any political action by a routine and secure corporate career with compatible civic responsibilities. When we were campaigning in Philadelphia, a friend gave me all sorts of advice as to how SCOTT should attack the enemy. I listened with great interest to his heated and enthusiastic words as we stood in a drowning rain. He told me that he had taken this day off to carry out a charitable project, so I urged him to take time to join us for a while during our campaign. Suddenly our organization became the most leprous group of characters that ever pledged allegiance, and he quickly ended his association and literally fled into the crowd. He was not about to interrupt his preplanned career. Too bad—for him. He missed an invigorating and educational experience.

Ten Commandments for Parents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in a recent sermon, Rabbi Emmet A. Frank, of the Beth El Hebrew Congregation of Alexandria, Va., outlined 10 commandments for parents which deserve thoughtful consideration by every father and mother.

Because his words impressed me so deeply, I would like to share them with my colleagues, and so I ask unanimous consent that the 10 commandments for parents be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEN COMMANDMENTS FOR PARENTS

(By Rabbi Emmet A. Frank)

1. Thou shalt earn your children's respect and not acquire it through fear.

2. Thou shalt not re-create your life through your children.

3. Thou shalt give your children every opportunity to expand and express their individual personality and not smother their growth.

4. Remember your children are human and have feelings, emotions, and problems as serious to them as your own.

5. Thou shalt return understanding and instruction, not recrimination, when your children confide in you. Let them feel comfortable in knowing they can turn to you for encouragement; do not frighten them away.

6. Thou shalt teach by precept and example, serving as a model and not a critic for your children.

7. Thou shalt not seek perfection from your children.

8. Thou shalt keep your word and thereby teach your children the inestimable worth of honor.

9. Thou shalt not shield your children from the realities of life.

10. Thou shalt teach your children there is a right and a wrong and that God, not man, is the yardstick.

Abba Eban: A Great Statesman Departs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, America's loss will be Israel's gain when Abba Eban, Israel's able and talented Ambassador to the United States and the United Nations, leaves to enter politics at home. A skilled diplomat, with a high degree of eloquence, Ambassador Eban has established an enviable reputation as a man who can walk into a situation and take command.

In his important assignments, Ambassador Eban has enunciated with magnificent ability the Israeli position on numerous thorny issues. In doing so, he has won the respect and admiration of friend and foe alike.

As one of his greatest admirers, I am pround to salute this fine champion of the noble State of Israel. As he and his charming wife leave Washington, I am pleased to wish them Godspeed and good luck. I am sure that in the days ahead both will contribute much to the progress of the great bastion of democracy in the Middle East.

Mr. President, the Washington Post and Times Herald in a recent editorial heaped well-merited praise on Mr. Eban.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ISRAEL'S AMBASSADOR

Abba Eban has been an unusually effective advocate of his country's interests during his 8½ years as Ambassador of Israel in Washington. His vogor in the United Nations, where he has been Israel's permanent representative since her admission a decade ago, has been equally marked. This Cambridge-trained diplomat has presented the cause of the young Jewish state with great oratorical brilliance and intellectual agility, and sometimes he has overwhelmed others by the sheer force of his eloquence. If American and Israeli interests have not always coincided objectively in every particular, Mr. Eban has nonetheless done his best in official representations and in talks through the country to make them appear identical. He has emphasized Israel's bonds to the United States and Western freedom, but his alert mind also has encompassed a much wider interest in world affairs. As he prepared to return to Israel with his lovely wife to enter a political career, he can take much satisfaction that he has left a real imprint here. Washingtonians will expect to hear and see much more of him in high position in the years ahead.

William E. Warne

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, when I was in Korea last fall on business of the Armed Services Committee, I heard many encouraging things concerning our aid program there and many fine reports of the work of the UNC Economic Coordinator, William E. Warne, a Californian and former Assistant Commissioner of Reclamation and Assistant Secretary of Interior. Unfortunately Mr. Warne was out of Korea during the brief time that I had there, and I did not see him, although about 18 months ago he was in my office and met with a large group of Members, as some of you will recall, and discussed with us the aid program in Korea.

After more than 23 years of service to the U.S. Government and 7½ years overseas with the International Cooperation Administration and its predecessor agencies, Mr. Warne has resigned to return to California to be commissioner of fish and game. Many years ago, I was directly interested in the work he will undertake. I wish Mr. Warne well and know that his many friends in the House will be interested in the release that was made in Korea concerning his departure from there, and an editorial from the Hankuk Ilbo of March 6, as well as editorials from Seige Ilbo March 8, Seoul Shinmun March 8, and Chosun Ilbo March 6, which I include in my remarks:

[From Hankuk Ilbo, Eyes of News, Mar. 6, 1959]

THE SEA AND MR. WARNE, WHO IS LEAVING FOR FISHERIES AND GAME COMMISSIONER

Mr. Warne, UNC Economic Coordinator, is leaving for home to become fisheries and game commissioner of California State. He is one of most unforgettable foreigners to come to Korea and will be long remembered as a devoted friend.

Mr. Warne, who also has served as director of American aid mission in Iran, rendered a great contribution to the development of the Korean economy, making the most of the knowledge he acquired in Iran. He was even seen transplanting in rice paddy on Farmer's Day, and his farmer-like appearance with an A-flame on the back and a band on the forehead proved his friendly attitude toward us.

His assignment began in July 1956, when inflation threatened to override all previous economic efforts. He swiftly took many proper measures, such as establishment of CEB, preparation and execution of the financial stabilization plan and community development projects, and enlargement of OEC functions.

And it may be not merely because of his 8-year experience as an AP reporter that he held regular press conferences.

Now Mr. Warne is returning to his hometown where he was born, graduated from a college, and once worked for a ranch, to assume a high-ranking office of the State.

From the bottom of our heart we pray for his best health and success.

[From Seige Ilbo, Mar. 8, 1959]

WARNE MAKES MERITORIOUS SERVICES TO ECONOMIC STABILITY OF KOREA

UNC Economic Coordinator Warne is to assume a new post in the United States on April 1, winding up his remarkable career in Korea since July 1955. His views on the Korean economy as revealed at his recent press conference are identical to ours, in that, since our economy has been generally stabilized, incessant efforts to attain economic self-sufficiency including the exploitation of oversea markets in conjunction with a long-term development plan are necessary. In fact, Mr. Warne will be remembered by the Korean people whenever they look back to the process of their economic development.

He has not only been faithful to the policy of the United States but also had a good understanding of the position of Korea. Though his intermediately stabilization policy sometimes drew criticism, it has finally paid off in stabilizing our national economy.

As pointed out by Mr. Warne, there are many jobs to be undertaken to improve the Korean economy, and it is regrettable that we should have to part with him at this time. And we should like to stress the need to further develop our national economy on the foundation built by Mr. Warne.

[From Seoul Shinmun, Mar. 8, 1959]

WE ADMIRE HIS ACHIEVEMENTS AND WISH HIS CONTINUED SUPPORT OF KOREA

Aa announced, Mr. Warne will leave his present post April 1 to become Fisheries and Game Commissioner of the State of California. His achievements rendered during 2 years and 7 months in office have been so admirable that we Koreans cannot express too much how sad we feel at the sudden news of his resignation.

Mr. Warne is, indeed, one of many people who rendered distinguished service to the development of Korean economy, and many other Americans have been here to help Korea. With his departure near at hand, we would like to speak highly of his service once again.

Mr. Warne tried his best to see that American aid funds are effectively used, and spared no effort through the combined economic board in the reconstruction of Korean economy. He managed to maintain the 500-hwaan-for-$1 foreign exchange rate, controlled runaway inflation by establishing a financial stabilization plan, and rendered a great contribution to the stabilized economy. Reduced to ashes during the war, Korea owes very much to the cooperation and help of the U.S. aid officials for the reconstruction.

Of course, we must not forget Mr. Wood, his predecessor, whose contribution during the period of rehabilitation of war devastated situation paved the way for the present foundation of economic development on which Mr. Warne successfully brought the fruits of effort.

Outstanding among Mr. Warne's countless achievements are continuation of economic aid, introduction of DLF and foreign capital, accumulation of private capital, encouragement and development of managerial and technical know-how, establishment of a long-term economic development plan, and a community development plan.

The fact that the Korean economy has made such a rapid progress is due largely to men like Mr. Warne, who proved to be capable and sincere.

It is indeed regrettable that we should part with such a capable person. At the same time we cannot but feel somewhat uneasy about the future R.O.K.-U.S. relations with respect to aid programs, now that we have to part with Mr. Warne, who is familiar with our situation and can handle it accordingly, at the time when there are growing indications that American aid will be reduced.

Since it is inevitable that men must separate some time, we only pray for Mr. Warne's happiness and hope he will continue to support the cause of the Republic of Korea. We, for our part, should reward his achievements in Korea by further developing our national economy.

[From Chosun Ilbo, Mar. 6, 1959]

REPORT OF MR. WARNE'S DEPARTURE

The report that UNC Economic Coordinator Warne is to resign soon to assume an important post in the State of California will provide an opportunity for the Korean people to reevaluate his service. Since he assumed the delicate and complex post of economic coordinator 2 years ago, he has been second to none in powerfully promoting the financial stabilization plan to overcome runaway inflation. It is also to be remembered that American aid for Korea has almost doubled during the years Mr. Warne has been in office.

Of course, implementation of the financial stabilization plan and increased aid cannot be termed the achievements of Mr. Warne alone, but there is no denying the fact that his role has been important. Though there was some criticism of the financial stabilization plan, his achievements are expected to influence the economic rehabilitation of Korea favorably for a long while.

It is believed that he may feel regret at the fact that the long-range economic development plan cannot be completed before his departure. He has long been trying to present the most effective and rational fundamental plan for the overall development of the Korean economy. But in view of the fact that at least 3 years are required to draft such a plan for an underdeveloped nation, it is only natural that the plan, whose preparation commenced last year, has yet to be completed.

Although the financial stabilization program itself is a basic policy of the ROK Government, it is very obvious that Warne is one of those who strongly stressed the need of the program. And it should be remembered that Korea received, during his term, twice the amount of aid received previously.

Opinion is split on the achievement in connection with its merits and demerits, for it has been not without criticism that the tight-money policy adopted in the course of the financial stabilization program went too far.

And there is left an impression that Warne has changed the combined economic board's nature, from having an advisory function to having an executive one. We note that this is a matter to be reviewed by his successor.

Warne's resignation came after the conclusion of the regional aid directors' conference for the Far East. There might have been some particular reason for that.

Nevertheless we appreciate what he has done and wish him good luck and success.

Elk Hills Oil Turnover Would Be Major Scandal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 23, 1959

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following thought-producing editorial from the columns of the Sacramento (Calif.) Bee of March 24, 1959:

ELK HILLS OIL TURNOVER WOULD BE MAJOR SCANDAL

One of the greatest Government scandals in U.S. history involved the bribing by private oil interests of Albert B. Fall, Secretary of the Interior during the Harding administration, to get hold of the naval oil reserves of Teapot Dome in Wyoming and the Elk Hills in California.

Congressional investigations resulted in the turning back to the Navy of both fields and the imprisoning of Fall.

Yet for all this background President Dwight D. Eisenhower's proposal in his budget message to turn over all naval reserve oilfields to private interests has gone almost unnoticed.

It is true that private companies by close-in drilling have drained away much of the value of three of the four naval oil reserves. Largely because of this fact the President is partially right when he refers to the Navy's fields being relatively small and anachronistic.

But he could not be more wrong when he applied those terms to the Elk Hills field. And he made no exception to that field. Elk Hills is a prize not only for the private companies but for the Nation.

Instead of being relatively small, it is the second largest proved oilfield in the United States, surpassed only by the best Texas field. It contains 1 billion known barrels of oil worth $2,500 million. It could in an emergency supply half the military need for oil for the whole Pacific coast.

Capable of producing 200,000 barrels a day, about one-quarter of the west coast's present crude oil production, it is presently in limited production of 15,000 barrels of oil and 30,000 barrels of water a day, allegedly to check water encroachment into the field.

To turn over such a vast source of vital petroleum to private exploitation would be a monstrous giveaway and a prodigal assault on the Nation's defense. Eisenhower has just clamped a mandatory restriction on oil imports, with the claim such restrictions will aid defense by encouraging oil explorations at home and hence assure greater domestic security in this vital resource.

Against such a background, how can he possibly claim defense would be aided by handing over 1 billion barrels of oil at Elk Hills to be dissipated in all manner of usages? How can he argue that exploration will be advanced by giving over this gigantic source for which no exploration is necessary?

Congress had best stop this proposed posthumous victory for the Harding boys or it may have a scandal on its hands which will far exceed that of the abortive Dixon-Yates deal.

The Real Truth About Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT McNAMARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, some little men with big ideas of political power once started a smear campaign in an effort to show that the elected leaders of Michigan were forcing industry from the State and driving it into financial ruin.

This campaign collapsed because there was no truth to hold it up. Unfortunately, however, the lies and slanders by this time were being picked up by newspapers and magazines outside Michigan. These publications, apparently, made no effort to check the real facts.

A Detroit newspaper, the Detroit Times, has undertaken the task of setting forth the truth about this campaign of villification. An article published in the Detroit Times on Sunday, March 29, presents, in conclusive detail, the real truth.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRUTH ABOUT MICHIGAN—CRITICS NOW DRYING TEARS

(By John Creecy)

Who would have thought that a few kind words for Michigan would create such a stir?

The Times during the last week has undertaken, in its series "The Truth About Michigan," to answer some of the slanders that have been spread concerning our State's solvency and economic outlook.

We thought it was high time that, at least, some of the more obvious and damaging falsifications were corrected.

And so, it turned out, did a lot of other people.

Representative Edward Jefferies, Democrat, brought 150 copies of the Times to the House and told his colleagues in a speech: "I believe that after every member of the legislature reads this maybe we can get down to business and do something for the people of the State of Michigan."

Congressman JOHN BENNETT, Republican, of Ontonagon, announced that he would insert the Times series into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Senator PAT MCNAMARA, Democrat, beat him to it. The Michigan Committee for Economic Development and other pro-Michigan groups mailed out as many copies as it could immediately lay hands on, seeking to dry the tears of some of the misguided editorialists who have been sermonizing on Michigan's downfall.

It is to be hoped that one reached the editor who, a couple of years ago, started the eight-ball rolling by inviting a number of industrialists to express themselves on the subject of taxation.

Amazingly enough, they all seemed to prefer low taxes to high taxes. And they concurred in the obvious generality that if taxes in Michigan got notably higher than in other States, the fact wolud be taken into consideration when locating future plants.

From this simple beginning arose the nationwide uproar over Michigan's scandalous tax situation.

Although there are legitimate disagreements between political and economic groups regarding details of Michigan's tax program, U.S. Department of Commerce figures show that there are 30 other States where the tax bite takes a bigger share of the average citizen's income than it does here.

Charles R. Landrigan, executive vice president of the Detroit Edison Co., says: "I have never heard of a company which left Michigan because of the tax situation."

But to read the anti-Michigan propaganda which has been circulated in rival States, you'd think there was a huge column of such corporate refugees beating a footsore retreat.

Nowhere are the wails of sympathy louder than in California—the most heavily taxed State in the Union. Just a few days ago the Los Angeles Times ran a piece naming Michigan as the worst State in the Union.

As evidence it cited a statistical survey showing Michigan at the bottom of the list of 15 States in the matter of new construction for business.

How true is this? Well, apparently it's about as misleading as such a statement can be.

According to the magazine Engineering News Record, the February issue which appeared well before the Los Angeles attack, Michigan ranked fourth among all States in industrial construction in 1958.

Industry in Michigan spent $110 million for expansion, a jump of nearly $30 million from the 1957 figure. The total outranked every State except Texas, New Jersey, and Illinois. And the Engineering News Record figures also showed that a steadier trend of expansion was maintained in Michigan in the last 5 years than for the country as a whole.

The most urgent job of Michigan's leaders, it seems to us, is to talk the State up instead of talking it down.

This can be done, we think, without dodging the fact that Michigan does have problems and that solutions must be found for them.

It is true that Michigan's economy is subject to sudden ups and downs, with remarkable effects on employment figures. As William Haber, noted professor of economics at the University of Michigan puts it:

"Michigan is the most highly industrialized State in the United States. About 50 percent of our wage earners work in the manufacturing industry.

"Nearly 37 percent of personal income received by people in Michigan in the form of wages and salaries comes from manufacturing.

"As a result, we are especially allergic to national developments which adversely affect manufacturing production and employment, especially automotive production.

"Michigan is hit harder in a recession than most other States. The percentage of our labor force out of work is usually two times the national average. This is not a recent development.

"Our present experience conforms to what happened in 1921, in 1929–33, in 1937, in 1949, and again in 1954.

Professor Haber, in his recent testimony before a subcommittee of the U.S. Senate banking and currency committee, pointed out that, as a result, the cost of unemployment insurance in a recession is likely to fall most heavily on employers here, putting them at a disadvantage with their competitors in other states whose manufacturing industry is more diversified.

Part of the picture, Professor Haber contends, is the failure of Federal unemployment legislation to accomplish what it was intended to do—that is, eliminate interstate differences in cost of unemployment insurance. Instead, the way it has worked out, these differences have been accentuated.

In asking that the committee consider creating a regional unemployment insurance equalization fund, he commented:

"There is no good reason why a State like Michigan or Pennsylvania or any other State should be penalized because of a recession which is national in origin and has a more serious impact in that State."

In his analysis, the Detroit and Michigan problems are a complex of several factors.

"The first is a major shift in defense procurement with a concentration on aircraft and missiles, rather than tanks and ordnance. As a result of the shift, Michigan may have lost 100,000 to 125,000 jobs.

"A second factor is to be found in the decentralization of automobile assembly and production.

"It should be emphasized that such decentralization is primarily motivated by market considerations, by locational factors designed to take advantage of population concentrations to reduce transportation costs and achieve similar economies.

"It is not a flight from Michigan because of taxes or wage rates or 'economic climate.'"

As other factors, Professor Haber cites the Packard-Studebaker and Nash-Hudson consolidations, and the increasing use of automation in manufacturing. He adds:

"Taken together these four factors combined with the recession provide an explanation of Michigan's present problems.

"They appear to me to be more impressive and logical than most of the talk about taxes, labor costs and unfavorable business climate.

"These issues are of course always present. They do not in my opinion have an important bearing on the causes of our present problem."

Now read Professor Habers' view of Michigan's future:

"Assuming high levels of employment nationally one can be decidedly optimistic about Michigan's economic outlook.

"Given time, an accurate interpretation of Michigan's economic advantages plus a cooperative relationship between the Michigan business community, labor and the State government, the State's economic growth can be resumed at the rate which prevailed before 1955."

Pointing to figures which indicate that Michigan population will continue to increase at a rapid rate, he commented:

"Population growth by itself does not generate jobs. It provides, however, a sound basis for economic growth.

"And there is no reason to assume that Michigan's rich resources in manpower skill and in management competence, coupled with its natural resources in water and chemicals to mention but the obvious, are likely to be developed and exploited for a growing population and an expanding labor force.

"There is no exodus of industry out of Michigan. The facts are to the contrary. There are more manufacturing plants in this State than there were in 1949 or 1953.

"And even the automobile companies, while they are now building elsewhere, have made substantial investments and expansion in their Detroit and other Michigan facilities in the post-war period.

"Michigan's industry is overconcentrated in manufacturing and especially in automotive production.

"There is a crying need for a greater degree of diversification to insure a better balance and lesser dependence upon the economic fate of one or two major products.

"Such a program has not been pursued with any vigor thus far, since it did not appear necessary. An opportunity to develop aircraft production and electronics after the war could easily have been exploited and this would have provided a more balanced economy.

"We need an industrial redevelopment program. The resources promise its success once we pursue it with the vigor which has made Michigan a great industrial State."

Poison in Your Water—No. 50

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article entitled "Pollution Problem Remains Unsolved" which appeared in the Kalamazoo (Mich.) Gazette.

POLLUTION PROBLEM REMAINS UNSOLVED

(By Byron Troyer)

A group of industries and municipalities seeking to solve Kalamazoo River pollution problems through building of reservoirs is expected to disband soon.

Dwight L. Stocker, chairman of the Battle Creek-Kalamazoo River Intermunicipality Study Committee, said Saturday he expects to set a date next week for a meeting of the committee to officially disband the group.

The reservoir plan was dropped by the committee after a meeting December 3 in Battle Creek, at which the firm of Malcolm Pirnie Engineers, New York, recommended that it was not feasible. The engineering group recommended after a study of several months of proposed reservoir sites that cost of creating them would be excessive.

Dropping of the plan apparently leaves industries and cities of the river's basin on their own in solving pollution problems.

"This is one of the possible solutions we have to write off," Dwight L. Stocker, chairman of the Battle Creek-Kalamazoo Committee, said after the engineeers reported the reservoir plan would cost $27 million.

"Apparently, this leaves each community, individual, and firm to work out his own solution to pollution problems," Stocker commented. It is assumed that the committee will be disbanded after disposing of a small balance in its treasury.

The Pirnie study showed it would be necessary to provide about 65,000 acre-feet of stored water to control pollution of the Kalamazoo River from Battle Creek to Comstock under present conditions. Another 180,000 acre-feet would be required for the stretch of river between Comstock and Plainwell.

Proposed reservoirs in Rice Creek and Augusta Creek would each provide 90,000 acre-feet, or a little less than the total amount required to keep the river in satisfactory condition. Another site on Wanadoga Creek, a tributary of Battle Creek north of Battle Creek, could provide 55,000 acre-feet, the study showed.

End of this project throws the pollution problem back into the laps of industries and cities along the course of the river, who have been under strong pressure from the Michigan Water Resources Commission to reduce their industrial discharges into the river. Both cities of Kalamazoo and Battle Creek and many paper mills already have made considerable reductions in their pollution loads through treatment plants and other means.

"With but few exceptions, industrial discharges into the river are from the paper industry," the engineering study noted. "Seventeen paper mills of importance discharge a population equivalent of about 570,000 persons."

Reducing the load of wastes into the river becomes an added business expense which injures the price position of Kalamazoo Basin paper mills in competition with other mills, mill owners contend. As a result, officials of several have publicly stated they will not expand operations in the Kalamazoo Valley further if compelled to assume large waste treatment costs.

Oklahoma Water Resources, Present and Future; Address by Associate Commissioner Floyd E. Dominy, Bureau of Reclamation, Before Oklahoma Utility Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT S. KERR
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Mr. Floyd E. Dominy, who has recently been appointed by the President as Associate Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation. The address was delivered before the Oklahoma Utility Association at Tulsa, Okla., on March 26, 1959.

The subject of Mr. Dominy's address is of great interest, not only to his audience, but also to those who have been so deeply concerned with the development of the water resources of my State. The information contained in the speech is such that I believe it will be of interest to all who read it.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OKLAHOMA WATER RESOURCES, PRESENT AND FUTURE

It was a particular pleasure for me to receive an invitation to talk about Oklahoma's water resources here today because it indicates a growing awareness of the importance of water in the future of your State.

Water resources and their development and utilization have long been of utmost interest to us in the Bureau of Reclamation but our activities in the early decades of Federal reclamation were concerned primarily with the more arid areas up against the Rocky Mountains and westward to the Pacific Ocean.

It has only been in recent years that there has been the interest and demand for an expansion of reclamation activity into the Subhumid Belt runninging roughly along the 97th meridian and including most of your State. From our experiences of more than half a century in water resource development, I can tell you without qualification that Oklahoma's future growth and economic stability, like that of most of the Nation, depend in large measure on how well the available water supply is put to use.

I can tell you also that this is one of the primary concerns of Secretary of the Interior Fred Seaton. Secretary Seaton comes from the subhumid area of central Nebraska which has a precipitation pattern similar to that in Oklahoma. Irrigation development there is much farther along, however, thanks to usage of abundant ground water which is easily pumped. He has seen the benefits to be realized from using this additional supply of water and is backing us to the limit in carrying on an orderly development program in all of the Western States.

A few months ago I had the pleasure of making a trip through part of Oklahoma and observing once again at firsthand some of the State's water resource projects and possible future development. Also, I was able to talk with some of your State officials and leaders in water resource development and management.

Oklahoma has reached the point where intelligent and firm decisions must be reached concerning its water resources and their development. It is a challenge which must be met to guarantee future industrial and agricultural progress, and related population growth.

The Census Bureau foresees an increase of 60 million people in the United States in the next 18 years but its projections do not indicate any increase in Oklahoma. As a matter of fact, from a high point of 2,403,000 in the State in 1931, population dropped to 2,283,000 in 1950, and the 1960 projection forecasts a population of 2,189,000. By 1970, according to Census Bureau forecasts, Oklahoma will be down to 2,135,000 people.

This outmigration and decline was triggered by the drought and economic depression of the 1930's. Development of new water supplies carry over storage to achieve better balance between the lean and the fat water years, and better utilization of what you now have can reverse this situation.

The welfare of all the various utilities represented here today depends on healthy industrial and agricultural activity and growth, so all of you have a real interest in Oklahoma's water resources and what is done with them.

Oklahoma's surface water supply—that which comes from shallow ground waters and terraces—is from recent precipitation. Other water—which is now stored in deep aquifers such as the Ogallala formation of the High Plains—comes partly from rain and snow which occurred centuries ago. This means that most of water supplies we are talking about and the ones Oklahoma expects to use are closely related to the day-to-day and season-to-season fluctuation in rainfall.

The climate of your State varies from semiarid in the western part, where annual rainfall averages some 17–18 inches annually, to humid in the eastern and southeastern region, where average annual precipitation is more than 50 inches in some sections. For the 59-year period from 1900 to 1958, precipitation for the State as a whole averages 33-1/10 inches.

But don't be misled by averages. It takes anywhere from one to five or six feet of water to produce a crop, depending on the kind of crop, the locality, and the pattern of rainfall. Consider also the fluctuations in both annual and seasonal amounts of precipitation. In Oklahoma, the minimum precipitation in this century occurred in 1910 when precipitation totaled about 19 inches or about 40 percent below normal. This was approached again in 1956 when precipitation averaged about 21 inches for the State as a whole.

The recent drought, however, has set a record when we consider any 5-year consecutive period where precipitation was deficient. In the period 1952 to 1956, inclusive, precipitation averaged only a little more than 77 percent of normal, and precipitation for every year in that period was less than normal.

The compounding effect of this deficiency in precipitation resulted in a drought which was more severe than has ocurred over any extended period since 1900 and probably set a record for an even longer period of time.

These precipitation statistics are for the State as a whole and are based on annual records. Many local areas have experienced much more critical times because of seasonal droughts which are often severe and damaging.

The effects of these droughts are distress to agriculture and economic hardship generally. Muncipalities and industries are hard pressed to meet their water needs as a result of inadequate streamflow and inadequate ground-water supplies.

Looking at the other side of your climatic picture, you have unusually heavy precipitation in some years and in some localities although not necessarily in the entire State. This often results in floods which cause damage and economic loss. Threat of floods in certain areas also retards development. Floods and droughts are not uncommon in the same year as was clearly demonstrated in 1943.

The amount of water falling on Oklahoma, based on normal rainfall of 33⅒ inches, is about 123 million acre-feet annually. This is a lot of water. However, most of it is lost through evaporation from the land surface or transpiration by growing plants. Geological Survey records show that the average annual runoff from the land surface into your rivers and streams is about 19 million acre-feet, or a little more than 15 percent of the total that falls.

There is inflow from neighboring States and, according to best estimates, some 37 million acre-feet leave Oklahoma annually.

If runoff were evenly distributed from year to year and throughout the State, your water problems would be simplified. However, about two-thirds of the average annual runoff of the State occures in the eastern third of the State.

Even more striking is the annual variation in runoff. In 1945 the total outflow from the State was about 74 million acre-feet, while in 1956 it was less than 10 million acre-feet. Of far greater significance, the 5-year average flow out of the State for the 1952–56 period was less than 18 million acre-feet, or less than 50 percent of the long-time average. The important fact to remember is that the minimum flows, over critical drought periods, rather than the average flows, largely control the water supplies that we can depend upon.

These discussions of fluctuations in water supply have been concerned with surface water or streamflow. The other source of water in Oklahoma—ground water—now constitutes the total supply for many areas.

One of the most important and certainly most strategically located ground-water areas of the State is in the high plains. Throughout much of the panhandle are of western Oklahoma, the Ogallala formation forms a large underground reservoir which provides practically all the water for that area. In many areas, high-yielding wells can be obtained and in recent years many thousands of acres of land have been irrigated by pumping from ground water.

There is very little runoff from this area, but recharge of the ground-water formations is relatively low since most of the precipitation which falls is evaporated from the land surface or used by plant life. Consequently, the ground-water supply constitutes a vast reservoir which can be exhausted if pumped faster than its limited recharge rate, but can furnish assured, long-term supplies if properly conserved.

Oklahoma also has other lesser reserves of ground water but these constitute a base for only limited growth. Most of the new water required for future economic expansion must come from wise and vigorous development of the available surface water supplies.

An important factor in understanding Oklahoma's water problems is the quality of its available supplies. Here in Oklahoma many streams and ground water supplies are unsuitable for every purpose. This condition results to a large extent from natural pollution such as salt springs discharging directly into streams or ground water aquifers and the washing of soluble minerals out of the soil by precipitation.

It is of particular interest in Oklahoma that research now underway with the support of private industry and the Federal Government offers hope that economical means will be developed for the conversion of saline water to a usable quality.

Another source of pollution is industrial waste. Disposal of oilfield brines in the past has caused extensive pollution in some areas. Your State leadership recognizes the folly of such practices, and vigorous steps are being taken to prevent the occurrence of inadequate waste disposal.

Oklahoma, like all other sections of the Nation, has been using greater amounts of water each succeeding year. Aside from rapid increase in municipal and industrial use, Oklahoma has experienced a remarkable increase in irrigation. In 1940 only about 2,000 acres were irrigated. By 1949, 34,000 acres were under ditch, most of this increase resulting from the W. C. Austin Federal Reclamation project, in Jackson and Greer Counties, which was just coming into irrigation production at the close of the decade.

In the past decade, since 1949,, irrigation has pushed forward at an amazing rate because of the drought and the realization by progressive farmers that irrigation pays. Latest information on irrigation furnished by the extension division of your State university shows about 300,000 acres are now being irrigated. About two-thirds of the area is irrigated from ground water by pumping and the balance comes from surface water including reservoir storage and unregulated streamflow.

The latest statistics we have on water use in Oklahoma are estimates by the Geological Survey for 1955. These figures show that 1⅛ million acre-feet annually or 976 million gallons of water were used daily in the State for all purposes exclusive of hydroelectric power generation. In that year, domestic and industrial consumption was a little over 200,000 acre-feet, and irrigation used about 250,000 acre-feet.

Since then, irrigation has increased about 35 percent and other demands have also gained. It is probable that your total water use, exclusive of water used in generation of hydroelectric power, is now approaching 1½ million acre-feet annually. Of this total water use, about one-third comes from ground water and the remainder is obtained from surface runoff.

The history of water use in Oklahoma has followed the natural pattern of developing the easy supplies first. As is to be expected population has concentrated in the areas of adequate water supply when other factors have been equal.

Most of the existing water facilities which furnish the million and a half acre-feet used annually have been planned and constructed through local initiative, including that of many of the utilities represented here today. They have usually been started to serve small towns and have had to be expanded as the towns have grown into cities.

However, unprecedented migration of rural population to urban areas, unforeseen increases in the national population, and greatly increased demands for industrial production have resulted in water demand greatly in excess of the capacities of the existing developments. These factors, together with the recent unprecedented drought, have resulted in constantly recurring water problems of increasing magnitude.

Due to these conditions, the search for new or supplemental sources of supply is intense at many locations in your State at the present time. Numerous water projects are either under construction or in the planning stage. The city of Tulso has recently completed a second Spavinaw Creek development and Oklahoma City is constructing extensive works which will transport water more than 100 miles. Lawton is constructing new facilities.

As water supply problems have become more difficult, local interests and communities have sought the assistance of appropriate State and Federal agencies. As the result, the Bureau of Reclamation and other Federal agencies have constructed Federal reservoir projects in which storage capacity is provided primarily for water supply purposes or is added to capacity provided for flood control or other purposes.

It is well to remember that until recently the most pressing water problems in Oklahoma were primarily the control of the devastating floods which have periodically plagued your State. Consequently, until a few years ago, most of the Federal works proposed or constructed in Oklahoma were primarily for flood control. In these, incidental storage capacity was sometimes available for conservation use.

Now, however, growing water demands make conservation of remaining undeveloped streamflow by regulation and storage essential to the future.

This is a nationwide need and was recognized by the 85th Congress in the Water Supply Act of 1958. This legislation, title III of Public Law 85–500, is directed toward insuring that, to the extent practicable, all Federal reservoirs develop the optimum water storage potentialities of their sites for municipal and industrial use even though there may not be an immediate need for the water.

I have already expressed an opinion that Oklahoma has reached the point where intelligent and firm decisions must be made concerning your water resources and their development.

Here at the crossroads, the future of your water resources will depend on the logic and wisdom of the goals that are set. These goals must be supported by a well-defined water policy set forth in appropriate statutes and vigorously and equitably administered. Otherwise, it is conceivable that the water resources over a considerable part of your State may be dissipated or wasted instead of being reserved and used for beneficial purposes including domestic, municipal, and industrial uses and irrigated agriculture. These purposes comprise the major part of the economic base to support your future growth.

To establish and adhere to a wise and equitable water policy will require courage of the highest order by those who have responsibility for legislation and administration, because pressures to do otherwise will be great. But failure to do this can only lead to chaos in water resource development, and ultimately economic stagnation for certain sections of your State.

But let's not overemphasize the wrong path. I prefer to think that the right course will be found and followed. If this be so, here's what I believe will be the pattern for your State in water resources and their development.

First, we must recognize that agriculture is one of the more important industries of your State and, certainly, land is a basic resource. Measures for the conservation of your soil resources should be continued. Cultural practices to maintain soil fertility and prevent soil erosion are essential. Measures to prevent flooding and the movement of sediment into your water courses are desirable and should be carried out wherever they can be effective.

These worthwhile practices, however, do not necessarily mean nor do they justify indiscriminate storage of water at every conceivable point where it is possible to build impoundments. Much water so stored would be wasted by evaporation and nonbeneficial consumption.

Your ground water is very important to your future supply. Systematic groundwater investigations should continue. They will make it possible to intelligently develop new water supplies in certain localities. At the same time, this information will provide a guide to prevent development beyond that which the aquifer is capable of supplying. Artificial or induced recharge may help ground-water supplies in some areas. It must be recognized, however, that in the more arid sections of the State there is little runoff now from the land surface. It is not probable that large additional water supplies can be obtained by increased infiltration in those arid areas.

For the future, however, most of your water supplies must come from surface runoff. Your State officials recently established a policy that, whenever a reservoir is planned and constructed, adequate storage capacity shall be provided for the capture and storage of water for beneficial purposes. Whenever possible, water supply is to be emphasized as a primary function. Feasible dam and reservoir sites are limited and must be fully exploited whenever developed. This is a wise course of action and in line with national policy.

It is desirable that the State, with the cooperation of appropriate Federal agencies and local interests, should begin working on a master water plan. Such an undertaking would assess the long-range water needs throughout the State; and analyze available water resources, their quality and their distribution within the State; and finally, create an overall plan which would make available water resources meet the needs to the maximum extent practicable.

A master water plan must not necessarily be complete and rigid before any new work is started. On the contrary, such planning should be flexible and capable of being remolded from time to time as needs, conditions, and experience show desirable. Such a master plan will show what reservoirs should be developed to capture and control water not now used. Order of construction can be determined by need and economic feasibility.

Already, in western Oklahoma, plans are being made for reservoirs on Beaver Creek, Salt Fork of Red River, and Otter Creek, and Rock Creek in south central Oklahoma, which will essentially utilize all flows of those streams to the extent it is economical to develop them at the present time. The entire flow of the North Fork of Red River, the North Canadian River above Oklahoma City, and the Washita River above Chickasha are appropriated by existing uses or projects now underway or proposed. It is apparent that for all practical purposes most of the usable surface water resources in the western half of Oklahoma are already committed.

The big part of Oklahoma's water resources lies in the eastern one-third of the State. As opportunities for developing adequate water supplies locally are fully exploited, it may be necessary to move the abundant and surplus surface water from eastern Oklahoma westward into the drier areas.

We have seen this kind of development going forward in the West for many years. We are now transporting water more than 500 miles through tne Central Valley of California. The Colorado-Big Thompson project in Colorado brings water from the western slope under the high crests of the Continental Divide to the overappropriated and water-short eastern slope. Storage is basic to any such plans and cost and economic justification will be the limiting fac-

tors of such large-scale water movement in Oklahoma.

Because of the erratic nature of streamflow, even for the streams in the eastern part of Oklahoma, it is essential that maximum storage for streamflow regulation and conservation be provided whenever reservoirs are constructed as your new State policy requires.

Besides the storage reservoirs, a system of pumps, pipelines and canals will be required to transport the water westward to points of use. A great deal of low-cost power will be required for any such movement.

In order that an orderly process of water resource development may be carried out, it is essential that water rights be firmly established and adequately protected. Your recently established Oklahoma Water Resources Board warrants united support in a program of sound water right administration.

How the work which will ultimately be required will be undertaken cannot be determined now. Planning and construction probably will be joint ventures in which local interests, the State, and appropriate Federal agencies will all play their part. It will be a big but rewarding task if well planned and logically carried out.

In closing, I want to make one more reference to water rights and particularly as they relate to our Bureau of Reclamation operations. We have heard shouts of alarm on many occasions that the Government is stealing water. I want to refute any such allegation emphatically as far as the Bureau of Reclamation is concerned. We are required by law to observe State water laws.

We also are required to obtain reimbursement for costs entailed in providing water supply for municipal, industrial, irrigation or related purposes. To insure reimbursement, we consider it essential that water rights be established to insure continued availability of water for project purposes. We obtain such rights in accordance with the applicable State water law. If a State does not have adequate water right legislation or administration to protect the water rights of a project, we do not favor construction of a project. The interests of the Government must be protected and, also, interests of the water users who must repay the cost. I am convinced that this will be one of the most important factors in connection with future development of Oklahoma's water resources.

I urge that each of you become acquainted with your water problems, and take an active interest in development of the State's water resources. It is a job for all and requires the highest degree of cooperation at all levels of Government and the people themselves. Your State's future depends, to a large degree, on how well you work together.

The Townsend Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, when Congress passed the Social Security Act in 1935, it was widely predicted and almost universally believed that title I (the title concerned with old age assistance) would prove to be little more than a temporary stopgap. The theory was that as social security matured and more and more people qualified for old age insurance, the need for assistance would disappear. It has not, of course, worked out that way at all. Today nearly 2,500,000 elderly persons still are recipients of old age assistance. Close to 500,000 persons draw both old age insurance and assistance. The assistance program, which was supposed to have outlived its usefulness after a few years, has become a permanent fixture.

This is most surely to be deplored, not because we are helping people who need help, but because of the stigma that attaches to charity of whatever nature. Our States subject recipients to half a dozen humiliations. The means test, required in all States, is simply a modern version of the Elizabethan pauper's oath. Many States require applicants to sign documents giving the authorities a lien on their homes. Others badger responsible relatives, under threat of legal prosecution, to contribute to the support of welfare clients. In more than half the States the names and addresses of recipients are made a matter of public record.

I know of cases in which elderly women are actually ashamed to cash their welfare checks at the grocery store because they feel they will be looked down upon. I know of other cases in which welfare clients have been reduced to tears by the constant and impersonal probing of case workers. The assistance program strips recipients of their dignity and self-respect. What is even worse, it perpetuates poverty by limiting clients to subsistence levels and penalizing them by reducing their grants whenever they show initiative by earning and working.

There is, to the best of my knowledge, no way of eliminating this disgraceful and un-American system as long as we continue to cling to the present social security system. Yet I think my colleagues will agree that it is desirable to eliminate any program which humiliates and stigmatizes free Americans.

There is a practical way of accomplishing this goal, and it lies in the enactment of a bill, known as the Townsend plan bill, which has been introduced in this session of Congress by Mr. BLATNIK and Mr. GUBSER.

This proposed legislation would solve the problem simply by paying retirement benefits as a matter of right. This cannot be done under present social security because benefits are related to earnings; and people who can show no earnings are disqualified, and therefore must rely on charity. H.R. 4001, by contrast, would impose a universal gross income tax; the rate would be moderate; citizens would automatically be eligible, just as children automatically are entitled to a public education as a matter of right.

Surely there is no excuse in this land of ours for the crushing burden of poverty and the twin evil of grudging charity. These blights can be removed, and there is no reason in this world for further delay.

H.R. 4000 and H.R. 4001 supply the solution. I heartily commend them to the attention of my colleagues. Here is a magnificent opportunity for the Congress to restore dignity and decency to millions of American senior citizens. It is difficult to imagine a goal more noble.

The Greatest Age of All Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Greatest Age of All Time," by Mr. John Park Cravens, Sr., of Booneville, Ark.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GREATEST AGE OF ALL TIME
(By John Park Cravens, Sr.)

After waiting untold millions upon millions of years, the human creatures on this, our small planet on which we live, are at the dawn of exploring outer space. I believe this will be successfully done within the next few years, and its results will be for the glory of God first, and secondary, material gain for this world of ours as a whole, and all of its nations will only be able to benefit equally.

The people of our earth, with few exceptions, know that such as earthquakes, wars, cyclones, disastrous fires, volcanoes, hurricanes, and other things can happen, but they have faith and believe our planet will continue to orbit unharmed and hold its proper place in the universe, and it in no way will be affected by scientific discoveries or the exploring of outer spaces. And, throughout countless past ages, humankind has not feared or worried about anything going wrong with the workings and the existence of our home planet which is but a small cog in the machine of a vast universe. Down through all time since the dawn of humanity, people have not feared that the sun would not rise or never set, and they have looked upon the moon, the sun, the stars, and other planets with awe, and thought that a great and Divine Spirit controlled their earthly home and everything they saw in the vast heavenly panorama. A small percent of them may have believed different as some of today do, but their percentage was negligible.

Today, a greater part of he people are afraid of what hydrogen bombs, and other weapons of destruction will do to harm our earth, and I do not think this will happen, and that outer-space exploration will be done peacefully, and no harm will come to the universe or any part of it because of mankind's present and future scientific achievements.

According to the scriptures, "The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament sheweth his handywork." Also, "The heavens declare His righteousness, and all the people see His glory." As I see it, these are two of the most impressive verses of the Bible. From the beginning of mankind, the peoples of our earth have had the privilege of looking up into the heavens, and seeing His great handiwork. As the ages of the past rolled by, there have been countless millions of people that lived on this planet of ours who never were but a few miles from the places of their births. But the eyes of all of them, like those of today, had the experience of many times, and also the privilege, of gazing upon the moon, the sun, the stars, and other things of the celestial firmament with the realization they were the work of a master hand. Only a small percent of the past and present have seen much of the world on which we live, but all with proper sight have seen the heavens in all their great im-

pressiveness. When we gaze upward to the heavenly scene we know that millions upon millions of people of ages of the past have done the same, and were impressed as us of the present day and age, with the glory of a creator of all they beheld. We can see the love of God about us and the beauty of His creation in several ways on this earth, but though the heavens be far away, when we look up into them we can see His love and glory in greater form in such as the sun and moon that gives us light and life.

I will never forget when I was a little child, and there were no electric fans and air-conditioners in our home in the Petit Jean Valley, below the Great Mount Magazine of the Ozark Mountains. When the summer months came there were always a few dry and hot days, and my mother would make pallets with homemade pieced quilts on the grass lawn of our residential yard for members of our family to sleep on until after midnight cool breezes arrived, and we would go to our bedrooms. As I lay on my pallet in the yard before sleep came to me I would look up into the heavens as I listened to the singing of the crickets, the low of cattle in fields nearby, the falls of a swiftly running creek, the singing of a mockingbird, the baying of a pack of dogs chasing a fox, and other sounds, were not strange to me, but my eyes would become transfixed at the sight of the moon and the stars which greatly facinated me until I feel asleep.

The next morning I told my grandmother what I had seen, and asked her many questions, and she answered them as best she could. She told me about God creating the heavens, and our earth, and His gift of eternal life. And many times after that, when a child, I lay on my pallet on the lawn of a night and looked up at the moon and stars grandmother told me were so far away, and I wondered if anybody would ever be able to travel to them, and if they could, what a glorious thing it would be. Sometimes I would see flocks of wild fowl winging their way from Canada to South America, and wondered if it would be possible for them to fly to the moon. God has not denied any human creature of all the past ages with proper eyesight, the right to look up into His heavens and behold His great works of His own creation.

I believe the time will soon be here when people of this earth will travel to, and return from, the foreign planets, which will open up a new phase in the spiritual and material life of the peoples of our earth, and I believe this is a part of the plan of the Creator of us and all things. When I was a youth and would look up into the heavens on a clear and calm Ozark Mountain night, I did not realize that in my day the people of America would send a manmade instrument past the moon to orbit the sun. Neither did I realize or think I would live in a space-travel age which I look upon as the golden age of God when improved telescopes, radar, aircraft, rockets, and other things would bring our world so close to the foreign planets to which we can safely make round trips. I believe that successful space travel by the people of this earth will mean their getting closer to the Creator and eternal head of all things.

Down through the ages many changes took place in our world, and they were unknown to distant lands about; but when a new comet appeared in the skies, it was known to all peoples. Alexander the Great wept when he believed there were no more countries on earth for him to conquer. I believe during his lifetime he many times looked up into the vast outer spaces and realized they were controlled by a Supreme and Divine Power, and the planet on which he lived was only a small segment or part of a great kingdom of worlds mystifying to him and beyond his reach. And how wonderful it is that man is now on the threshold of exploring outer space.

Great is the reward of man to overcome the laws of nature against him in his pursuit of science for the benefit of humanity and progress of civilization and the general benefit and longevity of life upon this earth of ours, and greater still is the reward of those who overcome temptation and sin and pursue a path of pureness in heart and righteousness, as after death they will receive from God the gift of eternal life. And now that we have come to the space age, we have reached the most vital point in our earth's history since its creation. And I believe that much will be accomplished scientifically, but greater will our faith in an Almighty Creator become, our souls and our religion and our brotherhood will become broadened and strengthened as our outlooks upon life in general, and we will be brought closer to God in all respects, and there will be less jealousy, rivalry, and hate among the races and countries, and there will be a greater understanding and more good will.

I believe that after space travel is achieved in the great advancement and progress of this world, the importance of human souls will greatly and naturally take precedence over that of material things. "What profiteth a man if he should gain the whole world but lose his own soul."

I believe within the next 10 years man will begin making trips to the Moon and Mars, and other foreign planets known to our Earth, and from them make new discoveries about outer space that would be most vital and important in continued exploration. It is possible new planets will be discovered, and some could have on them a form of life similar to ours, and in time man will explore them, and from them he may discover other planets farther on out into space. It may be that man could spend millions of years in a chain of such exploration, and space is composed of many galaxies. And is could be that man of this earth will be limited to his own galaxy in his travels to and return from outer space. I believe as we travel onward and farther out into space, greater will we recognize the glory of God in our hearts, minds, and souls, and no longer will our world be a small planet isolated in a vast universe, but will be the headquarters of a kingdom of planets.

After keeping them closed for millions of years, the Divine Creator of the Heavens, has opened up the paths of space travel to us. It is the greatest challenge of all time ever to come to humankind. I hope the peoples of this planet succeed, and use the resulting benefits for Gods Glory, and peace on earth and good will to all men, women, and children. Otherwise every living thing on this earth will perish by the hands of man, and not by the will of God, and I have faith that the political, military, and scientific leaders of our world know what the results of a world war would be, and will never enter into such a conflict, and there will be peace, and man will continue to go forward in his exploration of outer space for the benefit of all the peoples of our earth, and those that should be living on other planets besides ours, and the glory of God.

Civil Defense Obsolete and Wasteful

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEPHEN M. YOUNG
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, a recent article, entitled "Porter on Civil Defense," which was published in the Cleveland Plain Dealer on April 2, 1959, is worthy of careful study. It offers an exceedingly clear commentary on the waste of taxpayers' money on the utterly useless and vague program of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.

Philip W. Porter, associate editor of the Cleveland Plain Dealer, is a nationally noted columnist. He served as a colonel in World War II. He is an eminently respected and widely read author and commentator. In fact, it is safe to assert that many thousands of readers of the Cleveland Plain Dealer turn to his column and read it first, before reading the front-page news.

I ask unanimous consent that his article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I commend it to my colleagues in the Senate.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Apr. 2, 1959]

PORTER ON CIVIL DEFENSE—FEDERAL GOVERNMENT WASTES VAST FUNDS ON USELESS AND VAGUE PROGRAM

(By Philip W. Porter)

Senator STEVE YOUNG not long ago let fly with a plain spoken denunciation of the Civil Defense Administration as outmoded, obsolete and wasteful. He was completely right. The Federal Government spends money in a lot of silly ways, but none more so than on this outfit.

YOUNG pointed out what has long been obvious to any sensible person—that mass evacuation from cities is impossible, there is no real defense against nuclear attacks, the present activities of Civil Defense are just so much wheel spinning, and money spent on this bureau is pure waste.

Nothing will be done about it, however, because neither the administration nor Congress seems willing to take such a brutally realistic view of the facts.

YOUNG spoke kindly of the volunteer civil defense workers who have done wonders in time of floods, tornados, and big traffic jams. This, actually, is the only visible sign of real usefulness in the entire civil defense setup. These folks have not only been useful and tireless—they have often been heroic. For that matter, the officials appointed to civil defense have tried to do a job, under impossible conditions, and should not be scolded.

But the main trouble is that no one, from the top on down, seems to know what the job is now, or what it ought to be. They know they don't have the funds to build enormous underground shelters. They know the populace cannot be worked up in peacetime or even cold war, to really take seriously or participate in those absurd occasional drills, when air raid sirens sound. It looks like play acting. Federal employees can be herded out of buildings when the alarms sound, but who else pays much attention?

It may sound hard and fatalistic, but it's far better to face the fact that if we ever get into an atom war and are on the receiving end of a hydrogen bomb, thousands of people are going to be killed. If you're lucky, you won't get it; if unlucky you will, and that's that. Just as thousands of civilians were killed in Britain, Germany, Russia, Japan, and Italy by aerial bombing in the last war.

After the first raids, when nobody really believed he was going to catch it, those people developed caution, and took to what bomb shelters they could devise: Some really heroic firefighting and bomb-demolition work went on. But the public didn't awake or respond until casualties got heavy. That's human nature. That's the way it would be here, too.

The only sensible thing for ordinary people to do is to familarize themselves thoroughly with first aid, home nursing, and other similar facilities provided by the Red Cross. And the only sensible way for the Government to spend money preventively is to subsidize such activities, and organize classes in them, instead of appointing civil defense officials to write directives, paint signs designing special evacuation highways, buy sirens (which couldn't possibly give 5 minutes warning against an ICBM), shuffle paper, and draw salaries.

It is possible for large numbers of men and women to take additional training in first aid, to know how to take care of cuts, wounds, and burns. It is possible for them to give blood for storage against emergency. It is possible to educate them in disaster-relief teams—to go to other nearby cities which might be hot.

The idea that somehow, in this day of missiles traveling 10 times faster than the speed of sound, we could really detect and destroy all of them, or alert an entire population to evacuate a crowded city without panic, is wacky, and most folks know it. Hell's bells, we can't even get home in cars on our main streets when there's a sudden 6-inch snowfall. Nor get ourselves untangled on State roads on summer Sunday afternoons.

The Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association Daily Radio Roundup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association Daily Radio Roundup of March 20, 1959.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GTA DAILY RADIO ROUNDUP OF MARCH 20, 1959

To hear some people talk, farmers are sitting on top of the world. Their income is up, taxes paid, money in the bank, cows in the barn—and new rubber on the tractor. And all paid for, too.

Well, you farmers are the best judge of whether all that is true or not. Are you satisfied with the way things have been going? If you are, it doesn't show. It didn't show up, either in the election last November. That's when farmers turned their backs on administration farm policies and gave the Democratic Party a powerful mandate to develop a new and better farm bill. It was a mandate to oppose, and if possible reverse, the farm policies of the President and his Secretary of Agriculture.

The farmers had patiently tried and tested Eisenhower farm policies for 6 years and found them inadequate. It was time for a change. That's what farmers had in mind.

But how about that change. Is it coming? What is the democratically controlled Congress doing about living up to the mandate voted by farmers? Democratic leaders, along with farm State Republicans who were elected or reelected on an antiadministration farm platform, say they are doing all in their power to honor that mandate. They are determined to develop a new and better farm bill. They believe they can pass such a bill and make it stick. Maybe not the first time, but they say they'll pound away until they succeed.

But as one Democratic spokesman said: "It is only fair to advise farmers that the Congress is working under a blanket of restrictions." First, there is the limitation imposed by the President's veto power. The Democrats and their GOP farm colleagues know that the President will veto any bill they might pass which would do anything to raise farm prices substantially. So that tightens the clamps. No farm bill would get anywhere unless Congress could muster a two-thirds vote to pass it over the veto.

Secondly, Congress is limited in what it can do for farmers by the administrative power held by Secretary of Agriculture Benson. Farmers have seen how good farm programs can be ruined by unsympathetic administration. The power of the Secretary of Agriculture to work against the will and intent of Congress is very great.

But, on the other hand, Congress has the power to slow Benson down by letting the air out of the tires. That's what the Congressmen have done so far and they've hidden the pump. Democrats gave this assurance to farmers: No more price-support cuts, no punitive taxes on farm co-ops, REA will not be turned over to Wall Street, and the drive for a decent farm program will continue because they expect to have a more sympathetic President and Secretary of Agriculture after 1960.

So that's what farm Democrats are saying today. Not all Democrats, of course, because some are not more sympathetic toward farmers than Secretary Benson himself. Fortunately, they are in the minority.

One very good way to keep informed on up-to-the-minute farm developments is to tune in every day, Monday through Friday, to the radio program sponsored by farmers of the upper Midwest through GTA—the co-op way.

The Supreme Law of the Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, recently I received a memorandum from Mr. J. Luther Glass, a consultant on juvenile court law and procedure in the Virginia Department of Welfare and Institutions. In this memorandum, Mr. Glass discusses implications of the Supreme Court's school segregation decisions in relation to fundamental constitutional questions. I ask unanimous consent that this thought-provoking article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THOUGHTS TO REMEMBER

(By J. Luther King)

Brown v. *Board of Education*, decided by the Supreme Court of the United States on May 17, 1954, has caused me to do a great deal of thinking on the subject of our basic law, the Constitution of these United States.

Frequent reference has been made to this decision as being the supreme law of the land. Those responsible for this are, to say the very least, guilty of fuzzy thinking. The Constitution could not be plainer on the subject. Article VI, paragraph 2, of that great document uses these bold words:

"This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of land; * * *."

The above-quoted language makes no provision, or provides any excuse, for any decision of any court ever becoming the supreme law of the land. Assuming that the Court acted within the scope of its constitutional authority, its decision can never be more than the law of that particular case.

But did the Court have a constitutional right to reach the conclusion that was reached on May 17, 1954? That is the question that this article proposes to answer.

The best place to start answering this question is to look at the first paragraph of the body of the Constitution, that of article I, section 1, which is as follows:

"All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives."

Nowhere in the Constitution can we find authority for the Supreme Court, or the Chief Executive to exercise legislative powers. Those powers remain within the Congress alone. The two words, "herein granted," are most important. They are key words, meaning powers granted to the Federal Government by the original 13 sovereign States. A clear understanding of these two words reveals the sort of checkrein the people determined should be held over the General Government. Many great powers were reserved for and retained by the States and the people. This is well stated by a competent court in *Livingston* v. *Van Ingen* (9 Johns. (N.Y.) 507):

"When the people create a single, entire government, they grant at once all the rights of sovereignty. The powers granted are indefinite and incapable of enumeration. Everything is granted that is not expressly reserved in the constitutional charter, or necessarily retained as inherent in the people. But when a Federal Government is erected with only a portion of the sovereign power, the rule of construction is directly the reverse, and every power is reserved to the members that is not, either in express terms or by necessary implication, taken away from them, and vested exclusively in the Federal head. This rule has not only been acknowledged by the most intelligent friends of the Constitution, but is plainly declared by the instrument itself."

The next place where it would be well to take a good, long look is at the 10th amendment to the Constitution. Its language is crystal clear, and reads as follows:

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

Since the Constitution is silent as to schools or education, it naturally follows that the United States has never been given jurisdiction over this question. There are those who claim that the 10th amendment is outmoded and no longer has any effect. But how could this be true? Has it ever been repealed? It appears that the 18th amendment became somewhat outmoded and was repealed by the adoption and ratification of the 21st amendment. It has also been said that Chief Justice Marshall's decisions killed the 10th amendment. If that be true, why did not Chief Justice Hughes follow the same procedure in killing the 18th amendment?

Now the Court claims to base its authority for outlawing segregated schools upon the provisions of the first paragraph of the 14th amendment. The first sentence of the 14th amendment had only one purpose, to wipe out the effect of the Dred Scott deci-

sion, which, incidently, was one of the soundest decisions ever rendered by the Supreme Court. The second sentence of this amendment is framed in this manner:

"No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

Now let us consider for a moment the language just quoted. Assume for the moment that a very large class of citizens as a group are denied the right to vote. Would not this constitute abridgment of their privileges, or amount to denying them equal protection of the laws? It would certainly seem that way. Could not the Court remedy the situation simply by decreeing that such was in violation of the 14th amendment? You would certainly think so, wouldn't you? But consider that the Negro man found himself without the right of suffrage, and he found his remedy in the 15th amendment. Likewise, the ladies of the country discovered that citizenship, education, high moral standards and interest in good government were insufficient to insure them the right to vote. Did they hire lawyers to acquire their right to vote under the 14th amendment? They did not. They brought pressure to bear which resulted in the adoption and ratification of the 14th amendment.

So, then, it would appear that the Supreme Court has exceeded its authority in the Brown decision. It not only exceeded its authority; it tied its decision to the socialistic views of MYRDAL and to the 14th amendment, about which grave doubts exist as to whether or not it has ever become a part of the Constitution, for the reason that Southern States were blackmailed into ratification in order to get back into the Union.

Would it not then follow, as the night the day, that the only legal way to deny to the States their inherent right to legislate as they see fit concerning school matters would be to amend the Constitution as was done when the 15th and 19th amendments were needed?

One further thought, have you considered the possibility of bringing a suit in the Supreme Court itself, seeking a declaratory judgment as to whether or not the 14th amendment was properly proposed, adopted, and ratified according to the provisions of article V of the Constitution? Read article V and consider how the Southern States were denied representation in the Congress when two-thirds of each House voted upon this proposal; and further, the then composition of southern legislatures, having been at that time composed mainly of ignorant Negroes and carpetbaggers.

Ponder these questions if you seek to understand the basic, fundamental principles of constitutional government.

Excessive Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Nation continues to be plagued by the serious problem of excessive unemployment. This is a very personal type of tragedy in nearly 5 million American homes.

The American people, last November, turned to the Democratic Party to point the way out of the recession. Thus we have been handed a heavy and urgent responsibility.

The Democratic advisory council, keenly aware of this responsibility, has issued an excellent and comprehensive statement on this problem of unemployment. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Appendix as follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 6, 1959]

Last fall the American people cast an overwhelming vote for the Democratic Party. That vote meant many things.

It meant a repudiation of a tired and weak Republican administration. It expressed a deep and growing concern over our country's unmet needs at home and abroad. Above all, it was a call for action—for strong, positive leadership and programs. And, by their votes, the American people made it clear that they expected that leadership and those programs from the Democratic Party.

The Democratic platform of 1956 spelled out clearly the objectives of our party and the policies and programs necessary to their achievement. During the following 2 years the Democratic advisory council interpreted that platform in 26 major policy statements and applied it to the specific issues and problems facing the Nation.

Of course, we recognize that our program cannot be realized fully while the executive branch remains in the control of the Republican Party. Under our system of government it is not possible to force the Executive to use his great power wisely or well or even at all, against his will. He can fail to propose in all cases and fail to dispose in many. Timidity in the Executive cannot be offset fully by boldness in the Congress. It will require a Democratic President in the tradition of Roosevelt and Truman, working with a Democratic Congress, to place America squarely back on the road to true national progress.

INEXCUSABLE UNEMPLOYMENT

The Democratic Advisory Council is greatly concerned by the critical and inexcusable level of unemployment. This has been tolerated all too long. With unemployment approaching 5 million and with the equivalent of more than another million full-time unemployed resulting from those who can only find part-time work, there is unmistakable evidence that our economy is not functioning satisfactorily, and that immediate corrective steps must be taken.

To those who are employed, unemployment is too often regarded as an annoying Government statistic. But to the 20 million American men, women and children who make up the families of these unemployed, unemployment means suffering, want, fear and loss of self-respect. This is the most critical domestic problem today. No American who desires to work should be denied that opportunity. No national obligation is greater than making available to every person in our country the chance to utilize his skills, his energy and his mind to the fullest.

The principal reason for the disgracefully high amount of unemployment is the failure of the Republican administration to use the great power of our Government as an instrument of economic growth.

INADEQUATE GOP BUDGET

The inadequate and shortsighted Presidential budget submitted to the Congress in January shows that the Republican administration hopes to balance the budget without balancing the economy. It has lost sight of the three basic objectives of our economic system:

First, to achieve a high and steady rate of economic growth.

Second, to use economic means to reflect our sense of national priorities of needs and desires.

Third, to assure economic opportunity and justice for all and a fair division of goods and services.

We are not growing enough.

We are neglecting our great needs.

We are not providing economic justice for all our people.

President Eisenhower's program says that, in order to fight inflation, we must default on all three of these fronts. This is ridiculous.

Our major problem today is that private and public consumption has lagged behind our current productive capacity and that departures from full employment and full production have resulted. This is the condition we must now correct.

President Eisenhower insists that we can save ourselves from inflation at home and from the challenges of hostile governments abroad by spending less. This means that we should try to save ourselves by doing less. Such counsel points the way to disaster. And disaster, at home, is now being suffered by the unemployed and their families.

CITES PARTY BELIEFS

The Democratic Party does not believe in spending for its own sake, but we know that a nation which is doing too little is not spending too much.

We are not doing enough when millions of Americans cannot find work, and when the billions of dollars of goods and services they could produce are being permanently lost to our country.

We are not doing enough when our children have inadequate schools, when 13 million American families are living in substandard housing, when many American men and women are undernourished and when many more have too little or no medical or hospital care available to them.

We are not doing enough when scores of American communities are scarred by spreading slum areas, woefully overloaded public and private services in transportation, waste disposal, and air pollution.

We are not doing enough when our natural resources are being insufficiently developed and insufficiently protected from private exploitation.

And we are certainly not doing enough when our Nation's military defenses are in jeopardy and when we are failing to meet our international responsibilities and our own self-interest in promoting the economic development of the free world.

Legislative programs to meet these urgent needs must be enacted. We recognize that many of them will meet with the opposition of leaders of the executive branch of the Government and that of their counterparts in the legislative branch. Some needed programs may be blocked by this combined opposition. But this expectation should not deter forward-looking Democrats from pressing ahead with the policies and programs so overwhelmingly endorsed by the American people last year.

BENEFITS EXHAUSTED

In the interim, we must meet our responsibility as a nation to the individual unemployed. Approximately 2 million persons have already exhausted both State unem-

ployment benefits and the temporary extension voted by Congress in 1958, or are not covered by such benefit programs. The Department of Labor estimates that almost 200,000 more will exhaust their State unemployment benefits in each month from April through October.

To meet this problem therefore, requires, at the very least, the continuation in full for another year of the temporary extension of unemployment compensation benefits, as enacted in 1958, and its application to those not covered by existing State unemployment compensation systems. The proposal to close out this program by providing benefits for a short period only for those who have already exhausted their State benefits does not even meet this most minimum of requirements.

The temporary extension of unemployment benefits is not, however, the full answer to the individual problem. As our experience of the past year has graphically demonstrated, State unemployment compensation systems are woefully inadequate, both in the duration, and in the amount of the benefits which they provide. It took a Republican recession to demonstrate vividly how far we have gone backward in the matter of unemployment compensation.

In relation to current prices, wage levels, and living standards, many States today provide smaller unemployment compensation benefits than were provided 20 years ago. In a period when business profits are immeasurably greater than they were in the 1930's, the contributions required from employers to finance unemployment compensation are only a fraction of those which were required when the systems were first established, under the force of Federal law. Those few States which have sought to meet their responsibilities in this area have been placed at a disadvantage by the refusal of other States to do likewise.

WOULD ALTER LAW

What is called for here is the reestablishment of the system of unemployment insurance in its intended role as protector of the unemployed and stabilizer of the economy. The Federal Congress in 1959 should follow through on the principle first established in 1936 and condition the exemption of employers from the tax provisions of the Federal Unemployment Tax Act upon the provision by the States of adequate unemployment compensation benefits. Such a program, as contained in bills already introduced in the Senate and in the House (S. 79; H.R. 3547), would cost not 1 cent in Federal appropriations.

We also again urge the enactment of area redevelopment legislation, similar to that vetoed by the President after the 85th Congress had adjourned and which passed the Senate late last month by a narrow margin, with the Democrats voting almost 3 to 1 in favor and the Republicans voting over 7 to 1 against.

Once more we are witnessing callous Republican indifference to the suffering and needs of people who, through no fault of their own, are unable to obtain jobs.

We support the immediate increase of the national minimum wage to at least $1.25 per hour with a realistic broadening of the coverage provided under it to include more than 10 million additional workers.

We also favor an increase in social security and railroad retirement benefits to a realistic level which will reflect today's living costs.

A sound, national unemployment compensation program is critically important and urgently needed today, but in the longer run, it should be regarded as a palliative, not a solution. A healthy, expanding economy, sufficient to meet our national and international needs and responsibilities, is the true solution to the unemployment problem, and to most of our other problems as well.

Fair Treatment for Great Lakes Maritime Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill which, if passed, would eliminate a terrible and inequitable situation which has repeatedly been called to the attention of the Governor and the State Legislature of the State of Ohio. This bill will provide the necessary remedy by amending section 3305(f) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to withhold tax credits under section 3302 from a maritime employer who maintains the office from which the operations of a vessel are regularly supervised, managed, directed and controlled in a State that does not, on and after July 1, 1961, treat maritime service the same as other service for the same employer.

My bill, Mr. Speaker, if enacted, is adequate to achieve the results desired; namely, elimination of stipulations in State unemployment compensation laws which discriminate against maritime employees by affording them protection against unemployment on terms less favorable than those extended to workers in other covered industries. Illustrative of the form of discrimination which my bill is designed to terminate is that authorized by the Ohio unemployment compensation law, whereunder maritime employment is treated as seasonal and the workers engaged therein are eligible to receive unemployment benefits only during the 9 months of the year in which the Great Lakes shipping industry is in operation—Revised Code Annotated, page 1954, section 4141.33(B).

Under such a provision, a maritime worker who consistently is rehired during each annual 9-month shipping season would never be able to qualify for benefits during the 3-month layoff period.

In addition to singling out maritime workers for this special treatment, even to the extent of distinguishing them from other workers engaged in seasonal employment, Ohio also appears to protect entrepreneurs in the maritime industry from the exaction, in conformity with a merit-rating plan, of a substantially severer unemployment compensation tax than is imposed on employers in more stable trades. Indeed, under the Ohio law, a maritime employer who regularly rehired all of his workers at the end of each annual 3-month layoff period conceivably would be entitled to the highest rating accorded employers with stable employment records, and, correspondingly, to the lowest rate at which Ohio unemployment taxes are levied; to wit, 0.1 percent. By way of contrast, Wisconsin, which subjects employers engaged in seasonal industries to the same conditions as are applied to all other employers, conceivably might impose on maritime employers a merit-rating exacting as high as 4 percent—Ohio Revised Code Annotated, page 1954, section 4141.25; Wisconsin Statutes Annotated—West, 1957, section 108.18 (4); Ohio Board of Review, Decision 655–BR–51, June 18, 1951; Commerce Clearing House, Inc. Unemployment Insurance Reporter; Ohio, paragraph 2000.08; Wisconsin, paragraph 2000.

What is sought to be achieved by the passage of my bill is the enlargement of the power of the Secretary of Labor to the end that he may withhold approval not only of entire State unemployment compensation laws—United States Code, section 26:3304(c)—but also of discriminatory provisions of otherwise certified State laws which affect maritime workers adversely. Upon withdrawal of Federal approval of such provisions, an employer of maritime workers covered thereunder would cease to be eligible for the 90-percent credit allowed as an offset against the Federal 3-percent unemployment tax—United States Code, section 26: 3301, 3302(a)(3)—and would be exposed to the burden of paying in their entirety both the Federal as well as the State unemployment compensation tax.

Foreign Aid Facts and You

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, my regular weekly letter to the people of my district treats of our foreign aid program and our present national fiscal situation. The discussion of these subjects is pertinent today in the face of the proposed foreign aid appropriation for the next fiscal year.

Mr. Paul Peters has prepared a bulletin on the same subject that gives added information. I include my letter and Mr. Paul Peters' bulletin as a part of my remarks for the enlightenment of my colleagues who will vote soon on the appropriation for foreign aid for the coming fiscal year:

FOREIGN AID FACTS AND YOU

1. In 1948, 450 people were employed to hand out foreign economic aid. Ten years and $41 billion later the foreign aid staff had grown to 12,000 employees directing 2,000 projects. Besides that, 9,000 persons are engaged in the military aid program that has given out $22 billion.

2. A total of $3 billion foreign aid funds has been given to foreign governments to help reduce their national debts and balance their budgets. In order to do this we had to borrow the money and increase our national debt.

3. Two billion dollars in foreign aid has been given to governments that are hostile to the United States—Poland, Yugoslavia, and the Soviet Union.

4. An official report on foreign aid given to oil-rich Iran states: "U.S. aid in Iran, between 1951 and 1956, totaled a quarter billion dollars. This was administered in a loose, slipshod, and unbusinesslike manner, so that it is impossible to tell what became of the money."

5. The much-touted Development Loan Fund is a foreign aid device to loan money on what amounts to second mortgage securities and accept soft local currencies in

repayment. The Development Loan Fund also lends money to American businessmen to build oversea factories to produce goods in competition with American-produced goods. Seven hundred million dollars has already been appropriated, but so far only $400 million has been obligated.

6. India—a country that has received hundreds of million of dollars in aid from us—increased her Communist vote from 4 million to 12 million between 1952 and 1957. Today the Communist Party is the second largest party in the Indian Parliament.

7. Our foreign aid program results in confusion, misunderstanding, and often chaos. After 15 years of giving out $63 billion in foreign aid we are probably the most disliked and envied Nation in the world.

8. More than one-fourth of our national debt of $285 billion has resulted from our foreign aid programs. The annual interest on the foreign aid portion of our debt is $2 billion. Our past and present foreign aid programs amount to 20 percent of all tax money collected from American individuals. So, 20 percent of your Federal tax money goes for foreign aid. Figure out how many of your dollars go for foreign aid.

TODAY'S FINANCIAL PICTURE

Recently Secretary of the Treasury Anderson personally briefed the members of the Ways and Means Committee on the Nation's financial picture and the national debt. In a nutshell the following is the picture:

(a) Our total debt amounts to $867 billion, distributed as follows:

	Billion
Federal debt	$285.0
State and local debt	60.0
Corporate debt	284.0
Individual debt	238.0
Total debt	867.0
This year's budget receipts will be	63.0
This year's budget expenditures will be	80.9
This year's deficit will be	12.9

Our Federal Government is having difficulty today in refinancing Government bonds when they become due. There are two reasons for this situation: First, our Government credit standing is not so good as it was 20 years ago; and, second, the demand for money for industrial expansion is much greater today than ever. Therefore, competition for money is keen.

Other countries are cutting down their national debts while we are increasing ours. Why?

SPENDING FOR FOREIGN ECONOMIC AND MILITARY AID IN 13 POSTWAR YEARS GREATER THAN GRANTS-IN-AID AND CHECKS TO INDIVIDUALS BY BILLIONS

In the 13 postwar fiscal years, 1946 through 1958, inclusive, the U.S. Treasury has disbursed more of the taxpayers' dollars for foreign economic and military than was disbursed as grants-in-aid to State and local governments plus checks direct to individuals for subsidies, relief, and all other purposes, including veterans' benefits.

As a matter of fact, the obvious preference of foreign governments and people over the hard-pressed American taxpayers, probably will be one of the hottest issues in the campaigns of 1960. The issue is already getting so hot that efforts of the Eisenhower administration to dress up foreign aid as a military necessity in support of our national defense efforts or as a method to "contain" communism are not receiving the reception expected. In fact, the record shows that foreign aid has not contained communism, nor has it in any way lessened our own expenditure for national defense.

The table following shows in separate columns by fiscal years, the reported expenditures for foreign aid (grants and credits) and the amounts disbursed here at home as grant-in-aid and checks direct to individuals other than loans for the 13 postwar years:

Fiscal year	Reported gross foreign aid	Grants-in-aid and checks to individuals
1946	[1] $6,904,122,806	$1,209,107,183
1947	[2] 8,523,477,612	1,694,070,076
1948	7,087,000,000	5,551,054,046
1949	7,602,929,206	5,493,710,703
1950	6,338,536,000	5,518,879,345
1951	6,624,286,000	4,850,097,620
1952	5,068,000,000	4,241,158,202
1953	7,030,000,000	4,053,941,794
1954	5,155,410,175	4,284,380,522
1955	4,380,920,377	4,594,669,209
1956	4,473,177,000	5,152,135,647
1957	4,625,000,000	6,468,449,700
1958	4,661,000,000	7,420,709,899
Total	78,351,136,176	60,615,424,066

[1] Excludes loans to several American Republics.
[2] Includes British loan for $3,750,000,000 of which $2,050,000,000 had been disbursed. Excludes subscriptions to International Bank and International Monetary Fund.

Gasoline Price Fixing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, Subcommittee No. 5 of the Select Committee on Small Business, of which I was and am privileged to serve as chairman, made an investigation during the 85th Congress of distribution practices in the petroleum industry.

In reply to a recent inquiry made by the subcommittee to the Department of Justice, as to actions taken on subcommittee recommendations, we received the following letter:

MARCH 24, 1959.

Hon. JAMES ROOSEVELT,
Chairman, Subcommittee No. 5, Select Committee on Small Business, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROOSEVELT: In your March 16, 1959, letter you request a brief summary of progress made by the Department during the past year relating to the recommendations made in the interim report of Subcommittee No. 5 concerning distribution practices in the petroleum industry. Your subcommittee recommended:

"1. That the Department of Justice investigate the present influence of consignment, commission, and company operated stations in price leadership, maintenance or fixing, or in price discrimination against independent lessee-dealers, as possible violations of the antitrust laws.

"2. That the Department of Justice Investigate, take appropriate action and report to the House of Representatives as to the legality of suggesting retail prices and of the creation of trade areas by oil suppliers within which they grant competitive allowances or subsidies to petroleum lessees and dealers."

Regarding No. 1 above, the Department during the past year has considered numerous retail gasoline price fixing complaints involving consignment, commission, and company operated service stations by the major oil companies. A number of these complaints concerned the west coast area and were referred to the trial staff handling the case of *United States* v. *Standard Oil Company of California*, the so-called west coast oil case. Other similar complaints from Charleston, W. Va., and New Hampshire were investigated by the Department and further action is under consideration at the present time. On January 12, 1959, the National Congress of Petroleum Retailers, through its general counsel, William D. Snow, Esq., submitted to the Department an accumulation of complaints received by the association involving control of gasoline prices through commission and company operated stations. This complaint named 10 major oil companies and was based upon information received from independent dealers and officials of dealer associations in 20 States and the District of Columbia. It involved approximately 60 market areas where allegedly the major oil companies utilize strategically located high gallonage commission and company operated stations to control retail gasoline prices, including those of independent dealers. This complaint was given immediate and careful study by this office and on February 24, 1959, a conference was held by the Department with complainants from eight States where the practice appeared to be most prevelant. During an all-day discussion complaints were evaluated for the purpose of selecting areas where there appears to be the best chance of developing evidence for antitrust enforcement action. The areas have now been selected and steps are being taken to initiate appropriate enforcement action.

Pending also, as you may know, is a grand jury investigation in Denver, Colo., involving gasoline prices in that area. I cannot comment on this investigation of course since the grand jury has not completed its investigation. As you are aware, we have pending in South Bend an indictment involving retail gasoline prices which was returned on October 7, 1958. This case, *United States* v. *Standard Oil Company, et al.*, as you know, was based largely on information developed at hearings conducted by your committee. A copy of this indictment is enclosed for your information.

Recommendation No. 2 above is being handled by the Federal Trade Commission by arrangement with the Department, in order to avoid duplication of effort and expense. We understand through liaison channels that the Commission has conducted an exhaustive investigation of the practice of suggesting retail prices. Likewise, the Commission has conducted and also has pending investigations involving the granting of allowances and subsidies to certain dealers under its responsibility to enforce section 2(a) of the Robinson-Patman Act.

We have forwarded a copy of your letter to George B. Haddock, Esq., Chief of the Los Angeles office of the Antitrust Division, 1602 U.S. Post Office and Courthouse, Los Angles, Calif., for his comments on your inquiry about proposed legislation relating to the petroleum industry in California. You will be advised further in this matter in the very near future.

Sincerely yours,

VICTOR R. HANSEN,
Assistant Attorney General, Antitrust Division, Department of Justice.

Housing and the Little Fellow's Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, Columnist Raymond Moley, formerly promi-

nent in Government circles in the New Deal days, pays tribute to the perspicacity of our colleagues, Representatives McDONOUGH, HERLONG, and ALGER, in the following discussion of housing legislation:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Mar. 22, 1959]

HOUSING BILLS REVEAL HYPOCRISY OF LIBERALS WHO SPONSOR THEM

(By Raymond Moley)

The monstrous hypocrisy of the liberal groups now in control of Congress could not be better illustrated than in the omnibus housing bill before the House and the one passed by the Senate in February.

These breast-beating friends of the "little fellow" propose, as they have enacted in the past, a much bigger windfall for rich investors than the alleged benefits they offer in subsidies to the people they claim to help by cheap housing.

GOP HAS OPPORTUNITY

Speeches by three Members of the House, taking less than 10 minutes of the time of the House on March 3 and 9, have opened an issue which, if seized by the President, the Vice President, and the Republican Party, could strip the mask from their political enemies who are trying to win the 1960 election with taxpayers' dollars.

They could also do exactly what they proclaim they want to do—knock the "party of the rich" label from the Republican Party. It is one of the hottest but least understood social and economic issues of our time.

The three Congressmen who opened this lid are men who, by ability and sincerity, have won the respect of every right-thinking individual in their districts. One is a Democrat, the others, Republican. They are GORDON L. MCDONOUGH, of California, A. SYDNEY HERLONG, JR., of Florida, and BRUCE R. ALGER, of Texas.

Certain public-housing bonds, issued by local housing agencies, represent local obligations only. They have back of them the full faith and credit of the United States. This Federal backing gives them their gilt-edged value.

BOON TO WEALTHY

The Federal Government gives them a very exclusive tax-exempt basis, which makes them very attractive to people with large incomes. They are really rich men's investments. They pay a little less than regular U.S. Government bonds—around 3 percent, depending upon the year they are issued.

In the omnibus housing bill passed by the House committee, about $2.6 billion is authorized, and over their 40-year life they will generate $1.9 billion in interest. But to a person of large means, who pays 50 percent or more in income taxes, the tax advantage will be very large indeed.

As an example of the windfall, Mr. HERLONG cited an issue acquired by a large bank to be sold to its clients. While the interest rate on these would be 3.4 percent, the people who get them, provided they have incomes of from $50,000 to $100,000 a year, will realize from 14 percent to 26 percent on their investment. And it should be noted that this range of income is exceeded by a great many people in this country.

These bonds go into the market in competition with regular U.S. bonds, which pay only a little more in interest and which the Treasury is having plenty of trouble in selling. The reluctance of investors must compel the Treasury to pay higher and higher interest on its bonds. This will be an item in the budget which must be paid every year for all those years.

The impact, therefore, will fall on all taxpayers, including the little fellows that the liberals claim they love so much. Thus, the liberals behind this housing bill, just like those who have voted over and over for similar bills, are really soaking the poor to enrich the rich.

OLD DECEPTION

This deception has been going on for a long time, and there have been strenuous protests against it. In 1952, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, W. M. Martin, Jr., said:

"Not only do such issues (tax-free housing bonds) absorb some of the funds which would otherwise supply a market for Government bonds or for mortgages generated by new private construction, but they afford an opportunity for wealthy individuals and corporations to reduce legally their income-tax payments in a period when it is essential that tax revenues be as large as possible."

Some of the mayors who are rushing to Washington to support these liberal housing bills should realize also that these tax-exempt housing bonds go into competition with their own municipal bonds and compel them to pay more and more interest to get money for their own communities. All they can pledge for those municipals is their own faith and credit. The housing bonds have Uncle Sam's endorsement.

It is time that this hoax on the little fellow be thoroughly aired.

Texas Broiler Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DOWDY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, on March 16, 1959, at Winnsboro, Tex., the following address was made to the Texas Broiler Association by its president, Mr. J. B. McMillan, of Garrison, Tex.:

It has been said that Texas Broiler Association was a voice crying in the wilderness. If that were ever true, it is certainly true no longer. For ever since TBA founded U.S. Poultry & Egg Producer Association in Dallas on Washington's Birthday in 1957, the press of the Nation, including all the great news gathering agencies, scores of great daily and weekly newspapers, practically all farm papers, newsletters, magazines, radio, and TV, have reported the hard-driving TBA efforts in every nook and cranny of this God-blessed land from the Atlantic to the Pacific, from Canada to the gulf.

And when the TBA membership voted to affiliate with our great Food Industry Union, it was considered of sufficient importance to warrant coverage by the aristocrats of press and radio, and we are always getting telegrams from various papers asking for reports on our various meetings.

With all that, it is literally true that wherever the shrill cry of the rooster has pierced the dawn and the hen has cackled in proud triumph, your own nationally known TBA has touched the hearts and won the respect and heartfelt sympathy of countless thousands to become far and away the best known poultry producer organization in these United States. True, there has been plenty of biased reporting, innuendoes, half-truths, insinuations, and outright misrepresentation. But that great mass of mankind whom Abraham Lincoln called the plain people nevertheless brushed aside the malice and sensed the truth behind the great crusade for a fair deal for broiler growers and eventually all farm folks, and came to trust, respect, and applaud the unyielding tenacity of TBA in its fight for economic stability, justice, and fairness in our loved and battered broiler industry. And, if our mail can be trusted, there is no doubt that even now multiplied thousands of prayers for the success of TBA's efforts are ascending heavenward, borne on the wings of eternal hope. And we have strong support in every major broiler-growing area of Texas and in many other States, including Louisiana, Arkansas, New Jersey, Ohio, Indiana, California, Oregon, Missouri, Maryland, Virginia, and others.

Equally significant is the fact that we have been fought as bitterly as we have been fought unfairly by the great mass producing combines whose selfish greed has deliberately wrecked the broiler industry with senseless overproduction. Insane production without regard to what the market can take at a reasonable price. Apply that principle to United States Steel, General Motors, and the other behemoths of American business and every one of them will explode and vanish in chaos in less than 1 year. Nothing yet developed can stand the senseless philosophy of overproduction practiced by our broiler industry's mass producing combines. But there is method in this mass producing madness. These powerful combines are simply trying to destroy the last vestiges of family farm production and then, having the field to themselves, they can make the American housewife repay all their losses and build fortunes that would make the fabled wealth of Croesus pale into insignificance. That is the very essence of monopoly. And make no mistake about it, these mass producing broiler monopolies are as much the enemy of our feed dealers, processors, hatcheries, and smaller mills as they are of us broiler producers on the family farm. Yet far too many of these smaller industrymen who depend upon the family farm growers have allowed themselves to be misled by propaganda put out by these vicious and evil mass producing combines who are determined to destroy not only the farm growers but those industrymen who serve the farm growers as well. We have always preached and argued that the broiler industry was a closely knit economic unit and that the well-being of each segment demanded the cooperation of all. We still stand solidly on that principle and are, and have always been, eager and anxious to cooperate for the benefit of us all. For in true cooperation lies the salvation of us all. So when you hear me cussing the industry, remember that I am talking about the powerful mass producing combines and not the honest feedmen, processors, and hatcherymen, all of whom are marked as victims of these evil and destructive combinations, just as we are.

And remember that it was your own Texas Broiler Association who first dared to brand these powerful mass producing combines as vicious and destructive monopolies, enriching themselves on the blood, sweat, and tears of multiplied thousands of unoffending broiler growers and did so on a great national platform from which some of the most powerful Members of the Congress of the United States also addressed the poultry producers of the Nation and pledged support for an economically sound and stable industry. From that moment onward, TBA has been feared and hated by these vicious monopolistic wreckers of a great industry because they know that we have turned the fierce white light of public opinion on the almost incredible abuses so long practiced.

As a matter of fact, we are proud of most of our Texas broiler industry leaders for it is a well established fact that most of our troubles come from beyond the borders of Texas. The Texas industrymen deserve commendation and I am happy to commend them for their efforts to cut down senseless overproduction of broilers, even though their action proved to be shortsighted and unwise, resulting in dismal failure and serious injury to all segments of our industry. I refer to the fact that in 1957 Texas tried to

cut down the stupid and ruinous overproduction but the mass producing combines in other States, as usual, took advantage of our good intentions and increased their already swollen overproduction more than enough to offset the Texas cutback. Thus, while Texas fell from second to fifth place in broiler production, the mass producing combines boomed and national production of broilers rose by some 21 percent, totally wiping out the Texas reduction and keeping the industry in economic chaos and spreading ruin for thousands of growers and their friends, the feed dealers and smaller industrymen. Texans are accustomed to advance and when we fell from second to fifth place in broiler production, it hurt all Texas. It did not help the growers. It did not help the industry. It helped only the arrogant, mass producing combines who created all the chaos in the first place.

Therefore if the industry had cooperated with Texas Broiler Association in its continuing efforts to stabilize the broiler industry on sound economics and good business, not only we but they too would have been far better off and Texas would have been able to have held its rightful place in broiler production thereby benefiting us all as honest and sincere cooperation is always bound to be beneficial to any group that has the courage to practice it. We are still ready and willing to cooperate with all segments of the industry and we hope that our friends in the industry will see both the necessity and the justice of helping us establish a good working relationship with all segments of the industry.

But the Texas industry effort to reduce ruinous overproduction, mistaken and unwise though it proved to be, nevertheless proved once more the absolute correctness of TBA in its insistence all along that the broiler industry was national in scope and therefore a national problem which no State, not even Texas, could solve alone and that nationwide action was required.

Although TBA has thus far failed to win cooperation, we have never stopped fighting for the great principles for which we have always stood. We have also realized that the broiler industry is so vast and so concentrated that only the Government or the great family of organized labor are strong enough to bring stabilization, justice, and sound economics out of the appalling chaos existing in the broiler industry. Thus, denied help and cooperation from our own industry we turned to the great food industry union, Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America, AFL–CIO and, in this 63 year old union, we found as fine a group of men as it has ever been my good fortune to meet. Able, helpful, sincere, hard-working, and dedicated men, it is an honor and a privilege to know them and to work with them in the great task before us. When we went to them for help, they generously extended a helping hand and have shown us more consideration, more helpfulness, more sincerity, more understanding of our problems and more Christian brotherhood than we had found in the entire broiler industry and all the industry dominated poultry organizations in the United States put together. And if you will read the constitution of our union, I know you will agree with me that any man or woman who lives up to the high standards set forth is not only a patriotic citizen but a good Christian man or woman in every sense of the word. And in the charter, are the important words: "The autonomy of the union is hereby granted and recognized." That means, my friends, that whatever is done in our broiler grower union will be done by broiler growers, with each member having an equal vote. It necessarily follows that our broiler grower union will be as good or as bad as we broiler growers make it and if we fail, we cannot blame it on any one, certainly not on the international union. It is strictly up to us and if we do our part, success is certain and we and our children will enjoy a sound and stable broiler industry for generations to come. And our part is simply in joining our union and then voting and supporting it, thus making it an effective and powerful organization backed by the economic and political might of 18 million members of the great family of organized labor. No farm group in the history of American agriculture have ever had such a great opportunity as broiler growers now have and, if you support this union, it will be the dawn of a new day for all farm groups, for the eyes of the Nation are watching us as they have never watched any farm group in history. It is our opportunity and our responsibility. Therefore let us take time by the forelock and seize opportunity while we can. For, if we let this pass, we will never have another chance to save our broiler house and equipment investments or to get decent pay for our work.

Now just what is a union? Well, a union is simply a group of people associating themselves together for the benefit of all and operating on the tried and true democratic principle of majority rule. That means that when we growers have decided an issue by majority vote, we will be backed by our own great Food Industry Union with 397,000 members all over the Nation. And that is not all for we are a part of the powerful AFL–CIO and can depend upon the support of this great organization with more than 18 million members. Now just think a moment about that 18 million members with whom we broiler growers are now privileged to stand on equal terms. Why do so many men and women stand solidly together year after year? The answer can only be that there is great good in the union and that each and every member actually benefits from his or her membership. Think a little further and you will realize that most of these 18 million union members are heads of families and, say there are four people in the average American family. That would be 72 million people enjoying direct benefits, security, and protection from the union in their daily lives. Thus, nearly half of all our people enjoy direct benefits from unions while millions more enjoy indirect benefits such as a higher standard of living, better economic conditions and better pay. Indeed all the people in our Nation enjoy manifold benefits from the economic security unions make possible. That is why we are proud, honored, and grateful to be a part of our great Food Industry Union, the amalgamated.

Moreover, working men and women are not the only people who believe in the principles of unionism. Try to find a doctor who does not belong to the American Medical Association. Try to find a lawyer who does not belong to the bar association, which is nothing more or less than a lawyer's union. And, if you do find a doctor who does not belong to his association or union, you will find an outcast in his profession no matter how brilliant he may be. And if you happen to find a lawyer who does not belong to the bar association or lawyer's union, you dare not hire him for even should he win a favorable verdict for you, the higher courts would throw it out as was done recently right here in Texas. And even our good friends, the bankers, with all their vast economic power, find it necessary to organize and you can be sure that they have very powerful organizations, which are, after all merely bankers' unions. Now, if organization helps the banker, how much more would it help the broiler grower? If the doctor and the lawyer need organization, with all their special training and skill, how much greater is the need of effective organization for broiler growers? Look around you, the banker, merchant, doctor, lawyer, factory owner, bricklayers, schoolteachers, even ministers of the gospel all have organizations to protect their rights and bring security. Now, ask yourself the question: If all these people need unions, how can we broiler growers hope to survive standing alone?

No, ladies and gentlemen, there is no substitute for effective organization and, if we want the good life, with good pay and all that goes with good living for ourselves and our children, we must organize and stand solidly together for the enduring benefit of us all. There is no other way. And as an organized group, you can do anything you want to do so long as it is honest and reasonable. Unorganized, you will remain helpless and exposed to every wind that blows.

In conclusion, let me humbly urge that you take advantage of this God-given opportunity to become a member of the most effective organization ever developed by man, the great family of organized labor, yet privileged to run your own broiler grower union without interference.

So let each of us put the old shoulder to the wheel and begin now to make things happen the way we want them to happen and the way to do that is join your own TBA broiler grower union today and then ask your friends and neighbors to join for the quicker we can get a few hundred more members, the quicker we can begin to get things done. The initiation fee is only $5 and the regular dues will not begin until the membership has voted on what those dues shall be. That is the democratic union way. Join today. I thank you.

Industrial Michigan Faces New Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT McNAMARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, a newspaper in my State, the Detroit Times, has been making a notable effort to clear away the lies and slanders that have been perpetrated about Michigan recently and to get at the real truth.

The Detroit Times has not been doing a "whitewash job" in presenting the facts. One article, for example, notes that Michigan has perhaps been lagging in developing the scientific and basic research brainpower that is needed to cope with the new age.

Yet, the article shows that Michigan has already taken great strides to correct that deficiency. I ask unanimous consent that this article, from the Detroit Times of Friday, March 27, be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE LAGS ON SCIENCE

(By Jack Pickering)

It may be that the traducers of Michigan have missed the most significant criticism that might have been lodged against the State from the standpoint of economic development.

That is research and scientific brainpower.

In this direction Michigan is, indeed, lagging.

"Lagging" does not mean that Michigan is at the bottom of the heap. Michigan is far from that. In some respects Michigan is outstanding in scientific forethought. In

some respects she is so-so. In some respects she is behind the eight ball.

The best way you can sum up the situation is to say that Michigan, up to the last few years, has been adequately supplied with scientific brains.

Now, in the morning of a new kind of age, Michigan has allowed too many other areas to leap too far ahead.

It hasn't hurt very much—yet. But unless something is done soon, the consequences will become more and more obvious.

Yet now comes the most encouraging sign of what otherwise would be a dark outlook: The effort to correct this situation already is in progress, and the effort started before the "man in the street" was even aware of the problem.

The Governor's science advisory board includes men who, without question, are among the truly thoughtful leaders of scientific thinking.

In a word, their opinion, now taking form, is that if Michigan is to earn its rightful share in the future, it must start developing new products and new industries.

To develop these, somebody must invent or discover them.

In a word, what Michigan needs is more research. More scientific study.

We'll get back to that in a minute, but first let's just remember Michigan's history in this century.

Michigan has been the automobile capital, the shrine city of mass production. Automobiles grew to such a fabulous importance that Michigan neither wanted nor needed—nor could have handled—many other industries.

It was a big enough task just keeping up with the demand for more cars.

Now, for the first time (the Great Depression was a painful interlude but not a milestone) the automobile industry has reached its adulthood.

That doesn't mean it won't produce even more cars in 1965 than it did in 1955. It probably will. But it no longer can keep growing at the rate of its infancy and youth. It is grown up.

With continued growth of population, and with automation, Michigan must find other work for its people to do.

That is why, among thinking people, the real issue today isn't any of the incidental criticisms which are being nurtured so noisily by outsiders.

The need is new ideas and new knowledge. The ideas for new industries rarely leap full-grown from concept to useful products.

Some man, working for the sake of knowledge alone, uncovers a new fact. Einstein evolved the mathematical formula for translating matter into power, but it was years before anyone split an atom, and still more years before splitting atoms became a bomb, and even more years before fisioning atoms became useful power supplies.

By the nature of Michigan's development, the State for decades has not been hungry for basic ideas. It had one—the idea of a horseless carriage! for half a century it has taken the utmost in ingenuity and skillful management to make the most of that basic idea.

Now, at last, it is time for some additional ones.

How does Michigan stand in producing thinkers—and laboratories in which to do their thinking? Not especially well.

We have six colleges and universities which are doing a pretty good job of training students. A pretty good job. University of Michigan is, indeed, one of America's great universities. But it isn't the "Athens of the West" that some overenthusiastic Ann Arborites once tried to tell themselves it was.

We have Wayne State University, University of Detroit, Michigan State University, all producing engineers and science graduates—and one educator gratuitously commented that MSU's activity in this line is much underrated.

Western Michigan University and the School of Mining and Technology at Houghton are not to be forgotten, either. We have some good schools.

And yet, at the same time, Michigan is a strange mixture of strong and weak points. U. of M. ranks third in the United States, exceeded only by Massachusetts Institute of Technology and California Institute of Technology, in defense projects being handled for the Government.

Yet Michigan schools are graduating only about 100 bachelors of science in electronics, when the State needs at least 1,000 a year.

Curiously, in the important field of physics, the big Ann Arbor campus has only about three dozen undergraduates specializing in physics—yet has several hundred graduate students taking advanced work.

The implication is unavoidable: Michigan has skilled teachers and excellent laboratories, yet people from other States are more interested than we are in making use of them.

You have proof right there that for whatever reason, Michigan residents in the mass are not making adequate use of the facilities we already have.

Now let's look at a different phase, yet related. Last year the National Science Foundation awarded 389 first-year graduate fellowships. These are awarded to topflight students, and they are allowed to go to whatever schools they choose.

Only eight came to Michigan; 230 went to the notable schools of the east and west coasts.

A significant resignation was announced only last week. Dr. J. Earl Thomas came here nearly 4 years ago to head the physics department at Wayne State University. But he has resigned and will leave at the end of the present session. He came here with dreams of building an outstanding physics department; he found, he says, too little interest in such a goal.

True, Wayne State has its financial problems, but Dr. Thomas said that the worst lack was a lack of enthusiasm, a lack of dreams which could be achieved, a lack of respect for intellectual curiosity and scholarship in too many high places.

He is getting more money to go to an electronics corporation in Massachusetts, but the money hasn't taken all the sting out of his failure to achieve what he wanted to achieve.

What is his feeling as to the reason for Michigan's seeming lack of interest in a scholarly approach to science? He thinks it is a price Michigan has paid for its greatness as a mass production center.

"Too much of the attitude," he says, "that everything must be immediately useful in the automobile business. Too little patience or respect toward basic ideas, and an absence of reverence for scholarship for its own sake."

Don't let that word "reverence" mislead you. Don't make the mistake of thinking that this physicist is demanding that people bow down to an academic symbol.

For Dr. Thomas is not an ivory-tower idler. Only 40, he worked on the atomic bomb at Los Alamos, helped develop rockets at Cal Tech, is currently doing work for the Navy.

You don't develop new products, new methods, new industries out of thin air, he insists. You accomplish these concrete benefits by a pattern that has proved itself over the centuries. The scholar finds a new fact, not necessarily having the slightest idea what it is good for.

In due time somebody finds a use for it. But there isn't any shortcut. Omit the basis, and the rest is futility.

Or if you want to hear the same thing by somebody else, take a reference from a preliminary report from a subcommittee of the Governor's advisory committee on science.

The committee members are worth noting carefully: George J. Huebner, Jr., Chrysler research engineering chief and the man who headed the team which developed the Chrysler missile program and ultimately lofted America's first satellite; Dr. Michael Ference, physicist and head of Ford's research laboratories; Dr. L. A. Sweet, Parke, Davis research director; Dr. Winston Kock, of Bendix; Dr. Lawrence Hafstead, GM vice president and the man who discovered a characteristic of neutron emission which is what makes nuclear powerplants possible, instead of merely bombs.

These men, obviously, have one foot in each of two worlds: The scientific world, and the business world. So mark this from their report:

"Half of all products now manufactured in this country can be traced directly to a research laboratory, and profitability of many of the others rests on research.

"Our high standard of living and our growing economy in the United States are no longer based on natural resources and fortunate geography, but on scientific research."

Thomas and other scientists are bitter at the remarks of some so-called "practical" men who sneered at research in the past.

C. E. Wilson's remark is one: "I agree with Boss Ket: 'If you show me a piece of basic research, I'll show you something useless'."

Or Kettering's proud announcement that he had a sign outside his laboratory, "Leave all slide rules here before entering."

Or even Henry Ford's objection to sending his son to college—although there are some who suspect Ford, as was often the case, wasn't sneering at knowledge so much as he was suspicious of the rah-rah attitude that once seemed to be the outstanding characteristic of campuses.

Even since the war at least one atomic energy laboratory was disbanded by a top-ranking Michigan executive because he could see no immediate sales possibility from understanding the atom more fully.

But lest this recital of past mistakes seem depressing, look at the other side of the coin. The auto companies, once so sure that the practical side was all that counted, now have influential representatives—see the committee list above—insisting on research as the key to the future.

Note that Michigan (led by Walker Cisler, of Detroit Edison) is in the forefront of peaceful atomic power, with the construction of the Enrico Fermi plant—and don't think that is being built by some tinkers with wrench and tinsnips. A powerful team of mathematicians, physicists and engineers are doing it.

Burroughs, Upjohn, Parke-Davis, Bendix and a host of others are showing how research builds business.

For still a further point, admitting that Michigan has need of stimulating its interest, and respect, and activity in science, is there still time for Michigan to catch up? Has Michigan, in fact, slipped?

One highly reliable index to the economic health of any community, nation or state, is its use of electric power.

In the 10 years 1947-57, Michigan's kilowatt-hour consumption rose 8.8 percent.

Eleven Western States increased 9.8 (California rose 9 percent, while New Mexico and Nevada, with a lot of catching up to do, rose 15.8 and 16.9).

New York showed only 5.8; busy New Jersey 8.3 which still didn't match Michigan; the New England States 6.7; Ohio a lusty 12.4 although other Midwest States ranged from 5 to 7; Kentucky-Tennesse-Alabama-Mississippi, 16.7, indicating quite a surge there.

It might not hurt, however, to keep this in mind. You don't just buy good scientists, or hire them away from somebody else, or pick them off trees. You train them, from schoolboys on up.

And while Dr. Thomas is understandably disappointed in his own experience here, his present viewpoint is objective and interesting:

"I came here because I knew that Detroit industry had to have basic science to support it. This still is so. Industry goes where the ideas are. If Michigan wants part of the aircraft, or jet engine business, what better way is there than to design better air frames or engines here? Incidentally, it puzzles me to hear so much about gas turbines in the automotive field, yet there seems to be no effort to design jet engines—and General Electric gets contracts instead.

"However, there are some promising things about Detroit, too.

"One is its population. It seems to me that Detroit, instead of being a melting pot, is more of a marble cake, with so many nationality groups all remaining separate entities.

"At the same time, this may be a very important factor in its way. This reverence for scholarship that I mentioned—it is very strong in Europe and other parts of the world.

"I think that may be why the east and west coasts, being more exposed to other nations, and their thinking, have acquired more of this attitude toward scholarship. There is nothing that foreign-born parents like so much as to see a son become a scholar.

"The hope of Michigan lies with the people. Not the native-born leaders, but the people."

Annual Report of the New York Civil Defense Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the New York State Civil Defense Commission has recently published its annual report. The report reflects the philosophy of the civil defense program in New York State, and presents the case for a greater awareness of the potential dangers that confront us. I ask unanimous consent that the foreword of the report be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as I deem it worthy of the attention of my colleagues.

There being no objection, the foreword was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREWORD

The annual report for 1958 marks the completion of 8½ years that the present civil defense program is in operation in New York State. Despite its origin in wartime, it has now become a continuous peacetime program reflecting recognition by the Federal and the State Governments that civil defense, like military defense, constitutes a bulwark of our national security and is, therefore, an essential element of everyday life.

As the year comes to a close, two questions appear uppermost in mind: What has been accomplished in the past year? Where are we heading in the coming year? The second of these is the most important, for nothing can be done about the past; but, it is within our power to do something about the future.

Reviewing the accomplishments of the year toward attaining an effective civil defense, several major developments stand out. One is that the State civil defense plan and the 12 target-support area plans were completed; and that city and county plans and in the case of the latter, also town and village plans, are in the process of completion. The other development, ensuring the progressive improvement of the Nation's civil defense, was the promulgation by the President of the national plan for civil defense and defense mobilization.

Thus, the broad general civil defense doctrine on the Federal and State levels has been firmed up, and the course of action that needs to be taken is now clearly defined. In the latter connection, New York State has already moved to coordinate its efforts with those of the Federal Government.

The preparation of the written plans did not introduce any basic changes in the concepts underlying the work of the Commission and the local civil defense organizations up to the present time. The approach adopted by the Commission from the outset has been fundamentally sound; and, with few minor changes, our planning policies and principles have been kept up to date in line with new requirements. While the written plans, which consolidate and reflect the latest thinking, serve a useful purpose in enhancing civil defense efforts in the immediate future, there is no need to break sharply with the past, lay new foundations, and begin our work anew.

What will be required, however, is a more intensive effort in familiarizing ourselves with the contents of these plans and in making the doctrine universally known throughout the State. With the written plans as a basis, manuals and other detailed guides have been developed for use in training. This step will enable us to test our plans and also to apprise the organized civil defense forces and the population as to what our problems are and what needs to be done to resolve these problems.

Since there is a broad definite thread of continuity in our civil defense program, the work which is planned for the future should not be difficult to grasp. We need only to examine past accomplishments to disclose the gaps which exist and then to chart the new areas of civil defense activity on which we must embark.

Coupled with the day-to-day efforts to advance our civil defense preparations is another important job which we must undertake. Those of us who have been in civil defense over the years know and appreciate its vital importance. There are others who need to be convinced. True, civil defense has not been accepted as readily as military defense; therefore, we have the job of winning this acceptance. This we must achieve if we are to gain the wholehearted cooperation of the entire population without whose support and assistance civil defense can never be fully adequate.

There still prevails to strongly the idea that all our national security requires is to build up and maintain military retalatory forces. It is difficult to understand how we can conceive of full retaliation if, with the first blow against us, our homefront will be unable to withstand and deal with the effects of initial attack.

Today, national survival depends on the timely availability of weapons superior to those of the the potential enemy. It also depends on the capability of the homefront, which will be a primary battleground, to measure up fully to the exigencies of modern war. One cannot do without the other.

With soundly based National and State plans, defined responsibilities, and tested procedures, civil defense can now proceed to present a genuine deterrent to an enemy's plan to overwhelm the American people by terror. Americans will be able to survive, get on their feet and fight back. This is the objective of a well-organized civil defense.

Until such time as nations will give up war as a means of settling disputes, we will live under the threat of war.

Modern arsenals of war now consist of weapons armed with an explosive potential measured in millions of tons of TNT. Nuclear explosives are so plentiful that a number of nations now possess sufficient quantities to carry out any military action they may desire.

Delivery systems—that is, the manned aircraft and ballistic missiles—have been perfected to the point where their numbers are now simply a matter of industrial production capability. Guidance systems have been improved to the point where any target, wherever located, can be attacked.

Underlying these developments is the salient fact that offensive capabilities are outstripping defensive capabilities. According to our military leaders, there is no assurance of a perfect defense which an enemy could not penetrate.

We are confronted, therefore, with the prospect that we might have to live in a state of siege, with the enemy operating from bases thousands of miles away.

Urban concentration is the heart of modern civilization. Our very existence is centered in highly complex and interdependent communities. While this system of living has brought us untold benefits and has enabled us to achieve the highest standard of living in the history of mankind, it is also the source of grave potential danger in that in any attack on the United States the concentration of population and industry will become the most inviting and convenient focal points of attack.

In any future war that nation will win whose people are prepared to and can withstand the shock. This can be accomplished only through recognition of the problem which will confront us in any future war and through advance preparations to cope with the dangers that will face us. The means through which we can achieve such preparations is civil defense.

A misconception prevalent among many of our people is that civil defense is something apart from our daily lives and our Government. Actually, civil defense is our Government and our people at war. It must be recognized as a way of life, and must be fully integrated into our governmental structure.

In war as in peace, the safety and welfare of the people are entrusted to the regularly constituted local authorities. The mayor's responsibility as chief executive does not cease because of war, nor does the responsibility of the chief of police for the maintenance of law and order, nor, for that matter, does that of any other official within his sphere of authority. However, because of the impact of war, many normal duties will have to be expanded and new duties added.

Civil defense, then, involves all of Government plus the additional facilities and personnel which will be required to enable us to take care of the added burdens imposed by war.

The concept of civil defense has undergone tremendous changes since World War II. Its mission is the same—advance preparations preattack to insure adequate preparations before an attack; to bring assistance to stricken areas following attacks, to keep production going in support of the war effort; and to lay the basis for recovery when hostilities cease.

Adjustments, however, have been made in our approach to civil defense to meet the new requirements created by the new weapons and delivery systems. These ad-

justments conform to the changes which have taken place in military defense.

The basic pattern of civil defense evolved in recent years is geared to meet the various contingencies dictated by modern war. This pattern provides for effective arrangements to warn the people against impending attack; for training people in what to expect in the event of war and keeping them informed of the progress of hostilities during war; for laying the basis of various types of evasive action they can take, depending on the warning time available; for a shelter program; for permitting the marshaling of all available resources and capabilities for postattack disaster rescue and relief operations; and, finally, for instituting measures promoting recovery and restoration following attack and the cessation of hostilities.

Civil defense is essentially a "package" type of operation involving all phases of remedial action which can be taken under the circumstances. Sound planning requires that we prepare for the remote as well as the highly probable contingencies. We have made constant strides in all of the courses of action, except shelter. Here, a special effort must be made.

With the possible warning time being steadily reduced by speedier instruments of delivery and the increase in the destructive yield of weapons, the need for adequate shelter is ever more apparent and becoming even more urgent. Shelter will afford protection to some degree against all of the destructive effects of nuclear weapons—heat, blast, and radiation.

As a parting word, there are two points which I would like to emphasize. One is that civil defense preparations should not be turned on and off depending on the temporary state of international relations. When tensions become critical it will be too late to do something about civil defense preparations. The program is too broad and inclusive to permit its adequate development at a moment's notice even if a crash program were undertaken. Like military preparations, it must be continually developed and maintained; and its development should be such that, if any need arises to put civil defense into immediate effect, it will be done quickly and with effective results.

The other point is leadership. In view of their magnitude and complexity, adequate civil defense preparations require the best in leadership. It is no small job that can be conducted as a secondary effort. One needs only to examine existing civil defense plans to see its far-reaching ramifications. Coupled with this is the fact that civil defense preparations require financial outlay. We must use what we have, but we must not terminate or impede civil defense preparations on financial grounds. Obviously, this also calls for an outlay in peacetime. These expenditures need not be on as extensive a scale as the military, but we should not begrudge the price of a modern missile-bearing submarine in order to keep our civil defense going.

C. R. HUEBNER,
Director.

President de Gaulle of France on the Berlin Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BYRON L. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, on March 25, President de Gaulle, at his press conference in Paris, offered some profoundly significant observations in noting that two-thirds of the inhabitants of the earth lead a miserable existence, while certain peoples have at their disposal what is necessary to insure the progress of all. He asks what is the use of the dangerous wrangling over West Berlin and the German problem. For in our time, he says, the only quarrel worthwhile is that of mankind. He invites us to vanquish misery, to abolish poverty through international cooperation, and suggests that this should be the primary subject for the agenda of possible East-West conferences.

I commend to the attention of the Members the following official transcript of President de Gaulle's remarks:

The crisis opened by Soviet Russia on the subject of Berlin plunges the world into grave anxiety.

Three closely related questions are put by Moscow:

The possibility of measures which would raise an obstacle to the movement of American, British, and French military elements between West Berlin and the Western Zone.

The destiny of the German people, which would be profoundly affected by the formal separation of Germany into two states and by the fact that the former capital of the Reich would become incorporated in territories under totalitarian dictatorship or subjected to conditions which would lead to this servitude.

Finally, neutralization of a zone in Europe of which Germany would be an essential part.

Let us add that the Soviet Government, in pressing the West to open negotiations on the fate of Berlin and on a peace treaty with the two Germanys, made it known that it envisaged transferring its rights and responsibilities regarding the city to the Pankow (East German) authorities. In this case, the goings and comings of American, British, and French forces would have to be made in agreement with Pankow, a situation which Washington, London, and Paris would find themselves forced to recognize.

Should the Western Powers see the way barred to them and should they want to open it by force, they would come up against Soviet troops stationed in East Germany who, we have been told, are not there to play marbles.

This being so, it might be thought that France wishes to profit from the crisis and, joining the move to split the German people, insure for herself, at the expense of that country, advantages parallel to those which the Soviet Union seems to wish to seize for herself. That is a policy that others have been able to practice toward an unfortunate neighbor.

It is not only policy. If the present Germany seemed dangerous to us, then no doubt the memory of trials suffered by her actions and the desire to prevent their recurrence would motivate our demands. But Germany, as she is, in no way threatens us. We even think that with her capabilities, her energy, her resources, she constitutes an essential element in the life and progress of Europe and the whole world.

Even more, as is normal for two old adversaries who have given up fighting and destroying each other, France and Germany have resolved to cooperate. On this point, the policy of Chancellor Adenauer coincides with ours. Quite recently, Mr. Segni confirmed to me that it was also that of Italy.

We shall thus support nothing which would be such as to lead the German people to despair or to compromise its peaceful future or to wreck the hope which, after so many shocks and tears, has arisen on both sides of the Rhine.

One might think, on the other hand, that France might consider keeping out of the quarrel. Being without means of action, that is to say of destruction, equal to those in the hands of the Americans and the Russians, and thus, without the power to try and impose her policy, she might endeavor to keep outside the conflict and, should it come to that, out of the war. This would amount to France, in an attempt to keep her life, giving up her reasons for living. But also this would be to destroy the Atlantic alliance, and alliance which is unimaginable without the participation of France.

Thus nothing except atomic war could prevent Soviet domination from spreading over all Europe and all Africa, before it went on to cover the rest of the world. After which, the human race, or as much of it as would have survived, would everywhere be given up to the oppression of dictatorship and to the frightful upheavals brought about by dictatorial trends and leaders.

We prefer to maintain the alliance until the day when the future of peace is assured.

We hold it necessary in the first place that America, Britain, and France should not agree to allow anyone to put obstacles in the way of the comings and goings of their troops to and from Berlin. As a result of the victory, as well as of arrangements concluded in the past with Soviet Russia, the three powers have the right of passage. If anybody opposes this, they and all others who might come to support them would commit an act of hostility toward the Western Powers and would thus be responsible for the clashes which could follow.

As regards the fate of the city itself, we note that those of its inhabitants who have the opportunity to express their views are unanimous in wishing it to stay Western. For this reason and for others, we would not allow West Berlin to be given up to the Pankow regime.

Furthermore, we are not prepared to recognize this regime as a sovereign and independent state because it could not have been born and could not exist except by virtue of the Soviet occupation and because of an implacable dictatorship.

From the point of view of the foreign relations of the French Republic, we cannot put on the same level, on the one hand, this arbitrary construction and on the other, the German Federal Republic, where citizens say, read, and hear what they like, come and go as they please and, in complete freedom, elect their representatives and their government.

The reunification of the two parts into a single Germany which would be entirely free seems to us the normal destiny of the German people, provided they do not reopen the question of their present frontiers to the west, the east, the north, and the south, and that they move toward integrating themselves one day in a contractual organization of all Europe for cooperation, liberty, and peace.

But, pending the time when this ideal can be achieved, we believe that the two separated sections of the German people should be able to multiply ties and relations between themselves in all practical fields. Transport, communications, economic activity, literature, science, the arts, the goings and comings of people, etc., would be the subject of arrangements which would bring together the Germans, within, and for the benefit of, that which I would call "Germanness" and which after all is common to them, in spite of differences in regimes and conditions.

As regards turning Germany into a neutralized territory, this extrication or disengagement in itself has no meaning for us which is of any value. For if disarmament did not cover a zone which is as near to the Urals as it is to the Atlantic, how would France be protected? What then, in case of a conflict, would prevent an aggressor from

crossing by a leap or a flight the undefended German no man's land?

What narrow strip would remain between the Meuse and the ocean, in which to deploy and use the means of the West? Certainly, we are supporters of the control and limitation of all weapons of war. But, in order for these measures, apparently humanitarian, not to risk leading to our disappearance, they must cover an area deep enough and large enough for France to be covered and not, on the contrary, exposed.

On these different subjects and on others, I do not see, for my part, any objection of principle to the opening of negotiations, whatever precedents there may or may not have been. M. Couve de Murville would thus attend a conference of foreign ministers, should one be held.

If it were to develop that that conference, after thorough examination of the problems, succeeded in sifting out the elements of an agreement on important points, then, with Premier Michel Debré at my side, I could myself take part in a meeting of those charged with the supreme responsibilities of the great powers.

But it is clear that, in order to achieve something worthwhile, it is necessary to prepare the topics for discussion in such a forum, and discussions must be carried out in a peaceful atmosphere. In this matter, I am in complete agreement with what President Eisenhower said recently.

On this serious occasion, France feels qualified to speak clearly and calmly. First of all, because she has no feeling of competition or animosity toward the Russian people. Quite the contrary, she has a real and traditional friendship. In the next place, for the reason that in the matter of Germany, which is the stake in the crisis, she has been able to master her grievances and, taking into account the changes which have occurred there, to consider this country not as an enemy, but as a partner.

Lastly, because France herself does not yet have atomic bombs, and, unlike the three others, is not subject to the obsession of launching her bombs before those of the adversary have been able to accomplish their mission. In short, France looks at the present crisis in her own way, with clarity and even with impartiality.

That is why, speaking in her name, I am sure of speaking the thoughts of more than 2 billion human beings who think as she does. Because of, and in comparison with, the risks run by our species and of the immense human tasks that we could and should accomplish in common, any summons which might be addressed to the West with a view to obtaining abandonment by intimidation would be hateful and absurd. When, in both camps, everything is arranged so that means of destruction, capable of annihilating continents, could be unleashed in the space of a few seconds—at a time like that, creating a state of tension, such that any error, any incident might unleash the cataclysm, would be trantamount to presenting the very existence of humanity with an unpardonable challenge.

When two-thirds of the inhabitants of the earth lead a miserable existence, while certain people have at their disposal what is necessary to ensure the progress of all—what is the use of the dangerous wrangling over West Berlin, the East German Democratic Republic, and German disengagement?

For, in our time, the only quarrel worth while is that of mankind. It is mankind that must be saved, made to live and enabled to advance.

We, who live between the Atlantic and the Urals; we, who are Europe, possessing with Europe's daughter America, the principal sources and resources of civilization; we, who have the means to feed, clothe, and house ourselves and to keep warm; we, who have mines and factories going full blast, well-tilled soil, railways where run numerous trains, roads choked with cars, ports filled with ships, airports full of aircraft; we, all of whose children learn to read, who build many universities and laboratories, who form armies of engineers and technicians, who can see, hear, read what is of a nature to satisfy the mind; we, who have enough doctors, hospitals, medicines to ease suffering, to care for the sick, to ensure the life of most newborn infants—why do we not erect, all together, the fraternal organization which will lend its hand to the others? Why do we not pool a percentage of our raw materials, our manufactured goods, our food products, some of our scientists, technologists, economists, some of our trucks, ships, aircraft in order to vanquish misery, develop the resources, and help in the work of less-developed peoples? Let us do this—not that they should be the pawns of our policies, but to improve the chances of life and peace. How much more worth while that would be than the territorial demands, ideological claims, imperialist ambitions which are leading the world to its death.

It seems to me that this should be a primary subject for the agenda of possible East-West conferences. In case of agreement in principle, it would evidently be necessary to draw up a common plan of organization and implementation.

If we should hold a summit conference this year, I would be ready to speak of it with my friends, Mr. Eisenhower and Mr. Macmillan, and I hope that Mr. Khrushchev, whom I met some time ago in Moscow in the entourage of Stalin and who has come a long way since then, will be willing to take an interest in it.

Question: "How do you feel that the situation has developed in Algeria since last year when you offered the 'peace of the brave' to the Algerian rebels?"

There have been 130 years of vicissitudes in Algeria. For 4 years and more now, fighting and attacks have not ceased. We are living in an age when, on this earth, a gigantic organization is militating everywhere against the West, while the West often neglects to look after itself. We are witnesisng a turmoil which, inside the Moslem world, sets many Arab countries against foreign peoples, many states and parts of states against others of the same race and the same religion, and many leaders against other leaders who, like themselves, and yet against them, claim to be the champions of unity. Under these conditions, I doubt that anyone has ever been able to imagine that peace and prosperity would come all of a sudden to a torn Algeria, or that all that was necessary, at the height of a persistant fever, was to shout down one slogan with other slogans in order that all the internal and external causes of the present war should disappear as if by magic.

Personally, I do not think that, and I never say it. On the contrary, I believe and I say that the destiny of Algeria depends upon a task of long duration, the task of a whole generation performed under conditions and in a spirit that are completely new and that are aimed at enabling Algeria to reveal herself to herself and to open herself to the world as it is. I believe and I say that such a task is inconceivable without the presence and the action of France. I believe and I say that France has made her resolve, that she is now following a clear and firm plan and that, while endeavoring to achieve pacification as soon as possible, she is working for a transformation that will enable Algeria to find her new self.

What has been done for this transformation? This is what has been done in 8 months:

From the political point of view, the way of equal and universal suffrage has been opened for the first time and forever to the Alegrians, giving them the means of expressing their true will. Irreversible measures have established a single college for all women and men and given the Moslems the largest proportion of elected representatives in every kind of election. It was on this basis that the referendum, held last September, showed that the vast majority of the Algerian people trust me to secure for them peace, liberty, and dignity and to act so that Algeria will thereby remain linked to France. Legislative elections were held in October. The Algerian municipalities will elect their councils next month. Later, the general councils [of the departments] will be elected. Doubtless it may be objected that the war situation interferes with the objectivity of these various elections. It is nonetheless true that they are taking place, that the nature and the composition of all representative bodies have been profoundly altered by comparison with what they were and that thus the Algerians are henceforth ensured of self-determination as peace is gradually restored. That is a revolution if ever there was one.

With regard to economic development and social conditions in Algeria, anybody can see for himself that the implementation of the industrial and agricultural plan of Constantine has been started and that the Premier has just called attention to this fact. As it sometimes happens that France and progress share the same luck, by a happy concidence, the exploitation of Saharan oil and gas have just given Algeria the necessary means for getting things started. Algerians, take a look at your country as it still is. Soon, I promise you, you will see a very different Algeria.

From the point of view of education, the number of Algerian schoolgirls and schoolboys increased last year, will increase this year and in each of the years to come by hundreds of thousands so that, before 10 years have elapsed, all the children will be going to school. At the same time, a great effort is being made to train professional, technical, administrative and military personnel. And what value should be given to the number and importance of human relationships, which are constantly becoming more numerous between all France and all Algeria? In these relationships, the Army—in which, I might mention in passing, serve 110,000 Moslems—plays a major role. Intellectually, socially, morally, Algeria is in a period of gestation. A body of young people is emerging there, which includes those who have fought on one side or the other—young people who will want to see the birth and growth of a new Algeria, that is to say, a modern, educated and fraternal Algeria.

As this new Algeria takes shape in body and spirit, her political destiny will appear in the minds and in the votes of her children. I am sure that the Algerians want and will want this destiny to be tied to that of France and that the latter also wants and will want it, because this fits in with the nature of things, with common sense and with sentiment. This is a magnificent task which calls for the efforts of all the Algerians, of all the communities and of the French of France. By comparison, the desperate continuation of combats and attacks appears each day more absurd, because this continuation no longer seems to have any justifiable aim and therefore can lead only to hatred, misery and death.

Yes, blood and tears still flow; yet, Algeria and France are marching together toward the future—a future which, I assert, will belong to everyone and in which no door will be closed.

In Dixie: Mob Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Camden Chronicle, Camden, S.C., March 22, 1959:

IN DIXIE: MOB ACTION

Ironically enough, news the past few days on the racial issue front—news of the violence-and-trouble variety—has all come from Northern States.

In Michigan, Delaware, Indiana, New York, and Pennsylvania, everyone is supposed to be happy integrated—if you believe the professionals who specialize in stirring up racial conflict and disorder.

In those States there may be integration, but it appears to be far from happy.

Take, for instance, the situation in Detroit where white policemen are accused of staging a slowdown strike after they were assigned to ride with Negro policemen in squad cars.

Before March 1, Detroit's police patrols had operated on a segregated basis. That is, a car was occupied either by two white patrolmen or by two Negroes.

A new police commissioner took over. Evidently he's one of those commissioners with political ambitions. He ordered mixing.

So white patrolmen slowed down their rate of writing traffic tickets and otherwise registered oblique protests.

The commissioner got tough. "Racial integration is here to stay," quoth he. "Anybody who doesn't like it better resign right now." He had some takers. Probably he will have more when other white patrolmen line up new jobs.

In Wilmington, Del., a Negro family moved into a formerly all-white neighborhood. What was described as a "crowd" gathered in front of the Negro residence. Stones were hurled through windows. Firecrackers were exploded. Police were forced to erect barricades and stand guard.

If any such thing had occurred in the South, the headlines of Northern newspapers would have been knee-deep chronicling what angry Dixie mobs were doing.

At Evansville, Ind., a Negro preacher went into a barbershop. He wanted a shoeshine. The proprietor told him, "We don't give colored people shines in this shop." He called the police. The preacher was charged with disorderly conduct.

The city court dropped the charge, although the prosecutor said there was a "valid basis for the charge." He added, however, that "a criminal court is not an appropriate forum for resolving complex questions concerning integration in public places."

What if that had occurred in South Carolina or Georgia? The town would have been overrun by NAACP lawyers, FBI agents, assorted do-gooders, and the usual posse of trained seals from the bleeding-heart integrationist press.

School integration isn't progressing too well even in New York City. Fifty persons, including Negro preachers, staged a demonstration outside the Brooklyn Board of Education's offices.

What was their complaint? Too many schools still have pupils of only one race, or only a scattering of Negroes. They want districts rezoned so more white children will be forced into Negro schools, and vice versa.

And there was more trouble at that housing parade, famed in film and story, Levittown, Pa. A white pastor offered moral support for a Negro couple whose move into the white community had caused protest. His church lost 30 members. He resigned.

What if that had occurred in the South? You can imagine what the northern headlines would be saying, and how the "telly-V" commentators would be telling the Nation, ever so ponderously, how the fate of the Nation was at stake.

All these instances underscore the fact that southerners are far from being alone in contending that forced integration represents a denial of individual right of association in schools, business and private life.

They also demonstrate the fact that forced mixing causes rioting, violence and ill will, since there are no such troubles in South Carolina and other Southern States where the fact of segregation's basic wisdom is accepted by the vast majority of both races.

Welfare State in Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Indianapolis Star, Saturday, March 21, 1959.

WELFARE STATE IN ACTION

A picture of Indians of the Six Nations picketing the White House probably attracted no more than a curious glance. But the next time you are traveling in a part of the country where there is a major Indian reservation, give it more than a curious glance. Give a thoughtful look. There, but for the grace of God, sit you, or we.

But for the grace of God, and the independence of a lot of ancestors who figured they would work things out for themselves rather than look to the Government to take care of them.

The Indians were not given as much choice about it. For more than 170 years—though considerably less in the case of some tribes which were less tractable than others—the all-providing guardian of the reservation Indians has been the U.S. Government. In any case since well beyond the memory of any living elder, the reservation Indian has been the beneficiary of a cradle-to-the-grave welfare state administered in Washington.

What is the result?

In Mississippi the Jackson Clarion-Ledger and Daily News recently looked to the Choctaw Indians, whose reservation is there, for an answer. A missionary called the Choctaws the most poverty-stricken group in the Nation. The only serious challenge we can think of to that statement might come from those who would claim that the distinction belongs to some other reservation tribe. This condition has been developed under generation after generation of management of economic affairs by Federal experts. It is to such management as this that the welfare enthusiasts want to turn over the entire American economy.

The missionary critic said the adult Choctaws average a second grade education. An Indian Agency official said this wasn't so, that the Choctaws have a fourth grade average. The Federal Government, from the beginning, has been responsible for providing education for the reservation Indians. This is the same Government which the Federal aiders say must plunge into all American public education at once, to save it from disaster.

The last school census showed some 91,000 Indians of school age. A third of these were in public schools, off the reservations. Nearly 8,000 were in mission schools. About half of the rest were in federally provided schools. On the Navajo reservation alone, in the Southwest, there were 15,000 school-age children not in school. School facilities were not available for them. It is to the Federal Government, which has had the responsibility for reservation schools from the beginning, that the Federal-aid enthusiasts now want the whole country to look for money and example in providing adequate schools. What an example.

The tuberculosis death rate among the Choctaws is put at five times the national average. The infant death rate is termed three times the national average. The Federal Government is and has been responsible for hospitals and medical care for the reservation Indians. The welfare staters want to turn over the health of the entire Nation to the mercies of a bureaucracy with a record like this.

These are, to be sure, examples from the worst of the Indians' experience. Many Indians, either in groups or individually, now live just as well as anyone else. But they haven't done it under the care and feeding of the Federal Government. These are the ones who have succeeded in taking over the management of their own affairs, or who have left the reservations, or who have been so fortunate as to have oil turn up under their tribal lands.

Take a long and thoughtful look at the tribal groups which have continued to depend on the wisdom and benevolence of Federal paternalism. You will see what all America would be like a few generations from now if the welfare state planners should succeed in taking over.

Let's not let it happen. Let's chuck the welfare state, with its security and its benefits, into the ash can where it belongs. Let's go back to the principles and practices of individual initiative. They built a nation out of a wilderness. They can keep the Nation going forward to ever greater heights of freedom and progress.

Our Senior Citizens Deserve Better Treatment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, as I am sure most of my colleagues know, I have been a strong advocate of the Townsend plan for national insurance throughout my career as a Member of the Congress. It is a matter of pride to me that the Colorado delegation, to which I have the honor of belonging, has invariably cooperated 100 percent on those occasions when a discharge petition was employed in an effort to bring this legislation to the floor.

I consider it a privilege to speak in this Congress in behalf of H.R. 4000, the current Townsend bill, which now resides within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means.

I sincerely hope that this committee will see fit to issue a favorable report on H.R. 4000 when this Congress is called upon to consider revision of our social security program. The amendments it proposes are, in my mind, long overdue.

Many of my constituents were rather badly disappointed with the social security amendments of 1958, and I must say that I can hardly blame them. The 7 percent increase we voted for beneficiaries of old age, survivors, and disability insurance, and the few additional dollars we appropriated for recipients of old-age assistance constituted a pitifully inadequate solution to the problems which our senior citizens must face every day of their lives.

It is a sad but true fact that these problems too often tend to be ignored or overlooked, not only by the whole of society, but here in Congress. And yet it is Congress, and Congress alone, to which these people must look for a solution.

I suggest that our basic approach has been erroneous. Last year, for example, we satisfied ourselves with a so-called cost-of-living formula. We were told that since the last social security benefit increase, the cost of living index had jumped by eight points, and so, as a curious compromise, we settled on a 7 percent increase in benefits. On the surface, this seemed to be a not unreasonable solution. But the real crux of the matter lay beneath the surface. The truth was that the original benefit level was so absurdly low that the tiny increase we authorized served only to perpetuate an existing evil. What I am saying is that a small percentage increase at the poverty level does little more than bring poverty up to date, and the amelioration is so insignificant as to be virtually nonexistent. Our social security fabric needs a complete overhaul. Repairs on a tiny percentage scale are like patches on a worn garment.

As we all know, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has exhibited no fondness for a realistic benefit level; indeed, at hearings during the previous Congress, Department spokesmen made it abundantly clear they favored only minimal improvements. The Department has time and again reiterated its contention that the system must be kept solvent, and that any benefit increases must be related to the program's financial capabilities. It is impossible to quarrel with this logic. But it is equally impossible to accept as final the notion that our vastly wealthy Nation has strained its resources to the point where no further improvements can be made in our social security structure.

I suggest we have been the victim of partial truths. There is, to be sure, some evidence that the present social security system has matured to the extent that little further growth seems feasible—at least within the cost range that people will tolerate. But this does not mean there is no better system. The fact is, a better system does exist.

The better plan is H.R. 4000. It is better because it can do the things the social security program cannot do, that is, pay higher benefits to more people without the risk of insolvency, and at same time assure that retirement benefits will at all times bear a realistic relationship to living costs.

It is quite natural that as benefits under the present program grow more and more expensive, the Congress will grow increasingly reluctant to increase them. I believe we have just about reached that point. It is time now to take a long, hard look at the system itself. If we can find a more economical way to pay the higher benefits our senior citizens deserve and need, then certainly we are morally obligated to give it close and careful scrutiny.

For this reason I urge the Committee on Ways and Means to consider H.R. 4000 as the next logical step in the development of our country's social security pattern.

The Plight of the Cities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] once again has called attention to the plight of America's urban communities. In an excellent article entitled "A Voice for the Cities," which was published in the March 7, 1959, issue of The Nation, he points to the need for a greater recognition in the councils of government, of urban problems. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A VOICE FOR THE CITIES

(By Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK)

This is a land of milk and honey and money.

We have become accustomed to a gross national product and a rate of private expenditures which are, in the old Hollywood phrase, "merely colossal." But our schools are deteriorating, traffic is strangling our cities, slums are spreading quicker than we can eradicate them, and in the midst of affluence there is poverty. Seven million American families are existing on incomes of $2,000 a year or less.

Our failure to face and deal realistically with these problems amounts to a kind of paralysis in our public life. The scope of our action is determined not by a forthright analysis of the facts which all admit, but by preconceived limitations growing out of inertia and outmoded thinking.

Last November's election was, I am convinced, an indication of profound public discontent with the way things are going. Americans voted for candidates of both parties who appear to look to the future and not to the past. If we interpret the voter's mood accurately, complacency with present-day America cannot be the mark of the current Congress.

My own discontent, when I look at our public scene, rises for many reasons, but the one about which I perhaps feel most keenly is our failure to recognize and deal with the change which has transformed us from a rural to an urban nation.

Simply because of the economics of housing, the continuance of our present cities is assured for the immediate future. For some time the rate of new housing construction has been insufficient even to take care of our expanding population and to replace dwellings which burn or are demolished. The prospect for the future shows little chance of improvement. People will continue to live in cities for the simple reason that there is nowhere else for them to go. There is grave question, of course, as to what kind of cities they will be, but in any case they will continue to house at least as many people as they now do.

Even with the most optimistic assumptions as to urban renewal, we can expect to house in our central cities only 17 million of the estimated total population increase of 55 million in the next 20 years. Thus, at least two-thirds of our population growth must be housed outside the core cities of our metropolitan areas. In other words, the metropolitan explosion cannot be stopped.

So we are going to have central cities and rapidly growing fringe areas which surround and swallow many smaller cities. Within another generation, the remaining gaps will be filled in the continuous urban and suburban belt reaching from Portland, Me., to Alexandria, Va. The problem is to make these urban concentrations as civilized an environment as possible.

What is wrong now is familiar to all of us: The decay of the older areas of central cities; blight and slums; the flight of the middle class to the suburbs; the vicious circle created as talented people desert the central city, leaving a leadership vacuum filled by those less skilled culturally, economically, and politically. And, on the other hand, the often barren life in the suburbs—inadequate community organization, the haphazard provision of services through inadequate special districts, and the oppressive problems of transportation and communication (traffic bottlenecks, lack of downtown parking) resulting in strangulation of the commercial areas of the central cities.

Yet a visitor from outer space, looking at the structure of our Federal Government, would conclude that America is still a rural Nation, with rural problems its dominant concern. We have a Department of Agriculture, which devotes itself to the problems of the farm; we have a Department of the Interior, which reflects the interests and needs of the more sparsely settled States; but there is no department with responsibility for the problems of the tens of millions of people living in forced congestion in metropolitan areas.

City people, too, need an advocate in Washington. To illustrate; The Senate became disturbed last year about the plight of the Nation's railroads. The Department of Commerce was concerned; so was the Interstate Commerce Commission. The Commerce Committee of the Senate has a standing subcommittee with jurisdiction over railroads. So it organized a study. Those of us who have been worried about a related problem—namely, the plight of the commuter and the deterioration of mass transit in the cities—tried to make sure that urban mass-transit problems would be covered in this study. The answer was no. States rights intervened.

No department of the Federal Government has any interest in what should be done about commuter-transportation services. No committee or subcommittee of the Congress has any jurisdiction. Yet mass transit is not merely a State and local problem. Much of the traffic crosses State lines. Some of the railroads involved serve many

States. Let's face it—State and local governments are incapable of dealing successfully with this problem in most localities—just as urban renewal was generally beyond their competence until the Federal Government stepped in.

Maybe the ultimate answer is that mass transit should not be a Federal problem, even in part. Maybe the same applies to air and stream pollution, and water supply. But what concerns me most is that, at the present time, we don't even have the mechanism for examining such problems, comprehensively and making intelligent national decisions.

I believe the first step should be the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs at Cabinet level with the responsibility of keeping abreast of urban and metropolitan problems and developing recommendations for Federal, State, and local action. The department would represent the urban viewpoint in the administration of nationwide programs which particularly affect cities and their suburbs—notably, highways and water conservation. It would be assigned—initially, at least—only those operating programs which are peculiarly urban, and these are already clustered in the Housing and Home Finance Agency. But the department, to my mind, would be something far beyond the present HHFA. The additional element would be a "hunting license" to study, research, and recommend, and a responsibility to listen to representatives of groups like the HHFA, understand their problems, and reflect that understanding in the policy-forming processes within the executive branch.

I have seen the criticism that a new department should not be formed until a philosophy of Federal-State-local relations is agreed upon. I think the logic points in just the opposite direction. Governmental philosophies do not spring full-blown into being; they evolve. But they cannot evolve unless someone in government has responsibility for thinking creatively about them. We will get the philosophy far more quickly if we establish the mechanism first.

In 1957, speaking at a convention of the American Institute of Architects, I responded to the question, "How can the city be restored?" by suggesting that three things are needed: more money, changes in political structure, and elimination of political lag.

First, money. Our central cities are in mortal danger not only through strangulation from traffic congestion but through financial starvation and attrition. The city, still the hub and nerve center of its area, must provide more and more services at increasing costs not only for the people who live in it, but also for those who work in it, use its facilities, but no longer vote, live, and pay taxes there. Moreover, the people who can best afford to sustain the increasing costs of maintaining and improving the city's facilities are the very ones who have moved to the suburbs.

Some recently published figures on the Washington area illustrate this point. They reveal that the average family income for families living within the District of Columbia in 1956 was $4,900; but in the immediate surrounding area it was $6,773, more than one-third higher. In nearby Montgomery County, Md., it ranged up to $7,735. I suspect the same relative income levels hold true for similar areas.

As the city's costs go up, its tax resources go down. Those who move in are poorer than those who move out. Morover, in the competition with State and Federal Governments for tax revenues, local government comes off a poor third. Business, looking for lower tax rates, is following the flight to the suburbs. The city is left with the problems of providing the needs and services required for civilized living without the money to cope with them.

I don't believe the way out of this financial dilemma will come through local taxing systems—even as they may be revised. Wealth is too unequally distributed; its location bears too little relation to the need for services. Hence the property tax is unfair and relatively unproductive as well as relatively inflexible. And there is hardly any other kind of tax available which can be administered well on a local basis. Local sales taxes drive business outside the taxing jurisdiction. Graduated income taxes have been largely preempted by State and Federal Governments.

There are only two alternatives. One is to establish a new level of government, a fourth layer, that will correspond geographically to the new community, the metropolitan area. The other is to use the larger judisdictions that already exist: the State and Federal Governments, which in practical fact means the latter, since States are as limited in their financial resources as the cities.

All the evidence I have seen indicates that, despite the current outcry, the Federal budget is less of a strain on the national tax base than local budgets are on local tax resources. Since 1946, State and local taxes per capita have risen three times as fast as Federal taxes; State and local debts (a rough measure of the excess of need over resources) have also risen much faster than the Federal debt. This is why it seems to me that the economy campaign now being waged by some powerful organizations is totally misguided when directed against those parts of the Federal budget which would relieve the burden on local taxpayers—for example, Federal aid to education. Equally misguided have been the administration's cuts in urban renewal, which is a splendid example of something that could not be done at all if the communities had to rely on their own tax resources.

The second obstacle to restoration of the city is obsolete governmental structure. The legal and political framework in which we struggle to provide for the city of the future is sometimes our own worst enemy, when it should be our greatest ally.

What would we do if we were the Founding Fathers, and were creating a national political structure in this year 1959 instead of 1787? Of course, we would still create a Federal system, but would we have 49 States—plus Hawaii—with the present boundaries? Of course not. We would pay attention to the natural boundaries of social, economic and political communities and regions—we might even try to make boundary adjustments from time to time as conditions change.

But we are the captives of the mistakes, as well as the beneficiaries of the wisdom, of the Founding Fathers and their successors. We can't do much about illogical State boundaries in our lifetime. We can only try to moderate their effects.

In the meantime, there is a great opportunity for political invention at the local level. Instead of the unimaginative labyrinth of special and ad hoc bodies created in our metropolitan areas, let's continue to search for new approaches to metropolitan government. The need is great. I favor such developments as those being worked out in Toronto and Atlanta, in Dade County, Fla., and Allegheny County in Pennsylvania. And, in seeking larger jurisdictions, let's use intelligently the larger jurisdictions that already exist—the county, for instance; or for problems which cross county lines, the State; or for metropolitan problems that are characteristically interstate, the Federal Government.

If this last month sounds like a dangerous invasion of our honored tradition of local home rule, consider what's happened in highways. Very few of our communities had made any real start in building the metropolitan highway system of the future until the new Federal highway program was enacted. Now superhighways within metropolitan areas are an accepted part of the interstate system. Communities have the wherewithal to get these highways built, yet local control over the location of the highways is not truly lessened. City authorities participate to the full in these decisions. Under Federal leadership we have improvised a de facto metropolitan structure for highway-building which is working.

The same evolution is evident in regard to metropolitan water supplies. Municipal water supply has already become an important factor in Federal river-development projects; eventually, it may be the major factor. And because of the multipurpose use of water today, it may require a river-basin governmental agency to coordinate various consumer uses.

But to use our higher levels of government as we should in the solution of urban problems, two other political reforms are required:

1. We must bring the State legislature up to date, so that the tail of the rural counties stops wagging the dog of our huge urban populations.

2. We must reorient a Federal Government superbly equipped to deal with the nineteenth-century problems of agriculture and natural resources, and hardly equipped at all to deal with the urban society which today it largely represents.

A Federal Government which does not pay as much attention to urbiculture as to agriculture, to the conservation of cities as to soil, to the movement of people and goods within as well as between cities, is not adapted to today's America.

The third obstacle to restoring the city I have called a political lag. Thomas Jefferson warned that "the laws and institutions must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind:" We must overcome the lag that separates the politician from the planner. The successful politician leads the people as well as reflects their views. Overcoming political lag means educating not just the politicians, but the public as well.

I don't suggest that creation of a Federal Department of Urban Affairs will determine whether the good society will survive. But I think it can be the focus for efforts to restore our cities—perhaps our greatest challenge in the age-old battle of man to control and shape the environment in which he lives. The struggle between man and his surroundings—both those he found and those he made himself—is the stuff of which history is made. Along the path of this struggle, civilizations have come and gone.

And in many ways, the city is civilization. It is more than form; it is substance, life, spirit. Streets, buildings, and facilities exist for a purpose; they came into being because people need them to lead the type of existence which they preferred to any other.

And the desire to live in cities, the desire for urban culture—these will continue as long as civilization lasts.

Economic Conditions in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the recent annual report of the United States Steel Corp. contains a very forceful statement by Robert C. Tyson, director and

chairman of its finance committee, which I believe warrants wider comment and study. It is not confined to a defense of our capitalistic system, but is rather an analysis of profits, their function, importance and necessity in an economic structure, dependent upon continually expanding employment.

I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Tyson's statement printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PROFITS—THEIR FUNCTION

(Statement by Robert C. Tyson, director and chairman of finance committee, United States Steel Corp.)

United States Steel and its management have long realized, as recorded in previous annual reports, that United States Steel—its employees and its stockholders—can prosper only as its customers and the Nation as a whole prosper. The combined good or ill fortune of its customers affects United States Steel in multiplied fashion. The percentage swings in United States Steel's business from one year to another are roughly double those of the Federal Reserve Board's index of industrial production.

Steel being cheap, durable and serviceable in so many ways is a principal material used in creating the Nation's tools of production—plant, equipment, construction, transportation, and the like. Hence United States Steel's business responds especially to investment in new tools of production. United States Steel's direct interest in new production investment is but part of what is, or should be, a widespread national concern. For it is only as the Nation's tools of production are kept sufficient and efficient that the Nation can either expect to enjoy economic progress with its rising standard of living, or hope to survive in a position of leadership in a troubled world.

Of relevance, too, in view of the unemployment that exists, is the truism that the only way that a new self-sustaining productive job ever comes into existence is that savings are invested in tools of production. This creates the environment in which men may go to work producing the marketable values to cover their continuing wage and the investors' profit.

In America people do not invest savings in job-creating tools of production unless they thereby expect to gain a profit in so doing or to diminish a loss otherwise to be incurred. The American competitive enterprise system is an acknowledged profit and loss system, the hope of profit being the incentive and the fear of loss being the spur. Since some two-thirds of all employment in America is furnished by corporations, it is of deep concern to observe how greatly over the years the corporate incentive has been undermined. This may be noted by comparing the compensation of employees in the Nation with the corporate profit through which so great a part of the employment is maintained and new productive employment inspired.

The fact is that over the past decade there has been a sharp downward trend in the relative position of profit in the American economy. This trend has already cut the profit incentive approximately in half. Thus, as may be seen the chart, corporate profits just before and shortly after World War II ranged from about 12 to 14 percent of the Nation's employee compensation. Since then the percentage has shrunk to about 7 percent. Most employees realize that the only true job security they have is that their employers can make profits and so continue to hire them. In terms of this measurement the margin for job security has been cut about in half.

Almost everybody "believes" in our competitive enterprise system. But may have misconceptions of its nature and function and so lend at least passive encouragement to those who would either bargain away, tax away, or regulate away profits, all of which efforts have something to do with the undermining of the profit incentive which has taken place.

PROFITS AND INFLATION

A principal pretense about profits, proffered primarily by labor union leaders, is that corporate profit rather than cost-push wage inflation is responsible for price inflation. This attitude ignores recorded facts. What the Nation's prices must cover, if production is to continue, are the costs and profits of producing the goods and services that constitute the net national product. The principal official components of that product, as determined by the U.S. Department of Commerce, are: The compensation of employees, including employer contributions for social insurance and other employee benefits; taxes on business, including corporate income taxes; the income of unincorporated enterprises—proprietors; and the profits of corporations.

The net product increase, for example, from $221 billion in 1947 to an estimated $400 billion in 1958. Of the $179 billion increase, $125 billion was attributable to increase in employee compensation, $27 billion to increased taxes and $27 billion to increased income of unincorporated enterprises—proprietors—and miscellaneous items. There was no increase in the 1947 corporate profit component of $18 billion. To have kept pace with the rise in the combined other components since 1947, corporate profits in 1958 would have had to be about $34 billion, as contrasted with the all-time high in 1956 of $23 billion.

It is indeed curious reasoning which contends that rising prices are attributable to corporate profits—the only major component of net national product that did not increase—instead of to the wage and tax components which account for about 85 percent of the increase.

A profitable economy is actually less susceptable to inflation than one in which profits are meager. Shrinking profits and mounting unemployment go together, invoking, as most recently witnessed in 1958, inflation-threatening Federal deficits.

BIG PROFITS

Perhaps the most widespread misconception about profits is that a big profit, by whatever convenient measurement, is unfair and should therefore somehow be confiscated for other purposes—be they higher wages, bigger taxes, or lower prices. But the fairness of a profit, or of a loss, is never to be determined from its arithmetic magnitude, but only in terms of the fairness of price, wage, and other transactions of which it is the mere arithmetic consequence. In the American tradition fair dealings are those into which there enters no element of dictation, compulsion, or intimidation. If they are honest and voluntary, they must be deemed fair and beneficial by the participants who otherwise are free not to undertake them—and so also must the profit or loss result be deemed fair.

DIVIDENDS

Among other misconceptions about profits is the notion that stockholders get all the profits of corporations. They do not. All the money that stockholders ever get from their corporations (except in the event of dissolution and distribution of assets) are the dividends declared to them. Dividends are a relatively small but exceedingly vital part of the Nation's income. They are small—they average only about one-twentieth as much as the national compensation of employees, and the trend in this ratio over the past decade or more has been slightly downward. They are vital because on that slender thread of income to compensate those who have risked their savings to provide the tools of production depends the functioning of the American economy. They, like spark plugs in an automobile engine, are a tiny part of the whole mechanism, but one without which the whole mechanism fails. Abolish profits and dividends through taxation or otherwise and out of the ensuing chaos would inevitably arise some sort of socialistic dictatorship. In view of this it is as sadly surprising as it is socially foolish that corporate income paid in dividends should be double taxed—first as earned, and again when transferred to stockholders as dividends.

INCOME REINVESTED IN BUSINESS

Another fallacy is the belief held by some that the remaining part of income, which we designate "income reinvested in business," represents a stagnant pool of purchasing power that has been siphoned off from the economy and which in the general interest, should somehow be forced back into circulation. It is a viewpoint sometimes urged as justification for bargaining, taxing or regulating away profits. But nothing could be further from the truth, and that the idea is given any public credence at all probably stems from accounting terminology which labels this remaining part as "undistributed profits" or "surplus." The people who compile the figures understand very well that income reinvested in business does not represent an accumulated pool of cash purchasing power. Income reinvested is a tag which, for convenience in keeping track of things, is put on part of the money which has come into, flowed through, and for the most part, already passed out of the business as an expenditure for tools of production or other assets that are needed to operate the business.

PROFITS AND CASH FLOW

That there is no pool of purchasing power to be raided for any purpose can be readily demonstrated by the recorded facts of United States Steel. To establish this truth United States Steel has aggregated for the 13 years, 1946–58, the conventional items of its income statement and other items relevant to the cash flow. The compilation discloses that although receipts from customers were $41,344 million, the increase in cash was only $20 million—and this despite the fact that $1,391 million was recorded as income reinvested. To have had even this little increase in cash United States Steel had to secure $750 million from the sale of its bonds, common stock, and property. The simple fact is that income reinvested is a representation of purchasing power that has been expended rather than of purchasing power accumulated and available to be tapped.

The principal reason that income reinvested represents purchasing power already expended is that cash spent for new tools of production was $1,493 million more than the $2,473 million of wear and exhaustion of facilities—depreciation—recorded as cost. Of this excess, over $1,050 million was the extent to which recorded depreciation was deficient in recovering the buying power originally invested.

USES OF INCOME REINVESTED

Corporate income reinvested, like dividends, constitutes a very small part of the Nation's income flow; but, like dividends, it is an exceedingly vital part of that flow. It has numerous functions to perform.

In periods of inflation a first claim on income reinvested is to make good the deficiency in depreciation and so to preserve the enterprise. Under the tax code and presently accepted accounting principles the depreciation cost is based on the number of dollars originally paid—often long ago—for the depreciable asset. But as the buying power of the dollar declines, the depreciation amount becomes less and less adequate to cover the cost of equipment that must be purchased if the company is merely to stay

even. During inflation, depreciation recovers the dollars originally expended, but not the buying power represented by such dollars, and income reinvested is thus called upon to do part of the job that depreciation ought to do. The extent to which income is preempted to perform this stay even function has appropriately come to be called phantom profit. In the case of United States Steel, as previously noted, the depression deficiency due to inflation over the years 1946–58 amounted to over $1,050 million.

Not only is much of income reinvested thus necessary to maintain existing supplies of tools and the jobs that go with them, but income reinvested is also the most immediate, direct, and traditional source of money to purchase additional tools of production. Such purchases not only provide the jobs of making the new tools, but also the jobs of later operating them to increase the abundance of needed or wanted goods and services.

There are still other vital functions for income reinvested to perform. Additional money can neither be borrowed nor repaid unless income reinvested be present or prospective. Thus few will lend their money to a corporation except that it be a going corporation with income prospects to assure safety of principal and interest. And a corporation that once becomes indebted cannot pay off that debt except out of income earned or through sale of stock, which latter, in turn, is not possible without income prospects. Income reinvested is also the most immediate and direct source of increased working capital required not only by inflation but also to facilitate the functioning of an expanding productive economy.

He who would squeeze income reinvested to increase wages, taxes, or other costs, or to reduce prices, would simultaneously be squeezing out: (1) Money needed to overcome depreciation deficiency and maintain existing tool capacity and employment, (2) the employment supplied in making both replacement and additional tools, (3) the employment of more labor to operate the additional tools, (4) the new and better products that come from new and better tools, and (5) the most immediate and direct means that exist of financing and expanding industrial capacity, important in peacetime and essential in wartime.

PROFITS AND FREEDOM

There is a big difference between the American economy and the Russian economy. In the American economy productive effort, through the voluntary and competitive decisions of free men, is automatically and continuously devoted to meeting with maximum satisfaction the wants of all the people; in Russia production is by governmental compulsion directed toward satisfying the aspirations of its ruling class with mere subsistence for the people. But the American economy cannot function if there is interference with the voluntary and competitive markets by which the community bestows its rewards. These rewards are in terms of income or profits to those who most ably produce what the community wants at prices it is willing to pay, while those who serve to its lesser satisfaction receive lesser incomes or experience losses.

Our system rests on its provision of opportunity for free men to benefit themselves by saving and investing, but only if in so doing they serve the public's economic interest. If the benefits from so doing are removed, then progress must stop, unemployment arise, and government compulsion replace the voluntary decisions of free men.

A profit and loss system can be practiced only by free men. They cannot sacrifice that system without sacrificing their freedom.

American Automobile Association International Travel Survey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the American Automobile Association has recently published the result of a survey made of the some 600 Americans in 19 States who have utilized the international travel service of the 12 affiliated AAA clubs. This survey throws additional light on the broad extent of travel by Americans abroad and its great significance for peace and better understanding.

I ask unanimous consent that the survey be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the survey was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SIGNIFICANT FOREIGN TRAVEL SURVEY

(Following is a copy of a questionnaire distributed recently to persons who have utilized international travel services of 12 affiliated AAA clubs. Under each question, we have tabulated the results.)

We feel that the following facts are significant:

Question No. 6: Nearly 50 percent reported for 5 weeks or longer; 32 percent of the respondents spent 10 weeks or more abroad.

Question No. 6: Nearly 50 percent reported that their trip changed preconceived attitudes about the countries or people visited.

Question No. 8: While questions 6(b), 7, and 8 requested specific reactions and points of view, an analysis of the comments showed replies to No. 8 as the most interesting. Recognizing that they come from people in all walks of life, we feel that many of the definitions of "tourism and its benefits" are extremely thought provoking. On the basis of these, it might be said that Americans who have traveled abroad have a deep insight into the true meanings of personal contact with peoples of other lands. (Comments received in reply to question No. 8 are attached in exhibit A.)

Question No. 9(a): Of those answering this question, 91.3 percent favored increasing tourist contact between the United States of America and U.S.S.R.

Question No. 10: 64 percent of the respondents expressed interest in visiting the U.S.S.R. (A few clarified their replies by saying that they would not consider going to Russia at the present time, or under the U.S.S.R.'s current regime.)

Question No. 11: Considering the fact that 77.5 percent of the participants were abroad in 1958, it is interesting to note that 29 percent planned to go abroad again in 1959 and 22 percent have plans for foreign travel in 1960.

TOURIST SURVEY BY THE AMERICAN AUTOMOBILE ASSOCIATION

(Questionnaire mailed to 600 residents of 19 States who patronize the international travel services of affiliated AAA clubs. The questionnaire had a 41 percent return.)

JANUARY 22, 1959.

DEAR FRIEND: As part of a research project dealing with the touring experiences of people who have patronized the international travel services of the motor clubs affiliated with the AAA, we will appreciate your answering the following questions and returning this form as soon as possible in the enclosed stamped envelope. Since we are anxious to complete this survey, your immediate response will be appreciated.

Thank you very much.

AMERICAN AUTOMOBILE ASSOCIATION.

1. Most recent year of your trip outside the United States: 77.5 percent, 1958; 15.5 percent, 1957; 7 percent, 1956 (or previously).

2. Length of your trip: Average length of time abroad 8 weeks; 10 weeks or longer, 32 percent; 5 to 9 weeks, 37.3 percent; less than 5 weeks, 30.7 percent.

3. Countries visited: England, France, West Germany, Italy, Spain; others: Caribbean tour, Mexico. Ninety-two percent went to Europe or included Europe in part of a more extended tour.

4. Country liked best: Most frequent mentions: Switzerland, 34.5; Italy, 25.5; England, 14; France, 13; Austria, 11.5; Scandinavia, 11.5; (split votes counted as one-half).

5. Was your trip: (a) solely for pleasure? (b) combination, business and pleasure? For pleasure, 75.5 percent.

6. (a) Generally speaking, did your trip change any attitudes you had about the countries or people visited? Forty-seven percent reported "yes"; 53 percent reported "no." Some clarified their reply by stating that their most recent trip did not alter their attitudes since they had previously been abroad.

(b) Could you cite a specific example?

7. What single fact or observation impressed you most in any one country, or overall?

8. In a few words, how would you define the true meaning of tourism and its benefits to the people of the world?

9. (a) Do you favor increasing tourist contact between the United States and the Soviet Union? (b) Americans to Russia only? (c) Russians to the United States? Of the respondents answering part (a), 9.13 percent were in favor of increasing tourist contact; 8.7 percent has no opinion or did not reply. Only one respondent favored restricting United States of America-U.S.S.R. travel to Americans only. More than 90 percent favored Russian visits to the United States.

10. Would you, personally, like to visit Russia? Sixty-four percent expressed interest in visiting Russia; 28 percent were negative; 8 percent did not respond to the question.

11. When do you expect to make another trip abroad? 1959, 29 percent; 1960, 22 percent; 1961 or later, 15 percent. (Thirty-four percent did not respond to the question or said they had no definite plans.)

EXHIBIT A

AAA TRAVEL SURVEY

Question No. 8: "In a few words, how would you define the true meaning of tourism and its benefits to the people of the world?"

"There will be no real peace in the world until people of all nations have a respect for each other's point of view. International tourism is the only way to bring this about" (Massachusetts).

"More Americans should go abroad, not just for the pleasure but to become better acquainted with the people of other lands. This personal contact and the understanding which results can, if multiplied by thousands, exert a tremendous influence for good and for peace" (North Carolina).

"In knowledge, there is understanding. In understanding, there is respect. Tourism evokes a mutual respect—the greatest need in our world today" (Ohio).

"Tourism helps you appreciate the cultures out of which America has been created: the religious, the literary, and the artistic treasures that have motivated our thinking" (Virginia).

"Only by actual contact with peoples of other races, and with their modes of living, can anyone possibly gain an understanding and appreciation of their true worth" (Washington State).

"It broadens the horizon and destroys more prejudices than it causes" (Rhode Island).

"Tourism provides the opportunity of getting to know people better—their strengths and their weaknesses. It broadens one's understanding of the problems faced by different nationalities and in so doing develops a true tolerance for all peoples. One cannot think ill of a friend and travel develops this type of friendship" (Rhode Island).

"Tourism should be guided by a desire to learn not to teach. You may be paying your way but you are still a guest of the country" (Pennsylvania).

"Tourism is the means of bringing about understanding between nations. For the average person it is only by meeting people from other lands that they realize they have the same problems, hopes and emotions as themselves" (Pennsylvania).

"The perception of the likenesses in man rather than political differences commonly stressed by the press; the increased consciousness of the vastness of the world, to say nothing of outer space. It increases our sense of unity and appreciation of people. Americans need to discuss politics with people of other beliefs in order to intelligently defend and live in a democracy" (Pennsylvania).

"Although tourism can increase as well as decrease prejudice, when indulged in with the right spirit it increases human understanding and sympathy and enriches one's personality" (Ohio).

"Tourism is that indefinable quantity of which the American people do not do enough. Travel is a big thing in the United States of America. Everyone enjoys driving into another State or another area of their own State. But tourism takes one to another country, another land, where if you are wise you will try to live for a short while as do those other people and then you are better able to understand the ideas of foreigners and thereby become a better member of the family of nations. Tourism doesn't make you a foreigner. It merely makes you count 10 before you argue with one" (North Carolina).

"I am not ashamed of the label 'tourist' and get very unhappy with Americans abroad who try to appear cosmopolitan. These, however, are not as bad as the ones who shout from the housetops that they are Americans and everything in America is better. Real tourism can be, and should be, the best way of making people of all nations understand better the problems and anxieties of other nations. I had a driver in Spain who was an ardent Franco fan; I still can't agree with him, but I now understand why Franco is what he is in Spain" (North Carolina).

"Tourism means far more than 'seeing.' It means understanding—or seeing with the mind. This can lead the way to worldwide friendship and peace" (North Carolina).

"To the individual: Tourism is a means of enriching one's own life by incorporating into it not only the culture of one's own land, but the culture of others as well. To nations: An intelligent tourist of any land can grow more tolerant of the quirks of another land if he visits, and, by behaving tolerantly, can be a good will ambassador" (North Carolina).

"A better idea of what the differences are among people and how small they number to the same ideals and needs people have. A greater admiration for the many ways one can achieve life's ends and to realize your ways are not the only or the best" (New York).

"A tendency toward one world—in its best sense" (New York).

"Tourism in the best sense is an eager interest and appreciation for the good and beautiful everywhere and a sincere attempt to understand differences in problems and attitudes. Those who travel with closed minds might better stay home and save their money" (New Jersey).

"Traveling by automobile 7,000 miles and visiting people off the beaten paths and finding the Europeans generally happy and contented with their lot. They, in turn, finding out firsthand about America especially the North-Central United States. Being good will ambassadors to the people of Europe was our paramount desire and purpose" (Minnesota).

"To develop understanding between peoples; reduce distance—physically and emotionally—and alter artificial barriers between nations; to foster a sense of responsibility for others and an appreciation of their abilities, talents, and achievements" (Minnesota).

"To us, travel is not only a means of enjoyment, but greatly increases one's education. The firsthand knowledge of the many far places of the world gives each American a better understanding of the problems facing our civilization today" (Michigan).

"The learning to understand, respect, and appreciate our neighbors even though we cannot understand their language. This should not only affect vacationers but the leaders of our countries. When we learn to like and love each other, how can we ever want to harm each other?" (Michigan).

"Tourism should be an exchange, through personal contact, of ideas and attitudes, social, political, economic, and cultural" (Michigan).

"You cannot appreciate good music until you are exposed to it, nor can you enjoy or understand a book unil you have read it. You cannot know or become a friend of your neighbor until you meet him, therefore, by traveling abroad you can learn to appreciate, to enjoy and understand, and to to know and become a friend of your fellow men of other lands—thus creating a benefit for all" (Michigan).

"Enrich your soul by receiving the riches of our past; learn that men are the same decent people the world over" (Washington, D.C.).

"The growth in understanding that comes from personal contact with those of other countries can be a great stabilizing force for peace" (Colorado).

"One seldom can maintain a smug self-satisfied air concerning one's own country when one beholds the glories—both historically and artistically—found in other cultures. Traveling gives one a deep appreciation for the problems and desires—as well as the past achievements—of other peoples, thereby contributing often in a profound way to better understanding—the great hope of the world" (Colorado.)

"It has great possibilities for enlarging concepts and enhancing understanding, provided there is an open mind unhampered by preconceived ideas and bias, and that the individual has a sufficient command of language to be able to communicate and so to interpret the phenomena witnessed against the background of the country's culture" (Colorado.)

"If half the people of one country were to change places with a like amount in another country for 4 to 8 weeks each year, it would be the greatest peace creator yet found. Interchange of ideas and customs and mixing socially would shatter the impression that those opposed to their ideology are not as pictured by their leaders" (Colorado.)

"It dispels false conceptions and shows everyone as human beings no matter what their language or color of skin." (Colorado.)

"To broaden one's outlook. To realize the universality of man, of ability of capability" (Connecticut.)

"It is vital for as many individuals in the world to exchange common experiences on the level of everyday life. Meet your fellowman on his terms in his country. We don't have to give, we need to ask for what they all have—friendship and understanding" (Connecticut.)

"Realization that the United States is not the only place in the world where people, as individuals, have pride in personal and national accomplishments" (Connecticut.)

"I hope it tends to bring about a better understanding between the people of different countries. We can be good-will ambassadors as Americans if we will only remember, 'When in Rome, do as the Romans do' and respect their ways and customs even though they differ from ours. We would be chagrined if Europeans came over here and were as demanding and inconsiderate of us as some Americans are of their people" (Connecticut.)

"Tourism, intelligently managed, might be defined as the best way of getting rid of a lot of prejudices with which we are possessed in varying degrees" (Connecticut.)

"As the world grows smaller by communications it follows what we should emphasize—neighborliness and friendliness" (Connecticut.)

"I feel all people at heart are the same. They like to live and let live—and they like to be liked. Tourism gives us ordinary people with no ax to grand a chance to see and know our neighbors of foreign countries. To me, they were all most interesting and understanding" (Connecticut.)

Poison in Your Water—No. 51

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Texas Streams Still Polluted," which appeared in the Dallas (Tex.) News of February 17, 1959:

HEALTH RISK—TEXAS STREAMS STILL POLLUTED

(By Wayne Gard)

Often overlooked as a factor in the Texas water problems is the pollution of the State's rivers and creeks. Fish have been killed, livestock poisoned and human health endangered because of the sewage and industrial wastes dumped into streams. The recent growth of cities and industries has made conditions worse.

This problem, of course, is not confined to Texas. About 43 percent of our cities and 57 percent of our industries discharge raw or insufficiently treated wastes into nearby water. This poisoning costs the people at least a billion dollars a year.

Some Texas cities have built modern sewage-disposal plants only to outgrow them in a few years. Some industries have gone to much trouble and expense to treat their wastes, but others have done little or nothing about this. Apparently they assumed

that pollution laws would not be enforced, and often that has been a safe assumption.

Oil production in many parts of the State has complicated the Texas problem of stream pollution. In 1913 the Texas courts were directed to restrain by injunction the polluting of streams with oilwell wastes, but as more fields were opened the situation became worse instead of better.

Other laws against pollution were passed in 1931 and 1943, but they did not have effective teeth. The National Resources Committee stated, "The most serious pollution problem in the entire western gulf district is along the Trinity River. During periods of low flow, the river below Dallas is virtually an open sewer."

Pollution is always worse in a drought, in which the flow declines and water stagnates in isolated pools. Farmers who see thousands of dead fish floating on the water can't be happy at having their cattle drink from such pools.

One trouble with the Texas laws against stream pollution, which the legislature has been passing since 1860, is that of divided responsibility. The railroad commission has authority over oil producers, the board of water engineers supervises underground disposal of oil wastes, the game and fish commission is charged with protecting wildlife, the department of health is responsible for health protection, and the attorney general is expected to enforce all laws.

With each of these agencies going its own way and usually busy with other duties, stream pollution does not have the concentrated and continuous attention it needs. Many believe that a single State agency is the only solution.

The U.S. Public Health Service has advised the setting up of such an agency to end buck-passing. The legislature can hardly afford to await a serious disease epidemic from polluted water to cleanse Texas streams.

Business Should Be Socially Responsible

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today the responsibility of the business executive is very great. All of us should get direction and guidance from our religious principles. We cannot solve every problem by human law.

A fine article entitled "A Matter of Responsibility" appeared in the January–February 1959, issue of the Harvard Business Review. The article was written by F. S. Cornell, executive vice president of A. O. Smith Corp., of Milwaukee, Wis. The article takes issue with the viewpoint of Theodore Levitt, who in a previous article took the position that business should not be socially responsible.

Mr. President, in order that my colleagues and others may have an opportunity to read this fine article, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A MATTER OF RESPONSIBILITY
(By F. S. Cornell)

In the article's headline the philosophy of Levitt's piece is set down briefly: "Are they (the businessmen do-gooders) letting the country in for a nightmare return to feudalism by forgetting that they must be businessmen first, last, and almost always?" The stand has been made. And such a stand, especially in these times, demands an answer.

Not almost always but always, I am a businessman. And since I am, my social responsibility to my community, to my form of government—to our way of life—demands my active participation. I know I do not do this to ape a current vogue; I'm not sure how much love of fellow man plays a part in it.

But I do know that fear—fear as strong as fear can be in the face of the forces currently at work against our civilization—plays a prominent part in activating me.

I am the executive vice president of a corporation with a number of plants from coast to coast. In this post, I am charged with the responsibility of continuing the development, insofar as I am able, of this corporation built by those before me.

As it was with my predecessor, it is my responsibility to develop, to modernize, to expand, to make this business flourish so the greatest efficiency—and therefore the greatest profit—can be derived from the fruits of our corporate body's total efforts. I will never deny this responsibility. I believe in it and will continue to demand that this be our operating philosophy. But I will also continue to demand that we function as responsible and God-fearing people. The capital organization that does not remember this second truth defeats itself.

We are all aware that in every walk of life since the beginning of time there have been some bloodsuckers. And these we will probably have with us until the end of time. But in the end, these bloodsuckers defeat themselves.

To operate for profit only—no matter what the cost—is just not good business. It never has been and never will be.

I believe that we must have responsible, God-fearing hardheaded businessmanship. I believe in God. I love God and fear Him, and shall continue to do so. And I am not ashamed to say it. The fact—not theorem—that faces us now is that we have too much forgotten God, and our responsibilities as His people. This has much to do with the problems we face today.

"The world of God, peopled by man, demands social responsibility. The policy memorandum that sets this down has been in existence for some time." Luke 10: 23.

Let us keep this spiritual business out of our discussion, Levitt will say, asserting that businessmen are charged to make profit, not to bother with the social needs of the people for that is Government's job. But we are all a part of this Government—no matter how much any of us might want to deny it.

Government is not an ephemeral "they." It is an emphatic "we." When it is not, it will not be the government and the political ideology for which we all profess our most profound belief.

I believe in this form of government. And so believing, I cannot cast out the sense of responsibility that stems from my faith in God—for to cast this out is to defeat our own purpose.

Do so and you take the important step toward what I and, I hope, you are furiously fighting: The doctrine of communism. Contrary ideology is being too well sold, I am afraid, in some of our schools and, as it appears, in some of our more directed-to-leadership publications. From the growing red on the map, it appears it is selling pretty well through some of the Mideastern and European countries.

"God," "Fear," "Communism," "Politics": Levitt might say I am using all the popular antagonisms to make my point. I am—not because they are popular antagonisms, but because they are fundamental realities.

These represent fundamental realities of life that have played a part in the evolution of a management philosophy—the best I know—to use in creating a greater profit for my company and perpetuating the capital organization where I work. For I am not only responsible for the development of this corporation in today's market. I am also charged with the responsibility to do all within my efforts to protect my corporation and its market of tomorrow. I represent a position that will be filled by capable men after I have gone, and was filled by capable men before I came. We are an entity all charged with the same duty. A marketing man such as Levitt surely knows that this is a fundamental of marketing.

And because I am so charged, as a hardheaded businessman, I will sell social development. I will continue to do all within my power in my home and in the community to build a better climate for living based on a better living condition for our youth and better youth to live in it.

To attain this objective, I must participate in the social developments of our community, in the actions taken to develop and improve the executive, legislative, and enforcement branches of our Government.

We must do all things to cancel out the cancers that are growing, too rapidly, in our communities—in all communities. And when all of them are set straight, the world will be the place we want it to be.

I, and the many like me who have this understanding, will continue to do this in our own homes and communities. Hopefully, other people not of Levitt's thinking will follow this example.

With such seeds, we must develop, inspire, and create conditions and people—not of my own particular choosing, but individuals with a chance to grow in the atmosphere of ideology which we all say and believe is the "best way of life."

Target the community, and the world will take care of itself. That is not a profound thought. It is a basic axiom in all marketing. As Levitt well knows, start at the center and let your pattern grow, so that each outgrowing activates the next circle until the whole market is covered.

What are we marketing? And what has this got to do with "making the most profits possible"? We are marketing the American way of life. We are selling it by improving its weakest points—just as a marketer tailors his product to the demands and needs of his customer.

We are doing this because it is fundamental to build and to protect if we are to save our way of life in which a businessman can "make a profit." Would you have us otherwise? Would you have us all be carpenters building stairs that will carry people only as long as we, individually, need them—to have them crumple and be destroyed whenever we have finished with our own selfish wants? I personally could not live in a climate where "consideration of others" was not a primary credo.

But even not using this respect for the continuing dignity of man as a purpose for my actions, my case still holds. It is my responsibility to protect my corporation—not only today but tomorrow. Even accepting Levitt's dictum of "businessmen for profit only," I will practice social responsibility because it is simply a matter of good business.

The dangers which lie in active acceptance by businessmen of their social responsibilities are not what Levitt would have us believe. Quite the contrary, such actions are a means toward preservation of our way of life.

And, surely, if more of us don't get on stream and set the pace (which Levitt admits we are admirably equipped to do), we are not only going to lose the opportunity to

make the "most profit possible," but we are also going to lose our whole ideology, our children, and our children's children into a Godless society that is abhorrent to the thought.

Let us demand greater recognition of social responsibility and social action by businessmen. Let us quit talking of our work in the far countries, close to the peril of communism. Let us put the focus on our own lives and on our own communities. We must put all the forces of business's hard-headed profit-seeking abilities into a fight to build the strongest possible organization of youth and people. We are surely going to need them—and soon.

Carlton Cadettes Visit Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT THOMAS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the distinct honor and pleasure of welcoming to Washington a group of young ladies from the Jefferson Davis Senior High School in Houston. The 36 young ladies are senior members of the Carlton Cadettes, one of the finest high-school drill corps in the country.

For the past several years the senior members of this group have visited Washington on a tour of the eastern part of the Nation. The visit these young ladies pay to my office and to the Capitol is always one of the highlights of the congressional year to me.

On the trip this year, the cadettes visited Williamsburg and Philadelphia before coming on to Washington. While in the Nation's Capital, they toured the Capitol and other historic buildings. The young ladies also were able to visit the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis.

I am glad that the practice of high school students visiting the Nation's Capital seems to be increasing. These young people, the leaders of tomorrow, have a much better appreciation of our great country and our system of government after visiting the White House, the Capitol, and other points of interest. Certainly, it is refreshing for Washington to play host to thousands of these young visitors each year.

The Carlton Cadettes were accompanied by Miss Frances Newton and Mrs. Lorraine Nix, faculty sponsors for this outstanding group. Others who made the trip to Washington are Lorrie Blackburn, Margaret Boney, Charlotte Cernuch, Deette Dupree, Rosemary Evans, Judy Frederick, Gloria Garcia, Pat Genaro, Susan Gray, Sandra Hauck, Lucretia Hoke, Linda Holder, Betty Howard, Judy Jennings, Mary Krause, Annette Leu, Frances Mendoza, Jean Mitchell, Joyce Muery, Jane Noble, Diana Overstreet, Deanna Partain, Patsy Payne, Terry Perrigin, Linda Plemons, Sue Pool, Karen Sanford, Julia Santos, Estella Schott, Judy Spencer, Betty Thagard, Sally Thompson, Esther Williams, Jennie Wilson, Diane Wolf, Nita Yokem.

Nixon's Progressive Conservatism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, Columnist Holmes Alexander recently wrote of Vice President NIXON's views and attitudes on a number of important subjects and revealed the solid competency with which the Vice President has capability in dealing with the problems of the Nation. Mr. Alexander's column was as follows:

NIXON PROGRESSIVE-CONSERVATISM A PART OF THE RECORD FOR 1960

(By Holmes Alexander)

Vice President RICHARD NIXON must be considered the 1960 Republican nominee until proved otherwise. He is also owner of the best known, most forthright political record of all the Presidential aspirants, Republican and Democrat alike.

This statement will surprise only those who, perhaps, have never thought about NIXON'S positions on the issues and those who have judged NIXON by anti-NIXON appraisals. But if NIXON runs for President next year, and if he scores an upset over a Democratic favorite, it will be because the Nation has anticipated that a Nixon administration would be somewhat as follows:

Domestic affairs: RICHARD NIXON, if President, would hew to the Eisenhower line of the balanced budget and of finding free enterprise substitutes for Federal activities. Mr. Eisenhower's enemies call this the big business approach. They have chided Ike for his efforts to encourage private electrical power companies, group insurance plans, self-help housing schemes and for his smaller-than-Democratic appropriations to support the Government's share in welfare projects.

It's predictable that under NIXON the pro-business approach would be continued with better management in the light of the 1953–61 experience. The Nixon philosophy of government could be called progressive-conservatism. He does not believe, with some of us, in a return to fundamentalism. The Vice President holds that free enterprise offers the best chance for social and economic advances and that Federal enterprise bogs down in bureaucracy.

Foreign affairs: RICHARD NIXON, if President, would not substantially alter the Eisenhower reliance upon collective international security, but NIXON would move toward two reforms. In foreign aid, he would stress how rather than how much, indicating a major revaluation, especially on the information programs.

The Vice President has been deeply impressed with Russian foreign relations workers wherever he has been able to observe them abroad. They know their enemy. Without leaning on IQ tests and postgraduate degrees, NIXON in the White House would have one main criterion for American overseas personnel: that they understand our fight against the enemy, international communism.

Labor laws: In watching the Senate at work, NIXON concludes that passage of an inadequate labor bill, by which he means the Kennedy-Ervin measure, would raise a public clamor in 1960 for something much stronger.

If the second session of the 86th Congress failed to produce a labor bill with (a) fiduciary responsibility, (b) further protection of union democracy, (c) provisions against secondary boycott and organizational picketing, the 1960 campaign would be fought partly on the labor issue. NIXON'S prescription: that all unions follow the procedure which good unions already do follow.

Civil rights: "I believe in gradualism," NIXON told this reporter for quotation. "I would always expect progress, for example, in the southern acceptance of school integration. But I would expect that this progress, its methods and its degree of compliance would differ in different areas, according to the community customs and circumstances."

The Vice President's thinking on racial matters flows from two personal experiences. One, he was raised as a Quaker. Two, he has been around the world and he knows that at least 1 billion persons are not white. It is this reporter's educated guess that NIXON, as President, would be incapable of sending American troops against Americans.

White House leadership: As Vice President, NIXON has given loyalty. As President, he would require it. He sees loyalty as the first responsibility of a cabinet member and even of a vice-president, although the latter case is complex.

It is revealing, however, that NIXON feels Vice President Calhoun, who disagreed violently with President Jackson, was justified in resigning. But the justification in NIXON'S mind was strengthened by the fact that in the 1830's the Presidential succession moved from the Vice President to the Secretary of State, thus keeping the top post firmly within the party.

In general: RICHARD NIXON, if President in 1961, would rely chiefly upon past experiences, at home and abroad, in dealing with communism. He would follow the progressive-conservative line, as expressed in the afore-cited views, but not follow it stubbornly and inflexibly. Experience in these fields, of which NIXON has had more than any living American, would be the compass.

It is possible, I think, to forecast a Nixon administration but not possible with equal confidence to forecast the administration of any Democratic candidate. If the nation should choose NIXON—and political upsets are within easy memory—the reason could be that the Nation knows him best of all.

What—No Fifth?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, in the old days when a man bit a dog, it was news. In these modern times, it is news when a witness before a congressional investigating committee fails to seek the protection of the fifth amendment.

This phenomenon recently took place before the Foreign Operations and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee and the forthright testimony of the witness caught the fancy of the editor of the Waterbury (Conn.) Republican who wrote the following article which appeared in that newspaper on March 25, 1959:

WHAT—NO FIFTH?

(The members of a House Government Operations Subcommittee must have indeed been taken aback by the performance of one

witness who recently faced the probers. He answered all their questions without once hiding behind the fifth amendment.)

House committee probers have long grown accustomed to expect that when embarrassing questions are asked of certain witnesses the answers are bound to be hidden behind the fifth amendment. With a great many witnesses, such action to prevent self-incrimination is very much the order of the day.

So what a shock it must have been when a certain Edward T. McNamara, of Tampa, Fla., one-time public works officer for the International Cooperation Administration in Laos, southeast Asia, not only answered questions put to him but also offered unexpected information, without once hiding behind the fifth amendment.

And, in view of some of Mr. McNamara's testimony, we are a bit surprised ourselves that he didn't "take the fifth." For he testified accepting gifts of stock, of accepting sizable loans that were never repaid, and airline tickets from an American-owned construction company in Bangkok. The sum total, McNamara estimated, come roughly to $25,000.

He testified further that in his dealings with the firm, the Universal Construction Co., he recommended that the company be awarded public works contracts in Laos which totaled more than $1.6 million. He also said that he had no plans or specifications by which the quality of materials used or the performance of the construction firm could be adequately measured.

The committee offered no explanation as to why Mr. McNamara seemed so willing to testify in matters which could definitely put him behind the proverbial eight-ball. We rather imagine they didn't have any explanation. We can't think of any, either—except that perhaps like the man in the death cell, McNamara figured that he wanted to clear his conscience once and for all. At any rate, in this age of "refuge in the fifth," it was an amazing performance.

Although the editor may well have discovered some of the reasons for the manner in which the witness testified, I am sure that the basic reason for his revealing testimony was the careful and persuasive manner in which the factual case against him had been prepared by the committee staff and elicited by the subcommittee chairman, the Honorable PORTER HARDY.

Relaxing of Gambling Ban

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, in the 7 years that I have urged the Members of this Congress to support my national lottery bill, I have pointed out that the gambling spirit of the American people is deeply ingrained in human beings and cannot be legislated out of existence.

Further, I have argued that leading theologians in discussing the subject of gambling have insisted that gambling is not sinful nor immoral except when carried to excess, abused, or when it is corrupted.

I am happy to note that New York City's chief magistrate, John M. Murtagh, feels as I do on this issue.

The following newspaper item reports the highlights of Judge Murtagh's position as expressed Sunday, April 5, 1959, on the WCBS show, "Let's Find Out."

MURTAGH FOR RELAXING OF GAMBLING BAN

Asserting there is nothing basically immoral in gambling, Chief Magistrate Murtagh suggested yesterday that the laws should be changed to regulate it, rather than forbid it. The community's present attitude toward gambling and narcotics, he added, is "creating the situation whereby organized crime thrives."

He compared gambling bans with liquor-prohibition laws and pointed out that the latter finally had to be scrapped. Murtagh, on the WCBS show, "Let's Find Out," declared the underworld lives mainly on gambling and narcotics, and held that "gambling cannot be legislated out of existence."

He called for normal outlets for the gambling instinct, which he held to be immoral only if there were overindulgence, but he did not suggest what these outlets might be.

Results of Questionnaire Mailed by Hon. John F. Baldwin, of California, to Residents of the California Sixth District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. BALDWIN, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, 2 months ago I mailed a questionnaire to every family of registered voters in the California Sixth Congressional District. The response to this questionnaire was, by far, the largest that I have ever received. Many constituents not only answered the questionnaire, but attached supplementary letters or wrote detailed comments on the back of the questionnaire. I have spent many hours personally reading all of these comments, and they have been most helpful. I am firmly convinced that a Congressman can better represent his constituents if he knows the views of all of those constituents, than if he has only heard from pressure groups.

The tabulation of the questionnaire is summarized below:

1. It has been proposed that Congress pass legislation to insure to union members the right to elect their union officials by secret ballot. Do you favor or oppose such legislation? Favor 87 percent, oppose 5 percent, undecided 8 percent.

Answers from union members: Favor 83 percent, oppose 4 percent, undecided 13 percent.

Answers from nonunion members: Favor 91 percent, oppose 5 percent, undecided 4 percent.

2. Should we stand firm in the protection of West Berlin against Communist threats, or should we pull out of West Berlin? Stand firm 88 percent, pull out 4 percent, undecided 8 percent.

3. Do you favor, or oppose, the admission of Communist China into the United Nations? Favor 19 percent, oppose 65 percent, undecided 16 percent.

4. Do you feel that President Eisenhower and Allied leaders should, or should not, have a summit conference with Khrushchev of Russia? Yes 57 percent, no 24 percent, undecided 19 percent.

5. Do you favor, or oppose, statehood for Hawaii? Favor 85 percent, oppose 8 percent, undecided 7 percent.

6. A bill pending before Congress would provide that any Federal civilian employee who is a security risk may be discharged. Do you favor or oppose such legislation? Favor 76 percent, oppose 11 percent, undecided 13 percent.

Answers from Federal civilian employees: Favor 72 percent, oppose 7 percent, undecided 21 percent.

Answers from non-Federal civilian employees: Favor 80 percent, oppose 11 percent, undecided 9 percent.

7. It has been proposed that the social security program be expanded to provide for the payment of surgical and hospital bills for those who are retired and receiving social security pensions. The increased cost would be covered by increasing the social security withholding tax by an additional one-fourth of 1 percent or one-half of 1 percent on both employers and employees. Do you favor or oppose such legislation. Favor 63 percent, oppose 27 percent, undecided 10 percent.

8. Would you be in favor of, or opposed to, an increase of 1½ cents per gallon in the Federal gasoline tax for the purpose of keeping the Federal interstate highway construction program moving forward on schedule? Favor 39 percent, oppose 51 percent, undecided 10 percent.

9. The present income tax laws provide that oil and gas depletion allowances of 27½ percent may be deducted from profits before the income tax is computed. A bill has been introduced to reduce these depletion allowances to 15 percent. Would you be in favor of this reduction? Yes 41 percent, no 30 percent, undecided 29 percent.

10. Would you be in favor of legislation to make bombings of schools, churches, and other buildings a Federal offense? Yes 85 percent, no 10 percent, undecided 5 percent.

11. The Post Office Department estimates its deficit for the coming fiscal year will be $522 million. In view of this fact, would you favor an increase in the first-class letter mail rate from 4 cents to 5 cents? Yes 50 percent, no 43 percent, undecided 7 percent.

12. The present selective service or draft law will expire this year unless extended. In view of world conditions, would you be in favor of its extension? Yes 83 percent, no 10 percent, undecided 7 percent.

Monsignor Burke's Opening Prayer for Opening of the Massachusetts Senate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 20, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the opening prayer of Msgr. Joseph P. Burke of St. Patrick's Parish, Lawrence, Mass., at the opening of the Massachusetts Senate, who was the guest of State Senator William X. Wall, of Lawrence, Mass.:

PRAYER FOR THE OPENING OF THE MASSACHUSETTS SENATE, MONDAY, MARCH 16, 1959

We pray Thee, O God of might, wisdom, and justice, through whose authority laws

are enacted, and judgments decreed, assist with Thy holy spirit of counsel and fortitude the legislators of our Commonwealth, that their deliberations may be conducted in righteousness, and their enactments may be eminently useful to Thy people whom they represent. Let the light of Thy divine wisdom direct them in all their labors; and may all their actions be ordained to the peace and happiness of our Commonwealth, and to the perpetuation of Thy honor and glory forever and ever.

On this eve of the feast of the glorious Apostle St. Patrick, we further beseech Thee, Almighty God, to hear and grant this benediction upon our senators here assembled:

May the blessing of St. Patrick keep you and preserve you. May the joy of St. Patrick ever be in your hearts. And may the luck of the Irish be with you, always.

Statement of Dr. Donald C. Stone, Before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, on Mutual Security Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 17, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

STATEMENT BY DR. DONALD C. STONE, BEFORE THE HOUSE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE HEARING ON THE MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM AUTHORIZATION, ON BEHALF OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN THE U.S.A., APRIL 7, 1959

My name is Donald C. Stone. I am testifying here in behalf of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. by the authorization of its appropriate officers. I am currently dean of the Graduate School of Public and International Affairs of the University of Pittsburgh and a member of the department of international affairs of the National Council of Churches.

While I am here as a designated representative of the department of international affairs, I obviously cannot and do not presume to speak for each of the 38 million members of the 33 Protestant and Eastern Orthodox denominations in the National Council, but I am presenting policies and views adopted after careful study, discussion, and deliberation by the Council's policymaking bodies composed of official representatives of the denominations.

The Council believes it appropriate and desirable that in hearings such as this major religious groups in our country have the opportunity to share in expressing, from religious and moral perspectives, their views on the objectives, policies, and adequacy of the mutual aid and assistance programs of the United States. On behalf of the Council may I express appreciation for this opportunity.

GENERAL POSITION OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

In keeping with the actions of the council's policymaking bodies, we hold it to be a Christian concern and the moral responsibility of the United States to take all appropriate action within its capacity and resources to promote justice, economic betterment, social well-being, freedom, and peace among the peoples of the world, including our own—and especially among the newly independent, emerging, and developing nations. To this end we support the improvement and expansion of technical assistance, educational exchange, economic aid, trade, and private investment, and other measures essential to the improvement of conditions of life and the creation of free, responsible, and stable societies.

RELIGIOUS AND MORAL FOUNDATIONS

The competence and the responsibility of the churches to delineate the religious—the moral and ethical—truths or requirements which underlie public issues is well established. This has been a function of our religious traditions and heritage beginning with the prophets of old.

In studying God's purposes and requirements, as reflected in both the Old and New Testaments, we find the principle that the state should be founded on justice, that it is instituted by God to enact just and equitable laws, that in the fulfillment of its mission the state should be the organized expression of God's character and purpose. The state—to be specific, our country or any country—is thus judged by divine standards of righteousness and justice. Lawmakers, judges, and administrators are God's servants charged with bringing to all people the blessings of just, efficient, and humane government. Nations and individuals are accountable for their acts and are judged by God by the same moral and ethical standards.

We believe that governments, as individuals, must conform to the moral law of God. The people of a nation, as children of God, have the obligation of promoting justice, freedom, equality, opportunity, respect, integrity, and mercy in all relationships. So, too, government as the means by which people carry out their collective public concerns and responsibilities, must fulfill these same obligations.

This conception of the moral and religious foundation of government is uniquely reflected in the covenants of our country and in the official statements of our leaders.

The Declaration of Independence explicitly emphasized these truths. In the eyes of its architects, men are viewed as children of God, they have rights and values growing out of their spiritual relation to God, they are equal as personalities and equal as members of one human family, they are part of a world brotherhood, and government is a means subject to their control for achieving the benefits of their God-given rights.

George Washington summed up these views in his Farewell Address with the words:

"Reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in the exclusion of religious principle."

The mind of Lincoln was saturated with the same values of life—brotherhood, justice, mercy, honesty, reverence. A fundamental tenet in his political philosophy was the responsibility and the accountability of the Nation to Almight God.

In speaking of the rights of men, women, and children in the struggle for existence, President Wilson said, in his first inaugural address:

"Justice and only justice shall always be our motto. * * * The feelings with which we face this new age of right and opportunity sweep across our heart strings like some air out of God's own presence, where justice and mercy are reconciled, and the Judge and the brother are one."

I mention these factors in our heritage because they emphasize the necessity and practicality of applying moral and religious principle in the formulation and execution of public policy. We in the churches are concerned with the tendency to separate these interrelated aspects of life in the market place of daily decisionmaking.

We believe that these moral and religious foundations for government and public policy apply to the total community of mankind. They are the requisites for individual and group fulfillment at the level of the family, the local community, the State, the Nation, and the international community. Where individuals seek special privilege based on selfish interest, where they have no concern for the well-being of their fellowmen, and isolate themselves from responsibility for service to the general welfare of the community, there justice, freedom, economic and social advance, and public morality corrode and wither.

Likewise, when a nation on the basis of its narrow self-interest endeavors in isolation to provide for its protection, seeks the economic prosperity of its citizens with little tangible regard to the misery, poverty, and ignorance which may exist outside of its boundaries, or furthers the economic development of other countries primarily in the interest of its own security and as a means of obstructing the out-reach of an enemy, it, too, lacks adequate moral and religious foundation, and its policies will be frustrated and its actions resented.

It is in this context and on moral and religious grounds that churches support more adequate assistance for the underprivileged and disinherited peoples of the world and more effective measures of mutual help and self-help.

INADEQUATE MORAL AND RELIGIOUS RATIONALE FOR OUR AID PROGRAMS

We believe the concept of mutual security, under which countries join together to create conditions essential for peace and freedom, and for the furtherance of economic and social well-being, is consistent with the moral and religious principles just elaborated. We believe that in the Marshall plan these principles were fulfilled in a historic manner. The success of that program and its appeal to man's conscience and to the aspirations of human beings everywhere was due to the unusual extent to which the ideals of sharing, mutual respect, help, self-help, and the imperatives of human brotherhood were incorporated in the total program, especially during the first 2 years.

We are concerned with the extent to which present day official arguments justify both the military and economic components of the mutual security program almost exclusively on the basis of narrow self-interest, emphasize their value in counteracting Soviet imperialism, and imply that we can buy with our material surplus the support and friendship of countries whose help we need. We are concerned with the criticisms which grow out of a naive expectancy that people of other countries should be grateful for the programs which we ourselves declare we are carrying out in our self interest. How can right feelings and genuine mutuality be created among nations unless moral and psychological conditions essential to understanding, respect, and cooperation are fostered?

We believe that our country would be far more effective in achieving its stated objectives if the specific assistance programs, and the methods used in carrying them out, fulfilled more fully the moral and religious tenets which the Council of Churches and its constituent denominations have enunciated on several occasions before this committee. In doing so, we would be infinitely more successful in creating the conditions under which collective security, international cooperation, and economic progress can be realized. Moreover, under which the newly independent, emerging, and less-developed countries would feel partners in a common enterprise aiming at achieving their freedom, stability, and social advancement. We must develop a rationale that will meet the test of the collective conscience of mankind, and that test must be morally and ethically sound.

We must do these things because we are concerned for people as people—for the citizens of other countries as well as our own—and because misery, ignorance, despotism, and self-serving exploitation must be relieved wherever they exist—so far as the abilities, resources, and mercy of a people permit. The great extremes of poverty and relative abundance in this world are intolerable to the Christian conscience, and they will not be accepted for long by the peoples of depressed areas who today, through communication, education, transportation, and other forces which have created a shrunken, closely knit world, are determined that they, too, should share in the better things of life.

THE CHURCHES SPEAK FROM EXPERIENCE

Not only do the churches speak out of their religious conviction based upon sustained and penetrating study of the application of religious principles to U.S. foreign policy, but beyond this, the churches have had long, practical, and steadily broadening experience in oversea aid and in international cooperation. In mission work they pioneered in technical and economic assistance, in education, literacy programs, medicine, public health, agriculture, industry, mass communications, and leadership training.

During recent years, the churches have engaged in many types of relief and cooperative endeavors to administer to the distressed, and to help hungry, illiterate, diseased, and impoverished persons to become self-supporting and to guide their own peoples into responsible nationhood. During 1958, our churches contributed approximately $120 million to these ends. Through our Department of Church World Service, our churches have given aid to people in need around the world, distributed surplus food, sent relief in the wake of disasters, and pioneered in village and community projects. In 1958, the churches contributed $32 million for such aid.

Worldwide projects are carried on also by the United Christian Youth Movement, the United Student Christian Council, and United Church Women. These agencies and the Department of the Church and Economic Life and the Department of International Affairs of the National Council of Churches conduct study and action programs on international relations under the leadership of outstanding lay persons who have particular competence in these disciplines.

SOME GUIDING OBJECTIVES FOR MUTUAL AID PROGRAMS

Let us now turn to the implications of these moral and religious principles and perceptions to the mutual security programs now under consideration by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Based on their experience in international affairs, as well as on intensive study and discussion of U.S. policy and programs, the churches have evolved general principles which can be applied to our Government's international programs. The following are some of the guidelines and practices which we believe essential if our foreign aid efforts are to become more effective in developing conditions of peace with justice and freedom:

1. The United States should assist our fellowmen in the emerging, newly independent, and developing areas of the world to the full extent of our capabilities on one hand, and their absorptive capacities on the other. This objective of fostering improved conditions of life and internal political, economic, and moral strength in other countries, should find sufficient justification as a worthy national objective of its own, and not be made an incidental aspect of our concern to increase the military capabilities of countries allied to us or linked with us in collective security arrangements.

2. Although all parts of our foreign policy are interrelated and require coordination, economic and technical aid should be administered in relation to economic and social needs and opportunities, and divorced insofar as practical from military considerations.

3. In the absence of a clearcut mandate by both the legislative and the executive branches of our Government to focus our foreign economic programs on helping people because they are members of the broader human family, and because the principle of sharing is as essential in international development as it is within nations and communities, the various types of assistance as well as individual projects tend to become, in daily administration, unduly related to military and political factors. We believe this objective will be more realistically and effectively fulfilled if military assistance appropriations are separated from economic and technical assistance aiming at the long-term economic and social development of less technologically advanced countries. This broad policy of sharing and concern should represent a primary and basic feature of our total foreign policy.

4. The amount of assistance from all sources which is being provided today appears far from adequate to meet the elementary needs of the developing countries. Expanded programs of technical cooperation appear essential if the individual countries are to create institutions capable of rendering the most basic public services under responsible democratic government and if industrial, agricultural, health, education, and other vital aspects of civilization and adequate society are to be promoted.

5. It is evident that far larger sums of capital must be made available from public and private sources if any significant progress is to be made in many countries of the world toward increasing per capita income from $50 or $100 or $150 a year to levels on which people can live with some degree of decency and self-respect and develop the capacity to help themselves. The resources of the Development Loan Fund need to be increased to the extent that effective loans can be made and placed on a long-term operating basis. We support such measures as the proposed international development authority and the inter-American development bank as additional means for providing the essential capital.

6. Congress should establish these programs of assistance on a long-term basis in terms of objectives, scope, financing, and administration. Present authorization and appropriation practices prevent effective planning, force improvisation, create waste and inefficiency, and foil the fulfillment of objectives. By the time U.S. field staff are in a position to reach agreement with officials of the participating country, the period for which funds are available may have already expired. Representatives of participating countries are bewildered and the best laid plans are frustrated

7. We believe the objective of fostering the development and internal economic, social, and moral strength of other countries will be brought into sharper focus if the various tools or methods of providing economic and technical assistance are better integrated and coordinated. Because the rationale of our programs has not been clear, and because the Government has proliferated the several devices or means of assistance among several agencies, the result has been increasingly a haphazard collection of projects and diffused activities. We have produced such a complex dispersion of agencies and responsibilities that neither our own citizens nor the people of the countries with whom we are working can comprehend what is going on. In consequence, technical assistance, loan projects, and grant aid tend to be resolved in reference to momentary military and political considerations rather than as a positive part of a long-term sustained effort to produce stability, responsibility, freedom, and human betterment.

8. In applying the principle of mutual help in the administration of assistance programs, joint working arrangements with other countries needs to be emphasized. To be stressed also, is the fostering within the participating countries of indigenous organizations and staffs capable of planning and administering the country's development program, and of using external assistance effectively. Whether technical assistance is provided thrcugh Government agencies or private organizations, a common purpose is to develop indigenous leadership, professional skills, and democratic values required for effective economic and social development.

9. To assure the administration of the programs with the fullest integrity, vision, and moral purpose, more resourceful efforts are required in the recruitment and training of Americans for international service. To this end, it is imperative that the agency or agencies responsible for economic and technical assistance be established on a long-term basis and that they be in a position to recruit and train personnel for long-term responsibility. Many of the inadequacies of American personnel assigned to overseas service is due to the temporary and unstable character of the programs. We believe that many of the finest citizens of America—citizens who possess the requisite professional and technical skills, who have the humility and concern for human beings which this delicate task of working in another country entails, and who are prepared to undergo the rigors of training and separation from their homeland for long periods—will come forward if the Congress and the executive branch will manifest the greatness of our foreign assistance programs and indicate that they are determined to carry them forward throughout the period of years which success obviously requires.

10. To the extent that their administrative capacities permit, increasing emphasis should be placed on the use of the United Nations and other international organizations for the conduct of economic and technical cooperation programs. The same principles outlined above for bilateral assistance—moral, financial, administrative—apply to the collective efforts carried out through international organizations.

11. While the very nature of the types of assistance needed calls for heavy governmental responsibility, a maximum use of private initiative is to be encouraged. This includes such measures as broader guarantees to encourage private investment, the reduction of barriers to trade, and the fostering of private enterprise throughout the world. We believe, further, that there are many untapped opportunities under which Government programs can utilize American universities and other educational organizations, research institutions, foundations, consulting firms, and American business in industry in the conduct of assistance programs. Cooperative arrangements between corresponding institutions of the United States and the participating country often provide a superior psychological basis for assistance than the assignment of Government personnel.

OUR PEOPLE NEED LEADERSHIP

We are dealing here with complex and difficult problems. Few of our citizens can be expected to understand their technical aspects or administrative ramifications. But, all people have a conscience and respond when the moral principle is clear.

We of the churches will continue to foster the study and discussion of both the substance of policy and the relevant moral and

religious principles. Through the constituent denominations of the National Council of Churches, through a thousand local church councils, and through such branches as the United Church Women and youth councils, opinion and recommendations will be formulated.

However, we need creative and courageous leadership by both the Congress and the executive branch in these perilous times in pointing the direction. We need, above all, the justification and explanation of proposed policies and programs which stand the test of moral and religious principles, and which avoid appeals to narrow self-interest, prejudice, or an excessive reliance on military power in fulfilling our national responsibilities.

Pacific A-Tests Help Study of Radioactivity in Atlantic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. OLIVER
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, there has recently been considerable concern expressed over the increasing amounts of strontium 90 discovered in our wheat and milk. Oceanographers are equally disturbed about the possible effects that dumping of atomic waste materials into our oceanic depths might have. Injurious atomic waste could easily find its way to our dinner table through fish contaminated by absorption of waste material.

The following article, which originally appeared in the New Bedford, Mass., Standard-Times, illustrates yet another fascinating aspect of the science of oceanography. Our country's failure to adequately invest in this vital science could endanger our future health.

PACIFIC A-TESTS HELP STUDY OF RADIOACTIVITY IN ATLANTIC

(By Everett S. Allen)

The ashes of the atomic age—radioactive waste materials which may remain hot and lethal for hundreds or thousands of years—are going to start piling up soon. This prospect is driving oceanographers to find some place to dump them where they will not jeopardize the health of the human race.

Strontium 90, for example, which might remain radioactive for 5,000 years, could, if carelessly dumped into the ocean, find its way into the bones of sardines.

Ocean scientists, well aware of the importance of their task and the rapidly approaching deadline demanding a solution, are working to see that such a catastrophic eventuality never occurs.

HAZARD IS GREAT

A report of the National Academy of Sciences and the National Research Council concluded, "Unlike the disposal of any other type of waste, the hazard related to radioactive waste is so great that no element of doubt should be allowed to exist regarding safety.

"Stringent rules must be set up and a system of inspection and monitoring instituted. Safe disposal means that the waste shall not come in contact with any living thing. Considering 'half-lives' of the isotopes in waste (the length of time it requires for the isotopes to become harmless), this means, in general, for 600 years if cesium 137 and strontium 90 are present or for about 1/10th as many years if these two isotopes are removed."

Biologists have warned repeatedly that if the hot wastes get into water, they might be concentrated by plants and animals and ultimately find their way to foods for human consumption.

SOME IS DUMPED AT SEA

The wastes are radioactive byproducts of the operations of nuclear reactors. They must be kept from living organisms until the radioactivity disintegrates with the passage of time. Methods for this disposal in the oceans have been considered, but the circulation of the seas has led some to suggest that it might not be permanent.

In the United States, where there is plenty of land, there probably are disposal areas ashore sufficient to take care of this country's atomic waste for the next 20 years. For Russia, there is the Black Sea, which probably would be safe enough, but it is too far removed for any other country to use it even if the Soviet Union permitted it.

It is possible that other nations could cast their radioactive waste in concrete and dump it into the ocean; this now is being done here in New England—small quantities of this waste material from Boston are being dumped into the Gulf of Maine once each week.

However, atomic plants are expected to operate on so narrow a margin of profit that this might prove to be too expensive a proposition; presumably, they will not be able to afford to use partly expended fuel or to purify their waste products.

HAS TO BE SOLVED

Oceanographers properly have directed public attention to this problem as justifying their existence and warranting additional support of their research operations: The problem has to be solved, and they possess the training and experience to do it, given the opportunity.

Recently, 15 of the world's most prominent oceanographers gathered at the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution to establish a long-range planning group on an international basis, designed to take advantage of the broad cooperation engendered by the International Geophysical Year. Provisional chairman of the Conference was Dr. C. O'D Iselin, director of the Woods Hole organization.

Present at the meetings were Dr. Anton Bruun, Denmark; Comdr. R. A. Capurro, Argentina; Dr. Y. Miyake, Japan; Dr. R. Revelle, United States; Prof. I. Zenkevitch, U.S.S.R.; Dr. M. N. Hill, England; Dr. G. E. R. Deacon, England; Dr. G. Bohnecke, West Germany; Prof. H. Mosby, Norway; Prof. Steeman Nielsen, Denmark; Dr. N. B. Marshall, England, Prof. Y. LeGrand, France, and Dr. N. W. Rakestraw, of the United State.

PROBLEM PINPOINTED

This group decided there are three long-range problems of the ocean that are of critical importance to the future welfare of mankind, adding, "The first of these concerns the use of the deep sea as a receptacle for the waste products of our industrial civilization. This may be a particularly important problem in the future, when very large quantities of poisonous radioactive wastes will be produced by the industrial use of atomic power.

"We need to know whether we can dispose of at least part of these wastes in the deep sea or whether the oceanic circulation or the vertical movements of the fauna will result in too rapid a transport of dangerous material to levels in the sea from which the world's food supplies are in part derived."

To approach the solution of this problem, greater knowledge is required of the rate and character of the exchange between the deep and surface waters of the oceans. The physical difficulties of making such measurements have been overcome only in part.

MOTION TRACED

Among the new measurement techniques are these:

1. The use of natural radioactive substances occurring in the water, such as radio-carbon and tritium, to trace the paths of motion and the mixing of the waters.

2. Direct measurement of the deep currents by following free-floating buoys or by using deep current meters.

3. The measurement, with a new order of precision, of the salt content of the water. This allows the salt, itself, to be used as a tracer of the water movements.

4. Measurement of the heat flow from the interior of the earth into the deep water, which allows the heating of the deep water to be used as an index of the time of passage of the water over the ocean bottom.

The AIBS Hydrobiology Committee, a group of foremost American scientists, met in Washington to consider the problem of the probable contamination of marine waters with radioisotopes coincident with the accelerating development of atomic energy.

The committee concluded: "We are cognizant of the fact that the U.S. Atomic Energy Committee is planning to contain a major portion of the wastes, especially the high-level (of radioactivity) wastes, and to avoid their release to the environment.

CONTAMINATION INEVITABLE

"However, it was the consensus of the Committee that contamination of natural waters and of the sea is inevitable."

The Committee predicted that countries with limited land area and dense populations will be unable to contain their radioactive wastes indefinitely and noted the possibility of disposal of the high-level wastes in the deep sea "is being seriously discussed.

"Low-level wastes already are being introduced into coastal waters, a procedure which probably will become more commonly adopted. Thus, even though our country can maintain its radioactive contamination of the sea at a minimum, this is a global, not a local, problem, and it is imperative that the answers to a variety of questions be known before the problem becomes serious.

"The contamination is to be expected not only from the ultimate development of atomic power, but is present today as fallout, as induced radioactivity, and as wastes resulting from industrial, laboratory, and hospital uses of radioisotopes. The present rate of addition of radioisotopes to the sea is sufficiently small so that no serious problems exist as yet, except in isolated incidents associated with weapons tests.

"However, the biological, geochemical, and oceanographic processes which will determine the fate of radioisotopes in the sea are inadequately known and the development of pollution is so insidious that extensive studies should be initiated now to permit evaluation of the problem."

PRESENT SITUATION

Here is a thumbnail sketch of the present situation in this field:

Tritium, used as a tracer of water movements in the sea, is a radioisotope, a form of hydrogen. Some of it is present naturally in the atmosphere, and in the ocean; it combines with oxygen to form water, and we observe it first on earth as rain. This was the case until 1954.

In that year, atomic tests in the Pacific introduced artificially into the earth's atmosphere an amount of tritium equal to all that which was present before. Up to this point, tritium from the air was entering the oceans of the world, at sea surface, in roughly uniform quantities everywhere.

The debris from the bomb blast hung together in the air as a lump of tritium, how-

ever, and because the explosion took place near Eniwetok, in the northern latitudes, the tritium settled out mostly in the Northern Hemisphere. Thus, most of the tritium eventually entered the North Atlantic.

TRITIUM WATCHED

Now, oceanographers are watching this tritium, using it as a tracer device to learn about the North Atlantic's movements, including the rate at which ocean currents can smooth out this lump of radioactive wastes by carrying it deeper, or to other waters. By monitoring the tritium, they are presently watching to see how rapid will be its introduction into the South Atlantic.

Ocean scientists have to know at what rate this material will mix with sea water. For example, if something happened to an atomic-powered ship—sinking or collision, in either peace or war—what would be the effect of its mishap spewed atomic wastes into the shipping lanes?

How much of an area would have to be roped off and for how long would it remain hot and dangerous? What would happen to the food fish in the area?

Tritium, relatively harmless to mankind, is the guinea pig for the extremely dangerous strontium 90; sea waters presently have only a very low content of this latter long-lived atomic product.

But if tritium helps ocean scientists to know how the waters move, in which direction, how fast they mix, dilute, and transfer radioactive wastes, it could one day save thousands—or even millions—of lives.

The So-Called Democratic Advisory Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, the appended editorials from the Washington Evening Star of April 2, and the Newark Evening News of April 3, entitled "Burned Child," and "Disservice," respectively, express my feelings so well that I am grateful for the permission to insert them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with my brief remarks. The recent statement made by the so-called Democratic Advisory Council criticizing the foreign policy of the administration of the United States at a time when delicate and highly sensitive negotiations are going on, with tremendous import on the future of the world, is evidence of very bad taste if not gross stupidity. It is gratifying and heartening to know that the real leaders of the Democratic Party who are active in the affairs of our Government refuse to associate themselves with this group of eager beavers who in this instance would have been of greater service to their party and their country by keeping their mouths shut.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Apr. 2, 1959]

BURNED CHILD

The latest screed to emerge from the Democratic Advisory Council is a massive exercise in irresponsible nonsense.

Sponsored, as it is, by men and women of some stature, the truth-torturing nature of this foreign policy report is astonishing. Its ostensible purpose is to unload a partisan H-bomb on the Eisenhower administration. But even as a flagrantly political document it is self-defeating. For example, the report charges, with reference to the Formosa resolution ,that President Eisenhower heedlessly dropped a time bomb into the already explosive Far Eastern situation. It does not mention the fact that an almost unanimous Congress voted for the Formosa resolution. Does the Advisory Council's indictment extend to the Democrats who approved the resolution? Also ignored is the fact that the expression of American purpose contained in this resolution, time bomb or not, has served for nearly 5 years to discourage a Chinese Communist attack on Formosa. If this is catastrophic error, as the Advisory Council would have the people believe, we could do with more of the same.

This incredible document concludes on a questioning note. "Must we sit in paralyzed horror for 2 more years," it asks, "watching our strength, our influence, our position in the world, and our alliances dissolve, as just a hundred years ago men watched the Union dissolve under the weak and palsied hand of Buchanan?" The best that can be said for this kind of gibberish is (we hope) that no one will take it seriously—except, perhaps, the members of the Democratic Advisory Council.

To read the phrenetic language of the report is to understand why the responsible Democratic leaders in Congress have shunned the Advisory Council. They are better acquainted with the facts of life, and they have a better understanding of the harm which this kind of ranting partisanship could do to the country in a time of danger. It is not so easy, however, to understand why Dean Acheson would serve as chairman of the committee which presumably drafted the report.

In his days as Secretary of State, Dean Acheson was subjected to much the same kind of outrageous abuse, and one might think that as a burned child he would dread the fire. But evidently he does not. In partisan politics, apparently, the familiar maxims do not apply.

[From the Newark Evening News, Apr. 3, 1959]

DISSERVICE

The Democratic Advisory Council, to which Democratic leaders in Congress regularly pay no attention, has issued another in its series of attacks on administration foreign policy. This one, which comes from the council's committee headed by former Secretary of State Dean Acheson, is pretty much like the others that preceded it.

Administration failures in assorted areas are reviewed at length. There's a partial playback of the presidential campaign of 1952, and a foretaste of the sweetness to come in 1960. All of it is accompanied by the familiar council line that under Mr. Eisenhower our alliances disintegrate and our power declines.

Now Mr. Acheson and associate critics may be touched with genius in the conduct of foreign affairs, but they are nevertheless atrocious judges of timing. Their discordant blast came at an hour when foreign ministers of the Western powers were in Washington, engaged in consultations on the Berlin crisis and on their conference next month which will determine the fate of the summit meeting with the Soviet Union.

At this point the need for national unity is apparent to all except the Democratic Advisory Council. To strangers to Washington that title, Democratic Advisory Council, may sound impressive. It might mislead allied representatives who, unfamiliar with the intricacies of domestic politics, do not know how consistently the council is ignored at home, particularly by the Democrats who run the Congress.

Altogether, in the light of Berlin's tensions, the council's statement is intemperate, indiscreet and mischievous. It suggests a bitter division that is nonexistent, and therefore ranks as a national disservice.

Mrs. David W. Vess Selected Alabama's Mother of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 19, 1959

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, the State of Alabama recently selected a mother of the year. I am quite proud of the fact that the outstanding recipient of this honor is Mrs. David W. Vess, of Birmingham, my district.

Mrs. Vess is a most unusual mother. Aside from her own three grown children, she has become a mother to hundreds of prison inmates in Alabama. She spends many hours each week writing them and, since 1938, has made more than 1,000 visits to various prisons throughout the State.

An article recently appeared in the Birmingham Post-Herald which indicates the many good reasons for bestowing such deserved recognition on Mrs. Vess. Under leave heretofore granted, it is my privilege to insert this article in the RECORD.

VESTAVIA'S MRS. DAVID VESS NAMED ALABAMA'S MOTHER OF THE YEAR

Alabama's Mother of the Year is Mrs. David W. Vess, of 1857 Shades Crest Road, Vestavia Hills.

The 66-year-old mother of three grown children was selected in a statewide contest as most outstanding in her Christian home and community activities.

She will represent Alabama in the American Mother of the Year contest in New York in May.

Her selection was based on her unusual mission work.

Instead of spending her free time relaxing at home with her husband, Mrs. Vess travels the State spreading cheer to the forgotten men in prisons.

She has made a full-time job of prison welfare since 1938 when she took part in a religious service at Jefferson County jail.

For a time she worked with a group from First Methodist Church, then later went with an independent group which enlisted the aid of ministers and religious workers to conduct monthly services at State prisons.

Mrs. Vess has made more than 1,000 visits to Kilby Prison, Alabama's maximum security prison.

Draper Correctional Institution for younger men, Julia Tutwiler Prison for Women, and Atmore Prison Farm for Negro Men also welcome visits from mother Vess.

Each week she spends hours writing inmates, many of whom receive no other mail, and more time goes to visiting and helping the prisoners' families.

Mrs. Vess has been active in church work since her early days in Florence when she became president of the East Florence Baptist Church Sunshine Band.

She attends Southside Baptist Church and is a member of the Bonnie Howard Sunday School class there.

She also finds time to take an active part in WMU and the United Daughters of the Confederacy.

Of her selection as Alabama mother of the year she said, "It was all a shock to me."

Convicts in our prisons evidently thought she deserved the honor. They sent in more than 2,000 letters supporting her nomination.

Mrs. H. L. Anderton was chairman of the committee to select the Alabama mother.

The American Mother of the Year will be selected May 5 after a New York banquet to which all the State mothers of the year will be invited.

An interdenominational program, the search for mothers of the year singles out accomplishments of mothers in establishing Christian homes and in contributing to the communities in which they live.

Beer Halls at Gettysburg?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Members and all citizens will be interested in the editorial carried in the April 11 issue of the Saturday Evening Post, titled "Beer Halls at Gettysburg? Our National Shrines Need Protection."

The centennial of the Civil War is less than 2 years away. Unless the Congress sees fit to restore 1960 appropriations for the acquisition of lands at Civil War battlefields, they will not be in appropriate condition to properly commemorate this historic anniversary.

Perhaps, as Lincoln said, "We cannot dedicate, we cannot consecrate, we cannot hallow this ground," but certainly it is within our power not to detract from it further by preventing additional commercialization of the areas. The editorial follows:

BEER HALLS AT GETTYSBURG?—OUR NATIONAL SHRINES NEED PROTECTION

The commercial invasion of Gettysburg and other Civil War battlefields demonstrates the need of a firm new policy regarding privately owned land within our national shrines. Without such a policy, we shall witness the spread of residential subdivisions, automobile graveyards, and beer halls in the midst of cherished historic areas.

The traditional practice of buying 1 acre when 100 acres are threatened, and of depending on land donations from the States and wealthy public-spirited citizens, isn't good enough.

Of 24 million acres authorized by Congress for national parks, monuments, and historic areas, 700,000 acres are still privately owned. This is only 3 percent of the total, but the trouble they cause is out of all proportion to their acreage. These "inholdings" involve more than 3,000 individual owners. Many of their structures are eyesores and fire hazards. National Park Service officials testify that they create serious problems of administration.

The battlefields were established as national memorials in the post-Civil War era, when the lands around them were essentially farm country and were expected to remain so. The character of the landscape has changed, but basic legislation on land acquisition has never been updated.

At Gettysburg, the classic battlefield shrine, nearly 700 of the 3,400 acres within the authorized boundary are privately owned. This land is either being developed commercially or will be very soon. The field of Pickett's charge is sprinkled with motels and spreading subdivisions. An automobile graveyard flourishes where thousands of Union and Confederate soldiers fought for 7 desperate hours, often hand to hand, on July 3, 1863.

Other Civil War battlefields—Antietam, Manassas, Fredericksburg, Vicksburg, Kennesaw Mountain—also suffer. Half of Manassas, the scene of decisive actions in 1861 and 1862, is being swallowed by residential construction, almost in the backyard of the National Capital. Venerable earlier battlegrounds like Yorktown, Va., where the American Revolution was finally won, and Chalmette, La., where Andrew Jackson scored the greatest land victory in the War of 1812, are in danger, too.

To look beyond the battlefields, nearly all 29 of the national parks—except Crater Lake and Yellowstone—have problems of privately owned land. Not until 1948 were any funds appropriated for land acquisition by the Government, and then only meagerly. In the 5-year period of 1948 to 1952, the total was less than $1 million. Since then the problem has slowly gained increased recognition. Last year's appropriation was $1,500,000, and the new administration budget now before Congress recommends doubling the figure. The boundaries of the entire national park system could be completed today for an estimated $30 million to $40 million, but at the present rate, and with land values still soaring, it will take many years—and some of the choicest areas still will be lost.

Congress can select an alternate course—direct the Interior Department to liquidate the inholdings and provide the funds to do the job. The battlefields need first priority; the $10 million required to safeguard their boundaries should be earmarked for completion by 1961, the centennial of the beginning of the Civil War.

Endorsement of the President's Budget Plan for Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEAN P. TAYLOR
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I have received a resolution from the Women's Republican Club of Rennsselaer County, Inc., Troy, N.Y., as follows:

Whereas the Republican Party has traditionally been the party of Government economy, balanced budgets, lower taxes, and fiscal integrity; and

Whereas President Eisenhower has submitted a balanced budget for the coming fiscal year, yet the Democrat majority in Congress has indicated its refusal to vote a balanced budget and has already embarked on a giveaway spending spree; and

Whereas continuous deficit spending by Government is the chief cause of inflation which is the cruelest tax of all: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Women's Republican Club of Rensselaer County, Inc., Troy, N.Y., go on record in support of President Eisenhower's proposal to balance the budget and to apply any surplus to retirement of the national debt; and be it

Resolved further, That the Women's Republican Club of Rensselaer County, Inc., Troy, N.Y., urge all citizens to join in this economy effort by writing to their representatives in Washington and in Albany; and be it

Resolved further, That a copy of this resolution be sent to President Eisenhower, Congressman Dean P. Taylor, and Assemblyman Thomas H. Brown.

DAISY M. PINNEY,
President.

Reality of the Central Valley Dream

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. McFALL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to discuss the Central Valley project in California, which is one of our major investments in the development of water resources, fish and wildlife conservation, flood control, and human progress of the Nation.

In a recent editorial the Stockton (Calif.) Daily Record pointed out that this great project is not only providing uncounted benefits to California—it is paying for itself with interest.

Congressional appropriations for this kind of expenditure is not money thrown away, it is a wise investment in our future.

In the coming months, we will be considering authorizations and appropriations for worthy projects being added to this great Central Valley project.

Following is the complete text of this pertinent editorial, which illustrates most graphically the desirability of continued development of the Central Valley project:

REALITY OF THE CENTRAL VALLEY DREAM

Once a dream becomes reality it all too often becomes commonplace. So it is with the concrete and steel, the water and the power, of the Central Valley project which so long was a vision in the great and fruitful basin that is California's midsection.

Since this complex of dams, canals, power stations, and pumps began operation in 1949, the Central Valley project has brought a full or supplemental water supply to 800,000 agricultural acres. Last year water deliveries amounted to 2,541,837 acre-feet, an increase of 5 percent over deliveries in 1957. Power production was nearly 4 billion kilowatt-hours, the highest in the project's history. Less definable in specific figures are the project's benefits in terms of flood control and the protection of fish life.

Central Valley project now consists of 5 dams and reservoirs, 10 pumping plants, 364 miles of canals, 390 miles of operating roads and communications systems, and 4 electrical generating plants. There are nearly 800 miles of transmission lines. The huge earth-fill Trinity Dam now is the major element still under construction.

Federal money amounting to $589,302,000 has been spent on Central Valley project, according to the annual report of the Bureau of Reclamation, but this is by no means largess. About 93 percent of the cost is reimbursable to the Federal Treasury, and at interest rates of 3 and 2.5 percent. The

remaining 7 percent is charged to flood control, navigation, recreation, and conservation of fish and wildlife.

Last year Central Valley project grossed $17,966,444 in revenue from all sources, the bulk in sales of power, for a net of $9,233,396. This was a repayment to the Treasury. An interest payment of $2,427,022 was calculated in the operating cost.

Not only is the Central Valley project a practical reality in its benefits of water, power, and flood control, but also it is a sound fiscal operation. Repayment is well ahead of schedule, and at the end of the amortization period all taxpayers in the United States will benefit rather handsomely from the income.

Here is "a dream walking," to use the terms of a one-time popular song, which everyone in central California can see, a dream which still has not reached its complete reality. Surely the performance record thus far argues strongly to any reasonable man the desirability of bringing Central Valley project to its ultimate fulfillment. And the record should bolster, as well, the faint-hearted who have doubts as to California's ability to carry out its own plan for maximum use of water.

A Farmer's Views on the Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD one of many letters I have received expressing almost the same thought, this one coming from a young farmer in my district who responded to a recent questionnaire I sent out, which covered some of the farm programs.

Dean Enright of Timber Lake, S. Dak., has done a good job of expressing the views of apparently a large number of farmers in my district. Because so many of them have expressed similar ideas, I thought at least one of these letters should go into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the benefit of all Members of Congress. The letter reads as follows:

TIMBER LAKE, S. DAK.

DEAR MR. BERRY: I have studied the copy of H.R. 1231 which you sent to me, and am going to give you my very frank opinion. Since reading the last issue of "Farm Journel," it will likely have some bearing on all our beliefs about farm programs.

It has been my thinking for quite some time that bushel quotas rather than acreage allotments are needed. It has been proved the hard way that acreage allotments don't work. However, I do not understand the need for controlling the movement of wheat as set forth in your bill; nor do I see how you can control our preference for Wheaties over, say, Wheat Chex, or how many loaves of bread the Nation will eat. These marketing certificates and restrictions are too involved and would require a police force to control. It would seem to me a farm program should be for the farmer and not involve the manufacturer, exporter, importer, and what have you.

Another thing, if this would not do away with price support programs, then there is nothing accomplished. Price supports have long been a contributing factor toward surpluses. This is the merry-go-round we are trying to get off. Not only is the taxpayer in the grain business, he is also in the granary business. He buys the grain, furnishes money to build a granary, and pays storage on his own grain in a granary put up by himself.

This bill will still not do anything for the small farmer, that is, the man who has been forced out of the wheat farming because his acreage allotment was repeatedly whittled until he had to quit. This is the man who needs help—the sow-cow-hen-plow farmer.

You base bushel quotas on the production of wheat for the past 3 years, and the small farmer is left out. The big local farmer and the suitcase-program farmer will grab the money, as usual. We see men come to South Dakota each year who farm from Mexico to Canada. Uncle Sam furnishes them seed loans, guarantees them a crop under the Federal Crop Insurance program, and pays them for what they raise and also to store it. Now, I ask you, How can this type of farmer lose? Also, how can a small family-size farmer compete with this sort of thing? He could compete on equal footing, but he can't beat Uncle Sam's programs.

Perhaps these opinions of mine won't help you, but I do believe that this sort of thinking is gaining ground among the majority of the farmers.

DEAN ENRIGHT.

Rear Adm. Ralph K. James, U.S. Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the very many friends of Rear Adm. Ralph K. James, both in the naval service and outside, view with the greatest approval his nomination to the position of Chief of the Navy Bureau of Ships. One such expression of approval appeared editorially in the Long Beach Press-Telegram a few days ago. I have asked that it be set out here so that those who do not already know "Jimmy" James may join with those who do in the knowledge that under his direction, the Bureau of Ships will continue the excellent service to the Nation that it has given under the able leadership of its present chief, Rear Adm. Albert G. Mumma, U.S. Navy:

ADMIRAL JAMES: A NICE GUY WITH CHIP ON SHOULDER

Nomination of Rear Adm. Ralph K. James to the post of Chief of the Navy's Bureau of Ships is fitting recognition for a fine naval officer.

Admiral James, former commander of the Long Beach Naval Shipyard, is well known in this area. He has served as assistant chief of the bureau this past year, and when he left here to assume that post we wrote:

"If any naval official assigned to the Long Beach area ever deserved a 21-gun salute for outstanding service to this community, it is Rear Adm. Ralph K. (Jimmy) James."

This community has never had a finer friend than Admiral James. This was true when he served here. It has been true since he left. And we are confident it will continue to be true in the future.

When Admiral James came to Long Beach in 1955 he had the reputation of being "a nice guy." However, he found himself in command of a "sinking shipyard." He regarded it as one of the finest, most efficient naval facilities in the world; but subsidence—earth sinkage—threatened to destroy it, and he noted a lethargy to face up to the problem.

It was at that point that Admiral James began to acquire a new kind of reputation—that of being a nice guy with a chip on his shoulder. He started a fight to save the Navy yard.

He helped awaken Long Beach to the dangers of subsidence, and in so doing he helped the city convert its worry and concern into positive action to solve the problem.

When he takes over his new post of Chief of the Bureau of Ships, Admiral James will be in a key position in determining the future of the Long Beach Naval Shipyard, so important to this community.

We know he regards the local yard as one of the finest.

However, we also are confident that he will not recommend its continuance if he is not satisfied that appropriate antisubsidence measures are being taken. He is not the kind of man who will waste Federal funds on a hopeless cause.

Admiral James made this point clear when he visited Long Beach earlier this month. He commended the city of Long Beach and other oil producers in the Wilmington oilfield for making remarkable progress on a crash water flooding program to halt subsidence, but he also cautioned them to complete the program "without missing one date."

Nomination of Admiral James as Chief of the Bureau of Ships was announced by President Eisenhower. He is expected to assume his new duties in about a month after confirmation by the Senate, which is regarded as a routine formality.

Admiral James has a distinguished background and is well qualified for this new position. He should prove to be a great asset to the defense of the United States in this capacity.

We wish him well on his new assignment.

A Free Market for Gold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution adopted by the California State Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, at their March 1959 meeting with regard to providing a free market for gold, and their request that freshly mined gold, gold ore, and gold commodities be transferred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The resolution follows:

GOLD

Whereas the absolute and arbitrary control exercised by the U.S. Treasury over the production, disposition, and holding of domestic gold is a direct violation of the rights of personal liberty, personal security, and personal ownership of private property; and

Whereas the Government has usurped the right of individuals to sell newly mined gold to industry and to the arts, and has denied individuals the right to own, buy or sell this commodity in a free market; and

Whereas the sale of gold from our Federal gold reserve for other than monetary use annually exceeds the total domestic gold

production and is dissipating the U.S. monetary reserves; and

Whereas by making itself the sole buyer of newly mined gold in processed form and by fixing its arbitrary and low price, the U.S. Government imposes such hardships on the domestic gold producer that most of our primary gold mines have been forced to close operations; and

Whereas all matters pertaining to newly mined gold and gold commodities are now assigned to the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, to which it bears no relationship:

Resolved, That the California State Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to discontinue the sale of Government-owned gold from the monetary reserve to private industry and to restore to the people the right to freely buy, possess, sell, and otherwise treat gold, without price restriction, and to amend pending legislation to include other than newly mined gold; and

Resolved, That the California State Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, urges the U.S. Senate to take immediate steps to transfer all matters pertaining to freshly mined gold, gold ore, and gold commodities to the Subcommittee on Minerals and Mineral Resources of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, where they rightfully belong.

John W. Edelman, Textile Workers Union of America, Urges a Better Wage-Hour Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 20, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a copy of a letter sent to the editor of the Christian Science Monitor by John W. Edelman, Washington representative of the Textile Workers Union of America:

MARCH 24, 1959.

The EDITOR,
Christian Science Monitor,
Boston, Mass.

DEAR MR. EDITOR: Your editorial of March 18 was welcome in that it recognized the gravity of continuing unemployment and the inadequacy of the present unemployment insurance system. It is unfortunate, however, that the same editorial embraced a series of misconceptions about the causes of unemployment.

You assert, for example, that "demands for a higher minimum wage could easily result in more unemployment." The only possible basis for such a statement is the recent letter of Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell to Congress, which accompanied his Department's report on the impact of the $1 minimum wage instituted 3 years ago.

Mr. Mitchell's letter opposed a higher minimum at this time on the grounds that "disemployment," as he put it, might result. Yet the report itself, on which the letter was presumably based, does not offer any firm basis for the Secretary's stand. Like similar studies conducted by the Department of Labor after previous increases in the minimum wage, the report indicates that the $1 minimum had little or no effect upon employment, and for that matter, had little effect upon wages except those below or close to $1 an hour.

So many factors are involved in business mortality rates that measuring any one of them with any degree of accuracy is probably impossible. On the other hand, the absence of any pronounced change in the months following an increase in minimum wages certainly suggests that the increase was readily absorbed.

Nor can it be said that raising the minimum wage is inflationary. The industries most directly affected in the past (textiles, garments, etc.) have a generally lower price structure today than they had 5 years ago, when the Federal minimum was 75 cents. A study prepared for the Senate Labor Subcommittee found that the extension of wage-hour standards to large retail establishments, as proposed in a bill now before Congress, would not necessitate higher prices.

Your subsequent remarks about costs and prices are also unfortunate. You favor higher man-hour productivity, yet you seem to deplore higher wages and shorter hours. This is surely an unrealistic position.

Few would quarrel with your preference for better or cheaper products as productivity rises. The record clearly shows, however, that this classic piece of economic doctrine, like the law of supply and demand, no longer operates in many major industries.

In the auto industry, for instance, there is no visible disposition on the part of management to emulate the original Henry Ford. General Motors admittedly sets its prices so as to yield a 25-percent return on net worth, after taxes, on 180 days' operation a year; and General Motors sets the price standards for its competitors. This, of course, is just the reverse of the classic practice of lowering markup in a quest for greater volume.

If the sales resistance being encountered by the automakers is primarily a matter of price—and that's surely debatable—the blame doesn't lie with labor costs. Auto and steel are outstanding examples of industries whose price policies have little relation to once-accepted economic doctrine.

Thus the insistence of trade unions on winning, in the form of wages, a share of the fruits of productivity is the only practical way to maintain purchasing power and thus to keep the industrial machine running. The current campaign for a better wage-hour law is a part of that effort; and since it involves workers who, for the most part, have no other way to win a living wage, it surely deserves the support of the Christian Science Monitor.

Very truly yours,

JOHN W. EDELMAN,
Washington Representative.

Milwaukee's Mayor Suggests International Congress of Cities on Nuclear Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished mayor of Milwaukee, the Honorable Frank P. Zeidler, has again expressed his deep concern over the threat of atomic destruction which hangs over us all, and has suggested an international conference of cities as one means of lessening world tensions.

Mayor Zeidler expressed his views in a recent editorial in the Public Enterprise Record, published by the Public Enterprise Committee of Milwaukee County. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include that editorial:

WILL THE CITIES OF THE NORTHERN HEMISPHERE SURVIVE THE NEXT DECADE?

(By Frank P. Zeidler, mayor, city of Milwaukee)

One again the people in the cities in the Northern Hemisphere are threatened with wholesale death. The Berlin crisis with which the Soviet Union has confronted the United States may well trigger off a nuclear war which will destroy the United States, the Soviet Union and China. The dictator of the Soviet Union is determined to liquidate West Berlin, and the Western Powers through their leaders have expressed equal determination not to let it be liquidated. The opportunities for compromise seem very small, for Western Germany will not recognize the Communist controlled government of Eastern Germany, to which the Soviet Union will hand its authority. If the Eastern German Government attempts to blockade the road to Berlin, the Western Powers will fight. If the Western Powers fight, the Soviet Union will support the East German Government. On the other hand, the Soviet Union will support a plan for declaring all Berlin a free city provided its troops are included in the occupying powers. This the Western Powers will not agree to. Proposals are being made to have the forces of each government disengage and withdraw, but the Western Powers will not disengage to allow free Berlin to be overrun by the Eastern German Government.

If some decision is not reached, the cities of the Western World will become the greatest death trap of people in all history. Because of this possibility, some advocates of banning nuclear tests believe that the western governments should give into Soviet Union demands because the consequences are too horrible to contemplate. Others counter that to give into these demands would merely lead to further threats by the Soviet Union, and if there is to be a showdown ultimately, let it come now before the Soviet Union is too far ahead in rockets with which they can hit any city in the world.

The hope of the free world lies in the United Nations which should supervise Berlin as a free city under terms to be developed which can be acceptable to the powerful Communist Party and to the free world. The future of Milwaukee hangs upon the decisions to be made in the next few weeks.

A CONGRESS OF CITIES OF THE WORLD

In view of the fact that nuclear energy and explosives threaten the people of the cities of the world, the people of the cities ought to ask their national governments to consider calling an international congress of cities for the purpose of discussing the control of the manufacture of atomic weapons and the ending of the threats to the people in the cities. The leading officials of all the big cities ought to sit together in such a congress to see what can be done to end the tensions. When national governments talk war with each other, they are actually threatening not only the lives of people in the other countries but also the lives of their own people. When Khrushchev threatens nuclear war on the western democracies, he also threatens the lives of hundreds of millions of Russians in the cities in his own country. Thus, too, Hitler's war talk meant the destruction of every major German city and the death of millions of people in those cities.

National governments are often controlled by political parties whose strength usually comes from people who feel no personal

threat from war because they do not happen to live in cities, or can escape from them. The city dweller who is threatened, however, is often too busy with his personal affairs to pay much attention to what national governments are doing, and he doesn't know his own real interest. If the people of the German and Japanese cities could have known what would happen to them because their governments threatened and began a war, they might have countered their foolish national leaders who brought destruction on them. Therefore, the U.S. Government ought to invite the leaders of all the major cities in the world to a congress of cities and put forth proposals which can guarantee peace and freedom and the removal of the threat of atomic destruction. To this congress let there be called the leaders of the arts, the sciences, and all things cultural to discuss how men can learn to live together without threatening their mutual destruction.

For their part, the American cities ought to earnestly think how they can approach cities of similar characteristics around the world to lessen the misunderstanding and the ill will that has developed.

Poll of the People of the Second Congressional District of South Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I would like to include the results of a questionnaire I recently sent out to the people of the Second Congressional District of South Dakota.

Since this district is about equally divided between agricultural and nonagricultural interests, I made a special effort to obtain the benefit of the views of those in the agricultural area.

The questionnaire was sent to boxholders outside of first-class post offices and addressed to residents in first-class post office areas. Approximately 38,000 questionnaires were sent out in this manner, and approximately 7 percent have thus far returned their questionnaires.

In tabulating the results, I have divided the returns into four groups: the nonagricultural cities in the Black Hills area, agricultural cities and towns, farmer, and farmer-rancher categories.

Aside from the general questions on agriculture, labor, defense, and aid to education, probably the most interesting are the answers to questions 6 and 7 wherein 81 percent of the people of my district told me to vote against those grant-in-aid bills which violate the budget, unless tax increases are provided to cover additional costs. This, Mr. Speaker, does in my opinion give the Congress a good idea of the way the people of America feel with regard to grant-in-aid programs and wreckless spending in general.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that this questionnaire has been most valuable to me, not only because of the vote itself but because more than 8 out of 10 returning the questionnaire gave me the additional benefit of their thinking in footnotes at the bottom of the questionnaire itself. Many also enclosed an additional letter covering their views.

In presenting the tabulation, the percentages are listed simply as "Yes" and "No." The remainder have no opinion on the various questions.

QUESTIONNAIRE RETURNS

1. The defense of the United States—in the face of the Soviet Union's constant aim for world domination and the challenge of their outer space satellites—is a grave national problem. Do you favor expansion and an acceleration of our defense effort, particularly in such fields as long-range ballistic missiles, nuclear weapons, earth satellites, and basic scientific research, even though this may require additional taxes to meet these added expenditures:

Total: Yes, 64 percent; no, 18 percent. City: Yes, 77 percent; no, 13 percent. Town: Yes, 66 percent; no, 12 percent. Farmer-rancher: Yes, 59 percent; no, 26 percent. Farmer: Yes, 52 percent; no, 21 percent.

2. In the President's budget, he suggested appropriating $3.9 billion for our mutual security (foreign aid) program, on the basis that this program helps the free nations promote collective defense and economic growth and, as such, is essential to our security. Do you favor continuation of our mutual security-foreign aid program?

Total: Yes, 45 percent; no, 40 percent. City: Yes, 50 percent; no, 34 percent. Town: Yes, 47 percent; no, 46 percent. Farmer-rancher: Yes, 47 percent; no, 45 percent. Farmer: Yes, 37 percent; no, 35 percent.

If your answer is "yes," check one of the following:

Total: At present cost, 52 percent; at reduced cost, 41 percent; at increased cost, 7 percent.

3. In an effort to keep a check on domestic spending at a time when our defense program must have absolute top priority, the President has asked that Congress curtail certain civil programs and turn back the responsibility for various Federal grants-in-aid programs to the State and local governments. Do you agree with such a domestic belt-tightening program at this time?

Total: Yes, 72 percent; no, 16 percent. City: Yes, 76 percent; no, 16 percent. Town: Yes, 76 percent; no, 11 percent. Farmer-rancher: Yes, 75 percent; no, 14 percent. Farmer: Yes, 60 percent; no, 25 percent.

The President also suggests that new starts on construction of irrigation and flood-control projects be delayed until defense pressures on our economy have eased. Do you agree with this policy?

Total: Yes, 72 percent; no, 21 percent. City: Yes, 73 percent; no, 20 percent. Town: Yes, 69 percent; no, 24 percent. Farmer-rancher: Yes, 80 percent; no, 18 percent. Farmer: Yes, 70 percent; no, 24 percent.

5. School districts depend generally upon the real and personal tax base within their districts for the operation of the schools. Increased demands are being made upon districts by a higher pupil load, more classroom facilities, and increased salaries for teachers. Increased revenue can be obtained in four ways: (1) Increasing the real and personal property tax levy; (2) by the State adding 1 cent sales tax earmarked for education; (3) the Federal Government adding 1 cent on the net income tax, diverting it directly to the treasury of the State earmarked for education; (4) an expensive overall Federal aid-to-education program (Murray-Metcalf bill costing from $3 billion to $5 billion annually) with the necessary Federal regulations and controls. Which system do you prefer?

Total: (1) 14 percent; (2) 64 percent, (3) 19 percent, (4) 3 percent. City: (1) 9 percent, (2) 72 percent, (3) 15 percent, (4) 4 percent. Town: (1) 14 percent, (2) 63 percent, (3) 18 percent, (4) 5 percent. Farmer-rancher: (1) 15 percent, (2) 67 percent, (3) 17 percent, (4) 1 percent. Farmer: (1) 17 percent, (2) 55 percent, (3) 24 percent, (4) 4 percent.

6. In order to keep the budget in balance, would you favor requiring the Congress to levy additional taxes for all spending programs enacted which would be in excess of the anticipated national income?

Total: Yes, 52 percent; no, 32 percent. City: Yes, 54 percent; no, 33 percent. Town: Yes, 51 percent; no, 33 percent. Farmer-rancher: Yes, 55 percent; no, 28 percent. Farmer: Yes, 48 percent; no, 35 percent.

7. Do you want me to vote against those grant-in-aid bills which violate the budget unless tax increases are provided to cover the additional costs?

Totals: Yes, 81 percent; no, 8 percent. City: Yes, 81 percent; no, 6 percent. Town: Yes, 81 percent; no, 8 percent. Farmer-rancher: Yes, 88 percent; no, 7 percent. Farmer: Yes, 76 percent; no, 10 percent.

8. There is wide recognition of the need to more fully utilize the potential of our young people in professional fields, particularly science and engineering. Do you favor the granting of Federal tax deduction credit to parents for college tuition costs as one means of encouraging greater college enrollment of qualified young people?

Total: Yes, 55 percent; no, 35 percent. City: Yes, 57 percent; No, 34 percent. Town: Yes, 59 percent; no, 32 percent. Farmer-rancher: Yes, 56 percent; no, 35 percent. Farmer: Yes, 48 percent; no, 39 percent.

9. Following the findings of the McClellan Labor Rackets Committee hearings, the President recommended labor legislation which would do four things: (1) Safeguard workers' funds in union treasuries against misuse of any kind whatsoever; (2) protect the rights and freedoms of individual union members, including the basic right to free and secret election of officers; (3) advance true and responsible collective bargaining; (4) protect the public and innocent third parties from unfair and coercive practices such as boycotting and blackmail picketing. Do you want me to oppose legislation which falls short of these four goals?

Total: Yes, 74 percent; no, 14 percent. City: Yes, 75 percent; no, 13 percent. Town: Yes, 77 percent; no, 14 percent. Farmer-rancher: Yes, 78 percent; no, 13 percent. Farmer: Yes, 65 percent; no, 18 percent.

10. In his agricultural message, the President emphasized the food-for-peace program of expanding the use of our agricultural surpluses for food abroad. Although expansion involves increased expenditure, would you favor such a program rather than curtailment of farm production?

Total: Yes, 66 percent; no, 19 percent. City: Yes, 60 percent; no, 23 percent. Town: Yes, 65 percent; no, 19 percent. Farmer-rancher: Yes, 68 percent; no, 18 percent. Farmer: Yes, 69 percent; no, 17 percent.

11. Would you favor limiting our economic foreign aid program entirely to providing food supplies abroad?

Total: Yes, 49 percent; no, 36 percent. City: Yes, 40 percent; no, 43 percent. Town: Yes, 50 percent; no, 37 percent. Farmer-rancher: Yes, 48 percent; no, 38 percent. Farmer: Yes, 56 percent; no, 28 percent.

12. A crash program on missiles has produced amazing results. Would you favor a crash program in research for the development of industrial uses for farm commodities?

Total: Yes, 59 percent; no, 24 percent. City: Yes, 42 percent; no, 35 percent. Town: Yes, 58 percent; no, 24 percent. Farmer-rancher: Yes, 61 percent; no, 24 percent. Farmer: Yes, 75 percent; no, 14 percent.

13. Wheat is the principal farm commodity on which a legislative program may be expected out of this Congress. Would you

prefer the domestic parity or two-price system for wheat, with bushel rather than acreage quotas, to the present support program?

Total: Yes, 49 percent; no, 13 percent. City: Yes, 30 percent; no, 9 percent. Town: Yes, 47 percent; no, 12 percent. Farmer-rancher: Yes, 55 percent; no, 13 percent. Farmer: Yes, 62 percent; No, 21 percent.

14. Would you favor high Government supports on all farm products with absolute rigid production controls covering all farm commodities?

Total: Yes, 14 percent; no, 72 percent. City: Yes, 5 percent; no, 73 percent. Town: Yes, 10 percent; no, 72 percent. Farmer-rancher: Yes, 16 percent; no, 77 percent. Farmer: Yes, 26 percent; no, 65 percent.

15. The President has proposed an increase of Federal gasoline tax from the present 3 to 4½ cents per gallon to accelerate construction of the Interstate Highway System. Do you favor such an increase?

Total: Yes, 41 percent; no, 52 percent. City: Yes, 48 percent; no, 42 percent. Town: Yes, 43 percent; no, 50 percent. Farmer-rancher: Yes, 37 percent; no, 56 percent. Farmer: Yes, 37 percent; no, 59 percent.

Ominous Trend in Castro's Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, Dale Francis, correspondent for the Catholic periodical Our Sunday Visitor, knows much about Cuba. In the past I have inserted many of his articles in the Appendix, because I was convinced of his good faith and accuracy as a reporter. I have never met him but I have talked with him on the telephone.

Now he writes, "My own confidence in the possibility of a victory for freedom with Fidel Castro as the head of the government has been considerably shaken." He says that in his earlier articles he failed to anticipate the consequences of the unstable character of Fidel Castro and he overemphasized the importance of the fact that the vast majority of Cuban people do not like communism.

He says the biggest complication in the democratic forces was their organization. He says he recognizes the strong possibility that Castro may be a Communist and he says Castro's behavior is, "if you say it gently, irrational."

Based on my own observations, in Cuba and elsewhere, I have been disturbed about many developments. However, I still believe in the good faith of Fidel Castro and I do not believe that he is a Communist. I have written him at length about several important matters that do disturb me. I am looking forward to hearing his explanation by mail or next week when he comes here.

Castro's job is tremendous and he was not well prepared for its great responsibilities. Very few people would be. Cuba has been dominated for years by dishonest, terroristic governments. An honest and democratic government cannot be created overnight. However, we can ask that the leadership recognize its affinity with the free world against communism and we can insist that verdicts of acquittal by duly authorized tribunals not be reversed by executive decision. We can also be much disturbed about the overthrow of able, democratic labor leaders who were open and effective enemies of Batista.

I do not think Castro is a dictator yet but I do see an ominous trend. I agree with Dale Francis that "if it is true Castro is another dictator and worse, a dictator who does the will of the Reds, then the consequences of this truth are so terrible no one wants to face them." Face them we will have to if they do occur, but far better that we examine the trend at this time and make certain that Fidel Castro understands it for what it is and has an opportunity to reverse his policies before it is too late, both for himself and Cuba.

Under a previous consent I am including the text of the article by Dale Francis in Our Sunday Visitor for March 29, 1959, entitled "Will Cuba Be Betrayed?"

WILL CUBA BE BETRAYED?

(By Dale Francis)

A nationally famous news commentator, commenting on these articles, spoke of my complete about face on the Cuban situation and this is a most unfortunate misimpression. It is the situation that changed, not me. I was mistaken in that I had not expected such a quick change in the situation. I was not wrong in my reporting of the facts of both the situation that existed under Batista and the situation as it existed in the early days of the new government.

What I have tried to do, and what I intend to do in the future, is to report the news as it exists at the moment. My news sources in Cuba are, I feel quite certain, unequaled by any other newsman's and I will report accurately what I learn.

There was always the real possibility that democratic forces in Cuba could win out. I have informed and intelligent friends in Cuba who still believe they can win out. My own confidence in the possibility of a victory for freedom with Fidel Castro as the head of the government has been considerably shakened.

Democratic forces did not win out because of a variety of complications, some of which I will discuss in this article. Communists won out at least temporarily, because they are well organized. My own failure to anticipate their quick dominance—you will recall I always warned of the possibility of their gaining power—was a miscalculation based on the overemphasis I gave to the vast majority of the people who do not like communism and my failure to judge the consequences of the unstable character of Fidel Castro.

The biggest complication among the democratic forces was their lack of organization. Two examples will explain what I mean.

In Santiago de Cuba, an appointment was to be made of the director of education for the province. A person recommended by Archbishop Enrique Perez Serantes seemed certain to get the job. This person was a good Catholic, a believer in democratic freedom. His would have been an ideal appointment.

But another Catholic, who wanted the same position, opposed the appointment most strenuously and bickering over the position began. While the divided Catholic forces bickered over who should have the position, an active Communist was appointed.

The second example of lack of organization involved Catholics and Protestants. Castro had committed himself to religion in the schools in one of his many long talks. Quite naturally the secularists, free-thinkers, and the Communists did not want this, but so long as he had said it, there seemed to be little chance for them to express their oppposition.

The plan offered by Catholic leaders was similar to the released time plan in the United States. No one would be required to take religion who did not want it. Protestants would teach Protestants, Catholics teach Catholics, those who did not want religious courses could be excused.

Protestant leaders came out in strong opposition to the Catholic plan, charging violation of separation of church and state. They even added a protest against chaplains in the army, although again both Protestants and Catholics had chaplains.

The Protestant opposition gave the revolutionaries their opportunity. Immediately the Communist newspaper, Hoy, and the revolutionary paper, Revolucion, began their attacks on Catholic leaders.

The Communist organization was well established. It entered the 26th of July movement in full force almost a year ago when Castro brought in publicists like Marta Pravde and Carlos Franqui and he soon learned they had the know-how to get things done.

But despite the excellent Communist organization, the Reds could have done little without the help of the unstable character of Fidel Castro. The fact that Castro is the law in Cuba means that those who have his ear are able to dominate the country. Were the Communists to try to take control of the government either by voting strength or by military conquest, they would face certain defeat because the people are almost unanimously anti-Communist. But with only Fidel Castro to conquer, the task was relatively simple.

But then what of the theory that Fidel Castro has always been a Communist himself? There have always been those who claimed this. I have quoted those who know him well and deny it. Now, after having talked with probably the best informed men in Cuba, I have still not been absolutely convinced he is a Communist, but I recognize the strong possibility it may be so.

A man who has known him for years and has remained close to him since his arrival in Havana, told me he was convinced Castro is not a Communist. He said he believed that Castro has figured the Reds are the most competent workers he can find and that he is using them, believing he can outsmart them and get rid of them when he has used them. If this is true then Castro has just uttered the most famous of last words.

The evidence that Castro may be a Communist dates back to 1953. Students of Cuban history will remember the famous Montreal pact in which the Orthodox and Authentic Parties met in Canada to present a united front against Batista. What has not been known publicly until now is that there was a strong pressure group in the Orthodox Party that wanted this to be a popular front against Batist that would have included the Communist Party. Quite aside from the evil of communism, this would have been disastrous for it would have given Batista a chance to stamp his opposition as Red. There was never any serious consideration given by the 10 party leaders to this proposal for a popular front and there was an anti-Communist resolution offered by the Authentic Party.

This resolution was strongly opposed by some of the Orthodox representatives because they feared the pressure group in their party. Finally the resolution was dropped from the public statement. All of this was not made public and there would be no purpose in making it public now except for the fact that the man back in Cuba who had pressured the Orthodox representatives most strongly to include the Communist Party in the popular front was Fidel Castro.

When the Orthodox representatives returned he blasted them because they had not done as he had told them. Their explanation they had at least prevented the anti-Communist resolution was angrily dismissed by Castro. He said that, seeing how little influence he had in the Orthodox Party, he'd start his own movement. Soon after that there was the attack on the barracks at Santiago and the 26th of July movement was born.

This never before revealed information certainly suggests Castro may have always been Communist-minded. If it is true then never has there been a Communist supporter who more frequently lied, publicly and privately.

Against this theory is not only the testimony of friends who are anti-Communist but an irrational behaviour that would seem strange for a dedicated Communist.

To call Castro's behaviour irrational is to say it gently. Except in musical comedies, I doubt if there has ever been a Prime Minister quite like this one.

He is quite capable of holding up an important conference in Pinar Del Rio while he plays aboard a German warcraft, shooting off big guns like a little boy at play. He does not think it strange to suddenly leave a cabinet meeting to go out to see a show, asking the cabinet members to wait until he gets back.

All these things he has done and more, and these are not actions of a calculating man, but a strangely irrational man. When I reported to you after visiting with him, I spoke of his compulsive urge to speak, his egomania. All these things, which I tried to excuse as possible consequences of tiredness and the early days of excitement, have been accelerated rather than diminished.

His overriding of his own court in Santiago trials of the aviators, his denunciation of the rebel officer who served as defense attorney and the rebel officers who served as judges were not so frightening to me as what happened during the second trial.

Castro had said the aviators would be executed. He intended it that way, I am sure. But Archbishop Perez Serantes came once again to Havana, his tired body moved once again in an act of compassion, and he pleaded successfully for the lives of the fliers.

The next day Castro spoke. In words that alternately were calm and reasoned and then confused, exaggerated, and almost like the words of a madman, Castro announced the sentence for the aviators even while the second trial was going on.

Because they want so much for it to be true, many Cubans still have hope for freedom under Castro. But after this speech, after this clear evidence there is no law except Castro, it would take a great deal of hiding from the truth for any thinking Cuban to convince himself there was not a dictatorship in Cuba.

For anyone familiar with Communist terminology, the fact that this new government is Red dominated must be increasingly more apparent. Possibly the most revealing fact of all is semantic. For millions of Cubans, the happy end of the revolution came when Batista left. For the Communists, for men like Raul Castro, for others who have been deceived by them, the revolution really began then and is still going on. The Red and the Leftist newspapers and the public addresses of leaders are filled with the fact that this is a revolution that is not to end, and that any who even suggest there is anything to dispute are guilty of counterrevolution, which in Castro's Cuba is now a crime.

Why? The people of Cuba want Castro to be the apostle of freedom so intensely they will do anything to keep themselves from being convinced he is not. If it is true Castro is another dictator and, worse, a dictator who does the will of the Reds, then the consequences of this truth are so terrible no one wants to face them.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 16, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of March 28, 1959:

WASHINGTON REPORT BY CONGRESSMAN BRUCE ALGER, FIFTH DISTRICT, TEXAS

MARCH 28, 1959.

The second supplemental appropriation bill, 1959, totaled approximately $2,480 million and involved mainly Government salary increases voted in the last Congress. The big debate was over the $100 million increase to the Development Loan Fund, under foreign aid. The clash occurred over the Comptroller's figures of $678 million in the Fund still unexpended versus the argument that obligations or signed loan agreements totaled $685 million, leaving only a $15 million balance. Admittedly, the report accompanying the bill described the latter figures as "guess figures." To this uncertainty is added the disapproval some of us have over the loss of congressional control of this revolving fund, best example of which is our voting to spend more on the strength of "guess figures." Secondly, I find it hard to approve further spending, even meritorious (if it is), when we are spending beyond the already-too-high budget. The amendment approving this $100 million amendment additional spending passed by a vote of 183 to 59. I opposed it.

The Bretton Woods Agreement Act amendment in two parts deals with world loans (68 individual member nations):

1. International Monetary Fund: Its purpose, to stabilize member nations' currencies, endeavoring to keep currencies convertible by extending short term loans. The end sought being increased trade and monetary exchange between nations. Of a total of $9 billion, the United States has subscribed 26 percent, and this bill would provide another $1,375 million, 25 percent of which is payable in gold, as is 25 percent of the earlier subscription.

2. International Bank for Reconstruction and Redevelopment: Its purpose, to aid economic assistance of member nations through loans for projects such as electrical power development, port and transportation facilities, land reclamation and others. Of the $10 billion, the United States has bought stock totaling 28 percent. This bill would double the stock purchase of each nation (total becoming $21 billion). Of each nation's total, 2 percent is in gold or dollars, 18 percent in a nation's currency, and 80 percent callable as reserve. The nations of the world helping each other through joint participation is a neighborly, challenging, and commendable goal, as I see it. The results are satisfying in that no loans are in default, and banking policies—that is, businesslike procedures—are being followed. But dangers, that in starry-eyed idealism we must not overlook, include: (1) loans to stabilize foreign currency, the whole structure resting on U.S. credit and financial strength—the whole program is weakened to the degree that U.S. currency is unstabilized by our own deficit financing and debt through trying to help others. And we are operating at a deficit, (2) our gold reserve is steadily being depleted, and our currency value rests on this gold. Foreigners can convert dollars into gold, but Americans cannot. Of our $20 billion gold reserve, some estimate that $11 billion is callable now by foreign nations, (3) we add money to funds which must have large liquid assets when the United States because of continued expanding Federal spending is not liquid itself, with its own bonds becoming less attractive to investors, (4) how much of this loan structure is actually repayable through U.S. gifts of foreign aid in one form or another? It seems to me that no one can know until the study is made. Basically, if the U.S. economic systems on which world loans depend collapses, it would be the death of the free world and personal freedom which we all treasure. I feel our action of expanding spending programs is too hasty when we have a $13 billion deficit this year and another deficit in prospect. Can anyone seriously contend we can help strengthen others if we weaken or collapse our own economy? I cannot.

The fair trade bill, H.R. 1253, is before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee for hearings. Last year as a member of the subcommittee, I sat through weeks of hearings. This week I testified against this bill and presented 22 digested studies of the bill for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and colleagues who might be interested. The fair trade bill would permit manufacturers to set retail prices through Congress setting aside antitrust law which makes price maintenance conspiracies illegal.

For the layman, it may be difficult to take the matter seriously, it is so apparently antithetical to all our beliefs, but I'm convinced the proponents are serious. What's wrong with the bill? Well, it's unconstitutional, incompatible with free enterprise, and violates States rights and individual prerogatives. These charges can be spelled out with documentation. Information will be sent to anyone so requesting it. Retailers, particularly smaller independents, should study fair trade to learn how it will ruin, not help, them.

(EDITORIAL NOTE.—No kinfolk are on the payroll and no office rental payments are received for Texas' Fifth Congressional District.)

Rowland R. Peters of the Nocona News Named Editor of the Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK IKARD
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, my congressional district is very fortunate in having a number of excellent weekly newspapers, owned and edited by experienced, first-rate newspapermen. Just recently the Publishers' Auxiliary, national newspaper publication, named Rowland R. Peters, who is the editor of the Nocona News, Nocona, Tex., Editor of the Week. Mr. Peters is not only an outstanding editor but he takes an active part in the civic affairs of Nocona which has endeared him to the people in that community. I am proud to include in my remarks an article that appeared in a recent issue of the Wichita Falls Times concerning the newspaper background and present activities of Mr. Peters:

Publishers' Auxiliary, national newspaper publication, has named Rowland R. Peters, prizewinning editor of the Nocona News, Editor of the Week.

Mr. and Mrs. Peters bought the Nocona News in March 1952, and Peters has won the admiration of his readers for the positive stands he has taken.

"I have never failed to print anything or support any project that was for the good of my community," Peters says.

Since taking over the Nocona News, Peters has won 18 awards in recognition of outstanding work. Peters has all awards framed and hung on the wall in his office. He says, "They are my constant reminder to do a better job."

Not a single edition of his paper has been published without an editorial. Many weekly newspapers have cut out their editorials but Peters says: "I must be from the old school. I was taught that every edition should have an editorial, and the Nocona News will."

Peters got started in the editorial office of the newspaper rather late in life. He was a telegraph operator and had spent 16 years working for newspapers in that capacity. When the teletype came in, the entire profession was "washed out." Each operator had to find another profession. Peters started as a cub reporter, with a wife and two children to feed. It was hard, but in a short time he was promoted to reporter and then to managing editor.

STRONG EDITORIALS

He feels that every editor should take a positive stand in their editorials and should stand for those things that are for the improvement of the community. When Nocona started out to get its lake, the people defeated the first bond issue. Before the second election Peters wrote front page editorials favoring the lake. His most popular was headed "Going Fishing." The lake bond issue carried, and he received several awards for his editorial.

Peters writes a weekly column known to his office staff and friends as the "sacred column." But the name is "Round About Nocona." He writes funny incidents that happen to people, their children, and their pets.

He is one of the few people who has visited Alcatraz prison. Of course, there is little desire among the masses to make such a visit, but Peters decided he wanted to know what life was like on the tiny island behind the high walls. The trip was arranged and he has made numerous talks on the island prison.

Peters never misses a council meeting or school board session and he reports what happens at those meetings.

ACTRESS SEARCH

Peters remembers a train wreck that happened on a cold, windy night at Dunkirk, Ohio, when snow was about 3 feet deep. His paper received a tip that Joan Bennett, the actress, was on the train and he was sent out to find her. He found a woman who resembled her but she denied she was the famous star. After questioning her three separate times and getting the same "No" answer, Peters gave up and reported that actress Joan Bennett had missed the train.

It was almost 20 years later that he saw her on television and heard her tell about the train wreck in Ohio and the persistent reporter who tried to interview her.

"She was a better actress than I was a newspaper reporter," Peters says.

He claims to have the distinction of being the only editor who married his sports editor. His wife, Illo, was written up in Yank magazine, which devoted a full page to her duties as sports editor for the Bucyrus, Ohio, newspaper, during the war.

It was at a time when most of the staff had been drafted and Peters and a high school boy composed the editorial staff of the busy daily newspaper in a town of 10,000 population.

Peters has been active in civic affairs since he moved to Nocona. He has been a director of the chamber of commerce, a member of the rodeo association, worked with the FFA boys, the Camp Fire Girls and Boy Scouts, is a member of the Rotary Club, a Mason, and Shriner.

He has been invited to Marshall, Tex., to attend the East Texas Press Association conference and has been advised that he will receive at least one more award.

Just One More Decade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an editorial appearing in the March 16, 1959, issue of the Omaha World Herald, which is of concern primarily to those of us who are interested in keeping the Federal well from running dry. The editorial is as follows:

JUST ONE MORE DECADE

Time was when the congressional battle over foreign aid was won with the argument that permanent peace through temporary handouts was just around the corner.

Help our allies for just 4 short years, said Mr. Truman as he launched the Marshall plan in 1947, and our allies then will be strong and prosperous and able to pull their full weight in defense of the free world.

The 4 years came and went, and with them came new commitments for NATO.

But did foreign military and economic aid diminish? It did not.

Vote the funds we ask this year, said its advocates in the early 1950's, and things will be better next year. So the funds were voted, new areas shared in Uncle Sam's dole. Foreign governments came to rely on U.S. aid dollars until in Bolivia, for example, the aid amounted to more than the people paid in income taxes.

And while the aid advocates in Washington were saying, "just one more year," America's relief clients the world around were demanding, "Give us more." And the few lands still outside the vast area of beneficence were demanding, "How about us?"

So it went. Europe, southeast Asia, north Africa, Latin America, the Middle East, behind the Iron Curtain in Yugoslavia and Poland.

More and more and more aid. Steadily increasing resentment and outright hatred of Uncle Sam for not giving as much as was wanted. Staggering waste. Grandiose projects whose dubious benefits were rarely visited upon the common people. Intrenchment of anti-American regimes that might have fallen except for the U.S. aid which propped them up.

And what about the supposed friends who supposedly benefited? Are they firm allies, ready to stand shoulder to shoulder with Uncle Sam in any showdown with communism? Is aid making them more confident, more self-reliant, raising their standard of living, spurring them on to new accomplishment?

Except in a few cases—a very few—America's aid clients cannot confidently be regarded as reliable allies.

Nevertheless, President Eisenhower on Friday asked Congress for almost $4 billion in foreign aid for the coming fiscal year. And at the same time he predicted that aid will be needed for a long time. It will be needed, he said, to win the billion people of the less developed areas to America's side.

And how long will this take? He answered:

"The battle is now joined. The next decade will forecast its outcome."

Just 10 more years of aid, to find out how things are going.

And after 10 years, what? Just one more century, perhaps, or one more millennium? More likely until the well runs dry.

A Declaration of Independence From Federal Dependence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMER H. BUDGE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 16, 1959

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, there follows a statement approved by the Chamber of Commerce of Twin Falls, Idaho. It is a provocative statement which should invite all of us to make a new appraisal of the proper functions and responsibilities of the Federal Government. One of the greatest services which the Congress of the United States could perform would be the return of government of the people, by the people, and for the people back to the people and permit them to govern themselves on the banks of the Snake River rather than to be governed from the banks of the Potomac:

A DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE FROM FEDERAL DEPENDENCE

Whereas we, the members of the Twin Falls Chamber of Commerce are in agreement with the principles of individual freedom, a free market, limited government.

Whereas we believe the present trend in political thinking and fiscal policy will ultimately destroy our free institutions and the savings of our people and our children; and further we believe this same trend in political thinking and fiscal policy mortgages the future of our children to ultimately leave them economically destitute, politically enslaved, and defenseless; and

Whereas our Nation's strength lies in local, county, and State government, by the citizens using local, county, and State funds; and that under the trend of the present political philsophy our people are slowly and surely being lulled to sleep and deprived of their substance; and

Whereas we deplore those Federal agencies and representatives of Federal agencies who, in addition to their primary function, engage in activities designed to expand and perpetuate those functions beyond their original design and concept.

We therefore call upon all chamber of commerce and all like-minded groups throughout these 50 States and Territories who hold to the principles upon which this Nation was founded and under which it has prospered, and who hold with us to the principles of individual freedom, a free market,

limited government, to make and to protect this same declaration; to steadfastly resist further encroachment upon these principles by action of the Federal Government; to limit our use of Federal funds and to seek a corresponding reduction in tax levies and governmental controls; to avoid being deluded by glib tongue, trite phrase, and uneconomic thinking with promises of personal and financial security through the bait of Federal aid; there being no Federal aid, since Federal aid is our local money less the high cost of freight for political brokerage on its long trip to Washington and back—returned with the barnacles of Federal restrictions and bureaucratic controls.

With a belief in Almighty God, we therefore declare that those steps necessary to reestablish a Government of the people, by the people and for the people, be taken by all the people, not tomrrow but today.

And further we in Twin Falls resolve to take those steps necessary to bring again to the banks of the Snake those functions of Government now mushrooming on the banks of the Potomac.

Earl Haroldson, President; Carl Berg, First Vice President; Egon Kroll, Second Vice President; Warren Barry, Earl Faulkner, Lee Fillmore, William Lanting, Joe McCollum, Mel Carr, Otto Florence, Jr., Carl Irwin, Ed Heap, Bill Grange, Secretary-Manager.

Approved March 13, 1959, board of directors, Twin Falls Chamber of Commerce, Twin Falls, Idaho.

Endorsed by Earl Haroldson, president.

Poison in Your Water—No. 52

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article entitled "Fish Deaths Held Worst On Record," which appeared in the Washington, D.C., Evening Star of March 3, 1959:

FISH DEATHS HELD WORST ON RECORD

WINCHESTER, VA., March 3.—The executive secretary of the State water control board, A. H. Paessler, says a recent fish kill in the Shenandoah River below Front Royal was the worst in Virginia since the board began keeping records in 1948.

Mr. Paessler spoke last night at a mass meeting of fishermen here arranged by the Izaak Walton League of Winchester.

The water control board has estimated that 200,000 fish were killed.

Fred Glaize, chairman of the pollution committee of the local Izaak Walton League, told the meeting the number of fish killed in the Shenandoah River was closer to 2 million.

The water control board has said preliminary investigation indicated that industrial wastes from the American Viscose Co. plant at Front Royal killed the fish. A laboratory report is expected to be finished by the next water board meeting March 26.

E. Blackburn Moore, speaker of the house of delegates, and chairman of the water control board, told the meeting the company does not admit responsibility for the kill.

The Individual Soldier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 24, 1959

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I insert in the RECORD the article written by Bill Wescoat, editor of the Reynoldsville (Pa.) Star. Mr. Wescoat attended the XXI Corps—Army Reserve—Small Arms Tournament at Fort Meade, Md., recently and in his article pays high tribute to the individual soldier, both Regular Army and the reservist:

[From the Reynoldsville (Pa.) Star., Apr. 2, 1959]

(By Bill Wescoat)

With the news currently centering around the nuclear retaliatory powers of the United States in the event of an all-out war with Russia, our military chiefs defending their requests for more and greater weapons, and a high-ranking Army general's charge that our arsenal already contains too many atomic and hydrogen weapons, perhaps you would be interested in reading an informal report on the plain old individual soldier and his rifle.

Almost forgotten in our mad scramble to achieve and hold superiority in the nuclear and push-button warfare fields is the individual soldier—the man on the ground with a gun in his hands. The man without whom no war can be fought to a successful conclusion. Fortunately for all, there are Army commanders everywhere who fully realize the importance of the individual soldier, and who wage a constant battle for his recognition. Along this line, making a strong contribution to the effort, are the rifle and pistol matches held on every level in the Army, and culminating in the naming of all-Army champions.

I spent 6 days the past week attending the XXI Corps Commander's Small Arms Tournament at Fort George G. Meade, Md. I was not there as a participant in the matches, but on the administrative end of things and in that capacity I had an excellent opportunity to observe and to get the feeling of what is being done along these line.

The tournament, sponsored by Maj. Gen. H. J. Vander Heide, commanding general of the XXI Corps, brought together some of the top shots, both Regular Army and reservists, from Pennsylvania, Maryland, Delaware, Virginia, and the District of Columbia. The majority of the participants were reservists, however, and every effort was made to place the conduct of the tournament entirely in the hands of the reservists—the men who give 1 night a week and 15 days in the summer of their time toward building a strong Ready Reserve.

Under the capable direction of a young Reserve captain named Jim Speidel, who proved to be a real ball of fire, the tournament came off in excellent order. Actually, this was the first one exactly of its kind ever held, and it laid the groundwork for bigger and better operations in the future. If there was one impression the uninitiated observer, like myself, carried away from this tournament, it came from the intense interest and enthusiasm exhibited by the participants.

A tournament such as this costs a lot of money to build—your money—but if the ultimate objective can be realized then it is certainly money well invested in the military security of our country. The goal, of course, is to spread this interest and enthusiasm into Army units of all kinds, and by this to develop confident, competent rifle and pistol shots, who, in turn, will provide the sort of fighting men we desire if the need for their services ever arises.

Preparation for the tournament included 2 days' instruction by personnel from the Advanced Marksmanship Unit of the 2d U.S. Army. These people are real experts, and their instruction left little to be desired. Most people who have had any Army service have been exposed to rifle instruction and rifle-range shooting, but actually there is little comparison between this and tournament shooting. The latter involves, for the most part, experienced rifle and pistol shooters who look upon this activity as a hobby, and pursue it even more zealously than the most ardent golfer or fisherman follows his hobby.

The importance of the fact that most of the men participating in this tournament are reservists seems readily apparent. They are the modern Minutemen. If their eagerness and devotion to duty can be properly exploited, then the importance of the individual soldier will be enhanced, and our ability to wage war of any description in defense of our country will become greater. The motivating force behind such tournaments is much more than a man shooting at a target with a rifle, and it is toward this end that the XXI Corps is directing its efforts. Your tax dollars buy many things—some good, some bad. In this case I believe that in the overall program you are buying something we all hope will never be used—but if we must use it—it will be good.

Antarctic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Walter Sullivan, a reporter for the New York Times, has written a very interesting article on Antarctica which appeared in that paper on April 1, 1959. The article follows:

U.S. DECISION NEAR ON THE ANTARCTIC

After 3 decades of groping and uncertainty, the future of the United States in Antarctica will probably be decided here within the next 2 days.

A policy decision is being prepared by the National Security Council. The result may be an Executive order to be issued Thursday or soon thereafter.

The last time that the United States came close to a long range commitment in Antarctica was in 1939, when this country's chief potential enemy, Germany, was seeking to gain a foothold on that continent. The result was formation of the U.S. Antarctic Service, but World War II killed it and no official claim was made to Antarctic territory.

Now the Soviet Union is this country's only big rival in scientific exploration of the continent. The rivalry has been friendly and plans are being made by the two nations to continue the exchange of expedition personnel.

NO LAND CLAIMED

Neither the Soviet Union nor the United States has claimed any land in Antarctica. Nevertheless, both have clearly been motivated by a desire to be active in the area and thus have a say in any future settlement.

The debate as to who should run the U.S. antarctic program has been going on for 3 years or more. The four stations currently manned there by the United States were all established as part of this country's effort during the International Geophysical Year, which ended last December 31.

The International Geophysical Year program was run by the National Academy of Sciences, a nongovernmental agency, with funds allocated by the Government's National Science Foundation. Now operation of the program has been transferred to the Foundation, although the academy's committee on polar research still makes recommendations.

The interests of the various Government agencies are protected through screening of the projects by the Interdepartmental Committee on Antarctic Research. This includes representatives of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Weather Bureau, Coast and Geodetic Survey, National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Departments of State and the Interior. Dr. Alan T. Waterman, director of the National Science Foundation, is Chairman.

BILLS BY WILEY

On May 31, 1957, Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, the Wisconsin Republican, introduced a bill to create a Richard E. Byrd antarctic commission. It was sponsored by leading Members of the Senate. The commission would be on a level with agencies such as the Atomic Energy Commission. It would supervise nonmilitary antarctic operations supported by any branch of the Government.

The proposal was turned down by the Bureau of the Budget. It was also opposed by some members of the scientific community on the ground that it would make the antarctic effort political, rather than scientific.

Last January 29 Senator WILEY and his associates introduced a modified version of the bill. It provides for the creation of from 5 to 18 centers at academic institutions, under sponsorship of the commission.

Meanwhile the Committee on Polar Research of the National Academy of Sciences, headed by Dr. Laurence M. Gould, has offered a plan for the creation of a polar research institute. It might be modeled to some extent after Associated Universities, the team of academic institutions that runs the Brookhaven National Laboratory under sponsorship of the Atomic Energy Commission.

This institute would direct research in both polar regions. Its money would come from the National Science Foundation, which would also make arrangements for logistic support. Such support must be furnished on a large scale by the Navy and Air Force.

Still another proposal is to enlarge the Arctic Institute of North America to handle the antarctic program. This institute is a joint Canadian-American affair.

The rival schemes include a proposal to continue the present arrangement, in which the program is run directly by the National Science Foundation.

Scientists would like to establish a satellite-tracking station at the South Pole and install a communications net invulnerable to magnetic storms.

One of the more troublesome problems has been whether the United States should join with the Soviet Union and other nations in a joint antarctic mapping program. For several years the Russians have been pressing for such a venture but no Government agency has had the funds to participate.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va.*
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.* 6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind.* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J.*
Albert, Carl, *Okla.* 5115 Allen Terrace
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C.*
Alford, Dale, *Ark.*
Alger, Bruce, *Tex.*
Allen, Leo E., *Ill.* University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn.* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Anderson, LeRoy H., *Mont.* 911 Beverly Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Andrews, George W., *Ala.* 3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y.*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill.* 4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C.*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo.* Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J.* 113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans.*
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*
Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va.*
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn.*
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif.*
Barden, Graham A., *N. C.* 2601 Woodley Pl.
Baring, Walter S., *Nev.*
Barr, Joseph W., *Ind.* Tulip Lane and Glen Mill Rd., Rockville Md.
Barrett, William A., *Pa.*
Barry, Robert R., *N. Y.*
Bass, Perkins, *N. H.*
Bass, Ross, *Tenn.*
Bates, William H., *Mass.*
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y.*
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex.*
Belcher, Page, *Okla.*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla.* 1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich.* 3718 Cardiff Rd., Chevy Chase, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich.*
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak.* 118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn.*
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, (Mrs.), *Ga.*
Boggs, Hale, *La.*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass.*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo.* 3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.* 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C.* Calvert-Woodley
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y.*
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio.* 4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowles, Chester, *Conn.*
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala.* The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill.*
Brademas, John, *Ind.*
Bray, William G., *Ind.*
Breeding, J. Floyd, *Kans.*
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md.*
Brock, Lawrence, *Nebr.*
Brooks, Jack, *Tex.*
Brooks, Overton, *La.* 4413 46th St.
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*
Brown, Charles H., *Mo.* 3723 N. Oakland St., Arlington, Va.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio.* Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga.* Boston House
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va.*
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y.*
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*
Burdick, Quentin, *N. Dak.*
Burke, Frank W., *Ky.*
Burke, James A., *Mass.*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex.* 2737 Devonshire Pl.
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa.*
Byrne, James A., *Pa.*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis.* 1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Cahill, William T., *N. J.*
Canfield, Gordon, *N. J.*
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo.*
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo.*
Carter, Steven V., *Iowa.*
Casey, Bob, *Tex.*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich.*
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y.* The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky.*
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo.*
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill.* 1713 House Office Building
Church, Marguerite Stitt (Mrs.), *Ill.* 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa.* 3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Coad, Merwin, *Iowa.*
Coffin, Frank M., *Maine.*
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif.* 2820 Ordway St.
Collier, Harold R., *Ill.*
Colmer, William M., *Miss.*
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass.*
Cook, Robert E., *Ohio.*
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C.* 2480 16th St.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa.*
Cramer, William C., *Fla.* 6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr.* 4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa.*
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass.* 3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo.*
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn.*
Dague, Paul B., *Pa.*
Daniels, Dominick V., *N. J.*
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn.* 4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, James C., *Ga.*
Dawson, William L., *Ill.*
Delaney, James J., *N. Y.*
Dent, John H., *Pa.*
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind.*
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y.*
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill.*
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich.*
Dingell, John D., *Mich.*
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah.* 1817 N. Quinn St., Arlington, Va.
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y.*
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass.*
Dooley, Edwin B., *N. Y.*
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y.*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C.*
Dowdy, John, *Tex.*
Downing, Thomas N., *Va.*
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif.* 3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N. Y.*
Durham, Carl T., *N. C.* The Lee House
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N. J.*
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla.*
Elliott, Carl, *Ala.*
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn.*
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn.* 5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md.*
Farbstein, Leonard, *N. Y.*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla.*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa.* 3725 Macomb St.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y.*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex.* Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa.* The Congressional
Flynn, Gerald T., *Wis.*
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga.*
Fogarty, John E., *R. I.* 1133 House Office Building
Foley, John R., *Md.*
Forand, Aime J., *R. I.* 4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich.* 514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga.*
Fountain, L. H., *N. C.* The Westchester
Frazier, James B., Jr., *Tenn.* Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J.* 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md.*
Fulton, James G., *Pa.*
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N. J.*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md.*
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va.*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark.* 6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa.*
George, Newell A., *Kans.*
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn.*
Glenn, Milton W., *N. J.* Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Granahan, Kathryn E. (Mrs.), *Pa.*
Grant, George M., *Ala.* 4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill.*
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg.*
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa.*
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich.*
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa.*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif.*
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif.*
Haley, James A., *Fla.*
Hall, David M., *N. C.*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind.* 4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N. Y.*
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va.*
Hargis, Denver D., *Kans.*
Harmon, Randall S., *Ind.*
Harris, Oren, *Ark.* 1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va.*
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio.* 1323 Barger Drive, Falls Church, Va.
Healey, James C., *N. Y.*
Hébert, F. Edward, *La.* 26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va.*
Hemphill, Robert W., *S. C.*
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla.*
Hess, William E., *Ohio.*
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif.*
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa.* 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich.* 3018 M St. SE.
Hoffman, Elmer J., *Ill.*
Hogan, Earl, *Ind.* 5211 Flanders Ave., Garrett Pk., Kensington, Md.
Holifield, Chet, *Calif.*
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa.*
Holt, Joe, *Calif.*
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y.*
Horan, Walt, *Wash.*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif.*
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala.*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo.*
Ikard, Frank, *Tex.*
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn.* The Coronet
Jackson, Donald L., *Calif.*
Jarman, John, *Okla.*
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va.*
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa.* 2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich.*
Johnson, Byron L., *Colo.*
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif.*
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis.*
Johnson, Thomas F., *Md.*
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C.*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo.* 1111 Army Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala.*
Judd, Walter H., *Minn.* 3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo.*
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn.*
Kasem, George A., *Calif.*
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa.* Sheraton-Park
Kee, Elizabeth (Mrs.), *W. Va.*
Keith, Hastings, *Mass.*
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N. Y.*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y.* The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y.*
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex.* 3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex.* 4848 Upton St.
King, Cecil R., *Calif.*
King, David S., *Utah.*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio.*
Kitchin, A. Paul, *N. C.*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill.*
Knox, Victor A., *Mich.*
Kowalski, Frank, *Conn.*
Lafore, John A., Jr., *Pa.*
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis.*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga.*

Appendix

The Supreme Law of the Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, recently I received a memorandum from Mr. J. Luther Glass, a consultant on juvenile court law and procedure in the Virginia Department of Welfare and Institutions. In this memorandum, Mr. Glass discusses implications of the Supreme Court's school segregation decisions in relation to fundamental constitutional questions. I ask unanimous consent that this thought-provoking article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THOUGHTS TO REMEMBER

(By J. Luther Glass)

Brown v. *Board of Education*, decided by the Supreme Court of the United States on May 17, 1954, has caused me to do a great deal of thinking on the subject of our basic law, the Constitution of these United States.

Frequent reference has been made to this decision as being the supreme law of the land. Those responsible for this are, to say the very least, guilty of fuzzy thinking. The Constitution could not be plainer on the subject. Article VI, paragraph 2, of that great document uses these bold words:

"This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of land; * * *."

The above-quoted language makes no provision, or provides any excuse, for any decision of any court ever becoming the supreme law of the land. Assuming that the Court acted within the scope of its constitutional authority, its decision can never be more than the law of that particular case.

But did the Court have a constitutional right to reach the conclusion that was reached on May 17, 1954? That is the question that this article proposes to answer.

The best place to start answering this question is to look at the first paragraph of the body of the Constitution, that of article I, section 1, which is as follows:

"All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives."

Nowhere in the Constitution can we find authority for the Supreme Court, or the Chief Executive to exercise legislative powers. Those powers remain within the Congress alone. The two words, "herein granted," are most important. They are key words, meaning powers granted to the Federal Government by the original 13 sovereign States. A clear understanding of these two words reveals the sort of checkrein the people determined should be held over the General Government. Many great powers were reserved for and retained by the States and the people. This is well stated by a competent court in *Livingston* v. *Van Ingen* (9 Johns. (N.Y.) 507):

"When the people create a single, entire government, they grant at once all the rights of sovereignty. The powers granted are indefinite and incapable of enumeration. Everything is granted that is not expressly reserved in the constitutional charter, or necessarily retained as inherent in the people. But when a Federal Government is erected with only a portion of the sovereign power, the rule of construction is directly the reverse, and every power is reserved to the members that is not, either in express terms or by necessary implication, taken away from them, and vested exclusively in the Federal head. This rule has not only been acknowledged by the most intelligent friends of the Constitution, but is plainly declared by the instrument itself."

The next place where it would be well to take a good, long look is at the 10th amendment to the Constitution. Its language is crystal clear, and reads as follows:

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

Since the Constitution is silent as to schools or education, it naturally follows that the United States has never been given jurisdiction over this question. There are those who claim that the 10th amendment is outmoded and no longer has any effect. But how could this be true? Has it ever been repealed? It appears that the 18th amendment became somewhat outmoded and was repealed by the adoption and ratification of the 21st amendment. It has also been said that Chief Justice Marshall's decisions killed the 10th amendment. If that be true, why did not Chief Justice Hughes follow the same procedure in killing the 18th amendment?

Now the Court claims to base its authority for outlawing segregated schools upon the provisions of the first paragraph of the 14th amendment. The first sentence of the 14th amendment had only one purpose, to wipe out the effect of the Dred Scott decision, which, incidently, was one of the soundest decisions ever rendered by the Supreme Court. The second sentence of this amendment is framed in this manner:

"No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

Now let us consider for a moment the language just quoted. Assume for the moment that a very large class of citizens as a group are denied the right to vote. Would not this constitute abridgment of their privileges, or amount to denying them equal protection of the laws? It would certainly seem that way. Could not the Court remedy the situation simply by decreeing that such was in violation of the 14th amendment? You would certainly think so, wouldn't you? But consider that the Negro man found himself without the right of suffrage, and he found his remedy in the 15th amendment. Likewise, the ladies of the country discovered that citizenship, education, high moral standards and interest in good government were insufficient to insure them the right to vote. Did they hire lawyers to acquire their right to vote under the 14th amendment? They did not. They brought pressure to bear which resulted in the adoption and ratification of the 14th amendment.

So, then, it would appear that the Supreme Court has exceeded its authority in the Brown decision. It not only exceeded its authority; it tied its decision to the socialistic views of MYRDAL and to the 14th amendment, about which grave doubts exist as to whether or not it has ever become a part of the Constitution, for the reason that Southern States were blackmailed into ratification in order to get back into the Union.

Would it not then follow, as the night the day, that the only legal way to deny to the States their inherent right to legislate as they see fit concerning school matters would be to amend the Constitution as was done when the 15th and 19th amendments were needed?

One further thought: Have you considered the possibility of bringing a suit in the Supreme Court itself, seeking a declaratory judgment as to whether or not the 14th amendment was properly proposed, adopted, and ratified according to the provisions of article V of the Constitution? Read article V and consider how the Southern States were denied representation in the Congress when two-thirds of each House voted upon this proposal; and further, the then composition of southern legislatures, having been at that time composed mainly of ignorant Negroes and carpetbaggers.

Ponder these questions if you seek to understand the basic, fundamental principles of constitutional government.

History of the Red River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL B. LONG
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, recently I had the good fortune to listen to my colleague the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] deliver a very fine address to a large audience representing the people who live behind the levees of Red River in the States of Louisiana, Arkansas, Oklahoma, and Texas.

This address does a fine job in tracing the history of the Red River and the efforts which have been made by the Federal Government, the governments of the States, local groups, and individuals to control flood waters and preserve them until they were needed to irrigate the lands or furnish water to the residents of neighboring communities.

I ask unanimous consent that the address delivered by the senior Senator from Louisiana before the Red River Valley Association, in Shreveport, La., on March 31, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY SENATOR ALLEN J. ELLENDER BEFORE THE RED RIVER VALLEY ASSOCIATION, SHREVEPORT, LA., MARCH 31, 1959

I appreciate the invitation of your president, Cliff Fairbanks, and of my good friend, Roy Matthias, to be present here today since it offers me the opportunity of discussing with you some of the problems facing the Red River Valley and, indeed, the entire Nation, as a result of our very rapid increase in population.

It is always a source of pleasure to participate in your annual meetings, because you are dedicated to a cause in which I am deeply interested—the preservation of two of our most precious resources, soil and water.

Recently in reflecting on my 22 years in the Senate, where I have devoted a great deal of my time to the protection and development of the resources of our country, I had occasion to review some of the history of waterway improvements.

It was interesting to note that the first appropriation for the improvement of our waterways was made in 1824, and that by 1828 the War Department had requested an appropriation for the improvement of navigation on the Red River in the vicinity of Shreveport.

From the earliest days of exploration of our country the Red River was the main artery of entry into the Louisiana Territory. Many years ago a mass of vegetation and driftwood had become tightly packed for a distance of about 150 miles, in the bed of the Red River, forming the so-called great raft. This obstruction blocked the flow of the river, causing it to spread out and deposit its silt in the valley. Thus, the richest soil in America began the process of accumulation to form our fertile valley under this stagnant overflow. But because of the great raft, the valley, as today, was subject to severe flooding.

When it became imperative for the Federal Government to establish a garrison fort on the upper Red River in Texas, the War Department became interested in navigation on the Red River. Supplies for this garrison were sent down the Mississippi River, around the "raft," through the swamps and bayous, and then up the Red River.

On May 23, 1828, Congress appropriated $25,000 for the removal of the "great raft" from Loggy Bayou, 65 miles below Shreveport, to Hurricane Bluff, 27 miles above Shreveport. This was the first attempt on the part of the Government to improve the Red River, and harness it for the needs of man.

You are all familiar with the fact that Capt. Henry Miller Shreve, who helped to establish this modern city of Shreveport, found that the river presented a real flood problem. Before he could lay the foundations for Shreveport, he had to clear away miles of trees an debris in the river channel.

My interest in the beneficial development of the water resources of our Nation stems from my personal conviction that such developments were an important factor in achieving our present high standards of living, not only in this great valley of the Red River, but throughout the entire Nation.

All through history, water has dominated human life. The earliest civilizations appeared in the great river basins of Mesopotamia and Egypt. Settlements were limited to coast lines and river banks; trading centers arose at the confluence of navigable streams. Rainfall and drought set the stage for the drama of human existence.

Unless a well planned and aggressive program of water resource development is carried forward, our children and grandchildren will not have an opportunity to enjoy the many advantages that today we take for granted. We cannot afford to neglect our economic strength and our economic growth. If we ignore the development of our water resources, we jeopardise the expansion of our national economy. This we cannot afford if we are to maintain our position of strength, on which rests the future of the free world.

The benefits that result from completed projects are positive examples of increased national wealth created by such improvements. More startling proof exists in Europe and Asia, where the prosperity of the countries are directly proportional to the effort expended on projects to conserve soil and water. My recent travels through these areas have convinced me that unless we protect our greatest resource, water, unless we keep it inland and do not let it flow to the sea unused, some day many parts of our great country may become as barren as the Gobi Desert, or as the lands which I have seen on my travels in old Persia. Our history books tell us that about 500 years before Christ, the entire area of Persia was capable of sustaining the livelihood of 115 million people. Now it adequately can care for less than 14 million.

Consider the great valley of Mesopotamia between the Tigris and Euphrates Rivers. At one time that area could produce food and fiber for 15 million people. Today it can hardly supply the needs of 2 million people. Why? Because the rulers neglected a great natural resource—water. If it had been possible to retain the waters upstream on those great rivers, and not permit them to steal the rich topsoil and float much of it out to sea, the chances are that the great valley would still be very productive.

The fact is, that those rivers carried millions of tons of earth downstream and among other damage done, clogged the small tributaries and rivers of Mesopotamia. Today that land is not suited for extensive cultivation. It is sour. It is not productive farmland. Certainly we cannot afford to let that happen in our great country.

Two years ago I visited various portions of the Soviet Union for well over a month. This was my third trip to that country in as many years.

I had the opportunity of visiting cities never before seen by an American Government official—cities in the far reaches of Siberia, an area which had been pictured to me before my visit as wastelands of snow and ice—as a vast prison camp. But this was not what I found. To my great surprise, I saw a virgin land being awakened; a land that promises to make Siberia the granary of Russia. Industry was flourishing to a surprising degree. One of the principal tools the Russians are employing in this development is a well planned utilization of their waterways system, both for navigation and the development of hydroelectric power. I visited several hydroelectric power stations that were larger than our biggest, and one that was almost twice as large as any we have in this country. I observed foundations poured for the construction of turbines and generators which will have a rated capacity of 300,000 kilowatts each—almost three times larger than anything we have. And these projects were designed, constructed, and had all their component parts built within the Soviet Union. In fact, much of the work on the large turbines was being done at Novosibirsk, located in central Siberia, which was a small trading post in 1905, and now a city of almost 1 million.

As a result of my inspection of installations in Russia, I am convinced that in water transportation, and hydroelectric power developments, the Russians are inching ahead of us.

In any comparison of time, money and effort expended on resource development in Soviet Russia and the United States, there is, of course, absolutely nothing that we can do about the rate of such developments in Russia. They are proceeding with their own resources to meet the needs of their own economy. We must direct our attention to what we can do to satisfy our own needs.

But it makes my blood boil when the critics of an adequate program to develop our rivers cry "pork barrel." Without the improvements heretofore made, our great sea ports could not handle our vast world trade; our steel industry would starve for lack of the ore that comes through the Soo locks; and the Ohio Valley would not have earned the nickname of the Ruhr of America without providing for an adequate water supply and an excellent water transportation. Critics of this program, because they have no sound basis for attack, cry "log-rolling" and "political back-scratching." Well, Mr. Khrushchev does not need to roll any logs, or scratch any political backs. Russia is developing her natural resources for the simple reason that it is to her economic advantage. Russia will, if she can, do everything in her power to defeat us on the economic front.

Mr. Khrushchev has already announced that this is one of Russia's principal aims—to defeat us on the economic battlefields of the world.

Now, I want to make it crystal clear that I do not approve, condone, or sanction in any manner, the Soviet system, or endorse the means by which Mr. Khrushchev and his followers stay in power. That is not the point at all.

What I am saying, and what I have heretofore said, is that the Russians—well aware of the value of the development of their water resources—are moving ahead rapidly in this field. This is a statement of fact. We cannot hide from it no matter how much we might like to—no matter how much we dislike or abhor the principles of communism.

As a practical matter, if the Russians are intent upon waging economic warfare against our way of life, then it behooves us to assess the capabilities of our opponents. We must be realistic. No field commander ever defeated his enemy by consulting his own personal preferences instead of his intelligence reports.

No general achieves victory by ignoring his opponent's strength.

However, above and beyond the need to maintain economic growth in order to defeat the forces of communism on the present economic battlefront, development of our water resources is just plain good business and commonsense.

If we studied our history lessons we would know that water resources development is in the best interests of our own country. History is replete with examples of how societies down through the ages have organized themselves to match resources with needs. Success in this effort has insured survival, as with Switzerland; failure has resulted in decline and ultimate decay, as with ancient Persia.

Water, controlled and navigable, and of good quality, is the most important factor in developing a sound and progressive community.

In any given river basin there are a limited number of good sites for storage of water, and limited areas where distribution channels or protective works are feasible. These sites should not be preempted, or devoted to purposes which will freeze the pattern of development, so that future needs cannot be met or will become so costly as to be impracticable.

Let us discuss for a moment the use and availability of water. As is the case with many nations of the world, our inhabitants

settled this country along the river valleys. Two-thirds of our population at the present time resides within 50 miles of navigable water. But the increasing water shortage, which now, more than ever, is an important factor in the determination of proper plant location, requires that the many industries which must base their policies upon long-range future requirements, be located along waterways. In a recent study by the 10th Federal Reserve District, it was concluded that the geographical distribution of water supply may be of such a nature as to conflict with such economic goals as the diversification of industry.

There have been many comprehensive studies of resource developments made in recent years. One of the latest was the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resource Policy, dated December 22, 1955. In that report it was stated that the estimated use of water in the United States in 1950 was 185 billion gallons per day and that, based on an estimated population of 200 million by 1975, the requirement would be 350 billion gallons per day.

The November 28, 1958, issue of U.S. News & World Report contained a very penetrating article by Dr. Phillip M. Hauser on the so-called explosion of population in the United States, which sheds more light on one of the factors of increased water use.

Dr. Hauser is head of the department of sociology at the University of Chicago, and has been Deputy Director of U.S. Census. He points out that the newest projections of the Census Bureau place the population of the United States in 1975 at between 216 and 244 million. That is an increase in the predictions of from 8 to 20 percent in the past 3 years.

Putting it another way, taking a mean of the projections, a population of 230 million by 1975 would mean a 30 percent increase in our population in the next 16 years. Think of the tremendous increase in demand on all elements of our resources, including water. In terms of water we will require about 400 billion gallons per day. In other words, during the quarter century period from 1950 to 1975 we will more than double our water requirements.

I know that you can get almost as many estimates of the consumption of water by the American people as there are authorities making surveys. Some of them tell us that in 1850, the average consumption of water per capita by the people of the United States was 50 gallons per day. They tell us that in 1950 it exceeded 1,000 gallons per capita per day.

The Public Health Service, and others charged with responsibility in that regard, tell us that in 1980 the per capita consumption requirements for water by the people of the United States will be about 2,000 gallons per citizen per day. Unless we stop to think, such figures sound incredible. When you consider that in the transformation of raw material to finished products, 1 bushel of wheat requires 7,500 gallons of water, 1 ton of finished steel takes 65,000 gallons of water, 1 yard of woolen cloth takes 500 gallons of water, a pound of rayon takes 150 gallons of water, and 1 gallon of gasoline requires 25 gallons of water, you begin to appreciate the fact that our domestic consumption is but a small fraction of our per capita consumption.

We are continually reclassifying from luxury to necessity items for our personal comfort which add to our water consumption. Take, for instance, the great increase in air conditioning. This alone adds a huge demand on our water supply systems.

That is the kind of changing economy, industrial and domestic in which we now move.

It has taken this Nation, that you and I regard as the strongest on earth, 350 years to reach a population of 170 million people. At the present rate of increase that population will double in less than 40 years. That means that our annual productive capacity will also have to double in the same period to maintain our present standard of living.

If that be the case, we are going to have to speed up water conservation, rather than slow it down if we are going to meet the requirements of this increasing demand from our economy. Plans must be made now to meet those expanding needs.

When the time required to develop a major project—3 years or more for planning, then 8 to 10 years for construction—is considered, it becomes evident that now is none too early to start projects which are actually needed and justified. They will become critically urgent long before they can be completed on an economical program.

The U.S. Geological Survey found in 1953 that there were 1,000 cities, from fairly good size up to big municipalities, that actually had to maintain a very restricted use of water. If something is not done now, then in 15 or 20 years it may be too late.

The average rainfall in the United States is about 4,300 billion gallons per day. Of that amount, about 3,000 billion gallons goes back into the atmosphere by transpiration and evaporation, leaving a total of about 1,300 billion gallons as runoff in rivers and streams, or for percolation into the ground. This, then, is the ultimate limit of our supply. Our consumption in 1956 was about 200 billion gallons; that means that we are consuming about 15 percent of the maximum available supply. By 1975 we will be consuming about 30 percent of the maximum available supply. These are average figures and do not take into account geographical distributions, distributions throughout the year, or the quality of the water for domestic or industrial uses.

There is a vast difference in the amount of rainfall in the various parts of the country. For instance, in the North Atlantic States the rivers carry about 191 billion gallons, but in the basins of the Red River of the North, in Minnesota and North Dakota, which is about the same area, the runoff is only about 4.5 billion gallons. It is apparent, therefore, that there is a very unequal geographical distribution. In some areas the seasonal distribution is even more unequal.

Perhaps a more important question than our absolute capacity to care for the water problems of our agricultural and urban areas, is the question of the relative cost at which we undertake needed developments. The cost of future water supply development can be held to a minimum by intelligent planning of urban settlements, and by multiple purpose water resource developments.

To help meet that problem, the Congress under the leadership of my good friend the great conservationist, ROBERT S. KERR, the senior Senator from Oklahoma, enacted the Water Supply Act of 1958. That act set the stage for a more farsighted and comprehensive consideration of water supply in river basin planning and development. One of the most important features of this act is that it enables the Corps of Engineers to include storage in reservoir projects to meet future needs for municipal and industrial water where there is no water user immediately at hand to pay the bill. The act, however, provides for equitable reimbursement when the need develops.

This act provides as essential and long-needed basis for planning, as in the past no authority existed to build for future water needs, even though it was obvious that they would develop.

Quantity is only one of the considerations in maintaining an adequate water supply; the quality of the water is of equal importance. The greatest water needs are for mineral-free or lightly mineralized water. The kind of water we need is not found everywhere.

What is the present administration doing to help meet this problem? It has not only failed to recommend funds to start surveys, plans, or new construction on projects that are needed now, but last year built into the budget a planned slowdown which would delay the benefits from the projects underway. This would also increase the overall cost of these projects.

As you all know, last year when the Congress added some new starts for planning and construction, there was a terrific blast from the White House.

On September 2, 1958, the President reluctantly signed the public works appropriation bill. At that time he issued the following statement:

"In the Public Works Appropriation Act, 1959, the Congress has included approximately $39 million in funds to initiate construction on 65 unbudgeted new starts that will ultimately cost almost $700 million. Adding nearly $700 million to the already heavy future commitments for Federal Water Resources projects is but another instance of irresponsibility in the expenditure of public funds. I am compelled to approve the act, however, because it appropriates essential funds for continuing work on river and harbor, flood control, and reclamation projects that were started in previous years."

When you consider that the appropriation for construction in the 1959 act was approximately $870 million, was it really an act of irresponsibility in the expenditure of public funds to start new projects which will ultimately cost nearly $700 million? I do not think so. That is adding less than 1 year's future commitment at the present rate of construction.

Unless it is the desire of the administration that the water resource program wither and die on the vine—and that may be the underlying reason—a fair number of new starts should be added each year.

Perhaps these shortsighted planners in the Bureau of the Budget believe that the Federal Government is spending too large a portion of its budget in developing the water resources of this Nation. Let us examine the facts.

Between 1950 and 1956 our national population increased 11.2 percent. Between 1950 and 1956 the national income increased 42 percent. During the same period the expenditures for rivers and harbors and flood control decreased 14.9 percent.

I believe those figures are very significant. As all of you know, construction costs have increased on an average of 5 percent a year. If that average is applied to the 1950 expenditures of $627 million, we should be spending about $908 million in 1959 on the civil functions of the Corps of Engineers in order to maintain the same level of operations as in 1950. In contrast, the appropriation was just under $814 million. This comparison disregards the increased need for these public works resulting from our expanding population.

I am not unmindful of the fact that it is requiring more capital outlay to carry on this Government than at any time in our history, but I believe that to curtail the development of our natural resources, may be the most expensive economy that we can make.

What is the situation in our own Red River Valley? The Red River, with a drainage area of about 91,000 square miles, flows through Oklahoma, Texas, Arkansas, and Louisiana. The Red River constantly expends a portion of its great energy in attacking the easily eroded materials through which it flows. The river is continually changing its alinement, and the losses from caving banks are very extensive. In Louisiana, alone, the 10 local levee boards have spent in excess of $35 million dollars for flood control and major drainage. In addition, millions upon millions of dollars worth of public improvements, such as highways and bridges, a large portion of

which are part of the Federal Aid Highway System, have been damaged or rendered useless by floods and the meandering of the Red River.

Denison Dam was constructed by the Corps of Engineers to control the runoff from the upper 39,700 square miles of the Red River Basin, and thus reduce flood stages downstream.

For the past 2 years, when representatives of the Red River Valley Association appeared before the Public Works Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations to seek funds to continue this important work, floods were raging along the Red River. In fact, as I recall, we have had three floods in about 13 months in that area.

The fact that flood disasters still occur is not an indictment of the effectiveness of projects that are in operation. Quite the reverse is true. The effectiveness of the projects in operation emphasizes the fact that we are not progressing fast enough with our authorized projects for relief and control of these floods.

Year after year, waters that should be confined and utilized, flow over farmlands, destroying crops and cattle and driving many of the residents of the valley from their homes. Streets, sewers, water and gas lines, and other public facilities are destroyed. As terrible as are these losses, they can be repaired by the expenditure of millions of dollars for reconstruction. To me, a more serious loss is that resulting from bank caving, where thousands of acres of rich soil are carried out to sea each year. That is a permanent loss.

The great flood of 1945 demonstrated that the runoff from the uncontrolled areas below Denison can produce floods equal to or greater than the maximum of record. The present plan for flood control on the Red River below Denison Dam was based on that fact. That plan was authorized by Congress in 1946. As subsequently modified by Congress, this plan provides for controlling floods by means of reservoirs, supplemented by local protection such as levees, channel improvements, and bank stabilization measures. It is primarily a reservoir plan, since reservoirs account for about 90 percent of the cost.

Considerable progress has been made on the authorized projects. Denison, Texarkana, Wallace Lake, Ferrels Bridge, and Bayou Bodeau Reservoirs have been built, and they have been very effective in reducing the heavy damage sustained as a result of floods in the past 2 years. But it was never contemplated that these completed reservoirs by themselves would solve the problem. As long as major tributaries—including the Little River—are completely uncontrolled, the Red River Valley is a sitting duck for a disastrous flood.

At long last the control of the Little River by a system of dams, authorized in the Flood Control Act of 1958, which incidentally was one of the plans that was the basis for the previous veto of the bill by the President, offers a ray of hope. Following passage of the authorization act last year, funds were provided for the initiation of the preconstruction planning on the Millwood and Broken Bow Reservoirs.

These were some of the new starts to which the President objected when he signed the Public Works Appropriation Act for the current fiscal year.

As I previously mentioned, we must not only look to the quantity of water, but also its quality. Salt pollutants in the Red River Basin add over 5,000 tons of salt and sulfates each day to the Red River arm of Lake Texoma. Preliminary studies of the U.S. Public Health Service in water quality conservation indicate that there is a possibility of improving the quality of Red River water. The objectives of the investigation are to find the source of pollutants, determine the type and volume, and devise practical means for controlling them.

Project studies now under way indicate promising means of reducing pollution of the Red River. The principal source of natural salt pollution is a rather thin, long rock formation, about 500 miles long and not over 10 miles wide. This formation cuts across many large river systems and pollutes otherwise good quality water.

The fact that major sources of pollution can be isolated suggests the possibility of remedial measures to prevent contamination.

The early completion of this study, and accomplishment of the remedial measures, is essential to the full utilization of the water resources of this great natural asset.

The problems which we have here in the Red River Basin are typical of the problems of water resource development throughout the Nation. Significant progress has been made toward solving these problems, here and elsewhere. Much remains to be done, but the importance of our water resources is becoming more and more widely recognized. With the continued efforts of men of leadership and vision, such as this association has demonstrated in the past, these problems will be solved here, and elsewhere.

It is impossible for me to accept the proposition that the American economy cannot afford the expenditure of funds for wealth-producing projects in this country, at a time when the administration recommends a 26-percent increase in a foreign aid program that in all conscience should be reduced below the 1959 level. I am afraid that the only hope for a nod from the administration for the construction of public works will be those States that border another nation. In such instances it may be possible for such a State to get a few crumbs. Just last month it was announced that the United States and Mexico would jointly build a $100 million dam on the Rio Grande. I wonder if such a project will be subject to the same tests and requirements that a similar project lying wholly within the United States would be required to pass in order to survive?

Could it be that the Bureau of the Budget and the administration actually do not believe that the conservation of water resources makes a major contribution to the economic stability and welfare of the people? No, for that is the basis for requests for large expenditures for economic aid, and for the Development Loan Fund under the mutual security program.

I have frequently been referred to as the Senate's most outspoken critic of the foreign aid program, and I suppose it is true. As I have said many times in the past, I did support foreign aid as originally conceived and I have no apologies to make. I was willing to help our friends get back on their feet. This has long since been accomplished, but we still continue to help them in one way or another. My objections to the present program are based on personal observations of actual operations, and I am convinced that we are not achieving the desired objectives.

In some cases we are sponsoring the wrong projects in the wrong places. For example, we are building flour mills in order to convince the people of Korea that bread is a suitable substitute for rice in their diet. It is hoped that by so doing, the consumption of rice in Korea can be reduced, thus making rice available for export, ignoring the fact that Korea is thus being placed in the position to compete for Far Eastern markets which our own rice industry would desire to obtain. It must be realized that Korea produces very little wheat. Thus, after constructing the flour mills we shall be obligated either to subsidize the importation of wheat into this country, or give it to the Republic of Korea. Consequently, it will be necessary for our aid to continue ad infinitum.

In other cases, the advantages from the projects we sponsor do not inure to the benefit of the peoples of the countries involved. In addition, almost universally, the peoples of the countries we are trying to assist are totally unaware of the millions we are expending in the development of their country. In some instances, because we gave something to one country and did not give a like amount to another, the nonrecipient country begins to pout. The moral of this should be clear to the President—you do not solve problems by giveaways.

One of my principal objections to economic aid projects approved under the mutual security program is the lack of adequate considerations in the overall planning, and the complete disregard of economic justification. A project in a foreign country receives little or no consideration as to its economic soundness, and construction is frequently started before the project is conceived in its entirety, thus increasing unnecessarily the eventual cost. Whereas in this country the project must be specifically authorized after detailed surveys under prescribed standards, and after critical review at the local, State, and National levels.

The project is again subject to critical review in the annual appropriations. Of course, these projects must show a favorable benefit-to-cost ratio, under prescribed conservative standards.

Last year when the House adopted an amendment requiring resource development projects in the foreign-aid program to show economic justification, the administration forces had that proviso removed from the bill, on the basis that it would cripple the program, as indeed it would.

In concluding his message of March 13, 1959, on foreign aid, the President stated:

"If we are wise we will consider it (foreign aid) not as a cost but as an investment—an investment in our present safety, in our future strength and growth, and in the gorwth of freedom throughout the world."

If the President is really sincere, he will also consider resource development projects as investments in America's future, rather than irresponsible expenditures. Believe me, so long as we consider appropriations for resource development as outright expenditure, instead of as an investment which will return sound dividends, just so long will we allow the chaos of flood and drought to deprive us of the full benefits of our resources.

I am certain that the American people are tired of being told the Federal Government cannot afford to improve our own rivers and harbors—that it needs much of our tax dollars to provide similar facilities in foreign countries. If it provides additional funds to start resource projects it will unbalance the budget.

Our efforts to obtain sufficient funds to keep our public-works program going is becoming more and more difficult. I believe the time has come for the Members of Congress, and the entire Nation as well, to stand up and demand that the administration take a new look at its public-works policy, or else prepare for the entrance of a new administration that will.

USO—The Warmth of America in the Cold War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, it was my privilege this morning to listen to one of the finest talks I have heard in Washington. It was by our friend and associate, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]. The occasion was a breakfast of the United Service Organization's National Council. There were present 75 Members of the Senate and House. There were in attendance 600 members of the USO advisory group, representing every State in the Union. They were here for a 2-day visit. As Senators know, the USO—United Service Organization—has in its membership representatives of all religious groups, business, and labor—in fact, it is a cross-section of America dedicated to selling service, in its broadest interpretation.

The meeting started with a talk by Harvey S. Firestone, Jr., USO chairman. It was following his remarks that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] gave us a most illuminating and inspirational talk on the subject, "USO—the Warmth of America in the Cold War." The Senator's address gave a picture of the world today—the challenges which face us and the successes and failures of the Kremlin.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this fine address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WARMTH OF AMERICA IN THE COLD WAR

(Address by Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, Democrat, of West Virginia, to the United Service Organizations National Council hometown breakfast, Sheraton Park Hotel, Washington, D.C., April 8, 1959)

Mr. Chairman, members of the board of governors, ladies and gentlemen of the national council, and guests, once again we meet to applaud and appraise the work of the USO in servicing the needs of the young men and women of our Armed Forces.

I have been asked to discuss the topic of "The Warmth of America in the Cold War," a subject that admits of wide latitude, to say the least. However broad the title assigned, it bespeaks a particular aspect of the work of the USO and of the national character of America which is of central concern to all of us; it indicates the role of compassion and understanding which lies at the heart of so much of our work, as well as that of the individual affiliated agencies. It challenges also the need for our extending these qualities throughout the range of our national affairs—a point to which I shall return in more detail later.

This month, ladies and gentlemen, we memorialize the 18th year of the USO—a year heavy with symbolic import. For this is the year when the young men who were born—as was the United Service Organizations—in 1941 first become subject to military conscription.

These young men, and we ourselves, face a radically different world from that of 1941. In that year American troops were stationed only on American soil and American Territorial possessions, guarding our national security by means which were determined largely by 19th-century conditions of warfare and by Admiral Mahan's concept of naval power.

Today our national security is intimately involved with that of every nation of the free world, a security cemented by alliances with other nations throughout the Western Hemisphere, in Western Europe, in the Middle East, and in southeastern Asia. American troops have followed these alliances as guarantors of our national commitment to the security of the free world, from the wastes of the Arctic to the sands of Arabia, from Korea to Koblenz.

To a limited extent only is this a world of our own making—and even less so is it one of our own choosing. But this is the world we have and must abide with for an indeterminate future.

Until the turn of the century the world was ruled largely by 13 empires. The First World War led to the collapse of the German, Austrian, Turkish, and Russian Empires. By 1955 most of the remainder had been dissolved—with the British, French, and Dutch Empires eroding under the resurgent tide of colonial nationalism.

Since the end of World War II, 21 new sovereign nations have come into being; so also has a new kind of imperialism—that of the aggressive and militant Soviet-Sino Axis, animated by the dynamism of a new religion of the state. This new imperialism controls the strategic heartland of the Eurasian land mass, and—with its satellite nations—numbers well over a third of the world's population.

This is one measure of the change, ladies and gentlemen, that has taken place within less than two decades. Another, and correlative measure, was the presence in Washington last week of the foreign ministers of the NATO nations—an indication that the free world is not without the strength and the means to oppose the Soviet imperialism.

But let us not be deluded by our own terms. We use the term "imperialism" to apply to the expansionist designs of the Soviet Union—just as we used the same word to apply to Germany and Japan of 20 years ago. The German and Japanese imperialisms, however, were based upon a racial mystique of pan-Germanism and pan-Asianism, respectively—each developed independently of the other, and each relying ultimately upon military conquests as the means of expanding its sphere of influence.

The new imperialism of the Soviet Union is neither so limited in its appeal to other peoples nor in its means of exploiting this appeal. Indeed, military conquest, in the traditional sense, is only one means—and not the most important, either—of the new Soviet imperialistic design.

The successes of the Communists in recent years have been on the propaganda front, in areas of economic and political infiltration, and in exploiting the tensions of colonial nationalism rather than on the military front. There we have successfully opposed them, in Europe and in the Middle East.

Not only has the Soviet Union failed to expand its strategic military position, but it has also felt compelled to retreat from many of the advanced positions it held at the end of World War II. This we have failed to recognize amid the Soviet successes in other fields, but let me note a few of the areas of Soviet withdrawal:

In Europe, they have withdrawn from the Danish island of Bornholm, from the Finnish naval base, and from the strategically valuable section of eastern Austria, while they have been forced also to accept the independence of Yugoslavia and a loosening of their hold on Poland. In Asia they have given up their naval bases in Darien, they have withdrawn from Sinkiang, they have ceded their domain over the Manchurian Railroad to China, and there is even evidence that their hold on Outer Mongolia may be weakening.

Thus, although we have seen some Soviet military withdrawals in Europe, and the ceding of Soviet authority in Asia to Chinese power, we have witnessed also the continued successes of the Soviet in other and equally important areas. Through piecemeal economic competition on a selective basis the Soviet Union has succeeded in gaining an economic and political foothold in many of the underdeveloped nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. In the Middle East it has exploited, with varying degrees of success, the tensions of Arab nationalism—falsely appearing there, and elsewhere, as the defender of the very values which have given us our strength—the ideas of freedom, of human dignity and of national sovereignty. Then, too, Russia's recent scientific and technological achievements have been presented to the less industrialized nations as evidence of the superiority of the Soviet economic system over that of a free society.

This, then, is the face of our adversary—a resourceful, aggressive and cunning opponent—equally capable of offering the disarmingly open hand of aid to Iraq or the mailed fist of conquest to Hungary and Tibet.

Against the expansion of this power we have developed our system of economic and military alliances in Western Europe and southeastern Asia, the cornerstone of which, in each instance, is the military power of the United States. This power can be effective only as it exists in force and in readiness, for we will never again be granted—as we were in World Wars I and II—the opportunity of 2 or 3 years in which to prepare behind the shield of our allies. The Armed Forces of the United States are now the main shield of the free world—not the French infantryman of World War I, or the British Navy and Royal Air Force of World War II.

Yet the men and women of our Armed Forces—stationed at the ramparts in England and Western Europe, in Africa and the Middle East, in Okinawa, Japan, and Korea—these young people are more than the sword and buckle of freedom. They are also emissaries of the American culture and American character to the lands in which they serve. And unlike the system of Soviet communism, the ideals of America cannot be extended under the sway of boot and bayonet.

The extent to which the people of other lands will rally to the American cause of freedom is determined in large part by the image created by American service men and women stationed in those lands. In many instances our uniformed youth must overcome local hostilities—created sometimes by Communist agents, and sometimes by nothing more than the natural envy of the poor for the rich. But whatever the source, its most effective antidote is the natural generosity and compassion of the young people in our Armed Forces. For it is they who provide the living image—and sometimes the only concrete one available in those lands—of the meaning of American ideals. Whether it be the American GI who shares his rations with the Korean war orphan, or the American Army doctors who help improve native health and sanitation facilities in Libya—wherever they serve, the members of our Armed Forces are ambassadors of the American ideal.

Today this ideal embodies the concept of a world society which preserves the values of national sovereignty and individual freedom—as opposed to the Soviet ideal of a world superstate, with nationalities as well as individuals in subservience to the state. It is the ideal of the commmunity of man, voluntarily held together by compassion, understanding and respect for individual differences—as opposed to the soulless collectivism of the Soviet, held in thrall by a secret police.

The young men and women of our Armed Forces thus share a large part of the responsibility for making this ideal meaningful to the people of other lands. And in this task—as you ladies and gentlemen know—the USO shoulders its responsibilities as well. For we have gone well beyond the coffee-and-doughnut concept of ministering to the needs of our Armed Forces.

The educational, cultural, and religious programs of the USO, in this country and in our stations abroad, help to illuminate for our service people the values of the culture they are defending. In this respect, the very name of our organization—United Service Organizations, Inc.—comprised of people from a variety of religious faiths and national origins—this very name symbolizes the voluntary and generous aspect of the character we identify as "American."

This national trait of service and voluntary giving is, according to the noted historian, Arthur M. Schlesinger, one of the 10 contributions of America to civilization. He finds it in America on a scale unparalleled in other countries—in our 4,000 philanthropic foundations, in our contributions to the Red Cross, in our United Fund, and in CARE. And, he states, "Thanks to this ingrained trait of the national character, the Government found it easy to mobilize our people behind the Marshall plan, a costly tax-supported program for repairing the war-stricken economies of Western Europe. Though these official undertakings were in part designed to halt the spread of communism, they arose from deeper springs of human compassion and have no parallel in history."

This is a large part, ladies and gentlemen, of what we mean by the warmth of America. But this is not all. We must extend this spirit of warmth and compassion into more than just the areas of national good will and generosity with our own material bounty—important as these are.

For the crisis our Nation faces today encompasses the entire domain of our feelings, our will, and our intelligence. It is a crisis in the human spirit—a crisis which challenges our capacity to know, and to feel the knowledge that we are come to one of the great watersheds of history. As with every such place in man's long travail out of barbarism, it is a moment of danger as well as opportunity—and a moment of choice. This time the choice may be between a planetary holocaust or working toward a new plateau of civilization. We have the technical means for either, but do we have the human means—the imagination, the compassion, and the will to make the right choice?

While history shows many instances of noble causes overwhelmed by the brute forces of evil—man has more frequently brought on his own defeat by failure to pursue the right than by the active forces of evil. We are no exception. We have received no divine dispensation from our own limitations and frailties; it is not written in the stars nor in the flights of birds that our national will is to prevail.

Yet, we may say with assurance that the image of the United States which we present abroad can be no stronger than that which we show to ourselves. Thus, we must answer for ourselves the question of whether the warmth of America is borne of our genuine commitment to the values of a free society, or whether it is in large part merely the expression of exhuberance in our national wealth. The issue presented is whether—as individual men and women, and as a free society—we can once again generate as strong a faith in the values of a free society as in the material fruits of a free economy, and without confusing the identity of either.

Ours is the first civilization in history which has developed the means of eliminating poverty among all its members. For the first time in humanity's ageless struggle with nature we find at hand the means to release men from the iron chain of circumstance—from the pain and hunger which have been their daily lot.

The choice is ours to make, namely, either to use our national good fortune for the enlargement of the faith of man, to expand the ideal of brotherhood, and to extend our vision of the truth—or to continue with our present preoccupation with pleasure and profit, submit to a cult of mediocrity, and abide under the tyranny of our own selfish concerns and narrow nationalism.

Perhaps the latter seems a harsh and unfair description of our present national attitudes. This is a conclusion one may draw when he hears the constant boast of our increasing gross national product—without ever the question of "For what?"—when we spend $10 billion a year on advertising to convince ourselves that we cannot do without the things we don't need, when we spent $10 billion a year on alcohol and $3 billion a year on cosmetics, the two together equal to our total expenditures—public and private—for education? What other conclusion may one draw, when, with a gross national product of approximately $450 billion, we hear calamitous talk of national bankruptcy over the issue of spending $3.5 billion on foreign aid—less than 1 percent of our total product? Is this the image of a strong society?

More than 100 years ago Ralph Waldo Emerson stated that "Things are in the saddle." He followed this comment with the observation that "A man's things soon come between him and himself." Now, this was no prejudice of Puritan asceticism, but an observation on human behavior—applicable to a society as well as to a man.

The evidence surrounds us if we will but open our eyes, for we have many unfinished tasks in our own society: to furnish the conditions of human dignity to the 5 million or so of our own families who live on the squalid edge of poverty—to eliminate the conditions of urban blight that contaminate so many of our cities—to restore education and the life of the mind to their proper role in a democratic society. These are only a few of the problems that press upon us.

We have the means to solve these problems. But not all our wealth of technology and instruments will avail us if we lack the imagination to perceive, the compassion to understand, and the will to act.

This is, in part, the meaning of a recent comment by Archibald MacLeish—one of the most intelligent and perceptive observers of our times. In referring to the defense of freedom in our society, MacLeish stated that, "The man who knows with his mind only, who will not commit himself beyond his wits, who will not feel the thing he knows, or know the thing he feels—that man has no freedom anywhere. He is tugged by the string of whatever is told him, maneuvered by slogans. Sooner or later his life will seem indifferent to him, something managed by others, and he will acquiesce in the management, think about it as little as possible, occupy himself with the only things near enough to seem real—his car, his front lawn, those shadows on the television screen—symbolic shadows."

This retreat into the privacy of selfish and petty concerns is our chief enemy of the human spirit in America today. For our greatness—as individuals and as a Nation—is achieved in the complementary relationship of private rights and public responsibilities. Our finest hours as a people have thus been those when we presented to the world at large the hope of realizing a new moral and spiritual vision of man.

This, I believe, is also what the warmth of American means today.

Address by Hon. Herman E. Talmadge Before Tennessee Agricultural Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, the thoughtful speech delivered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] before the annual meeting of the Tennessee Agricultural Council in Memphis, Tenn., on April 3, 1959. More than 1,000 leading farmers and businessmen were present to hear Senator TALMADGE. These farm leaders were impressed by his analysis of the farm problem and his recommendations for a solution. I am certain that Members of Congress and others who are giving consideration to the plight of the American farmer in trying to do something to better his lot will be interested in the analysis of Senator TALMADGE and will be impressed with the fact that he has a specific program to present, which is deserving of most careful consideration.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a happy occasion for me to have this opportunity to meet with my fellow farmers.

And I do like to regard myself as a farmer even though my principal agricultural pursuit at present is endeavoring to plow under Secretary of Agriculture Ezra T. Benson and his farm policies.

It is a planting which, I am sure you will agree, is long overdue.

And I am pleased to be able to report to you that the climate for doing some major cultivating in that field is improving every day both in Washington and throughout the Nation.

As incredible as it may seem to those unfamiliar with the facts, we in the United States have a Department of Agriculture which is the enemy of the farmer.

Had the Department of Labor for 1 day been as antagonistic to the interests of organized labor as the Department of Agriculture for 6 years has been to the interests of the farmer, Mr. Reuther and his associates in the AFL–CIO would have ridden the Secretary out of Washington on a rail before sundown.

For 6 years now it has been the policy of the Republican administration to ruin rather than to save the farmer.

For 6 years now it has been the program of Mr. Benson and the Department of Agriculture to discredit rather than to help the farmer.

With apologies to the late great Will Carleton, the farmer's present plight might well be summed up like this:

"Worm or beetle—drought or tempest—on a farmer's land may fall,
Each is loaded full o'ruin, but the Benson farm plan beats 'em all."

Or to paraphrase that well-known bit of anonymous farm doggerel:

"Some people tell us that there ain't no hell,
But they never farmed under Benson, so how can they tell?"

Of course, my friends, it is not necessary for me to tell you who earn your living from the soil that the present farm program has been a miserable failure and American agriculture is in the worst mess in this country's history.

It is a situation which is reflected in every compilation of agricultural statistics.

It is a situation which is reflected in the accelerated shift of population from farm to city.

It is a situation which is reflected in last year's election results.

It is a situation which is apparent to everyone except Secretary Benson and President Eisenhower.

These are the irrefutable facts:

Between 1952 and 1958, realized net farm income in this country declined from $14.4 to $13 billion despite substantially increased Government payments. And, when the degree of inflation which has occurred since 1952 is taken into account, it is obvious that realized net income would have to be increased considerably above the $14.4 billion sum merely to put farmers back where they were in terms of purchasing power 6 years ago.

Such an eventuality is hardly likely under the present program, however, inasmuch as the Agricultural Marketing Service itself predicts a reduction of from 5 to 10 percent in realized net income this year.

During the same 1952–58 period, farm production expenses increased from $22.6 to $24.5 billion and the spread between farm and retail prices widened by $75 for each thousand dollars spent for farm produce. The farmer's share of the market-basket dollar dropped from 47 to 39 cents and still is falling.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics index for last January showed prices received by farmers at that time were 10 percent below those realized in 1947–49 while prices paid by farmers were up 19 percent for the corresponding period.

In view of the situation evidenced by those figures it is not surprising that the Department of Commerce reports that between 1950 and 1957 2,349,000 persons migrated from the farms of the Nation to compete for increasingly scarce jobs in urban areas. According to latest reports, that trend is continuing.

Those are the facts which Mr. Benson blithely ignores in insisting that black is white and failure is success.

The essence of his recent testimony before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was that—and I am sure this will be news to you—farmers in the United States never had it so good.

As a matter of fact, he told the committee in effect that things are going so good for the farmer that unless Congress does something about it before May 15 the whole country is going to pot.

His prescription for doing something about it turned out to be a bigger dose of Benson brand sulfur and molasses.

The Secretary can claim the distinction of being the first man in history to use his own failures as arguments in favor of his policies.

He is making much of the fact that realized net farm income increased 21 percent during 1958.

What he is not mentioning is the fact that the 1958 total still is considerably below the rate which prevailed at the time he took office.

He is making much of the fact that per capita farm income last year topped the previous high set in 1951.

What he is not mentioning is the degree of inflation which has taken place since the Korean war and the fact that farm income is spread among fewer families now that his policies have forced more than 2 million persons off the farm.

He is making much of the fact that the national farm surplus continues to increase.

What he is not mentioning is the fact that it was he who kept all surplus commodities off the world market during 1953 and 1954 and that it was not until Congress required by law that he do so that he began to move them into world trade channels.

He is making much of his contention that he could solve the problem of overproduction if Congress would give him authority to reduce prices.

What he is not mentioning is the fact that under authority given him since 1954 he already has reduced supports by an average of 20 percent and, at the same time, the wheat surplus increased by a third and the corn surplus doubled.

He is making much of his contention that he could restore the agricultural economy of the Nation if Congress would give him the laws he wants.

What he is not mentioning is the fact that of the 53 recommendations he has made to Congress, 48—or more than 90 percent—have received favorable legislative action and that those 5 which were turned down were of a relatively minor nature.

It will take more than Mr. Benson's usual pious sermonizing and glib platitudes to disclaim his responsibility for the sad situation which prevails in American agriculture today.

His contention that he should not be held accountable for the mess he has made solely because Congress has not given him everything for which he asked is about as plausible as his claim that he did American farmers a big favor by cutting parity prices by $200 million in January.

With Mr. Benson having his way, the farmers of America would be better off seeking their living at the dice tables of Las Vegas.

After all, even a crapshooter wins sometime, which is more than one can say for the chances of the American farmer under the Benson farm program.

The Benson program has depressed farm prices below the subsistence level.

The Benson program has forced farmers to abandon their farms.

The Benson program has stimulated artificially high prices for consumer goods.

The Benson program has generated unmanageable surpluses of farm commodities.

The Benson program has robbed the United States of its world markets.

The Benson program has resulted in a farm depression which, as we saw in last year's recession, is making itself felt in all other segments of our national economy.

Our experience has proved conclusively that reduced acreage, reduced prices, and rising costs lead only to reducing farm income to a disaster level. It has shown beyond contradiction that it is impossible to reduce production by reducing prices, to control production by reducing acreage, or to bring supply into line with demand through research, which has the effect of increasing supplies.

An openminded appraisal of all the facts affords no other conclusion but that we in the United States have reached the point where it is essential to the future welfare not only of the farmer, but also of the taxpaying consumer, that an entirely new approach be undertaken to solve the Nation's farm problems.

Both the farmers and the consumers of the United States have repudiated the ruinous policies of Secretary Benson at the polls, and they have given Congress a mandate to write a bold, new law which will give farmers the protection they have been denied for the past 6 years withot placing an intolerable burden on the tarpayers of the country.

The farmer wants to be returned to a free-enterprise economy, with protection equivalent to that enjoyed by labor through the minimum wage and collective bargaining, and by industry through the tariff and Government subsidies and contracts.

The taxpayer wants a stabilized farm program which will give his pocketbook a break both in the marketplace and at tax time.

Our experience with Mr. Benson's ideas of farming stands as conclusive proof that those ends cannot be achieved through existing concepts.

To effect a realistic and permanent solution to our agricultural problems we are going to have to profit by our mistakes and take advantage of the lessons we have learned at so great cost.

We are going to have to discard completely the present patchwork of discredited farm laws, start all over again, and write an entirely new program which will get away from the compounded failures and the stereotyped concepts of the past.

My long and serious study of this matter has convinced me that such a program must have three fundamental objectives.

First, it must let the farmer farm.

Second, it must guarantee the farmer his proportionate share of the national purchasing power.

And, third, it must put American agricultural commodities back on the world markets at competitive prices.

Those objectives can never be achieved until the Federal Government is removed from the business of buying, storing, transporting, and selling agricultural commodities—which it is now doing at a yearly cost of $1.027 billion to the American taxpayers—and the responsibility for marketing farm produce is returned to the farmer and private enterprise where it belongs.

Those objectives can be achieved only by freeing the farmer to plant and sell his crops as he sees fit and by limiting the role of the Federal Government in agriculture to paying the farmer the difference between the prices he receives for commodities sold for consumption in this country and 100 percent of parity.

Those objectives are encompassed in the Talmadge farm plan which I first introduced during the 2d session of the 85th Congress and which I reintroduced with the cosponsorship of Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON, of South Carolina, shortly after the beginning of the present 1st session of the 86th Congress.

The overwhelmingly favorable response which my bill has received from all sections of the country encourages me to believe that such an approach has widespread appeal not only among farmers but also among the general public.

While I would not say it can be enacted this year or next, I will make the prediction that when a new farm program is passed—and, if not before, one certainly will be after we install a Democrat in the White House in 1961—it will be along the lines of the measure I have proposed.

The Talmadge farm plan is exceedingly simple and can be understood by even the layman without the necessity of consulting

a Philadelphia lawyer or a certified public accountant.

It has five major points, as follows:

First, it would eliminate all acreage controls and Government loans.

Second, it would assign each farmer growing basic commodities a domestic production quota to be expressed in terms of unit measurements—pounds, bushels, bales, etc.—which would be the same percentage of the national consumption of basic commodities that the farmer's average annual production for the preceding 5 years bears to the total national average production for the same period.

Third, it would guarantee and pay to each farmer a sales price support of the difference between the price he receives for his domestic production quota and 100 percent of parity.

Fourth, it would require each farmer to submit a bill of sale with this application for sales price support payments.

And, fifth, it would impose a maximum of $25,000 on the amount of sales price support which any individual farmer could receive in any 1 year.

As an example of how it would work, let's take the case of an average cotton farmer who now has a 5-acre allotment on which he grows 3½ bales of cotton a year. Under the Talmadge formula, his domestic quota would be about 2⅛ bales which, when sold at current prices, would entitle him to a compensatory payment of $105 over and above the $315 he would receive in the market place. Those amounts would be in addition to his income from the sale of whatever additional cotton he might grow in excess of his quota to sell on the open market.

For cotton the Talmadge plan support price would be 40 cents a pound compared with the present market price of around 30 cents and the 81 percent of parity support price of 32.4 cents.

The actual amount of the compensatory payment to the individual farmer would depend upon the prevailing market price. If the market price went down the compensatory payment would go up and vice versa. The farmer thereby would have the firm assurance of a 100 percent of parity price on his domestic production quota regardless of the level of the market price.

The cost of my plan would depend upon the resulting free market price levels of the basic commodities, but in any event would be considerably less than that of the present program. It likely would vary between $1.5 and $2.5 billion and the agricultural experts of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress estimate its potential saving to the taxpayer at between $2 and $3 billion a year.

While costing less, it would put perhaps as much as $1 billion a year more in the pockets of the farmers. As paradoxical as that might seem, it would be the case because the high costs of administering the present bureaucratic program would be considerably reduced. For instance, one of the costs which would be ended would be the billion dollars a year now being spent to handle surplus agricultural commodities.

Furthermore, whatever its ultimate cost might prove to be, the Talmadge farm plan would assure that every farm program dollar went into the pockets of the American farmers which decidedly is not the case at the present time.

With particular reference to cotton, under my bill American textile mills would get an even break with their foreign competitors who can now buy subsidized American cotton $35 to $40 a bale cheaper than it can be purchased in this country.

In other words, the underlying philosophy of the approach I have proposed is to subsidize Americans instead of foreigners.

While I will match my humanitarian impulses with those of anyone, I do not believe in—nor do I believe the American people believe in—global philanthropy at the expense of the American farmer and the agricultural economy of the United States.

Even more important than the financial considerations are the intangible advantages to be derived from a free enterprise farm program bolstered by compensatory payments.

Such an approach is extremely simple and would take the redtape out of the farm program.

Such an approach would eliminate the regimentation and dictation imposed by acreage controls.

Such an approach would let the farmer plant what he wants and sell it as he pleases.

Such an approach would take the Federal Government out of the business of buying, storing, transporting and selling farm commodities and place the responsibility for marketing with the farmer and private enterprise where it belongs.

Such an approach would guarantee the farmer his proportionate share of the national purchasing power and restore agriculture to a free enterprise, competitive base.

Such an approach would end the accumulation of the national farm surplus which has glutted the Nation's markets and stagnated its economy.

Such an approach would make the national farm program an estimable budget item which would remain relatively stable over the years.

Such an approach would mean lower prices to both the consumer and industry and would put American agricultural products, both raw and processed, back on the world market at competitive prices.

Such an approach would give the farmer protection equivalent to labor's minimum wage and right to collective bargaining and industry's tariff and Government contracts and subsidies.

Such an approach would take the realistic view that the only justification for a farm program is to increase the income of farmers and would seek to do that by going in the front, instead of the back, door.

Such an approach would mark a new and fresh start which would release agriculture from the bonds of past mistakes and relieve the Nation's economy of the burdens of abortive farm laws.

There are those who contend that we should make agriculture entirely free and have no farm program at all. I do not share that viewpoint.

While I am enough of a Jeffersonian Democrat to believe that we would all be better off if our entire economy were freed and allowed to seek its own level, I am also, by the same token, enough of a realist to know that, with virtually every other segment of the Nation's economy protected by law, the farmer cannot be left as the only person without a legislative guarantee of his proportionate share of the national income.

If the farmer is to share in the general prosperity of the rest of the country—if he is to own an automobile, send his children to school, and give his family a reasonable standard of living—it is essential that a new farm program be devised which will give him that assurance.

The American standard of living is the highest in the world and to deny the American farmer legislative protection in the enjoyment of it would amount to putting him into direct competition with farmers in countries where living standards are minute fractions of our own and to make of him a virtual peon in a land of plenty.

While I would be the last to claim that my idea offers a complete solution to all the Nation's farm problems, I do sincerely believe that it affords a basis upon which agreement on a new national farm program can be reached. And I am now working toward that end with several of my like-minded colleagues in an effort to perfect my bill so as to give it the broadest possible base of support among all commodity groups.

I am hopeful that we can have an omnibus bill ready for consideration in the not too distant future.

Perhaps the most difficult of the problems with which we are wrestling is what to do about the $9-billion-plus surplus which Mr. Benson has accumulated.

My own idea is that a four-way disposal program should be undertaken.

The first step would be to have the National Security Council determine what portion of the surplus is needed as a national strategic reserve and make immediate recommendations to Congress for setting aside and preserving that amount of food and fiber for emergency use.

The second step would be to offer all local, State, national and international charitable, relief and welfare organizations and agencies donations of surplus commodities of whatever amounts they could utilize effectively in their humanitarian programs.

The third step would be to substitute surplus commodities for dollars in the conduct of the economic assistance phases of our foreign-aid programs, including long-term purchase agreements with underdeveloped countries like India.

And the fourth—and perhaps the most important—step would be to absorb the remainder of the surplus in the farm program itself.

The first three steps are self-explanatory and the fourth would be accomplished in this way:

Any farmer so electing could, by agreeing to put into conservation practices without payment the amount of land on which he would grow his domestic production quota, receive for sale on the open market at whatever price it would bring the equivalent of his quota from Government surplus stocks.

No compensatory payments would be paid on such sales as the farmer would have, in effect, received a payment in eliminating the cost of growing his share of the domestic market.

Under such an arrangement existing commodities would be substituted unit for unit for assigned quotas which would assure against disruption of normal trade channels. In addition, farmers electing the option would still be free to grow as much of any commodity as they desired for nonsupported sales on the world market.

Mr. Benson has seen fit in recent speeches to call the Talmadge farm plan "a long step toward a fully socialized agriculture," and to maintain that its proposal has joined the issue of "Goverment control versus freedom."

To the former assertion I would reply that Mr. Benson either is totally ignorant of the provisions of the Talmadge farm plan or he was looking in the mirror at his own program when he coined his description.

To the latter claim I would say that it is true that the issue has been joined but that the roles are the reverse of what he would have them be.

My recollection of elementary economics is that socialism is synonymous with nationalization or government ownership and control.

Now I ask you would American agriculture be more nationalized under my plan whereby the farmer could plant what he pleases and be held responsible for selling what he grows or under Mr. Benson's plan whereby the Government tells the farmer how much he can grow and then buys, stores, transports, and sells it for him?

My knowledge of the present farm program which stems from my own experience as a

farmer operating under it is that its basis is drastic and ever-constricting acreage controls.

Now I ask you would the American farmer have more freedom under my plan whereby the farmer would be free to decide for himself what and how much he would grow or under Mr. Benson's plan whereby the Government puts strict limits on his planting and subjects him to stiff penalties for failing to comply with them?

I think the answer is obvious from the observation that under the Talmadge farm plan Stanley Yankus, Jr., the Michigan poultry farmer who has been put out of business by Mr. Benson's regulations, would not find it necessary to emigrate to Australia to find enough freedom to run his farm as he wants to run it.

Mr. Benson in his statements and letters to newspapers has sought to label my proposal a Brannan plan.

Such a label is not supported by the facts of the matter.

The only point of similarity between the Talmadge and the Brannan plans is the compensatory payment idea and, if it is the intent of Mr. Benson to equate that feature of my proposal with the Brannan plan, then by the same logic it also could be called the Eisenhower plan, the Seaton plan, and, yes, even the Benson plan.

That is true because officials by those names have advocated a similar application of the compensatory payment idea to producers of metals and growers of wool and sugar.

It is most unfortunate that there are some to whom playing politics is more important than seeking to serve the best interests of the farmers of America.

The most lamentable aspect of the present national agricultural dilemma is that it is the end product of partisan politics.

The welfare of our farmers and the protection and preservation of our national economy are above any personal considerations. They demand that we cease playing politics with the farm problem and act in unison to restore to the farmer his freedom and his rightful place in the Nation's economic picture.

As Columnist Joseph Alsop recently pointed out with great sagacity the present situation has "sorely endangered" America's great asset of an "independent farming population." He declared with great truth that "socially, biologically, historically, this is a name well worth national investment."

The sands of history are littered with the wrecks of civilizations and nations which perished as the result of dissipating and destroying their independent farming populations.

The vitality of any people stems from the soil and it is an inexorable law of nature that it withers and dies when its roots are transplanted to a wholly-urban culture.

There is something about the tilling of the soil which nurtures in the human breast an appreciation of the true purpose of man's existence which cannot be instilled through any other pursuit.

As Thomas Jefferson put it: "Those who labor in the earth are the chosen people of God * * * whose breasts He has made His peculiar deposit for substantial and genuine virtue."

The worst fate which could befall our country would be for urban Americans to lose sight of the fact that their present and their future are dependent upon the maintenance of a vital and progressive agriculture.

The day we allow ourselves to be deceived by demagogic appeals into believing that the American farmer is an economic liability will be the day which marks the beginning of the end of our great Nation.

Americans must look beyond their own selfish personal interests and recognize the great truth uttered by Daniel Webster when he declared:

"Let us never forget that the cultivation of the earth is the most important labor of man. When tillage begins, other arts follow. The farmers, therefore, are the founders of civilization."

That is why we must look to our farms as the only source of a posterity which cherishes its heritage of freedom and is dedicated to its preservation.

That is why we must do whatever is necessary to sustain our farms as the roots of our great American civilization.

That is why we must insist that Congress act immediately and decisively to write and enact a workable and productive farm program which will assure for all time to come that those roots will continue to nourish and replenish the life's blood of our Nation.

Toward that end I have dedicated my every effort.

Toward that end I beg your advice, help and support.

I thank you.

President de Gaulle of France on the Berlin Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BYRON L. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, on March 25, President de Gaulle, at his press conference in Paris, offered some profoundly significant observations in noting that two-thirds of the inhabitants of the earth lead a miserable existence, while certain peoples have at their disposal what is necessary to insure the progress of all. He asks what is the use of the dangerous wrangling over West Berlin and the German problem. For in our time, he says, the only quarrel worthwhile is that of mankind. He invites us to vanquish misery, to abolish poverty through international cooperation, and suggests that this should be the primary subject for the agenda of possible East-West conferences.

I commend to the attention of the Members the following official transcript of President de Gaulle's remarks:

The crisis opened by Soviet Russia on the subject of Berlin plunges the world into grave anxiety.

Three closely related questions are put by Moscow:

The possibility of measures which would raise an obstacle to the movement of American, British, and French military elements between West Berlin and the Western Zone.

The destiny of the German people, which would be profoundly affected by the formal separation of Germany into two states and by the fact that the former capital of the Reich would become incorporated in territories under totalitarian dictatorship or subjected to conditions which would lead to this servitude.

Finally, neutralization of a zone in Europe of which Germany would be an essential part.

Let us add that the Soviet Government, in pressing the West to open negotiations on the fate of Berlin and on a peace treaty with the two Germanys, made it known that it envisaged transferring its rights and responsibilities regarding the city to the Pankow (East German) authorities. In this case, the goings and comings of American, British, and French forces would have to be made in agreement with Pankow, a situation which Washington, London, and Paris would find themselves forced to recognize.

Should the Western Powers see the way barred to them and should they want to open it by force, they would come up against Soviet troops stationed in East Germany who, we have been told, are not there to play marbles.

This being so, it might be thought that France wishes to profit from the crisis and, joining the move to split the German people, insure for herself, at the expense of that country, advantages parallel to those which the Soviet Union seems to wish to seize for herself. That is a policy that others have been able to practice toward an unfortunate neighbor.

It is not our policy. If the present Germany seemed dangerous to us, then no doubt the memory of trials suffered by her actions and the desire to prevent their recurrence would motivate our demands. But Germany, as she is, in no way threatens us. We even think that with her capabilities, her energy, her resources, she constitutes an essential element in the life and progress of Europe and the whole world.

Even more, as is normal for two old adversaries who have given up fighting and destroying each other, France and Germany have resolved to cooperate. On this point, the policy of Chancellor Adenauer coincides with ours. Quite recently, Mr. Segni confirmed to me that it was also that of Italy.

We shall thus support nothing which would be such as to lead the German people to despair or to compromise its peaceful future or to wreck the hope which, after so many shocks and tears, has arisen on both sides of the Rhine.

One might think, on the other hand, that France might consider keeping out of the quarrel. Being without means of action, that is to say of destruction, equal to those in the hands of the Americans and the Russians, and thus, without the power to try and impose her policy, she might endeavor to keep outside the conficit and, should it come to that, out of the war. This would amount to France, in an attempt to keep her life, giving up her reasons for living. But also this would be to destroy the Atlantic alliance, an alliance which is unimaginable without the participation of France.

Thus nothing except atomic war could prevent Soviet domination from spreading over all Europe and all Africa, before it went on to cover the rest of the world. After which, the human race, or as much of it as would have survived, would everywhere be given up to the oppression of dictatorship and to the frightful upheavals brought about by dictatorial trends and leaders.

We prefer to maintain the alliance until the day when the future of peace is assured.

We hold it necessary in the first place that America, Britain, and France should not agree to allow anyone to put obstacles in the way of the comings and goings of their troops to and from Berlin. As a result of the victory, as well as of arrangements concluded in the past with Soviet Russia, the three powers have the right of passage. If anybody opposes this, they and all others who might come to support them would commit an act of hostility toward the Western Powers and would thus be responsible for the clashes which could follow.

As regards the fate of the city itself, we note that those of its inhabitants who have the opportunity to express their views are unanimous in wishing it to stay Western.

For this reason and for others, we would not allow West Berlin to be given up to the Pankow regime.

Furthermore, we are not prepared to recognize this regime as a sovereign and independent state because it could not have been born and could not exist except by virtue of the Soviet occupation and because of an implacable dictatorship.

From the point of view of the foreign relations of the French Republic, we cannot put on the same level, on the one hand, this arbitrary construction and on the other, the German Federal Republic, where citizens say, read, and hear what they like, come and go as they please and, in complete freedom, elect their representatives and their government.

The reunification of the two parts into a single Germany which would be entirely free seems to us the normal destiny of the German people, provided they do not reopen the question of their present frontiers to the west, the east, the north, and the south, and that they move toward integrating themselves one day in a contractual organization of all Europe for cooperation, liberty, and peace.

But, pending the time when this ideal can be achieved, we believe that the two separated sections of the German people should be able to multiply ties and relations between themselves in all practical fields. Transport, communications, economic activity, literature, science, the arts, the goings and comings of people, etc., would be the subject of arrangements which would bring together the Germans, within, and for the benefit of, that which I would call "Germanness" and which after all is common to them, in spite of differences in regimes and conditions.

As regards turning Germany into a neutralized territory, this extrication or disengagement in itself has no meaning for us which is of any value. For if disarmament did not cover a zone which is as near to the Urals as it is to the Atlantic, how would France be protected? What then, in case of a conflict, would prevent an aggressor from crossing by a leap or a flight the undefended German no man's land?

What narrow strip would remain between the Meuse and the ocean, in which to deploy and use the means of the West? Certainly, we are supporters of the control and limitation of all weapons of war. But, in order for these measures, apparently humanitarian, not to risk leading to our disappearance, they must cover an area deep enough and large enough for France to be covered and not, on the contrary, exposed.

On these different subjects and on others, I do not see, for my part, any objection of principle to the opening of negotiations, whatever precedents there may or may not have been. M. Couve de Murville would thus attend a conference of foreign ministers, should one be held.

If it were to develop that that conference, after thorough examination of the problems, succeeded in sifting out the elements of an agreement on important points, then, with Premier Michel Debré at my side, I could myself take part in a meeting of those charged with the supreme responsibilities of the great powers.

But it is clear that, in order to achieve something worthwhile, it is necessary to prepare the topics for discussion in such a forum, and discussions must be carried out in a peaceful atmosphere. In this matter, I am in complete agreement with what President Eisenhower said recently.

On this serious occasion, France feels qualified to speak clearly and calmly. First of all, because she has no feeling of competition or animosity toward the Russian people. Quite the contrary, she has a real and traditional friendship. In the next place, for the reason that in the matter of Germany, which is the stake in the crisis, she has been able to master her grievances and, taking into account the changes which have occurred there, to consider this country not as an enemy, but as a partner.

Lastly, because France herself does not yet have atomic bombs, and, unlike the three others, is not subject to the obsession of launching her bombs before those of the adversary have been able to accomplish their mission. In short, France looks at the present crisis in her own way, with clarity and even with impartiality.

That is why, speaking in her name, I am sure of speaking the thoughts of more than 2 billion human beings who think as she does. Because of, and in comparison with, the risks run by our species and of the immense human tasks that we could and should accomplish in common, any summons which might be addressed to the West with a view to obtaining abandonment by intimidation would be hateful and absurd. When, in both camps, everything is arranged so that means of destruction, capable of annihilating continents, could be unleashed in the space of a few seconds—at a time like that, creating a state of tension, such that any error, any incident might unleash the cataclysm, would be tantamount to presenting the very existence of humanity with an unpardonable challenge.

When two-thirds of the inhabitants of the earth lead a miserable existence, while certain people have at their disposal what is necessary to ensure the progress of all—what is the use of the dangerous wrangling over West Berlin, the East German Democratic Republic, and German disengagement?

For, in our time, the only quarrel worth while is that of mankind. It is mankind that must be saved, made to live and enabled to advance.

We, who live between the Atlantic and the Urals; we, who are Europe, possessing with Europe's daughter America, the principal sources and resources of civilization; we, who have the means to feed, clothe, and house ourselves and to keep warm; we, who have mines and factories going full blast, well-tilled soil, railways where run numerous trains, roads choked with cars, ports filled with ships, airports full of aircraft; we, all of whose children learn to read, who build many universities and laboratories, who form armies of engineers and technicians, who can see, hear, read what is of a nature to satisfy the mind; we, who have enough doctors, hospitals, medicines to ease suffering, to care for the sick, to ensure the life of most newborn infants—why do we not erect, all together, the fraternal organization which will lend its hand to the others? Why do we not pool a percentage of our raw materials, our manufactured goods, our food products, some of our scientists, technologists, economists, some of our trucks, ships, aircraft in order to vanquish misery, develop the resources, and help in the work of less-developed peoples? Let us do this—not that they should be the pawns of our policies, but to improve the chances of life and peace. How much more worth while that would be than the territorial demands, ideological claims, imperialist ambitions which are leading the world to its death.

It seems to me that this should be a primary subject for the agenda of possible East-West conferences. In case of agreement in principle, it would evidently be necessary to draw up a common plan of organization and implementation.

If we should hold a summit conference this year, I would be ready to speak of it with my friends, Mr. Eisenhower and Mr. Macmillan, and I hope that Mr. Khrushchev, whom I met some time ago in Moscow in the entourage of Stalin and who has come a long way since then, will be willing to take an interest in it.

Question: "How do you feel that the situation has developed in Algeria since last year when you offered the 'peace of the brave' to the Algerian rebels?"

There have been 130 years of vicissitudes in Algeria. For 4 years and more now, fighting and attacks have not ceased. We are living in an age when, on this earth, a gigantic organization is militating everywhere against the West, while the West often neglects to look after itself. We are witnessing a turmoil which, inside the Moslem world, sets many Arab countries against foreign peoples, many states and parts of states against others of the same race and the same religion, and many leaders against other leaders who, like themselves, and yet against them, claim to be the champions of unity. Under these conditions, I doubt that anyone has ever been able to imagine that peace and prosperity would come all of a sudden to a torn Algeria, or that all that was necessary, at the height of a persistant fever, was to shout down one slogan with other slogans in order that all the internal and external causes of the present war should disappear as if by magic.

Personally, I do not think that, and I never say it. On the contrary, I believe and I say that the destiny of Algeria depends upon a task of long duration, the task of a whole generation performed under conditions and in a spirit that are completely new and that are aimed at enabling Algeria to reveal herself to herself and to open herself to the world as it is. I believe and I say that such a task is inconceivable without the presence and the action of France. I believe and I say that France has made her resolve, that she is now following a clear and firm plan and that, while endeavoring to achieve pacification as soon as possible, she is working for a transformation that will enable Algeria to find her new self.

What has been done for this transformation? This is what has been done in 8 months:

From the political point of view, the way of equal and universal suffrage has been opened for the first time and forever to the Algerians, giving them the means of expressing their true will. Irreversible measures have established a single college for all women and men and given the Moslems the largest proportion of elected representatives in every kind of election. It was on this basis that the referendum, held last September, showed that the vast majority of the Algerian people trust me to secure for them peace, liberty, and dignity and to act so that Algeria will thereby remain linked to France. Legislative elections were held in October. The Algerian municipalities will elect their councils next month. Later, the general councils [of the departments] will be elected. Doubtless it may be objected that the war situation interferes with the objectivity of these various elections. It is nonetheless true that they are taking place, that the nature and the composition of all representative bodies have been profoundly altered by comparison with what they were and that thus the Algerians are henceforth ensured of self-determination as peace is gradually restored. That is a revolution if ever there was one.

With regard to economic development and social conditions in Algeria, anybody can see for himself that the implementation of the industrial and agricultural plan of Constantine has been started and that the Premier has just called attention to this fact. As it sometimes happens that France and progress share the same luck, by a happy concidence, the exploitation of Saharan oil and gas have just given Algeria the necessary means for getting things started. Algerians, take a look at your country as it still is. Soon, I promise you, you will see a very different Algeria.

From the point of view of education, the number of Algerian schoolgirls and schoolboys increased last year, will increase this

year and in each of the years to come by hundreds of thousands so that, before 10 years have elapsed, all the children will be going to school. At the same time, a great effort is being made to train professional, technical, administrative and military personnel. And what value should be given to the number and importance of human relationships, which are constantly becoming more numerous between all France and all Algeria? In these relationships, the Army—in which, I might mention in passing, serve 110,000 Moslems—plays a major role. Intellectually, socially, morally, Algeria is in a period of gestation. A body of young people is emerging there, which includes those who have fought on one side or the other—young people who will want to see the birth and growth of a new Algeria, that is to say, a modern, educated and fraternal Algeria.

As this new Algeria takes shape in body and spirit, her political destiny will appear in the minds and in the votes of her children. I am sure that the Algerians want and will want this destiny to be tied to that of France and that the latter also wants and will want it, because this fits in with the nature of things, with common sense and with sentiment. This is a magnificent task which calls for the efforts of all the Algerians, of all the communities and of the French of France. By comparison, the desperate continuation of combats and attacks appears each day more absurd, because this continuation no longer seems to have any justifiable aim and therefore can lead only to hatred, misery and death.

Yes, blood and tears still flow; yet, Algeria and France are marching together toward the future—a future which, I assert, will belong to everyone and in which no door will be closed.

Question: "Would you like to indicate what is the meaning and the scope of the decision taken by France to withdraw her Mediterranean fleet from NATO?"

This is neither the time nor the place to set forth France's position on how world security and the Atlantic alliance should be organized. Today I merely state that the zone of possible NATO action does not extend south of the Mediterranean. The Middle East, North Africa, Black Africa, and Red Sea, etc., are not a part of it. Who can deny that France may possibly find herself obliged to act in these different areas? She would, therefore, have to act independently of NATO. But how could she do so if her fleet were not available? Without her fleet, how could she carry on any type of action in the regions that I have just referred to?

I observe, furthermore, that the two other great world powers of the Atlantic alliance—the United States and Great Britain—have taken steps to prevent the greater part of their naval forces from being integrated in NATO. I add that Americans and British have kept in their hands alone the principal element of their strength, their atomic bombers.

The fact that France has taken back the power to dispose of her own fleet certainly would not prevent her from using it, should the occasion arise, in a common battle in the Mediterranean. Thus, there is nothing in this change that might weaken the alliance. Quite the contrary. Indeed, I believe that the alliance will be all the more vital and strong as the great powers unite on the basis of a cooperation in which each carries his own load, rather than on the basis of an integration in which peoples and governments find themselves more or less deprived of their roles and responsibilities in the domain of their own defense.

Question: "Mr. President, you stated earlier that the French Government would consider as an act of hostility any interference with the free passage of western troops to Berlin. Would you like to elaborate on this point and say whether you believe that such a conflict could remain localized or that, on the contrary, it would lead to a generalized conflict? What would be France's attitude in the latter case?"

I do not seek to reassure anyone. I see things as they are. I believe that if, in the present state of the world, hostilities broke out, it is difficult to see how it would be possible to limit them. In either case it is a gamble. It is perhaps better to say to each other, "Speak to me of love."

Question: "Given your viewpoint on the question of cooperation and integration within NATO, can you say whether you envisage doing the same thing regarding the presence in the Mediterranean of units of the ground forces or of the air arm?"

Well, you will see what happens.

With regard to the fleet, I have just explained to you what the situation is and the reasons for it. Should other changes occur, you would certainly be informed.

Question: "General de Gaulle, the question has been raised in the last few days of a possible meeting between you and the King of Morocco. Could you tell us what foundation there is to this rumor?"

You may have learned that His Majesty the King of Morocco has publicly expressed the idea that there would be an advantage for both countries in a possible meeting of the two heads of state. I can tell you that my feeling in this matter is the same as the King's. As to the time, the place, the arrangements, and the subjects of such a meeting, you understand that I cannot answer. But I can say that on both sides matters are considered with a feeling of sincere and deep friendship.

Question: "General de Gaulle, does the Government accept the principle of direct negotiation with the FLN (Algerian National Liberation Front)?"

What do you call a direct negotiation?

Question: "A negotiation for a cease-fire."

Premier Debré repeated, in the most formal and solemn way, yesterday and the day before in Algeria that the offer that I made in October of a cease-fire is still completely valid. I do not think it would be useful for me to say it again. It is quite clear and certain.

I would even add that I wonder why we don't come to that, since that is how the unfortunate situation will end.

Bids and Contracts in Connection With TVA Turbogenerators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, recently, I made some remarks about bids and contracts in connection with turbogenerators for a TVA steam plant. Morris Cunningham, of the Memphis Commercial Appeal, wrote a subsequent article on this topic which bears out much of what I said.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Memphis Commercial Appeal, Mar. 15, 1959]

BRITISH FIRM'S CAPTURE OF TVA GENERATOR BID POINTS DISTURBING TREND

(By Morris Cunningham)

WASHINGTON, March 14.—The Tennessee Valley Authority's purchase of a steam turbogenerator from a British firm has spotlighted a situation that is becoming increasingly disturbing to State Department officials.

Simply put, it is the seemingly increasing frequency with which American industries are being underbid by their foreign competitors.

We like to think that American industrial know-how cannot be surpassed or undersold in any field. And in most instances, this is true.

But the growing German and Japanese industrial complexes are proving that it is not always true. Even with our tariff restrictions, these and other manufacturing countries are competing in American markets with American producers.

And in South America and other parts of the world, where the competition is on an equal footing, foreign industries are surging back to recapture their pre-World War II markets and more.

TVA's purchase of the steam turbogenerator was a particularly disturbing example of the trend because of the several significant factors that were involved.

TOP AMERICANS UNDERBID

Foremost was the fact that the American bidders on the contract were two of America's top industries, the huge, $4 billion General Electric Co., and the Westinghouse Corp.

Secondly, the purchaser was a Government agency, whose integrity in the transaction scarcely can be questioned.

But the most significant factor of all was the wide margin by which the British firm, C. A. Parsons & Co., Ltd., underbid the two American companies.

TVA announced the base bids were: Parsons (including about $1,500,000 in duties), $12,095,000; GE, $17,563,000, and Westinghouse, $17,633,000.

However, TVA said that after adjustments for differences in guaranteed efficiency of the machine, differences in escalation of prices, and willingness of the manufacturer to pay specified damages if the machine were not delivered on time, the evaluated bids were: Parsons (again including about $1,500,000 in duties) $13,140,700; Westinghouse $19,453,725, and GE $19,673,780.

Thus, the real amount by which the British firm underbid the two American companies, on an American Government contract, was more than $6 million and nearly 50 percent. And again there is the reminder that, to get the machine into the United States, the British firm must pay about $1,500,000 in import duties.

GE's public reaction to its failure, so far as has been detected, was not an announcement that it will strive for increased efficiency with the hope it can do better next time.

GE CRIES IN AGONY

Instead, GE attorneys hurried to the Federal office of Civil and Defense Mobilization with a petition to block the purchase. It argued that placing such orders abroad would undermine American capacity to make such machines.

Administration sources promptly let it be known that the petition has little chance of succeeding. And TVA, to its credit, proceeded with consummation of the contract.

Why did TVA seek foreign bids? The TVA Board of Directors answered that question with a formal statement detailing the whole transaction.

"For some time," the statement said, "TVA has been disturbed by the rising prices of turbogenerators. There are only three American firms which manufacture large turbogenerators. Since 1951, the prices charged by these manufacturers for such equipment have increased by more than 50 percent, while the average wholesale price of all commodities has increased only about 5 percent. It was this history of price increases by the only U.S. suppliers which led TVA to invite bids from qualified foreign manufacturers as well as domestic ones."

It said that invitations to bid were sent to the three U.S. manufacturers as well as the two leading British manufacturers. It received bids from GE, Westinghouse, and Parsons.

TVA said the Parsons bid was a firm price, while the GE and Westinghouse bids were subject to escalation clauses.

AMERICANS HAD BIG ADVANTAGE

TVA went on to point out that it specified that it would accept the lowest bid from a U.S. manufacturer if it did not exceed the lowest foreign bid by more than 20 percent. This, coupled with the $1,500,000 in import duties, gave the American companies a starting advantage of about $4 million. But, as it turned out, they needed a much bigger margin than that.

Beyond the surface evidence of the American companies' inability to compete, there are some puzzling factors in the transaction.

TVA's statement pinpointed one of these with a careful calculation of British and American electrical industry wage rates, and manufacturing times, which showed that the difference in labor costs in England and the United States on the machine would be only about $1,500,000.

TVA also pointed to the 50 percent increase in turbogenerator prices in the United States since 1951, compared to an increase of only 5 percent in the average wholesale price of all commodities.

Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee, chairman of the Senate Antimonopoly Subcommittee, pointed to the closeness of the GE and Westinghouse bids, and blamed the situation on administered prices.

"Where big business gains an exclusive grip on the market," he told the Senate, "the price goes up, up, up."

Perhaps this is the reason the American firms were underbid so badly. If so, it is more reassuring, from the standpoint of national prestige, than the surface indication that American firms were unable to compete.

But if it truly is the reason, it would seem to merit the further attention of Senator KEFAUVER and his Antimonopoly Subcommittee.

Education and Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS COTTON

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, because it deals with a subject of such widespread interest to the Senate and to the Nation, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Manchester (N.H.) Union-Leader of April 2, 1959, entitled "Truly Remarkable Book." The editorial discusses Adm. Hyman G. Rickover's thought-provoking and forthright book "Education and Freedom."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRULY REMARKABLE BOOK

One of the most challenging books it has been our pleasure to read is Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover's "Education And Freedom". Although the book will draw the usual brickbats from professional "educationists," it nevertheless is a godsend for those who are sincerely interested in bettering American education to meet the challenge of the future.

"Education and Freedom" is a startlingly frank and honest evaluation of what is going into Johnny's head as compared with what should be going into Johnny's head. Admiral Rickover has no time for the progressive educationist's belief in "life adjustment" courses. Citing the challenge of Soviet technological progress, the father of the nuclear submarine says that what is needed is a change in our whole attitude toward education and a determination that our children shall emerge from high school with the proper tools necessary for higher education.

It would be highly presumptuous to attempt a full appraisal of Admiral Rickover's book in one editorial. Simply to mention some of the positions taken by Rickover in his book is to open up whole new realms of controversy: That we should imitate Europe, which was never rich in land or raw materials, yet achieved enormous power, prosperity and world influence "through cultivation of brain power;" that mediocre people belittle any one who is in any way unusual, thus our more gifted children are largely unappreciated and their educational needs unattended; that we waste too much time counting school desks rather than considering "what the children sitting at these desks are being taught;" that we put too much money into marble palaces and not enough into teacher salaries; that our schools do not perform their primary purpose—"to train the Nation's brain power to its highest potential;" that "educationists" have made "misfits" of talented children by emphasizing "the ideal well-adjusted group;" that we have closed our eyes to the advantages of European and Russian education; that the "spirit of (John) Dewey permeates our teachers' colleges and state boards of education," thus influencing "the training of our teachers and the formulation of school curriculums" and making "its pernicious influence felt in the steady deterioration of secondary-school curriculums, the prolongation of elementary schooling, and the denial to teachers of professional status;" that the school's concern should be with the intellect alone and that there is no substitute for a liberal arts education in properly preparing young people in this modern world; that there is a need for national standards, "a national agency to set standards for school curriculums and teacher qualifications;" that we should establish demonstration high schools "to test the advantages of separate education for the talented."

Admittedly, this is a very sketchy outline of the many important points so brilliantly discussed by Admiral Rickover in "Education and Freedom." We have read few books which so thoroughly demolish "accepted facts" about education which are not really "facts" at all.

"Education and Freedom" should be read by every parent, legislator, educator, school board member—and, yes, even by those who feel they have a stake in preserving mediocrity in American education.

Mr. Gore on Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT GORE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Mr. GORE on Inflation," published in the Chattanooga Times of recent date.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. GORE ON INFLATION

Statistically, at least, the recession is over. Business analysts have the figures to prove it.

In dollar value of goods and services, the Nation is producing at the highest rate in its history. The gross national product (GNP) reached an annual rate of $464 billion in the first quarter of this year, about $11 billion over that for the last quarter of 1958 and almost $20 billion above the prerecession peak reached in the third quarter of 1957.

Personal income in February also rose to a record high, $364.5 billion figured on an annual rate. Consumer spending is up 7 percent over last year and expenditures for durable goods even more. Housing starts in February indicated an annual total of 1,300,000, some 200,000 more than the total starts last year.

The employment picture still causes concern. Despite gains elsewhere, 4.7 million workers or 6 percent of the labor force are listed as unemployed. Secretary of Labor Mitchell believes the jobless figure will recede to 3 million by October but few persons outside the administration are as optimistic.

But nowhere does there appear to be an end to the continued inflationary pressures which keep prices high despite an abundance of goods, availability of facilities to produce more if needed and the presence of a labor surplus to man the machines. What we have, as Senator ALBERT GORE recently asserted on the Senate floor, certainly is not the classical type of inflation, defined as too many dollars chasing scarce goods and services.

There is today $143 billion in circulation compared to $129 billion in 1952, Senator GORE said. But the amount in circulation in 1952 was 37.2 percent of GNP while the 1958 total is 32.8 percent. "Thus we have less money today in comparison with total goods and services produced than we had in 1952."

The Senator says the administration's use of monetary control as an anti-inflationary device has in itself proved inflationary. A smaller supply of money and a higher rate of interest, he said, has led major industries to finance expansion from profits swollen by price increases, rather than from borrowing. And, because installment buying has become a normal expenditure by the average person, labor unions have no compunction in asking higher wages when higher interest rates hit their members.

In his address, which he said would be one of a series, Senator GORE advocated, among other things, a stabilization of interest rates for both public and private financing, temporary controls on consumer credit, regulation of prices for basic heavy metals and appointment of a monetary com-

mission to give concentrated attention to the problem on this inspired inflation.

In the turmoil over the Berlin situation, Senator GORE's talk did not receive the attention it deserved. But because he is talking, and talking plainly, about a subject that touches every family where it hurts, he may well receive a better audience when he rises next to continue his series.

Arguments of the National Education Association for Federal Contributions to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Greenville News, of Greenville, S.C., in an editorial on April 7 most ably pointed out the fallacies underlying the arguments of the National Education Association for Federal contributions to education. The NEA has apparently abandoned all hope for our republican form of government and has become a tremendous lobby group for big Federal Government. In order that all the Congress may be aware of the disservice this organization is performing, I ask unanimous consent that this splendid editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEA GIVES UP ON THE REPUBLIC

Teachers and school officials who support the National Education Association may be surprised to learn that their dues money is being used to spread a doctrine of centralism as well as a program it says is aimed at better education.

NEA is no small-time operation. It is a giant organization which officially reported spending $85,788 lobbying in Washington in 1958. This was only some $3,000 less than was spent by lobbyists for the Association of American Railroads.

The greater part of NEA's activities in Washington were devoted to drumming up support for a huge program of Federal aid to education. This is a pet project of the Association and one in behalf of which it apparently will go to any ends.

It takes the position—sometimes tacitly and sometimes quite openly—that the States are on the retrograde, that they are quite unable to support even a minimum school program on their own, and that massive Federal intervention is not only desirable but even inevitable.

Heavily interspersed in the multitude of speeches and appearances before congressional committees which officials of the NEA make are tributes to the benefits of public schooling and dire warnings of the effect any decline in the health of education will have on the United States and its people.

With these latter sentiments no one can disagree.

We all concur with Ruth A. Stout, NEA president, when she says, "We cannot long endure as a domocratic, free, and responsible people without adequate systems of free public schools."

We all agree with Dr. Walter W. Heller, economic consultant to the NEA, when he says, "Higher and higher levels of education are required to supply a literate and well-trained source of military manpower in an age of electronic and nuclear weapons," and when he says that "without gifted and dedicated teachers at every level of the school system, our children cannot be prepared for the challenges they must meet."

But agreement with these premises does not prepare us for either President Stout's or Dr. Heller's conclusions. For their conclusions are contrary to both the spirit of the Republic and a good many of the facts of our present-day life.

Indeed, one is almost forced to conclude that they, and the NEA generally, have given up on the Republic. At least as they depict the scene in their testimony in favor of Federal-aid-to-education bills, they write the death warrant of the States.

The States, they heavily imply, are as outmoded as the dinosaur; queer, clumsy, inept creatures, strangly survivoring in a new world but obviously unable to meet its demands.

Says President Stout: "No longer can there be any question but that the Federal Government must assume a much greater role in the financial support of schools."

(Hush, you dissenters. The NEA has spoken.)

Says Dr. Heller: "* * * the Federal Government has at its command vastly superior administrative resources, division of labor, and the like. No State can match the inherent and adduced resources of the Internal Revenue Service."

(Kindly ignore the rude voice from the rear which shouted, "Sez who?")

In the 42 printed pages of testimony by President Stout and Dr. Heller we searched in vain for some acknowledgement that neither the Federal Government nor State or school district governments have any money of their own. The elementary fact that everything any of them may spend for education (or anything else) must come from the same place seems to have escaped them, incredible as this may be.

But it is from the taxpayers pocket that it all comes. If it goes to the Federal Government, it comes from his pocket; if it goes to the State or to a local district, it still comes from his pocket.

And if his pocket is as bare as the NEA sometimes claims it is, the Federal Government can pick it no cleaner.

The real reason that some States are so hard-pressed to lift their public school systems to the level they would like is that the Federal Government has usurped so many fields of taxation. And it has done so not because of its "vastly superior administrative resources, division of labor, and the like," but simply because a succession of left-wing Congresses has set out to destroy the States by taking away their sources of revenue.

But there is life in the States yet. Not by merely saying so can the NEA kill them. Not all of them are broke—not yet.

One of them, however, almost is broke. That is the State of Michigan and the NEA had the gall to sponsor the appearance of the man chiefly responsible for Michigan's sad situation before a congressional committee.

Gov. G. Mennen (Soapy) Williams was the willing handmaiden for NEA's aid-to-education bill. He echoed their line that the States are "virtually at the end of their financial ropes."

The NEA could have gotten no better authority on a bankrupt State. But the people know that Governor Williams is the man mainly responsible for putting Michigan in that condition. His advice on State finances is valuable only to the degree that it may indicate what not to do.

This insane act was only too typical of NEA's operations. It is a shame the organization doesn't stick to matters of education and leave alone the areas in which it has such an abundance of demonstrated ignorance.

The dues paid by its members would be better spent if it did.

Michigan: Hub of Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAT McNAMARA
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, an article in the Detroit Times of Thursday, March 26, describes how Michigan serves the world as a transportation center.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRUTH ABOUT MICHIGAN—WE'RE HUB OF WORLD IN TRANSPORT

(By Will Hardy)

Michigan's channels of transport by air, land, and sea extend like arms from its assembly lines to points across the Nation and throughout the world.

Detroit Metropolitan Airport, most advanced in the world, is a pioneer outpost for the coming age of jet travel.

Michigan's growing network of highways ranks among the Nations greatest.

The Detroit River, our waterway link to ports around the world, next month will churn from the whirling propellers of massive ocean freighters plying the Great Lakes for the first time with the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway.

Railroads, rising to meet the challenge of competition, are bidding to become links to both land and sea routes in a later-day revolution in their phase of the transport industry.

MORE JOBS AND PROFITS

All these developments are enhancing Michigan's position, already enriched by vast natural resources and ample labor supply, by creating free flowing lanes for the influx of raw materials and the output of our factories and farms.

The value and significance of these developments has been overlooked by the critics of Michigan's economic climate.

The real truth is that, while Utopian goals may not have been reached in all phases of transportation development, Michigan has made steady progress over the years.

This progress means savings to businessmen.

And in the highly competitive world of business and industry where fractional savings in costs per items multiply into millions of dollars in mass production, this savings helps produce profits for management and jobs for workers.

Oft-forgotten is the precept that American communities are built around their transportation systems.

When water transport was the only means of mass movement of materials, our Nation's first great cities were port cities.

In the late 1800's and early 1900's, railroads spurred the growth of inland cities.

Then came the automotive revolution, and highways brought new growth to hitherto remote areas and added to the transportation complex of the cities.

NATION'S NEWEST FOR JETS

Detroit and Michigan, ahead in automobiles, jumped ahead of the Nation in highways.

Now, with the air age blending into the space age, Detroit has soared ahead with dramatic development of the Detroit Metropolitan Airport as the Nation's newest and foremost landing field for jet-powered transport planes.

While other cities across the Nation lagged, Detroit Metropolitan officials jumped ahead, obtained a Federal designation for Detroit as an intercontinental expressway, and with Federal funds, built a 10,500-foot landing strip to handle the world's biggest and fastest airships.

Thus far, $26 million has been invested in the airport. American, Northwest Orient, Allegheny, Pan-American and British Overseas Airways Corp., now operate from the facility. Delta Airlines will begin using it Wednesday.

And the seven airlines still operating at Willow Run Airport are negotiating to make the move.

Except for local tax funds to acquire some of the land for the airport, and Federal contributions, Detroit Metropolitan is a self-sustaining operation. Revenues from airlines will pay off loans needed to finance construction. In fact, airlines will pay taxes to the county.

Meanwhile, there is underway a "shakedown" at City Airport to increase efficiency of operation and refurbish the facility and in the northeast part of the Detroit region, officials from Oakland and Macomb Counties are beginning to work cooperatively with Detroit and State officials to plan a new major northeast airport.

While air freight tonnage has been climbing steadily in recent years, it still represents no more than 1 percent of total freight tonnage in the area, Greater Detroit Board of Commerce officials estimate.

But the prospects for air passenger travel are fabulous.

Meanwhile, in roads, Michigan is making a staggering investment to keep cars and trucks moving freely. The State is currently nearing the halfway mark in a 5-year $1.25 million highway construction program.

This compares with $500 million spent in the 5 years previous to 1957.

Those who claim Michigan is lagging can't bear out their claim in this phase of development. The Bureau of Public Roads rated Michigan seventh in the Nation in total highway construction in 1958, and fourth in construction on interstate highways.

When the current highway construction program is completed in 1962, more than twice as many miles of four-lane divided highways will be completed as were built in the entire period 1905–57.

Nine hundred miles of expressways will connect all Michigan cities with population more than 50,000 and will provide through routes interconnecting 95 percent of the State's population and 90 percent of its industries.

The labyrinth of highways will pump new lifeblood into the core of Detroit, State Highway Commissioner John Mackie contends, and city officials agree.

They foresee a rebirth of industry along the expressway corridors in blighted areas and free-flowing avenues bringing revitalized commerce into the downtown area.

PIGGYBACK OPERATIONS

The railroads, emerging from doldrums in which their percentage of total national freight carried dropped from 75 percent to 48 percent of total volume, are developing piggyback and fishyback techniques.

Three Detroit area railroads have started the piggyback operation in which convertible vans are loaded from truck to railcar and vice versa, intact.

Wabash started the technique here 5 years ago. New York Central began it later, and the latest to announce Detroit area service is Chesapeake & Ohio.

While piggyback now constitutes only 1 percent of rail-freight volume, some experts say it will reach 35 percent in a decade.

Fishyback is certain to follow as port activity in Michigan Great Lakes cities grows with increased shipping through the St. Lawrence Seaway.

Despite belittling charges hurled during the port of Detroit development controversy, shipping is a great and growing industry both in the Detroit area and throughout the State.

Some 27 million tons of bulk cargo were handled through private terminals in the Detroit port area alone last year.

The coming season will tell whether voters were right in refusing to approve the use of public funds for development of Detroit port facilities.

Private operators will be put in the position of proving their contention that they can handle the new shipping potential created by the opening of the Seaway.

Port of Detroit Commissioner Director Carlis J. Stettin has announced that in the first 2 weeks of the navigation season, April 16 through May 3, 40 foreign ships have scheduled stops here.

That's nearly twice the number which docked in Detroit during the same period last year.

FROM ALL OVER WORLD

Half of the visitors will be from 3,500 to 9,000 tonners, newcomers that couldn't ply the Detroit River before because they could not get through the St. Lawrence River.

They will be coming from Alexandria, Egypt; Alicante, Spain; Damman, Saudi Arabia; Istanbul, Turkey, and a half-dozen other faraway places of exotic name and reputation.

A recent decision by the U.S. Maritime Commission subsidizes four U.S. lines to enable them to compete with foreign vessels for the Great Lakes area cargoes.

The import of all these developments—air, land, and sea—puts Michigan in an enviable position now and beckons great promise for the future.

The Foreign Aid Frown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "The Foreign Aid Frown" which appeared in the March 28 issue of the Messenger and Inquirer of Owensboro, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

THE FOREIGN AID FROWN

No sign exists that Congress in 1959 will be any friendlier to foreign aid than it has been for the last several years. So we can expect the lawmakers to bite fairly hard into President Eisenhower's $3.9 billion request.

Conservatives in both parties have a cumulative feeling that the aid program inescapably involves waste. They hope to minimize it by reducing the available total.

Others see cuts in foreign assistance as an easy way to win the economy tag without hurting themselves in the eyes of their constituents.

Some congressional liberals this time are said to feel that if foreign aid is slashed there will be more budget room for new programs they believe the voters want.

And there are those who have taken to objecting not because they dislike foreign aid or see it as an easy mark but because they feel the recent emphasis on military rather than economic help is a mistake.

The truth, of course, is that Congress as a whole grew so hostile to economic aid that it was slashed sharply, and the administration tries to work some of it back in each year by liberal interpretations of the phrase "defense support."

With assaults coming from so many quarters for such divergent reasons, only a miracle or an imminent threat of disaster somewhere among our foreign friends would be likely to salvage the President's whole program.

The program's prospects are not helped by the fact that its proponents seems to have lost most of whatever knack they had for presenting the case for foreign aid forcefully and persuasively.

We hear again and again that the Soviet economic challenge in the world is great, that there is a crucial testing between Red China and free India.

But the words the foreign aid advocates speak lack fire. They don't stir the blood of the citizen who wonders why he should care. The cause is made to sound tired.

The results of the voting in Congress will be tired, too, unless the supporters of the aid program find strong new drums to beat.

Annual Report of the Board of Directors for the Year 1958 to the Members of the America-Italy Society of Philadelphia, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the annual report of the board of directors for the year 1958 to the members of the America-Italy Society of Philadelphia, Pa.:

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS FOR THE YEAR 1958

To the Members of the America-Italy Society of Philadelphia:

The America-Italy Society of Philadelphia was founded in October 1956 with the simple and obvious desire to strengthen friendship and deepen the understanding between these two countries. It is a private nonprofit organization and the achievement of its aims will be arrived at through cultural channels. Thus both Italian and American contributions to painting and sculpture, literature and music, as well as progress in science, are the subjects stressed and highlighted. To this end it arranges concerts and exhibitions, lectures and film showings. Books and magazines are distributed and both Italians and Americans are helped to establish contacts in the other country. The fact that many people feel there is a genuine need for such a society has been amply shown by the magnificent response it has received from the

large and ever-growing list of members and their great generosity in helping the infant society to take its first steps.

Since its incorporation and to date, there are 12 life members, 31 sustaining members, as well as 6 patrons and 244 regular members. This is a total of nearly 300 with an increase of 100 over the year 1957. A glance at the treasurer's report, too, shows a distinct and reassuring improvement of the financial situation over the preceding year. This strong position, both financially and culturally, of the America-Italy Society in the life of Philadelphia owes much to the great encouragement and personal participation of Dr. Giovanni Luciolli, the Italian Consual General His wide knowledge of the Italo-American cultural relations, together with the assiduous help of his consulate staff, has been and continues to be of immeasurable benefit to the development of the society.

The past year also saw the establishment of a permanent address for the society. Through the acumen and quick action of Mr. Frank Carano, our treasurer, office space for the society's activities was rented adjacent to his own law offices. Mr. Carano's devotion to the society has been strikingly shown by the many services he and his office staff perform as an extracurricular and unrecompensed help in the day-to-day functions of the society.

And too, the society was extremely fortunate in securing the voluntary services of Mr. John S. Price III, as secretary. For nearly a year Mr. Price has administered the business and affairs of the society in a manner which is the admiration of all. On his shoulders falls the major burden of general work and to him we owe a great debt of gratitude.

In keeping with the announced aims of the society the past year has distinctly been one with cultural offerings. On February 10, the distinguished Italian author and critic, Persio Nesti, spoke at the Art Alliance under the joint sponsorship of that institution and the America-Italy Society. Being introduc ' by our board member, Mr. Jerre Mangione, the novelist and chairman of the Art Alliance's Literary Arts Committee, Dr. Nesti, of the faculty of the University of Florence, discussed modern Italian writers and their significance in connection with American literature.

A further item of literary interest was the exhibition in March at the Free Library, Logan Circle, of fine examples of Italian art books. On the opening night, Dr. David Robb, of the University of Pennsylvania, gave a lecture on medieval Italian manuscripts, a subject he had recently been working on in Rome in preparation for his forthcoming book.

In the autumn on a date similar to the concert of the Florentine Maggio Musicale Orchestra in 1957, the society sponsored the American premiere at the World Theater of Vittorio de Sica's new film "Il Tetto (The Roof)." The importance and excellence of Italian films in the postwar world is a matter of established cultural significance. We hope to obtain other films during the current year and in the future.

Interesting and valuable as all the foregoing events have proved, it is undoubtedly the spectacular success of the concerts by the Amerita String Orchestra that has brought the America-Italy Society into the front row of prominence in Philadelphia. Now in their second season this group of 16 first desk members of the Philadelphia Orchestra continue to present ancient and modern Italian music for small orchestras to the delight and admiration of the city's many music lovers. To Frank Costanzo, their manager, we owe special credit for his diligent research and for his superb choice of programs. Each concert features the work of an American composer of Italian descent which is in itself a contribution of great distinction. These concerts, apart from being sheer joy for the audience, are the most important factor in establishing and maintaining the prestige of the society.

But as has been true all through history, to maintain an orchestra has always been a luxury. The Amerita is no exception and if we are to keep it—and we must—we must devise some clever way to continue with it and a balanced budget. The 1957–58 season was only in very small part covered by the ticket sales. A most generous benefactor, Mr. Nicola D'Alonzo, gave a large donation which more than covered the deficit. While ticket sales are this year somewhat better than before, there still remains, however, the very real problem of financing these wonderful evenings unless we find other benefactors or draw heavily on our bank balance.

As one of the services to members many Italian magazines and publications have been sent gratis throughout the year, Provincial Art, Italian Scene, the monthly bulletin published by the Centro per Giornalisti Esteri, Italian Affairs, and the very decorative quarterly published by the city of Florence. We hope to be able to continue this feature, emphasizing those publications of artistic value and interest.

Another service, and one which is proving most popular, is the series of Italian lessons now being given weekly in the office of the society. As more members become aware of this excellent course, the attendance will undoubtedly increase.

Through the death of one of our earliest members, Dr. Domenico Vittorini, who was for 39 years a professor at the University of Pennsylvania and author of many books on Italian literature, we have lost not only a fine scholar but particularly a great promoter of friendship and understanding between America and Italy. It was thought fitting that formal recognition of Dr. Vittorini's unique talents should be made and some lasting memorial created. Accordingly, the society has established a scholarship fund, the income of which will make possible an annual award to some student of Italian at the University of Pennsylvania. Under the able chairmanship of Judge Eugene V. Alessandroni almost a quarter of the $20,000 goal has already been raised.

Thus we end the year with considerable pride in the high quality of what our young organization has been able to accomplish albeit in limited scope. For naturally the work of the society would be enormously extended if there were substantial increase in its membership. May I, in the name of the entire board, appeal to everyone who is interested in American-Italian cooperation, to try to the utmost to bring in new members in the coming year. While our main purpose is the deepening of understanding between two particular countries, in reality all fostering of international friendship is a basic force in promoting world peace. May the new Philadelphia society ever keep this broader goal in mind.

On behalf of the board:

HENRY CLIFFORD,
President.

Equality in Military Retirement Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, the problem of equalizing military retirement pay has been troubling Congress for some time. Proposed legislation on the subject which I have cosponsored is now pending in the Armed Services Committee. I believe this legislation should go a long way toward remedying the inequities that now exist, and I urge quick and favorable action on it. The problems involved are complex.

Much has been written in an effort to clarify the issues. In the April 2 issue of the New York Times, I have just read an article on the subject by Hanson W. Baldwin, an eminent authority on military matters. The article contains a good analysis of the situation, and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOYALTY: DOWN AND UP—ATTEMPT TO REMEDY EQUALITY IN SERVICE RETIREMENT PAY REACHES CRITICAL STATE

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

The attempt to remedy what the Services widely regard as a governmental breach of faith has reached a critical state.

The Defense Department sent to the Bureau of the Budget almost 2 weeks ago what a high official described as a neutral position on proposed legislation to equalize service retirement pay. The Defense Department report indicated no objection to the legislation, but neither did it endorse it. In turn, the Department did not ask the individual Services to state their own positions officially. It is known, however, that each of the Service Chiefs has, in the past, strongly urged that retired pay be geared unequivocally on a fixed percentage basis to active pay. In other words that there should be a proportionate increase in retired pay whenever active pay is raised.

It was this tradition that was violated by the 1958 pay act. All those who retired before its passage were given the sop of a 6-percent pay increase. Those who retired afterward receive, in case of a major general, for instance, sometimes as much as $157 a month more than another retired officer of similar rank and length of service. Numerous protests from the Services, from retired personnel, and from other sources have been reflected in this session of Congress in many bills introduced privately by various members of Congress to remedy what has been widely called discrimination and injustice.

NEUTRAL POSITION

It was in response to these bills that the Defense Department's neutral position—in effect, a hands-off attitude—was adopted. The Budget Bureau's position has not yet been forwarded to Congress, however, and when it is, it is likely to be negative. For the principal reason for creating two economic classes of retired officers was budgetary: it was plainly a money-saving reason.

It has been estimated by the Defense Department that equalization of retirement pay would add less than $25 million annually to the military budget in the 1960 and 1961 fiscal years, decreasing gradually to less than $20 million annually by 1972. But the total cost over the lifetime of the legislation might be about $400 million.

There is, moreover, serious concern among some Members of Congress about what has been called by critics the astronomical increase in the costs of service retirement benefits. The total retirement pay budget increased from about $645 million in the 1959 fiscal year to $715 million in the 1960 fiscal year (caused, in part, by the 1958 Pay Act)

and some fear that military retirement costs will soon pass $1 billion annually.

NO CERTAINTY SEEN

Though there is great support, therefore, for righting the wrong that many feel was done to deserving retired personnel there is no certainty, by any means, of majority congressional support for the new legislation, regardless of what position the Bureau of the Budget takes.

The problem is further complicated by the likelihood that, even if the Bureau of the Budget takes a neutral stand on the proposed legislation, it is unlikely to ask for more funds to pay for the increased costs. There is no provision in the administration's military budget requests for the 1960 fiscal year for the $25 million additional required to equalize retirement pay. If the individual services had to fund this out of their budgets without extra compensation other projects would suffer.

Thus again, in this case, as in so many of the current issues dealing with defense, the problem is money. But the basic issue should be simple. The equalization of retirement pay represents money spent—not for hardware, not for bodies, but for human beings and for a principle. Every sort of effort is being made to increase the professionalization of the services and to improve the attractiveness of service careers.

Tradition and principle in the past have amounted to what the services have always regarded as an unwritten contract with Uncle Sam—that retirement pay would always be inextricably linked to active pay.

CONFIDENCE BROKEN

But at one stroke the 1958 Pay Act, which broke this tradition, also broke the confidence of many officers in the word of the Government. What has been done once could be done again. If retirement pay can be, in effect, reduced, or limited, or changed or made all things to all men depending upon the exigencies of the time, the economic security which the services once offered and which other recent legislation has attempted to enhance, could be a meaningless attraction.

It is true that you cannot buy patriotism, nor can you purchase the best kind of officers. But the services will never attract and retain the kind of men they want unless there is loyalty down as well as up, and unless there is a mutual sense of faith and confidence. Man is still the soul of battle, and the righting of a wrong is cheap at any price.

The Turnpike Killer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article on highway safety written by Capt. Singleton Shaeffer, commanding officer, Troop C, District 2, Pennsylvania State Police. Captain Shaeffer points up the increasingly serious problem of permitting automobiles to operate on the Nation's turnpikes and highways with badly worn tires. He sets forth an excellent solution to this dangerous practice. This article first appeared in the magazine Traffic Safety, and was reprinted in the magazine Tires-TBA Merchandising.

THE TURNPIKE KILLER

(By Capt. Singleton Shaeffer)

There's a killer loose on our highways—especially on the turnpikes. This killer was once someone's friend and protector, a lifesaver in an emergency. Now, growing bald and losing its grip, the killer tire has become a public enemy in far more auto accidents than the public realizes.

Police are trained investigators, but too often this killer slips through the net of blame, masquerading under the names of "Too fast for conditions" or "Lost control on curve" or "Hazardous highway conditions." We need to strip off these disguises and identify this killer once and for all.

Bluntly speaking, my stomach turns over when I see a worn tire. It brings sickening mental pictures of the many dead and injured I have seen, spewed over our highways in their grotesque and ludicrous resting places, pinned in torn and jagged metal, horribly festooned with baggage, canned goods and children's toys. I feel the frustrating urgency of waiting for an ambulance which will whisk the broken bodies out of sight toward the merciful hands of hospital attendants. It all seems so senseless in this peaceful country of ours that I feel a compelling urge—even a moral obligation to speak out with what I know about the dangers of worn tires.

Believe me, I do know something about it. I'm no safety expert, but for 32 years I have been investigating auto crashes at the highway level.

First, let me point out that God, in his infinite wisdom, saw fit to place tread on the tips of your fingers. The loope and whorls of your fingerprints were not put there for identification alone. If they were eliminated, you would have difficulty holding a wet glass of water, a cake of soap, or a lifesaving grasp on any object you might reach for. This is a friction grip. On the highway it's called coefficient of friction. It's the difference between life and death on the highway.

My fellow troopers and I conducted the only realistic research I know of on the relationship of bald tires to accident frequency. The reports studied were our own accident investigations, checked and rechecked by competent traffic officers. Our laboratory was the Pennsylvania Turnpike. The results confirmed our belief that we not only had a State problem, but one of national significance as well.

BALD AS YUL BRYNNER

Even in Pennsylvania, with its outstanding program of compulsory semiannual vehicle inspection, faulty tires get by because we don't have a statute requiring tread on tires—only that the breaker strip, fabric or cushion gum is not showing. Amazingly, the spare tire is not included in the inspection at all. In other words, tires can be as bald as Yul Brynner, as long as they don't have a hole showing.

Since our concern with tires began several years ago, we have continued to gather data and experiment with remedial action. With a limited police force to patrol the 360-mile mainline of the turnpike, which carries almost an equal amount of out-of-State and Pennsylvania traffic, it is not possible to main each interchange or to stop traffic to check the condition of tires. However, spot checks were made at itnerchanges, at service areas, or when the police stopped a motorist for any reason. Thousands of written warnings were issued and hundreds were put off the turnpike with tires unfit for travel.

In 1956 faulty tires accounted for 29 percent of the fatalities on the turnpike. The relationship of good tread and weather was emphasized by the record during July and August of that year, when 68 percent of the fatalities involved bad rubber. Our deduction was simply that the 2-month period was unusually wet, coupled with the failure of vacationists to check their tires as thoroughly as they check their fishing tackle. Confirmation of this suspicion came when we visited one of the largest authorized service garages for the turnpike and found that 98 percent of the wrecked vehicles had bald tires. Some of the latest models with original tires were treadless.

In 1957 the percentage of fatalities involving tires was reduced to 19. The record would have been better if a wet autumn had not brought a rash of skidding accidents. As many as five persons were killed in one accident caused by bare tires.

What can be done? Our warning efforts have limitations. It's not primarily a police problem anyway. Controls must first come through proper laws in all States to prohibit the use of faulty tires. We have brake laws. Why not an adequate tire law? It is not enough to make sure your own car is safe. You are still risking a shattering, bone-crushing head-on collision if the other fellow skids into your path.

"WE DIDN'T KNOW"

The blowout, although bad enough to take several lives a year on the turnpike, is not the worst tire hazard to fear. It is the treadless, skidding, out-of-control vehicle that seeks its victims among the innocent travelers going in the opposite direction.

We interviewed thousands of motorists whose tires were considered unsafe. Not bent on killing themselves or anyone else, they had a common answer, "We didn't know they were that bad," or "Why didn't the garageman who inspected the car tell us?"

The No. 1 problem of the superhighways is still fatigue and lack of sleep. The many more thousands of miles of superhighway in the making probably won't change this situation. However, the constant No. 2 killer—too fast for conditions, with its hidden tire problem—can and should be brought under control now.

It is the prayer of those of us who patrol the highways that some immediate action be started among our legislators, safety groups, and administrators, which will end the reign of death of bad tires—at least one known cause of our Nation's traffic toll.

What you can do to help: Contact the State legislator of your district. Find out what protection you have against the use of a faulty tire under your State laws, and, if inadequate, you might suggest as a minimum the following: (1) That all vehicles operated on a public highway have at least a 16th of an inch of traction tread around the entire periphery of the tires, including the spare; (2) make it illegal to offer for sale a used tire not having a 16th of an inch tread as described or otherwise damaged in the sidewalls or casings, making it unsafe for use; (3) make illegal the resale of tire casings for recapping purposes that are not considered sound in the sidewalls and cords; (4) require a semiannual inspection of tire equipment, along with other safety features, that meet all the safety requirements above. Enlist help from local and State safety councils, motor clubs, and other safety-minded groups.

Remember this menace when you read your daily newspaper. It will unfortunately provide at least one tragic story of the mounting toll on our streets and highways. Seek out the real cause of the collision. You will be shockingly surprised how many times the owner of the car at fault was trying to get that last thousand miles out of a junkyard tire, thereby exacting the supreme price we pay for drivers who are not yet aware of the fact that the safest car on the road and its passengers are at the mercy of the worst junk heap that will run, where the public does not demand of its lawmakers the proper controls and from its enforce-

ment officers strict enforcement of the safety of all against the negligence of the few.

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE DEALERS

In a talk with Tires reporter, Capt. Shaeffer said that many tires are being sold today with fancy names that in his opinion were definitely unfit for turnpike driving. It is the responsibility of the dealers, he said, to sell tires of turnpike quality when they have the opportunity. He said he has spoken to many tire dealers and found them as anrgy as he is against the unscrupulous dealer who would recap a bad casing or sell a new or used tire that is unfit for the turnpikes.

"Dealers ought to clean up their own industry," he said. The advertising of dealers could make customers more aware of these problems, he thought.

All turnpike police cars are currently running on premium tires, he said. After experiences such as a new tire throwing a tread after only 50 miles of turnpike driving, all tires ordered have been premium quality. Ohio, New Jersey, and other troopers are doing the same, he said.

Legislation may be passed in Pennsylvania this month, he said, but until then troopers are watching for unfit tires at tollgates and on patrol, ordering thousands off the highways. Drivers are often grateful that their bad tires are pointed out.

In Defiance of Dictators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1959

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article appearing in the April 1959 issue of the VFW magazine, which contains an article by Mr. Robert K. Christenberry, acting postmaster of the city of New York, and chairman of the VFW Loyalty Day executive committee:

IN DEFIANCE OF DICTATORS

(By Robert K. Christenberry)

Let me offer a challenge to all freedom-loving Americans—a challenge that will not be easy to fulfill. It is a challenge to every man, woman, and child in the United States to stand up and reaffirm his or her loyalty on May 1, Loyalty Day.

This might sound silly to some, strange to others, and still others might ask, "Why do I, a taxpaying American, have to reaffirm my loyalty to the United States?"

To me the answer is simple, but to others it may be complex. I have reached the stage in life where I like to look back and recall the good times of days long gone. Days when, as a child, I troubled my parents with childish pranks; or the days as a young marine when I saw the horrors of war at Belleau Wood; or days of the roaring twenties, the hard thirties, and World War II.

But as I look back over all the good and bad I've seen, the better days and the poorer ones, too, I think how fortunate I am to be an American—a free American.

If you take into account the world's population, you'll realize there are very few of us who can call ourselves Americans, and even fewer who are willing to tell the world how proud we are to be what we are—loyal and true Americans.

Every member of the VFW proved his patriotism when he wore the uniform of his country and went to foreign lands to fight for the freedoms which we hold so dear.

But have we, veterans or nonveterans, ever examined these freedoms—freedoms that we take for granted? Have you ever paused to think what you would do if these freedoms were taken from you as abruptly as they have been taken from others? How would you feel if you did not have freedom of speech, or if you could not read the newspapers of your choice? Or could not worship where you please and when you please? Or were denied the right to assemble and, if necessary, petition?

The danger of losing these freedoms is possible, almost imminent, during this age of sputniks and outer-space vehicles. Why? Because we, as Americans, regard these everyday rights as part of our lives rather than as luxuries that most people do not enjoy or have not experienced. These freedoms have become our heritage; a heritage we must defend against all assaults.

As this day that has been proclaimed Loyalty Day approaches, it might be wise for all Americans to examine these freedoms and decide whether Loyalty Day means freedom or whether it is just another excuse to wave the flag.

Several hundred VFW posts across the Nation have indicated they will participate in a Loyalty Day celebration of some type this year. But if you consider the number of active posts in the Nation, this is a poor representation. VFW members know better than most how easily these freedoms can be lost, for they have seen the results firsthand.

In view of the current Berlin crisis, we should realize the importance of a unified country. The die has been cast. President Eisenhower has told the world, "We are not going to give one single inch in the preservation of our rights, and in discharging our responsibilities, in this particular region, especially Berlin." And yet, Nikita Khrushchev says that any "violation" of the East German borders would be treated by Russia as an act of war. Berlin is probably the most dangerous crisis since Korea, and we know that only strength repelled the Communist aggressors in Korea and saved the Far East from the Communist plague.

What would be a better show of strength now, when the country is facing a crisis such as this, than to have the American people stand firmly behind their government over the issue of Berlin? What would be a better way to show the free people of the world that Americans—regardless of race, creed, or color—stand united on this single issue, ready to fight, if necessary, to defend this symbol of freedom—West Berlin—that shines bright amidst the gloom of communism?

Recently Soviet Deputy Premier Mikoyan visited this country. He was accorded a warm and hearty welcome from many misguided Americans who believe that America can deal with these treacherous murderers in striving for peace. Reliable government officials who carefully followed Mr. Mikoyan's visit noted with distress that this dedicated Soviet leader gained the impression that the American people were not solidly behind their Government in either foreign or economic relations. These same officials quickly pointed out that no Communist official from Russia, or her enslaved empire, can fully comprehend our way of life or form of democratic government. From this misconception of our democratic government, Mikoyan has carried the word of "American discontent" to the ears of Khrushchev.

Many military leaders have predicted that if a third world war is to come, it will be brought about by miscalculation. This is exactly what high-level Government officials feel that Khrushchev has done—miscalculated the American people through the eyes of Mikoyan.

President Eisenhower has drawn the line. The United States will stay in Berlin. Khrushchev says we must go. The hands have been dealt, and now each must play his cards. The Soviet dictator believes the American people want appeasement as the road to peace, and that they will not back the firmness of the Government on the question of Berlin.

What would be a better way to show these disciples of the Devil that the American people are united behind their Government than for each person in this country to stand proudly on May 1 and reaffirm his loyalty to Americanism before the eyes of the world? What better show of strength than to have every man, woman, and child pledge allegiance to the flag of this country that is so vividly stained with the blood of Americans who died protecting this heritage we call freedom?

It is time for the American people to take an active part in these negotiations and to make their voices heard in the diplomatic chambers when the final hand is played. We cannot afford to let Mr. Khrushchev throw the entire world into a ghastly atomic war because he has miscalculated our unity as loyal Americans.

We are told that a future war will be too terrible to be invoked—even by the Communists. There is logic in this conclusion, but the stakes are too high to gamble on the hope that logic will always control the mind of a fanatic such as Khrushchev. Certainly all action must be taken to prevent a hot war. At the same time, we must do all we can to win the cold war, for we can freeze to death as well as burn to death.

Loyalty to our country means loyalty to ourselves, and this loyalty displayed before the eyes of these Russian terrorists will play an important role in winning the cold war. It is the concept of freedom—our loyalty to flag and country—that has forged America from a wilderness. The United States is no longer a piece of real estate. It is a complex of deep-rooted traditions and ideals, principles and preferences, a pattern of irrevocable commitments to the past, the present, and the future. The preservation of this Nation depends upon the conscience and sense of duty of its citizens.

For the first time in history, Loyalty Day has become a national observance officially. Through fate, it seems, Loyalty Day could become the strength the United States will need at the diplomatic conferences to prove America values her heritage more than she fears the threats of the Red dictators.

Every American should take an active part in this year's Loyalty Day celebration. If your local community has not planned such an observance, then get started on some type of program. Write to our Loyalty Day office, 610 Wire Building, Washington 5, D.C., We will gladly send you an information kit on how to organize a celebration.

Remember that a few short days after we celebrate Loyalty Day comes the day (May 27) when Khrushchev has said he will throw us out of Berlin. Let's now stand together and show this Red butcher that he has underestimated the readiness of the American people to unite against aggression, and to defend the freedoms we have fought so hard to gain and preserve.

Condensed Version of Speech by Dr. Alceu Amoroso Lima

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following

remarks of Dr. Alceu Amoroso Lima at the Pan America Union on February 16, 1959. Dr. Lima presently occupies the chair of Brazilian studies at the Brazilian Institute of New York University and is one of Brazil's leading intellects.

CONDENSED VERSION OF SPEECH MADE BY DR. ALCEU AMOROSO LIMA AT THE PAN AMERICAN UNION, FEBRUARY 16, 1959

One of the great mistakes of our time has been to consider arts and letters as mere entertainment. Yet they are the true foundation of peace within our hearts and of kindness in dealing with our neighbors.

Another misconception, perhaps still more dangerous, is that culture should serve economic aims or function as political propaganda. Arts and letters are ends in themselves. They should never be made to serve other purposes.

It is in the light of these simple ideas that I should like to discuss the problem of relations between the United States and Latin America. From my personal point of view, there are six major causes for the disheartening decay in inter-American relations.

The first of them, it sems to me, is the ever-stronger feeling of nationalism in our countries. A modern social philosopher has applied to the economically prosperous civilization of the United States a term which has won wide acceptance: "the affluent society." In contrast, Latin America might be said to represent a diffluent society, rather like the clay jug and the iron jug of La Fontaine's fable. Even if we reject the fashionable but humiliating concept of an inferiority complex on the part of Latin America, it is impossible to disregard the sense of distrust awakened in the weak by the strong.

The second cause of the depression in inter-American relations is to be found in Communist infiltration and propaganda. As you know, everywhere in the world anti-Americanism is one of the conventional arms of Soviet propaganda. I do not believe that Latin American communism is an imminent political menace, much less an electoral force. Nevertheless, I see, as does everyone, the strong impact of its unremitting and unappeasable propaganda upon attitudes toward the United States in our countries.

The other totalitarian extreme in politics, fascism or neofascism, is a further obvious source of distrust of the United States south of the Rio Grande. It represents a much more immediate danger than communism. The formal, inflexible discipline of the Communist Party is not in keeping with the Latin American temperament, whereas neofascist trends have close affinities with the personalistic tradition of our dictators. Democratic institutions will never engender communism in Latin America, but dictators may well be the forerunners of commissars. The pursuit of a dictatorial policy in Latin America, even under the common pretext of combatting communism, is the easiest of ways to bring about a Communist coup de force.

A fourth cause of friction in hemisphere relations is a lack of tact on the part of some U.S. citizens in dealing with Latin Americans, whether in an official capacity or in matters of private business. This shortcoming may well be reciprocal. The success of the good neighbor policy at the time of the Second World War, as contrasted with certain previous historical misunderstandings, is a strong argument against any attempt to impose a new way of life on people of different traditions and background. Good relations in this hemisphere will result, not from similarities among Americans of the north and of the south, but from the ways in which they complement one another.

If progress has recently been made in this area, a new difficulty has arisen through the emphasis which has been placed on economic and financial questions to the detriment of cultural relations. I shall return to this point in a moment.

Last, and perhaps least among reasons for the present difficulties, is a fear of increasing intervention by the governments in fields that were previously the preserve of private institutions. The extraordinary work which the Rockefeller Foundation has done in Latin American could never have been performed by persons toiling alone. There could be no better news than that the Ford Foundation is taking a particular interest in the educational problems of our countries. The task of the governments is to support, with funds which not even the great corporations have at their disposal, these efforts which represent the best hopes of real international cooperation.

Each of these questions involved in the achievement of unity in our hemisphere—the unity which is essential to the accomplishment of our mission to preserve liberty and human dignity in the world of today—deserves special attention. However, I propose but one for your consideration today: the importance of cultural relations.

One of the most important steps in the development of inter-American relations was taken at Bogotá, in 1948 with the creation, within the Pan American Union, of a Department of Economic and Social Affairs and one of Cultural Affairs. Mutual understanding among people as human beings is a prerequisite to political or economic unity at the government level. This understanding can come about only through cultural interchange and reciprocal recognition of characteristic cultural values.

One of the oldest sources of misunderstanding in our hemisphere stems from the Latin American prejudice which holds the people of the United States to be materialistic, utilitarian, and lacking in soul. The greatest and most startling surprise that an unprejudiced Latin American receives upon coming to this country is a realization of the importance of intellectual and spiritual values in the life of its inhabitants.

* * * There is a need to expand insofar as possible the programs for the exchange of persons that are being carried out, with increasing success, by certain agencies of the U.S. Government, and, very particularly, by the Institute of International Education. The job done by the latter can only be classed as outstanding.

Another practical matter to which I should like to call attention relates to the kind of people the United States sends to Latin America. Two of our greatest deficiencies are a lack of technical accuracy and a want of cultural methodology. Specialists in these lines can therefore serve as the most effective agents of a true exchange of cultural values between Anglo and Latin America. It is of greater advantage to Latin America to receive young scholars recently graduated from the excellent universities and technological institutes of this country than to be visited by outstanding authors and professors.

As regards the latter, the need is different. It is their writing, and not their presence, that is required for effective cultural interchange. What is called for here is the translation of their books.

There is another practical problem relating to the dissemination abroad of the intellectural production of the United States—a production which is but little known in our countries, and of far greater importance than even the majority of our cultural elite supposes. This is the question of the acquisition of the United States books by Latin Americans. Even when we can afford to buy your books, it is quite difficult to find the books or to make the subscription. The opening of good American bookstores in the larger cities of Latin America would be one of the most effective means of promoting mutual understanding.

Music is deep in the blood of Latin Americas. The United States boasts not only popular music and musicians of world renown but also a number of the greatest symphony orchestras on the face of the earth. I can bear personal witness to the extraordinary impact of these orchestras and musical artists upon the Latin American public.

We must recognize that the only propaganda which produces sure and lasting results is the truth. If, as Socrates said 2,500 years ago, man's first duty is to know himself, his second is to know his brothers in order to love them.

Secretary of State Dulles recently declared that peace through law is better than peace through force. However, there are two other means of achieving world harmony, means which are basic to understanding among men: peace through love and peace through beauty.

Position on National Defense as Taken by the Association of the U.S. Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter of transmittal from Mr. J. D. Ackerman, president, Association of the U.S. Army, dated March 13, 1959, and a copy of a letter which Mr. Ackerman sent to Assistant Secretary of Defense Charles C. Finucane, dated March 12, 1959:

ASSOCIATION OF THE U.S. ARMY,
Colorado Springs, Colo., March 13, 1959.

The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: I have noted with gratitude your interest in our national defense and am taking the liberty of enclosing copy of my letter to Assistant Secretary of Defense Charles C. Finucane. I believe the conclusions contained therein are entirely factual and I trust they are worthy of your support.

Again, our sincere thanks.

This chapter has 4,000 interested members.

Very truly yours,

J. D. ACKERMAN, *President.*

ASSOCIATION OF THE U.S. ARMY,
March 12, 1959.

Hon. CHARLES C. FINUCANE,
Assistant Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY FINUCANE: I am deeply indebted to you for your letter of March 5, 1959, and for your consideration of matters enumerated in my letter of February 4, 1959, addressed to Secretary of the Army Wilber M. Brucker.

I am very glad of your visits to Colorado Springs and Fort Carson because you are thereby better able to evaluate the excellent facilities at Fort Carson and the unexcelled training which is available here through the 9th Infantry Division.

With full faith I accept your statement "that the absolute maximum combat strength and readiness be maintained within

the authorized Army ceiling." Also your statement that "our ultimate goal is to provide the maximum military strength for the funds expended."

I have difficulty in reconciling these statements with certain facts and with present conditions in Berlin. It is a fact that Congress sought to head off the administration's announced plans to trim Army manpower, going beyond President Eisenhower's budget request. Congress provided extra funds to keep the Army at 900,000. Since that level was not made mandatory, the plan as announced by Secretary McElroy is a June 1959 Army strength of 870,000 men. Why not follow the desires of Congress and the judgment of our Army Chief of Staff and other informed military leaders?

Reference is constantly made to a reduction of 30,000 men. Natural attrition would accomplish that in a few months. The schedule, however, provides for the deactivation of a training division. There are now two: the 2d Division at Fort Benning, Ga., and the 9th Division at Fort Carson. If reduction in numbers is desired, the deferment of draft calls would accomplish that. These recruits are not ready for combat for a matter of months. Why not retain our trained battle-ready troops?

Is not the deactivation of an infantry division totally inconsistent with the present world situation and with the declaration of our Defense Department and Army leaders and spokesmen? Under date of March 3, 1959, Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, Chief of Staff, stated: "Any fighting because of Berlin would be with conventional weapons and ground forces. The close proximity of the East and West sectors rules out initial use of more destructive modern weapons."

He further states: "Berlin may require mobilization of the entire nation if the Russians use military force this spring to prevent access to Berlin." General Taylor further stated that a scheduled reduction from 15 to 14 regular divisions would not provide strength. Is this the time to deactivate an old established battle-trained fully equipped infantry division? A division with immediate mobilization capabilities?

March 10, 1959, General Taylor testified his forces were being cut too deeply. He said he would not have enough men to carry out the Army's assigned missions.

Under the same date, Secretary Neil H. McElroy stated: "That the United States expected any fighting that might result from the Berlin situation would be a big war and not a limited conflict."

Does the threat of a big war and mobilization of the entire nation justify in any way deactivation of a combat-ready division at this time? To me it is unthinkable. If this were done the need again arose for that division, it would take months to put it together and millions of dollars to equip it. The division so activated would in no way compare with the capabilities of of our present seasoned divisions.

History has plenty of evidence of our failure to maintain proper armed strength, and its cost in lives and money. I cannot believe that those of you in charge of our security will permit this to happen again.

In Berlin, we have two battle groups of 1,600 men each. Facing these troops the East Germans have an army of 110,000 men. The Russians have at least 400,000 men in East Germany. I wonder what they think when they read we are deactivating 1 of our 15 infantry divisions?

Sincerely,

———— ————,

President.

Junior Chamber of Commerce Honors Outstanding Young Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article entitled "Junior Chamber of Commerce Honors Outstanding Young Farmers" which appeared in the April 1959 issue of Kentucky Farm Bureau News.

The article is as follows:

JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE HONORS OUTSTANDING YOUNG FARMERS

(By C. H. Fields)

On April 6, 7, and 8, 50 of America's outstanding young farmers will gather at Cedar Rapids, Iowa, for the national outstanding young farmers awards banquet, sponsored by the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce, and the American Petroleum Institute.

One of these 50 will be Kentucky's William T. Roark, of Simpson County, president of Kentucky's No. 1 county farm bureau—an outstanding young farmer, leader in his county and State.

This is the fifth year of the junior chamber of commerce's outstanding young farmer program. Each year, the JC's select an outstanding young farmer in each of four regions in the United States. A. D. Sprague, Jr., Sturgis, was named one of these regional winners in 1955, and many of Bill Roark's friends firmly believe that he will receive the honor this year.

BILL ROARK: OUTSTANDING FARMER

According to Barney Arnold, farm director of WHAS, Louisville, who visited the Roark farm in Simpson County recently, Bill Roark believes in being practical about farming. That's why many of the important operations on the Roark farm are electrical or push-button operations.

At the present time, Bill Roark and his father have 315 calves on feed on their 985-acre farm, which they operate on a 50–50 partnership basis. The other major enterprise on the farm is production of Ky–31 Fescue seed. With plenty of good, well-managed pasture, the beef cattle operation has become the principal enterprise during the past 4 or 5 years.

The Roarks maintain a 100-cow breeding herd, and buy 200 to 250 feeders each year. Feeding management on the farm includes the use of stilbestrol, implanted in each steer. An accurate set of scales on the farm helps to keep a regular check on feeding gains. At the last check, the Roarks were achieving feeding gains of 3.12 pounds daily gain and a dressing percentage of 59 percent. Bill says their goal is to feed out 500 to 600 head of cattle for market annually, with gains of 3.25 pounds daily.

CITIZENSHIP AND LEADERSHIP

But Bill Roark was not selected by the JC's in Kentucky as a nominee in the outstanding young farmer award program because of his excellent and progressive farming operation alone.

An outstanding citizen in his community, Bill is an active church worker, leader in local civic clubs, active in the local chamber of commerce, fraternal organizations; and an outstanding leader in farm organization. In addition to his leadership roles in agricultural education, conservation, cooperatives, and marketing, Bill has been president of the Simpson County Farm Bureau for the last 3 years.

Under Bill Roark's leadership, the Simpson County Farm Bureau was last year named as the "No. 1 County Farm Bureau in Kentucky" by the State organization.

NATIONWIDE PROGRAM

The Junior Chamber's outstanding young farmer program is nationwide in scope, but the program reaches into individual cities, where JC chapters select outstanding young farmers (21 to 35) to compete in the State contest. This year, 29 local JC chapters participated by submitting nominations to the State JC organization.

At the State level, the program is operated under the leadership of the JC's agricultural committee, under the current chairmanship of Paul Hamm, county agricultural agent in Boyle County. Members of the State judging committee this year were Hamm, who serves as ex officio chairman; Dale Scott, Kentucky Farm Bureau; J. O. Matlick, editor of Kentucky Farmer; Wilmer Browning, University of Kentucky; and Jack Crowner, farm editor, WAVE and WAVE–TV, Louisville.

STATE WINNERS SELECTED

Selected from the local nominees this year were William Roark, first place; Wayland Givens, Owensboro, second place; and Paul McCubbins, Cambellsville, third. Roark will vie for honors in Cedar Rapids, when four national winners will be announced by the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce.

The Real Early Warning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, long ago it was observed that you cannot see the forest for the trees. In view of our intense present interest in missiles and nuclear weapons, and other defense mechanisms, the observation is particularly pertinent to our everyday problems.

In this connection, a short editorial in the Washington Daily News of April 6, 1959, should be read and, at regular intervals be read again, by lovers of freedom everywhere. The editorial follows:

THE REAL EARLY WARNING

On the subject of alerts and early warning of a Russian attack, you hear a lot these days. It comes at us by way of congressional testimony, learned articles, and speeches. It's both frightening and dramatic.

But, if you want to know the truth of it, ponder the testimony of Gen. Thomas S. Power, commander of our Strategic Air Command, who has told Congress:

"Many people * * * still think they will get warning, strategic warning.

"I maintain that we got our first strategic warning in 1848 when Karl Marx and Fried-

rich Engels published the Communist Manifesto.

"The Communists told us then what they were going to do, and they have been doing it ever since."

Criticism of United States Rising in Berlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks I would like to insert a news dispatch which appeared in the New York Times by the distinguished foreign correspondent Drew Middleton.

This dispatch points out at some length the present feelings of the British toward the Eisenhower administration over the question of Berlin. We seem to have created the impression as a result of certain comments by various of our military leaders that there is nothing to negotiate between the East and West and that a detente between the Soviet bloc and the Western bloc is undesirable. This impression is a mistaken one.

I am sure that the United States is prepared to negotiate with the Soviet Union, but in a manner which will not mean the bartering away of the freedom and interests of the West Berliners and the Western Powers. I am sure that there are many Members of this body and the Parliament of Great Britain that hope that an important and creative role will be given to the United Nations by the powers involved in order to alleviate the present grave situation over Berlin.

CRITICISM OF UNITED STATES RISING IN BRITAIN: OUTBREAK OF PRESS ATTACKS MARS WEST'S UNITY PLEAS—PRESIDENT CALLED WEAK

(By Drew Middleton)

LONDON.—Suggestions that President Eisenhower is too tired or too ill to lead the Western powers at a summit meeting are among the more extreme aspects of a sudden outburst of press criticism of the United States in Britain.

This has developed just when the Western governments, including that of Britain, are emphasizing the importance of unity in the coming talks with the Soviet Union. The criticism is as harsh on the right as on the left.

Malcolm Muggeridge, one of British journalism's stormy petrels, described President Eisenhower as a "poor, meandering old President" in this week's issue of the New Statesman, a leftwing weekly.

A Washington correspondent of the Sunday Express, an independent conservative newspaper owned by Lord Beaverbrook, suggested today that the President might have to resign, since a few weeks' extra work had necessitated a holiday for him.

The succession of Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON might not be such a bad thing, the correspondent concluded. "There could be far worse fates for America and the West," he said.

ADMINISTRATION CALLED "DEAD"

Mr. Muggeridge's view was that "probably no powerful country in history has had quite so dead a Government as the United States has today."

The writer went on to speak of the "benign and platitudinous immobilism" that General Eisenhower represents and to picture the President as an exhausted man. Mr. Muggeridge expressed doubt whether Eisenhower had more than the haziest notion of what Prime Minister Harold Macmillan was talking about during the meetings of the two heads of Government in the United States last month.

This criticism of the President of Britain's most important ally is more extreme than that in other newspapers here. But there is a groundswell of criticism of the United States, and it seems stronger among ordinary people than at any time in the last year.

"You Yanks want us to follow you, and when we do what do we get?" a man in a pub in the New Forest asked yesterday. "We get it in the neck. Look at this B.O.A.C. business. Doesn't anybody have any rights but Americans?"

He as alluding to discontinuance of the British Overseas Airways Corp.'s trans-Pacific flights because of the refusal of the U.S. Civil Aeronautics Board to license them.

MANY PEOPLE ANGERED

This is a relatively small matter, affecting only one corporation. But coming on top of other reports of United States discrimination against British exports, it has angered many people.

Their feeling seems to be that if the United States wants an ally in Britain, then Britain must be treated as an ally, not as a satellite. This may be a gross oversimplification of a complex relationship, but it reflects the feelings of many.

Comments by U.S. generals and admirals on war with the Soviet Union also have annoyed many. The Daily Mirror, Britain's most widely read newspaper, assailed such comments in a front-page editorial last week. Its criticisms were echoed in the Sunday Express.

"Oh, these brass-hatted fire-snorters," John Gordon wrote. The Express columnist went on to criticize American bluster talkers and to attack Gen. Lauris Norstad, Supreme Allied Commander in Europe, for doing his vociferous damnedest to kill any idea of easing the tension in Europe by the thinning out of troops.

The Sunday Dispatch reported that U.S. officials had been upset at Mr. Macmillan's initiative in trying to solve East-West differences.

The general picture offered to the public is that of a U.S. Government opposed to real negotiation with the Soviet Union, dominated by military men eager for a showdown and ruled by a President too tired to act.

These extreme attitudes do not represent the views of the Government. But the Government has done nothing during the present parliamentary recess to paint a different picture of its relations with Washington.

Since intimate relations with the United States are the cornerstone of the Conservatives' foreign policy, this silence has struck observers as odd.

Some suggest that the Government's silence may be a result of its resentment over the reception of the Prime Minister's proposals in Washington. There is considerable concern in some important government departments over the sterility of some of the proposals for negotiation put forward by the United States, West German, and French Governments in the latest Washington talks.

Coal Conference Ushers in Era

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column by Mr. Ray Tucker which appeared in the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of Wednesday, March 25, 1959:

COAL CONFERENCE USHERS IN ERA

(By Ray Tucker)

WASHINGTON.—Several of the once orneriest segments of American industry are now cooperating under a compact that may have a farreaching and constructive effect on the Nation's economy, politics, foreign trade, and the advent of the atomic age. This brash newcomer to the field of management-labor relations is the National Coal Policy Conference.

Not so many years ago, the bloody battles between the coal operators and the miners strained the hillsides and the homes of Colorado, Kentucky, and Pennsylvania. Within recent memory, John L. Lewis was fined $2 million because he as head of the United Mine Workers defied the Government. Harry S. Truman tried to seize the steel plants, over a dispute involving their captive coal mines.

Caught in the midst of these disputes were the Nation's numerous coal-carrying railroads that haul the bituminous and anthracite to the tidewater ports of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, and the Carolinas. When strikes shut down the mines, the railroads and the communities they serve along the seaboard suffered.

Today, these once conflicting interests have united to maintain economic peace, and to act together in advancing the progress of the soft coal industry, including producers, haulers, and users. And the initiator of this grandiose idea was the onetime bad boy of American politics and economics—John L. Lewis.

He was given credit for this innovation by George H. Love, who heads the new conference, and who is board chairman of the Consolidation Coal Co. Joseph E. Moody, president of the Southern Coal Producers' Association, will be executive director of the conference.

Administration leaders hope that this hatchet burying will set an example for other key and concentrated industries upon which the economy relies for peaceful production, profits, employment, stable wages, and prices. Washington has in mind such vital segments as steel, automobiles, maritime operations, transportation generally—in fact, all the activities so essential to prosperity and national defense.

President Eisenhower and Labor Secretary Mitchell, as well as many of their predecessors, have toyed with the thought of forming industrial councils. Under this system, a Government representative would sit in at the bargaining table on wage-price negotiations, representing the public interest.

THREAT IN INDUSTRY

But such a plan connotes the highly objectionable feature of Federal compulsion. The coal conference method may serve as a satisfactory substitute, for it will have many dealings with the Government.

Otherwise, as previously noted here in connection with forthcoming steel negotiations, Uncle Sam may find it necessary to clamp on controls. The undermining of the economy by persistent inflation and the possibility of war with Russia, in the official viewpoint, outlaw paralyzing stoppages of production by management or labor.

The coal operators and union officials were driven into their unprecedented togetherness by several threats to their industry. These include a fall in consumption of their product, oil-and-gas competition, foreign tariffs on their exports and the approach of atomic power. In several areas, they believe that the Government discriminates against king coal.

They have already achieved a few gains. They persuaded Eisenhower to restrict imports of residual oil, which were displacing annual production of 71 million tons of coal. They induced C. Douglas Dillon, Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, to protest against West Germany's new high tariff on U.S. coal, and Bonn's plan to buy from Red Poland. Dillon has been unsuccessful so far, but they are keeping the pressure on him.

They will ask the Federal Power Commission to investigate the rates which the natural gas industry charges for industrial and household use. They maintain that the price to industry is kept low to undersell coal, and that the loss is offset by an artificially high rate for individuals. If FPC continues to refuse their request, they will seek corrective legislation.

The coal operation and union officials also complain about what they regard as plans for premature development of atomic power for civilian use. In 5 years, they note, the Government has spent $500 million on this program, as against only $74 million on coal research during the life of the industry.

Since atomic power costs about 10 times as much as coal, oil, or gas, and since these resources are sufficient for 1,000 years, they will try to persuade Congress and the Atomic Energy Commission to slow down in the atomic field.

Here is how an editorial in John L.'s weekly hails this new movement: "The king (coal) is dead? Who says so? Long live the king."

We Need a Secretary of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, while the people await constructive action which will enable the U.S. Department of Commerce to serve effectively this Nation, the following serious article by Roscoe Drummond appeared in the New York Herald Tribune:

THE MOCK HEARINGS ON LEWIS STRAUSS
(By Roscoe Drummond)

The petty performance which the Senate Commerce Committee is putting on in connection with its mock hearings on confirmation of Lewis L. Strauss as Secretary of Commerce is, it seems to me, a discredit to the Senate and a disservice to decent government, any way you look at it.

What is happening is that by every devious and dilatory device some Democratic members of the committee are seeking to stall the hearings so interminably that somebody, somehow, will be able to turn up something discreditable to Admiral Strauss—or that he will be induced to resign in frustration. He won't.

Of course, the somebody who is most intensely eager to turn up the any tidbit which could be used against the Secretary-designate and who is busily working at it is one who has made an anti-Strauss crusade a personal preoccupation—you guessed it—Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER is not a member of the Senate Commerce Committee. Its chairman, Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, Democrat of Washington, by nature a man of good will and fairness, for some reason seems willing to play Senator KEFAUVER's little private game of "let's get Lewis Strauss."

I am not arguing that Admiral Strauss will be the greatest Secretary of Commerce since Harry Hopkins and Henry Wallace, appointed by President Roosevelt, or Averell Harriman, appointed by President Truman. I am not suggesting that every policy and every action which Admiral Strauss has initiated in a decade and a half of public service has been without error of judgment. I'd almost say he ought to be rejected if such a claim were true. But the facts which are pertinent are these:

Lewis Strauss has served three Presidents with equal loyalty and skill in posts of large responsibility.

When he was Special Assistant to Secretary of the Navy Forrestal, he did such a good job that he was decorated by both the Army and Navy.

When he was a member of the Atomic Energy Commission in the Truman administration, he found himself the lone supporter of the H-bomb, and when he won the backing of Mr. Truman, they together overcame the massive resistance to it.

When President Eisenhower in 1953 was looking for a way to demonstrate America's deep interest in further peace—not just talking about it—it was Admiral Strauss who helped devise and strongly supported the atoms-for-peace program.

At times Admiral Strauss has been a controversial figure. Any public official worth his salt will be.

Senator KEFAUVER, who seems to be biding his time to put in an appearance before the Commerce Commitee's hearings—which are being postponed for his convenience—is aiming to find some way to show that Admiral Strauss had an unethical part in the short-lived Dixon-Yates contract by which a private company, instead of TVA, would provide some power for the Memphis area.

I suspect that Admiral Strauss wishes the Dixon-Yates contract, later canceled, had never been born. But the Department of Justice—which you might consider prejudiced—and the Commissioner for the U.S. Court of claims—who is certainly not partisan and who examined the Dixon-Yates matter inside and out—found no evidence adverse to Admiral Strauss.

And the Commerce Committee's hearings on Secretary Strauss drag on. He was named last November. We are now almost into the fourth month of the present Congress and Chairman MAGNUSON has calmly adjourned everything until after the Easter recess, still waiting obediently for Senator KEFAUVER to unsheath his accusations.

None of this reflects any credit on the Senate.

It impairs the morale of the Department of Commerce.

It makes it increasingly difficult for any President to get able and honorable men to serve the government when a Senate committee shows such calculated discourtesy to an able and honorable public servant like Lewis Strauss.

The National Defense Education Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD, for the information of my colleagues, the following letter from the Rev. Virgil C. Blum, a distinguished educator from Marquette University, with reference to the National Defense Education Act.

The letter points up very clearly certain defects in the act. It is regrettable that some features of the bill discriminate against the children, students, and teachers in exercising their constitutional prerogatives in the school they attend or in which they teach. In other words, private education, including children, students, parents, teachers, and administrators are not properly represented democratically in the provisions of the act.

The objections which the Rev. Virgil C. Blum has to the act might best be summed up by saying that in welfare legislation the Congress should not demand the surrender of the freedom of mind and freedom of religion as a condition for sharing welfare benefits. Congress has shown a respect for the fundamental liberties in its school-lunch program and in providing grants to veterans who are disabled. These beneficiaries of Government aid are free to make a choice of institutional care including care in denominational institutions.

Under the National Defense Education Act of 1958 there is enforced conformity to the philosophical and theological orientation of State schools as a condition for sharing in its provisions. This requirement seems to violate the academic freedom of millions of children and thousands of students and teachers, because it requires that they surrender their freedom of choice in education or in teaching as a condition for sharing in provisions designed to help strengthen the national defense. Hence, in a program originally devised to promote the defense of freedom, the Congress has violated in fact, if not in intent, the civil rights of children, students, and teachers to freedom of mind and freedom of religion in the choice of a school.

MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY,
Milwaukee, Wis., March 9, 1959.

Hon. EDWIN B. DOOLEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DOOLEY: Since I think that it is the duty of every American citizen to do all in his power to preserve our liberties, I am taking the liberty to write to you in defense of freedom of mind and freedom of religion. This subject, I know you will agree, merits the calm and studied consideration of every individual interested in the preservation of the Bill of Rights. It is a subject about which there exists a great deal of confusion. Much discussion is neces-

sary to dissipate the confusion. But an exchange of ideas serves little useful purpose unless it is open, sincere, and frank. So I hope you will pardon me if I discuss the matter of academic freedom with you in an open, sincere, and frank manner.

In our constitutional context freedom of mind and freedom of religion in the field of education constitute academic freedom. This freedom in the search for truth has repeatedly been defended against State invasions by the U.S. Supreme Court. The constitutional principle of academic freedom was enunciated by the Court in *Meyer* v. *Nebraska*, reiterated in *Pierce* v. *Society of Sisters*, and restated in *Prince* v. *Massachusetts* and in *Everson* v. *Board of Education*. Moreover, the fundamental doctrine of the freedom of the human mind from every form of government coercion was emphatically stated by the Court in *West Virginia School Board* v. *Barnette*. Justice Jackson, moreover, pointedly remarked that government must "let men's minds alone."

The Federal Government's relations with citizens should be based on a full recognition of the integrity of the human person, particularly in those things that touch the mind and spirit of man. In all its public welfare legislation Congress should, therefore, incorporate provisions assuring and protecting the freedom of the human mind and spirit. But negatively, in welfare legislation Congress should not demand the surrender of the constitutional rights of freedom of mind and freedom of religion as a condition for sharing in welfare benefits.

Until recent years Congress did not, in fact, demand the surrender of freedom of mind and/or freedom of religion as a condition for sharing in such benefits. Much to its credit it showed a scrupulous respect for the integrity of the human mind and spirit in the provisions of legislation making available welfare benefits for the needy aged, dependent children, and the blind. It showed an equal respect for these fundamental liberties in the school lunch program and in programs providing grants to veterans partially or totally disabled. All these beneficiaries of Government aid enjoy freedom of mind and freedom of religion in the choice of institutional care, including care in denominational institutions.

Nor did Congress demand the surrender of academic freedom as a condition for sharing in the educational welfare benefits of the GI bill of rights, of the War Orphans Educational Assistance Act, and of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. Until last year Congress exercised a sensitive regard for the integrity of the individual person; it did not demand conformity as the price of welfare benefits. It did not penalize the individual who exercised his constitutional rights to freedom of mind and freedom of religion.

But now when our Nation finds itself in a life and death struggle with a government committed to the totalitarian control of the human mind and spirit, Congress for the first time, perhaps without due reflection, adopted a policy demanding the surrender of freedom of mind and freedom of religion as a condition for sharing in benefits which are designed to promote the security of the Nation. In the National Defense Education Act of 1958, it imposed enforced conformity to the philosophical and theological orientation of State schools as a condition for sharing in educational benefits. (Every school has a philosophical and theological orientation with regard to the most fundamental questions of life.) In so doing Congress has adopted a policy, unwittingly, no doubt, that seriously violates the academic freedom of millions of children and thousands of students and teachers. It demands that they surrender freedom of choice in education or in teaching as a condition for sharing in benefits designed to help strengthen the national defense. In a program ostensibly devised to promote the defense of freedom, Congress violates, in fact if not in intent, the civil right of children, students, and teachers to freedom of mind and freedom of religion in the choice of school.

Not even the most absolute of the absolute church and state separationists could object to the cancellation of 50 percent of a loan and interest (under title II of the act) for the independent schoolteacher who teaches physics, for example, and thus helps to strengthen the national defense. How does the partial cancellation of a personal debt incurred while attending Harvard, Southern Methodist, or Wisconsin University violate the first amendment merely because the teacher elects to do his bit to strengthen the national defense by teaching physics at Concordia Lutheran High School? The denial of such personal benefits to the teacher at Concordia merely because he teaches at a nonpublic school is an obvious violation of his freedom of mind and freedom of religion. His choice to teach at Concordia High School is penalized. He is, moreover, forcibly coerced through economic pressure not to teach at Concordia, but at some public school. Such enforced conformity violates academic freedom.

You are undoubtedly aware that the same discriminatory features are found in title V which provides for guidance, counseling, and testing institutes, and in title VI which provides for modern foreign language development institutes. In both of these titles Congress discriminates against teachers who are helping to secure the national defense by teaching in independent schools. If such teachers choose to improve the quality of their teaching by attending institutes they are, unlike teachers in State schools, deprived of the weekly $75 stipend provided by the act because they teach in nonpublic schools. In other words, a penalty is imposed on their efforts to strengthen the national defense in other than State schools.

Since the direct result of this penalty is to obstruct the fuller development of teachers and thus to obstruct the development of better teaching, the result of the discrimination is to obstruct the national defense effort. And yet, ironically, the act is called the National Defense Education Act.

Although under present interpretations of the first amendment direct support of denominational schools would raise constitutional questions, there is no reason why Congress could not by the use of contracts with independent institutions for the performance of specific academic tasks strengthen the national defense. State courts have repeatedly upheld such arrangements, and the Federal Government has repeatedly utilized this method of dealing with denominational institutions for the purpose of promoting the general welfare. Parents of independent school children are now subsidizing the education of their children to the extent of several hundred dollars. The Federal Government could constitutionally make direct grants to these parents to enable them to pay part of the cost of the education of their children. Such grants would not be a subsidization of the schools the children attend; they would merely relieve parents of a part of the penalty that Government has imposed on their exercise of a constitutional right.

These were some of the alternatives open to Congress to secure freedom of choice for independent elementary and secondary schoolchildren under title III. But Congress rejected them in favor of open discrimination against approximately 5 million children. The education of these children will suffer as a consequence. The national defense will suffer. This weakening of our national defense, based in large measure on brainpower, could well be the difference between Soviet scientific superiority and American superiority.

In this age when scientific superiority can well mean world domination, it is not fantastic to say that freedom in America and in the entire Western World may be lost because the Members of the Congress did not have the courage to provide freedom of mind and freedom of religion in educational assistance acts in the face of opposition by individuals and groups antagonistic to academic freedom.

We hope, however, that this Congress will amend the National Defense Education Act to remove the discriminatory features, that it will adopt a policy treating all students, teachers, and children alike regardless of their exercise of freedom of mind and/or freedom of religion in the choice of school. How a Congress that demonstrated such high regard for academic freedom in the Readjustment Act of 1944 and 1952, and in the War Orphans Educational Assistance Act of 1956 could set down conditions demanding the suppression of academic freedom in the National Defense Education Act of 1958 demands an explanation.

The giving of Government grants to individual citizens to enable them to purchase one or other of the principal needs of life violates no constitutional provision. The use of such money to purchase kosher meat, which is meat religiously oriented, or to purchase fish for a Catholic Friday dinner, does not violate the first amendment. The use of such money to purchase subsistent needs at Milwaukee's Home for Aged Lutherans does not violate separation of church and State. Nor did the use of GI grants for the purchase of education in the 474 Protestant, the 265 Catholic, the 5 Jewish colleges and universities of the Nation violate separation of church and State.

These are but a few of the many Federal welfare measures in which Congress incorporated the principles of individual freedom by subsidizing the individual directly and allowing him complete freedom of choice as to where he would purchase the needs of life. Both Federal legislative practice and constitutional law make it perfectly clear that when a person spends a Government grant to purchase personal needs at a shop, store, or institution, Government neither directly nor indirectly aids, supports, or subsidizes the establishment at which the purchase is made.

It seems to me that at a time when our Nation needs every bit of brainpower it can develop to meet the Soviet scientific challenge it is little less than national suicide to discriminate against millions of children and thousands of students in the distribution of educational benefits. And I think you will agree that such national suicide is doubly reprehensible when it is carried out to avenge (so to speak) those who have exercised their constitutional right in the choice of school. While Government experts testify that the Soviet Union could pinpoint cities in the United States with ballistic missiles fired from 5,000 miles away and thus to crush liberty, we cripple our scientific effort by penalizing students who exercise freedom of mind and spirit in attending independent schools. Even while we lag 5 years behind the Soviet Union in rocket and space technology (according to Dr. Wernher von Braun), our Congress spikes the slide rules of thousands of students who, under the first amendment, elect to attend non-State schools.

In our Nation's efforts to meet the Soviet challenge in the classroom, in the laboratory, in the engineering shop, and on the launching pad, we cannot afford, at the risk of national annihilation, to cripple the development of many of our best talents because they are nonconformists in attending independent schools and colleges. While our Nation is making every effort to meet the challenge of a totalitarian state that enforces conformity in things of the mind and spirit,

we obviously should not, through the use of economic penalties, violate the civil rights of millions of children and thousands of students by forcibly enforcing conformity in the things of the mind and spirit.

Confronted as is America with a Soviet challenge that threatens our very survival, it is high time, it seems to me, that Congress put aside the policy of expediency urged upon it by powerful pressure groups, as evidenced by contradictory principles found in titles II, III, and sections of titles V and VI of the defense act, on the one hand, and in title IV, and sections of titles V and VI, on the other hand, and adopt the rule of law that assures to all children and students equal rights regardless of their exercise of freedom of mind and/or religion in the choice of school.

I would like seriously to urge upon the Members of the Congress that in future measures providing educational benefits they be guided by the constitutional principles of the first amendment which guarantee academic freedom, that they follow the principles of freedom of choice which they have incorporated in many other welfare measures, and that they resolutely strive to achieve the national interest by giving to each and every child and student an equal share of educational benefits, regardless of the strong and vocal opposition of groups which are opposed to academic freedom.

You may be sure that I would very much appreciate hearing from you on this matter. Thank you for your kindness.

Sincerely yours,

VIRGIL C. BLUM, S. J.,
Associate Professor of Political Science.

The Real Test of Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "The Real Test of Education" which appeared in the March 31 issue of the Park City Daily News of Bowling Green, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

THE REAL TEST OF EDUCATION

The great stir over the quality and quantity of American education, begun when the Russians stunned us with their sputniks, goes on and on, though at slower pace and with diminished fanfare.

Broad differences exist not only among statesmen and civic figures but among professional educators as to what sort of direction our education should take. The amateurs can hardly be expected to resolve these if the experts cannot.

Whatever the methods and programs that can best serve our aims, we can all agree that what we want is a nation of educated individuals.

As generally thought of, that means people who are well informed, capable of making wisely the choices they must make as the final source of authority in a democracy.

It means, too, being equipped to develop one's own capacities to the fullest, and to take all the rewards life offers.

Yet the word "educated" can take on a meaning above and beyond these things. Many have tried their hand at defining an educated man, and this is an effort that probably will never cease so long as men can think.

Perhaps one of the best tries was made a generation ago by an educator who asked himself, "What is the test of an educated man?"

His conclusion was simple. An educated man is one who allows himself to be guided by proven facts, wherever they lead.

It sounds easy, but actually it's the toughest test imaginable.

It means that false notions, preconceptions, prejudices, fragmentary information, even ideas celebrated and treasured, must be cast out firmly the moment they clash with facts.

If you have believed for 30 years that rain cools off the air, will you accept another idea if scientists demonstrate with ample evidence that it is actually the movement of cool air into a warmed area that produces rain?

By this definition, the man who will accept it, and likewise will accept a thousand and one new notions destructive of his old ideas, is truly educated.

You may or may not agree with this definition. But there's not much question that the man who can pass such a test regularly is a pretty openminded fellow. We could use a lot like him.

The 11th Anniversary of the World Health Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, yesterday, April 7, there was observed all over the world another important milestone for a member of the United Nations family that has probably done more to improve the health of people of all races, and thereby helped to promote international understanding and peace, than any other body in the United Nations. I am referring to the 11th anniversary of the World Health Organization.

As my colleagues will recall, I have been pleased on many occasions to call attention to this most constructive organization—composed of 88 member nations all over the world—whose basic philosophy is that "health is a state of complete physical, mental, and social well-being—and not merely the absence of disease."

Last year the anniversary marking a decade of WHO's founding was especially significant since for the first time the World Health Organization met in this country, for a 3-week session, beginning May 28, in Minneapolis. Shortly prior to that time, Members of Congress had gathered in Washington in an afternoon and evening assembly to pay tribute to WHO; and leaders in American public health, physicians and laymen, diplomats and foreign-policy spokesmen, officials, and private citizens joined in celebrating the decade of WHO achievement.

I should like to add that the public-spirited health officer of my own State of Wisconsin, Dr. Carl Neupert, served in the capacity of advisor with the U.S. delegation to the Sixth World Health Assembly in 1953.

Recently there was published an article in the Barron County News-Shield, of Barron, Wis., which concisely and effectively points out the outstanding accomplishments of the World Health Organization, and wisely emphasizes the vital part played by it in promoting world peace. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Barron County (Wis.) News-Shield, Apr. 2, 1959]

Citizens of Wisconsin, and practically all members of the human race, for that matter, now enjoy better health with each succeeding year—thanks in part to the work of the World Health Organization.

Our present well-being, plus the fact that we can look forward to an even healthier tomorrow, certainly can be credited partially to the accomplishments of this vital, global agency, which is 11 years old on Tuesday, April 7.

The World Health Organization (WHO), consisting of representatives of 88 member nations, was founded on the philosophy that "health is a state of complete physical, mental, and social well-being and not merely the absence of disease."

Following this concept, it began work 11 years ago by tackling the problems of malaria, tuberculosis, and venereal disease control, the promotion of maternal and child health, and the improvement of basic nutrition.

What has the organization accomplished during the few short years since its founding? The answer is much—a 40 percent reduction of malaria from the 3 million deaths recorded in 1948; a 50 percent reduction of yellow fever between 1950–1955, and a marked decline in deaths of mothers and infants, to name only a few.

Though we are a fortunate people compared with those living in many parts of the world, we, too, benefit from the exchange of information and research to find causes, new treatments, and means of prevention of such major afflictions as heart disease, cancer, and many others.

However remote any of these accomplishments may seem, they affect all of us in one way or another. No one would deny that the state of health everywhere has a potential effect on our own.

Thus, by guarding against epidemic diseases elsewhere we are insuring ourselves against the spread of disease in our own country. At the same time we are not overlooking the potent force of health improvement as a substantial factor in furthering the world peace so important to us all. WHO deserves credit for helping us take immeasurable steps in that direction.

Albert "Albie" James Booth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, at the annual dinner held in Cheshire, Conn., by the alumni of the New Haven Boys'

Club, a great tribute was paid to a member of that group who recently passed away—the unforgettable Albert "Albie" James Booth.

"Albie" Booth the athlete won national renown as one of Yale's immortals. But more important, I wish to pay tribute today to "Albie" Booth as a man who went on from the gridiron to become one of his community's most respected and revered citizens—a leader in every field, a man of great moral and spiritual stature who has been an inspiration to many, many thousands of people.

I wish to bring to your attention and to the attention of my colleagues a letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Charles C. Finucane, to Mrs. Albert J. Booth, and a statement issued by the New Haven Boys' Club Alumni Association entitled, "A Free Spirit and Immortal," which will afford us but a brief glimpse of "Albie" Booth.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., March 12, 1959.

MRS. ALBERT J. BOOTH,
Hamden, Conn.

DEAR MRS. BOOTH: On behalf of the Department of Defense, I would like to express to you our heartfelt condolence and sense of loss at the untimely passing of your husband, Mr. Albert J. Booth.

His athletic exploits and continued dedication to the world of sports and physical conditioning, which plays such a vital role in the development of our young men, have long been an inspiration to the members of our Armed Forces. Wherever courage and a personal disregard for odds are admired, his name will be remembered.

Both in 1955 and 1958 Mr. Booth gave gratuitously of his time and talent conducting football officials' clinics for the Armed Forces in Europe. He had graciously agreed to return to Europe again this year to continue his fine work. This splendid contribution is warmly appreciated by the Department of Defense.

It is no small recognition of the esteem in which Mr. Booth was held by the Army and the Navy that he was a respected tradition at the annual Army-Navy game in Philadelphia, having officiated at four games since 1950, including the last three.

With the deepest sympathy, I remain,
Sincerely yours,

CHARLES C. FINUCANE.

A FREE SPIRIT AND IMMORTAL

Most people think of the famous Yale-Army game of 1929 when the name of Albie Booth is mentioned and this is, of course, understandable. This was Frank Merriwell come to life. And of late, his fame as a big time football official and a welcome guest at all kinds of sports and public functions has left a deep impression on all who had the good fortune to know him.

But for those of us who knew him all during the years of his sports playing at the Boys' Club and his career at Yale, he is much more than a popular, famous athlete and public figure. He was an effervescent warmhearted wonderful human being who stayed the same no matter what his surroundings and his companions of the moment.

The incidents we could recount would fill all the volumes of an encyclopedia the size of the Brittanica and still not tell them all. And it is really not necessary. One or two tell the whole story:

It was the practice at the New Haven Boys' Club on Friday nights during Phil Geiger's time to have a fun game after closing hours. Nobody saw these games and there was nothing in it for anyone in a material sense, least of all for the "Mighty Atom". And yet there he was, whenever he could make it, playing just as hard as though he was in the Yale Bowl. And for those of us who helped run the Boys' Club teams after the days of glory during Dick Lovell's regime, we will never forget going up to Worchester and walking into the crowded gymnasium to find that the attraction was not our New England Championship team but our taken-for-granted-in-New Haven Albie, who was such a lure to people everywhere as a symbol of the irrepressible spirit of the freeman. All this attention never went to his head and through it all he kept the same wisecracking, needling approach which kept all those around him warm and alive.

This terrible shock is the supreme test of faith in our belief in the immortality of the soul. And yet, it is not too difficult for those who have been blessed with the privilege of knowing this "Happy Warrior." For in his case it is clear that he will never be forgotten as long as men yearn for warmth, friendship and gaiety. And it is safe to say that he will be alive in spirit as long as there is spirit in man.

Coal by Wire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Coal by Wire," which appeared in the March 31 issue of the Messenger of Madisonville, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

COAL BY WIRE

Development of high voltage transmission of electric power that permits the locating of generating plants near coal mines is described in the current issue of Public Utilities Fortnightly. The article, "Coal by Wire," was written by A. W. Vogtle, vice president, DeBardeleben Coal Corp., Birmingham. People in coal fields like our own will be much interested.

Tracing progress in long-distance transmission of electricity in the past two decades, the article emphasizes the cost advantage of carrying electricity instead of fuel to consuming centers. It also notes that to obtain suitable plant sites near large metropolitan load areas is becoming increasingly difficult and expensive.

Mr. Vogtle points out that impetus to the development of high voltage transmission was originally provided in countries with large hydroelectric power sources remote from consuming centers. The 230-kilovolt power transmission network which Sweden inaugurated in 1936 has now been surpassed in numerous areas, with Russia's having recently installed an experimental line of 630 kilovolts.

As an outstanding example of progress in the field, Mr. Vogtle credits the 345-kilovolt lines of American Electric Power Co. with providing power reserve that bring important economies in capital and operating costs.

Meanwhile, he adds, improvements in mining equipment and methods have stabilized the mine prices of coal to electric utilities and "assure an adequate year-around supply, free of sharp fluctuations for the long future."

Multnomah County Medical Society Celebrates Diamond Jubilee in Portland, Oreg.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, my home community of Portland, Oreg., is regarded as one of the great medical centers of the Nation. This is shown by the generous grant of $1,297,000 allocated this year by the National Institutes of Health for a medical research building at the University of Oregon Medical School in Portland, to be matched by an equal sum from the State government of Oregon. I am proud to have had a role in sponsoring this grant.

Dr. Arthur F. Hunter, president of the Multnomah County Medical Society, has furnished me with the brilliant and witty toastmaster's address made at the 50th anniversary banquet of the society in Portland on May 16, 1934, by Dr. Adalbert G. Bettman. This address was revived recently when the Multnomah County Medical Society held its 75th anniversary banquet on March 21, 1959—a quarter of a century later.

Dr. Bettman's address is worthy of inclusion in the Appendix of the RECORD if only because he mentions one of Portland's illustrious physicians, the late Dr. Harry Lane, who served in this Chamber as U.S. Senator from Oregon, during the years of 1913 to his untimely death in 1917. Senator Lane, an illustrious physician, was a Democrat. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, for that purpose.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON A MEMORABLE OCCASION

(Remarks of the toastmaster, Adalbert G. Bettman, M.D., at the 50th anniversary banquet of the Multnomah County Medical Society, held in the old Hotel Portland, Portland, Oreg., May 16, 1934)

Half a century ago our colleagues established in the city of Portland a new medical society, to fulfill their desire for learning and discussing the latest medical knowledge so that their patients might receive, through them, the best possible medical services.

We are now celebrating that event. The Multnomah County Medical Society by its length of life has proven that an organization with these high ideals can live throughout the years. We are meeting in the same building in which many of its gatherings were held, and in the same room in which its members have often feasted together. We have met this evening to celebrate the 50th anniversary of our beloved society, and to honor the 24 followers of Aescalapeus who gave it birth. Of this noted group three are yet alive and in the active practice of our honored profession, and two of these, Dr. Josephi and Dr. Wheeler, are with us tonight. May they continue many years with the blessings of God upon them.

Let us pause a moment and give thought to each of these pioneer physicians, to those who have gone to answer their final call

with the Great Physician, and to those who are yet with us. I read their names:

Arthur Dean Bevan, Otto S. Binswanger, James Browne, Frank B. Eaton, E. P. Fraser, William Jones, Simeon E. Josephi, G. Cooke Lane, Harry Lane, Kenneth A. J. Mackenzie, A. I. Nicklin, Andrew C. Panton, R. G. Rex, William H. Saylor, H. C. Smith, John Smith, Curtis C. Strong, R. A. Urquhart, George M. Wells, John A. Watt, William B. Watkins, William H. Watkins, Cortez H. Wheeler, and Holt C. Wilson.

To paraphrase the immortal Lincoln we might say: We cannot dedicate our professional society. These men have done it with their daily lives. We cannot consecrate it. They have done it by their devotion to medicine. We cannot sanctify it. For that they have also done by their service to humanity. These far-seeing men and their successors, living and dead, who struggled with disease and who stayed the hand of death have set it far above other civic organization. Anything that we may say or think can have no effect on the glorious past of our society. We can, however, remember and revere those in whose paths we follow. The memory of their lives of devotion to their ideals stands out as a beacon in the night guiding us as we go on with their unfinished labor; a work that can never be ended so long as man is subject to disease, injury, and malformation. It is for us and our successors to forever continue their work, to battle as they battled, with constantly greater knowledge of the conflict, with better and better understanding of the ways of disease and always with improved mental and physical equipment for the struggle.

It is left for us to go on with the fight, to wipe out disease by prevention as well as cure, to lengthen man's years of life and to make them more comfortable.

From these honored charter members of our society and their coadjusters who carried on these many years, let us take inspiration in the furtherance of that cause to which we have dedicated our lives, and which we serve so completely and with such devotion.

Let their example be our guide, and let the members of this society carry on with new scientific facts as they become available, so that man may be freed of disease to live long upon the earth in happiness and peace.

May those whom we serve, in turn follow our example, and give a thought of service and devotion to their fellow men.

Utah Contributions in Connection With the Colorado River Storage Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter I have received from the Secretary of the Interior.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., March 9, 1959.

Hon. WALLACE F. BENNETT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BENNETT: We thank you for your letter of February 18, 1959.

Please be advised that the next annual report will contain, in an appropriate place, the contributions made by the State of Utah in connection with the Colorado River storage project.

Sincerely yours,

FRED G. AANDAHL,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Three Hundred and Fiftieth Anniversary of Henry Hudson's Departure From Holland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, just a few days ago men from three nations watched as a plaque was unveiled at the foot of a tower near the waterfront of Amsterdam in the Netherlands. The inscription recalled that Henry Hudson had departed in his sloop, the *Half Moon*, 350 years earlier on the voyage of discovery which led him to the river which now bears his name.

We of New Jersey, and our neighbors in New York, were highly pleased, I know, to see that our friends abroad have commemorated a voyage which is of special significance to us. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have an editorial from the Newark Evening News of April 5, 1959, relating to this subject, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AT AMSTERDAM

Amsterdam is celebrating the 350th anniversary of Henry Hudson's departure in the *Half Moon* on the voyage of exploration that was to take him past what is now a New Jersey county and up a majestic river both bearing his name.

In the long struggle among the European powers for control of the New World, New Jersey was first Dutch territory, then Swedish, then Dutch again, and finally English. The English lasted longest, until George Washington came along.

New Jersey was Dutch for 30 years, beginning in 1624. Its first Governor was Cornelius Jacobsen Mey. Peter Stuyvesant was Governor when the English took over in 1664.

Dutch influence was never completely eradicated and it has continued to our own time. New Jersey's first Governor after independence, William Livingston, was of Dutch descent. So were Govs. Peter D. Vroom and Foster M. Voorhees. The Dutch settlers produced the still powerful Frelinghuysen clan, notable Senators and judges, including Chief Justice Vanderbilt.

It is appropriate for New Jersey to be represented at the Amsterdam festivities, for they recall its own origins. Its delegates include Donald V. Lowe of Tenafly, which is in the heart of the old Dutch domain, and Salvatore A. Bontempo, the founding of whose native Newark represented the beginnings of English sovereignty. Mr. Lowe also represents the Port of New York Authority. Mr. Bontempo, State commissioner of conservation and economic development, represents Governor Meyner.

They doubtless are finding it a pleasurable assignment. Amsterdam, always picturesque with its stately squares and palaces, its broad Amstel River and miles of canals running past medieval mansions, is at its best in spring. They are too early for the tulips, but everything else that Holland has to offer, including some of the world's best beer and cheese and exquisite cooking, is available.

In Amsterdam they can see what Nieuw Amsterdam might have become, had not the English turned it, perhaps for the worst, into New York.

Analyses of Last Election

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, as was to be expected, there were a great many post mortems held after the election last year which did not come out very well for the Republican Party. Many people expressed their opinions as to the reasons for the apparent change in public sentiment and the failure of some tried and true Republicans to be reelected to the Congress. Indeed the national committee has conducted research work on this subject along with others and, of course, many reasons were propounded explaining the results and various suggestions given as to what the Republican Party should do to regain favor with the voters.

One of the most constructive analyses of the situation was contained in an article appearing in a recent edition of the Washington Newsletter, which is published by the National Federation of Republican Women. It was written by our colleague, Representative JESSICA MCC. WEIS, of New York, and I am pleased to have permission to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Mrs. WEIS is a lady of rare judgment, sound and practical vision, and experienced in the ways of politics; and I hope that the leaders of the Republican Party will take to heart the suggestions she submits in her article and incorporate them in a revised and forward-looking policy for the Republican Party. It is a great stimulus to all of us Republicans to have the benefit of JUDY WEIS' views.

(By Representative JESSICA MCC. WEIS, New York)

From many a pessimist these days one hears dire predictions of dark days ahead for the party, and from the worst of these comes the sad lament that the two-party system itself may be in danger.

I personally reject this kind of thinking; for if there is one thing that I have learned from my years of political activity, it is that the pendulum of political opinion is in constant motion. I do not fear for the life of the party, now or at any time in the future. However, the health of the Republican Party would be improved by a massive dose of political vitamin B. The women of the Republican Party and the National Federation have a great opportunity to help administer that dose. This is the time for some real soul searching and factfinding in order to

start that pendulum swinging once again in our direction.

The Republican Party, as a party, has managed only two congressional victories in the last 25 years, and has rather consistently given ground at every level. Even where we are still winning the margins are growing smaller, and unless we knuckle down and solve the political problem confronting us we are in very great danger of becoming a permanent minority party.

We can no longer delay in facing up to the grim fact of a weak internal party organization, particularly at the lowest, and most important, grassroots level. In 1958 we were simply outmanned, outworked, and outtalked, and in many cases, outfinanced. We cannot logically expect the opposition to be weaker in 1960. Therefore, it is imperative that we become a great deal stronger.

Since the 1930's, the regular party organizations of both major parties have been slowly disintegrating, but in the case of the Democratic Party, organized labor has been willing and able to take over the party apparatus, and today, the Political Action Committees and the COPE organizations of organized labor provide about 90 percent of the political workers and grassroots organizations for their party. We have yet to develop a comparable party structure, and this is the essential and overriding problem which confronts us. There must be a rebuilding of a strong, effective, dedicated party organization, starting from the ground up.

Having stated the problem, which is always relatively simple, it becomes imperative to look around for an adequate solution, and, in this connection, there are several things which must be done—the sooner the better.

1. We must decide precisely what issues we consider absolutely basic, and we then must enunciate them so clearly that every single citizen knows exactly what being a Republican means (and does not mean).

2. We must launch a fearless and constant attack on the inflationary big government philosophy that is motivating a great majority of the opposition. Here again, we must show in easy-to-understand language exactly how the New Deal-Fair Deal philosophy is slowly but surely stifling individual freedom and initiative, breeding a false sense of security, and corrupting those very economic and political principles which made this Nation great.

In other words—taking a page from the advertising industry—we must step up the selling campaign for our own product in two ways—by a clearer and better explanation of what we're selling ourselves, and by an equally clear explanation of what's basically wrong with our competitor's product. No matter how good the product—and ours is a good one—dynamic salesmen are necessary to do the job. Our salesmen must be appealing candidates, responsible, hard-working party leadership, and dedicated ward and precinct workers. This leads to a third important point.

3. We must make better use of our regular party workers, by providing them with solid, sensible, compelling reasons for putting forth more effort. We must instill in them a sense of purpose, a personal motivation for working as hard, and harder, than those who are being paid for, or coerced into, political activity.

4. Finally, not only must we have a greater effort from present party members, but we must actively recruit new membership, and leadership, for the party. At both ends of the age spectrum, we need new blood. Our party has a great deal to offer both the youth of America as well as our older, senior citizens.

In the final analysis, the only real answer lies in larger numbers of dedicated people with real convictions who are willing to roll up their sleeves and do the tough job of careful precinct-by-precinct organizing all over the country. And where is there a greater reservoir of such a dedicated, experienced and devoted group than in the National Federation of Republican Women? Hell hath no fury like a woman scorned, nor can any candidate withstand the onslaught of women when they are righteously aroused to the defense of those things in which they truly believe. The task will not be easy, but if we all pull together and work like mad, we will win; if not, we are in for another licking. The choice is clearly up to each of us.

The Four Horsemen of Cancer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, an estimated 50 million Americans now living will be stricken by cancer. Nearly one-half will recover and live useful lives following application of new discoveries in the fields of surgery, radiation, and chemotherapy. But beneficial results of these techniques are usually dependent upon early detection and prompt treatment.

Dr. Louis M. Orr, of Orlando, Fla., president-elect of the American Medical Association, recently delivered an address entitled "The Four Horsemen of Cancer" before an American Cancer Society area medical meeting in Atlanta, Ga. He pointed out that these "four horsemen"—fear, apathy, ignorance, and quackery—are as deadly as cancer itself. He stated that only education of the public will rid us of these four enemies, which now too often prevent prompt, accurate diagnosis and swift, needed care.

As one who has consistently advocated increased Federal expenditures for research to discover the cause and cure for this dread disease, I found these remarks particularly petinent. Advances won in the laboratory are meaningless unless they are translated into treatment in hospitals and clinics. Public awareness of the nature and dangers of cancer and a readiness to obtain proper checkups and institute necessary therapy are major factors in insuring that the victories of the scientist become victories for humanity.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Orr's compelling comments be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FOUR HORSEMEN OF CANCER

(Address by Dr. Louis M. Orr, of Orlando, Fla., president-elect of the American Medical Association, before an American Cancer Society area medical meeting in Atlanta, Ga., February 21, 1959)

American medicine had better realize it has a new enemy in the fight against cancer. This enemy has been working quietly but efficiently until it now can step forth brazenly into full view. We must destroy this newest but most dangerous of enemies—the four horsemen of cancer.

These four horsemen, as deadly as cancer itself, are fear, apathy, ignorance, and quackery.

Although each can help kill separately, all four are dependent on one another. Should one be slain, the others will weaken and perhaps die. All four are offspring of our own civilization. They prey on those cancer victims who might otherwise have been saved. Byron's famous line: "The Assyrian came down like a wolf on the fold," is a vivid image of the swift stealth of the four horsemen. Too often, the first sign that they have struck is the carnage left behind.

But we should study these evils more closely.

Ignorance is probably the least lethal of the four horsemen today. Ignorance has fallen victim to scientific progress during the last 50 years. But this horseman has drawn a new sabre and rides rampant under a different guise. Ignorance no longer thrives on a total lack of knowledge about cancer, but rather strikes in more restricted areas. People know what cancer is, but for too many, the acquaintance ends there. Ignorance befuddles people over the details of cancer—its symptoms, how to detect them, what can be done to cure cancer, and how to prevent it. Ignorance, however, has engendered two of the other horsemen, fear and quackery. The death of ignorance would cut the horses from beneath its offspring.

Fear, the heir of ignorance, makes its way into our lives over the well-worn roads of misunderstanding, half-truth, gossip, and "hush hush" secrecy. Fear keeps people from consulting a doctor about possible symptoms of cancer, or from requesting an examination. Fear breeds in gullible minds the fool's tale that cancer is like oldtime leprosy. Fear portrays the cancerous patient as a frightful disgusting creature, a social outcast condemned to a lonely death. Fear links cancer with inevitable amputation or dangerous surgery. But fear's worst damage is frightening or intimidating cancer sufferers to hide symptoms from their doctor in the early stages, or to avoid any discussion of cancer that might lead to a better understanding.

Apart from the other horsemen, apathy gallops across the plains and paths hewn by indifference and unconcern—the great American evils. Apathy can sap our strength and weaken the will. When it attacks health care, it greatly assists and encourages the flourishing of a disease such as cancer. Apathy presents a recurring obstruction to cancer consciousness, one that will be difficult to remove. Modern medicine can do little for the uninterested patient.

Quackery is the villian of humanity. It feasts on the fruits of ignorance and fear. Quackery brazenly displays its frauds under the banner of orthodox medicine. Victims of quackery are pathetic creatures. In delusion or desperation, they search for tangible pots of gold at the end of illusory rainbows. They seek rapid, simple or guaranted "cures" where medical science hesitates to speak dogmatically. Their inability to accept medical facts, sometimes jarring, leads them to the doorsteps of those who will promise anything in return for money. They are people whose lives might have been saved through early detection and treatment of cancer, but who have instead wasted precious time, squandered their savings, and perhaps sacrificed their lives because of a smooth-talking, quick-selling quack.

These then are the "four horsemen of cancer." That they should be destroyed is of no importance now. They must be destroyed.

Each one can be wiped out, or its power broken through public and professional education. Cancer consciousness will arm America against them.

Ignorance will be slain by knowledge, communicated to the public by an enlightened medical profession.

Fear will disappear as doctors reach out to their patients, utilizing their close personal relationship to install confidence and a clear understanding of cancer.

Apathy will die only after enthusiasm is implanted among doctors and patients by a vigorous, unceasing program of cancer consciousness and education.

Quackery can be trampled only by the honesty and determination of organized medicine. An open, uncomplicated explanation of cancer and cancer quackery to patients can be spread throughout society. Doctors should let their patients know why this or that "remedy" or guaranteed treatment is phony. And when a doctor must tell a patient that his case in incurable, the doctor should fortify his opinion in the patient's mind with as many different medical opinions as possible. If a patient can be told this unpleasant truth gently and intelligently, it is not likely he will waste hope and money on quackery.

The death blow for the "four horsemen" obviously will be education. I realize there has been a large output of educational material, such as slides, films, pamphlets and literature, which has been used in recent years to awaken cancer consciousness in America. But I think the time has come to intensify the campaign to adopt more vigorous means of reaching all the people and physicians.

The Indiana National Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRED WAMPLER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker, in tribute to the men of the Indiana National Guard for their heroic, selfless, and tireless flood-fighting efforts during the worst flood disaster to strike the State of Indiana since 1913, I am including in the RECORD today an article entitled "On the Flood Front," which appears in the April 1959, issue of the Indiana National Guardsman publication:

Indiana guardsmen had just completed clean-up operations in the aftermath of one of the most weird winter sessions in recorded history when torrential rains suddenly poured down on the State while the ground and streams were still in a deep freeze. The water ran off the frozen ground, filling the streams and flooding thousands of homes, industries and farmland.

The first flood forecast indicated that a flood was in the making but no one predicted that this situation was to suddenly develop into the worst flood since the year 1913. The city of Wabash was the first big community hit by the rushing waters of the Wabash River. National guardsmen were not even requested by the city fathers, as they were hit so suddenly that they were frantically working throughout the emergency period on the spot in a volunteer status.

Gov. Harold W. Handley, realizing that the situation could develop into a major disaster, ordered that a National Guard plane with observers fly over threatened area for the purpose of making an aerial reconnaissance to determine extent of damage and to determine the possible future effects of water on communities downstream. The observers made the flight beginning at Attica and following the Wabash River upstream to the city of Huntington, and then reported to the Governor that the situation appeared worse than what had originally been anticipated.

In addition to the immense amount of water, ice jams clogged the river at several places. The most serious jam was located between Delphi and Logansport. Governor Handley took immediate action and directed that the National Guard be made available for immediate duty, to assist in communities requesting assistance. He further stated that should a community believe that they were in danger, they should immediately inform him in order that he could have the adjutant general direct a seasoned qualified officer be sent to the area to determine what future assistance could be rendered by the National Guard and State agencies.

During a 7-day period, National Guardsmen were called out for duty in Fort Wayne, Logansport, Delphi, Lafayette, Terre Haute, Peru, and Oaktown. The National Guard threw all its resources into this battle to save lives and property. Helicopters, trucks, radios, sandbags, and personnel were a common sight up and down the Wabash River. The acts of humanitarianism and heroism are too numerous to mention here but the outstanding skirmish was fought at Terre Haute.

The Air National Guard, under the able leadership of Maj. George E. Myers, took immediate action when word was received that there was a possibility that the river might overflow the levees at West Terre Haute. Sandbags were placed by the thousands to reinforce and build up existing levees. All this prior planning and work was almost nullified on February 14 when a break developed in the hastily constructed levee, but due to the efforts of an unknown civilian who jeopardized his life by jumping into the river and placing some planks across the break, the guardsmen were then able to throw in sandbags to plug the break. After many days of labor by both the Air National Guard and the Army National Guard the battle was won in West Terre Haute.

On February 17, 1959, the threat of further flooding subsided and a tired, heroic group of guardsmen returned to their homes for a well-deserved rest. The citizens and authorities of the State were once again appreciative of the fact that they had a National Guard in Indiana, and they were officially thanked for their part in this disaster by the Governor, who published an open letter of thanks during National Guard Muster Day.

Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 38th Infantry Division, Indianapolis; Headquarters and Headquarters Detachment, 38th Infantry Division trains, Indianapolis; combat support company, Fifth Battle Group, 293d car, Peru; Headquarters and Headquarters Company, Fifth Battle Group, 293d car, Logansport; Company B, Fifth Battle Group, 293d car, Delphi; Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 538th Transportation Battalion, Terre Haute; Company C, 538th Transportation Battalion, Rockville; Company A, 538th Transportation Battalion, Brazil; Company B, 538th Transportation Battalion, Greencastle; Company E, Fifth Medical Tank Battalion, 152d car, Linton; Headquarters, Headquarters and Service Battery, Sixth Field Artillery Battalion, 151st car, Crawfordsville; Battery A, Sixth Field Artillery Battalion, 151st car, Darlington; Battery C, Fifth Howitzer Battalion, 151st car, Lebanon; Headquarters and Headquarters Battery, 38th Division Artillery, Indianapolis; Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 113th Engineer Battalion, Gary; Company A, 113th Engineer Battalion, Gary; Company C, 113th Engineer Battalion, Gary; 38th Aviation Company, Indianapolis; Battery A, Fourth Howitzer Battalion, 152d car, Vincennes; Battery B, Third Howitzer Battalion, 152d car, Spencer; Headquarters, Indiana Air National Guard, Indianapolis; Headquarters, 122d Tactical Fighter Wing, Baer Field; Headquarters, 163d Tactical Fighter Squadron, Baer Field; Headquarters, 122d Maintenance and Supply Group, Baer Field; 113th Tactical Fighter Squadron, Hulman Field; 122d Tactical Hospital, Hulman Field; Headquarters, 122d Air Base Group, Hulman Field; 122d Air Police Squadron, Hulman Field; 122d Communications Squadron, Hulman Field; 122d Food Service Squadron, Hulman Field; 122d Installations Squadron, Hulman Field.

I regret to say, Mr. Speaker, that tragedy and danger and loss of human life, private and agricultural property, the natural consequences of flood devastation, are still threatening the people of the Wabash Valley area.

The following press reports testify to the continuing plight of the valley and the surrounding territory:

From the Terre Haute (Ind.) Tribune, an April 1, 1959, report entitled, "Mass Typhoid Shots Given in Flood Area," describes the plans being made by the city of Rockford, Ill., to fight the threat of a possible epidemic resulting from the floods in that area:

ROCKFORD, ILL., April 1.—Fear of a typhoid fever outbreak led to plans for the mass immunization today of between 900 and 1,000 persons forced from their homes by the still rising waters of the flooded Rock River.

Flood damage already in this northern Illinois city of 107,000 was estimated by Civil Defense Director Eugene O'Malley at $500,000.

The crest was expected tonight.

The Rock River was flowing nearly 5 feet over the Fordham Power Dam, where most river stagings are recorded. The alltime high was 5 feet, 3 inches in March 1929.

Miles upstream at Beloit, Wis., the river rose about a half foot at the Wisconsin Power & Light Co. dam Tuesday and continued to rise very slowly.

Water to a depth of between 4 to 5 feet rolled around the homes in the exclusive North Park residential area and those in the Shore Drive section. Between 400 and 500 persons had been forced to evacuate their homes.

The muddy waters rolled over Blackhawk Island, 3 miles south of Rockford, to a depth of 2 to 3 feet. The island, about one-fourth of a mile wide, and three-fourths of a mile long, is the site of scores of small homes, many of them temporary structures in which transient laborers lived. About 500 persons were evacuated from the island by civil defense workers.

Plans for setting up a central evacuation center in which to house and feed the evacuees were abandoned after conferences between Red Cross, civil defense and Winnebago County relief officials. The agencies, however, provided housing and meals for all those who were unable to obtain other facilities.

None was injured in the orderly evacuation carried out by the volunteer workers in amphibious ducks and boats provided by the civil defense unit.

Rockford is 35 miles east of Freeport, where the Pecatonica River flooded about 40 blocks during the weekend. The Pecatonica flows into the Rock at Rockton.

The Pecatonica ebbed slowly today, and at Freeport receded from nearly all of the once submerged area.

And, from the Attica (Ind.) Ledger-Tribune of April 3, 1959, the following

item which is headed, "Fourth Round of Floods Rise in Hoosier Streams":

April rains persisted in Indiana today, building up the year's fourth round of floods in the upper and middle Wabash River, but at moderate levels.

The upper Wabash went 5½ feet over flood stage at Wabash Thursday but dropped more than 2 feet overnight.

No extensive damage was indicated from minor flooding expected at some downstream points—4 to 5 feet over flood stage at Lafayette Saturday, and 1 to 2 feet over at Covington Sunday and at Montezuma Monday. The White River may reach flood stage at Edwardsport Tuesday.

The Wabash was already almost 5 feet over bank top at Lafayette and near flood stage at Attica, Covington, and Montezuma.

Gusty northwest winds up to 42 miles an hour blew more rain clouds over the State, dumping another half inch of rain at Warsaw for a 2-day total of an inch and a half. Frosty temperatures in the thirties were forecast for tonight.

The Weather Bureau forecast fair skies and a weekend warmup from the damp, chilly weather, but more showers may fall Sunday, followed by another cool snap Monday.

Rains in the next 5 days are expected to amount to no more than a quarter to half an inch, with a possibility of a new round of showers Tuesday or Wednesday.

Protection of News Sources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the Pulitzer Prize-winning paper, the Medford Mail Tribune, recently carried an excellent editorial written by a graduate of the Columbia University School of Journalism in New York, Mr. Eric Wentworth, on the subject of protection of news sources.

The editorial points out in practical terms the significance of such protection to the functioning of a free press. In the language of the editorial: "Unless reporters can track down these stories and relay them to their readers, the public's right to know is violated."

S. 965, which I introduced in behalf of Senator HUMPHREY and myself, would give explicit Federal recognition to the news reporters' privilege not to disclose the source of confidential information. It is premised on the assumption supported in the editorial that it is "sound public policy to sanction that privilege by statute."

Mr. President, I commend this editorial to the attention of all Senators interested in this important subject, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Medford (Oreg.) Mail Tribune]

PROTECTION OF SOURCES

A possible first step toward a law guaranteeing Oregon newsmen the right to protect confidential news sources has been taken this week.

The Portland Newspaper Guild voted Tuesday night to ask the State legislature for such a law. As proposed by the guild, it would apply to newspaper and press association reporters, radio and television reporters, and newsmen from other publications.

Twelve States, according to the guild, already have such laws.

Why does the guild—and many other reporters—want such a law?

Some news stories, often important ones, must be gotten the hard way—by going beyond those facts public officials or other news sources want people to know.

In accomplishing this the reporter relies on confidential sources—individuals willing to give him the facts he needs, or at least, valuable tips, but who are unwilling to be mentioned or quoted in the story when it is published.

The reporters give them his word he will not reveal his source. He knows how important this trust can be to his helpers—often their jobs are in danger if it becomes known they gave him certain facts, even though the public has every right to know those facts.

After confirming the facts and perhaps adding others, the reporter writes the story. He refers to his contacts as informed sources, or by some other nonrevealing phrase. Next time, these contacts will be ready to help him again.

If in providing the public with information it is found necessary on some occasions to protect news sources, then such protection, being a guarantee of public knowledge, should itself be guaranteed by law.

But this has not been the case recently in New York State. New York has no such law. A New York Herald Tribune columnist, called as a witness in a civil suit, has been found in contempt of court for refusing to name a confidential news source. This finding was upheld by the U.S. Court of Appeals. The case now appears headed for the U.S. Supreme Court.

"We find no reason," the appellate court said in its opinion, "to depart from the precedents, Federal and State, refusing to recognize such a privilege in the absence of a statute creating one."

Should the Supreme Court either uphold or decline to review the appellate court's opinion, a twofold threat is created.

The first is that the precedent will extend to other cases, and may even reach beyond the courts to legislative investigations.

Second, and more important, news sources will begin to run dry, still trusting the reporter but fearful of later implication. The more important or controversial the story at stake, the more likely this would be to occur.

Unless reporters can track down these stories and relay them to their readers, the public's right to know is violated.

Such a law creates a basic conflict. One side is the reporter and his source. On the other is the right of a court to elicit all the facts of a case in the pursuit of justice.

But there is precedent for such privilege. Doctors and ministers, for instance, cannot be compelled to reveal information given them in confidence. In the case of reporters, there is the added fact, that protection of the confidential sources is a protection of the people's right to know. As such, we believe it would be sound public policy to sanction that privilege by statute.

Situations where such a law would come into play are not common, but they are sufficiently frequent to justify affirmative action by the legislature.

It is a right of the people—a right to information—which is at issue.—E.W.

The Heritage of Maloney High School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, April 5, 1959, the Francis T. Maloney High School was dedicated in Meriden, Conn.

It is fitting that this new high school should bear the name of a distingiushed former Member of this House from my State who though deceased is still with us in Connecticut in our memory and respect. Francis T. Maloney represented our State of Connecticut first in the House of Representatives and then in the Senate where he rose to such heights as to deserve the rarely given title of a "Senator's Senator."

It is fitting that this new school, dedicated to teaching our young people educational, moral, and civic values should be named after one whose intelligence, moral integrity, and sense of civic duty was and is a source of strength and inspiration to all of us.

In honor of Senator Francis T. Maloney, I insert in the RECORD the following editorial from the Meriden Record of April 4, 1959:

THE HERITAGE OF MALONEY HIGH

The dedication of our new Maloney High School holds a very special meaning for the people of Meriden who remember with affection and admiration the local statesman for whom it is named. Boys and girls who will enjoy the privileges of education in this building are too young to have personal recollections of Francis Maloney. It is the privilege of the older generation to tell them of the rich heritage of character and example with which their institution is endowed by virtue of bearing the Maloney name.

Like other great statesmen in American history, like all intelligent-thinking Americans, Francis Maloney was convinced that next in importance to freedom and justice is popular education, without which neither freedom nor justice can be permanently maintained. This concept is basic to our American way of life. But education means different things to different people. Francis Maloney had very definite ideas about the value of a classical education in preparation for whatever vocation a man or woman might choose as a means for self-support and medium for contribution to society in general. And those twin purposes for a vocation were in his mind indivisible.

Today, when the public at large is taking a new look at the type of education provided by our public high schools, it is good to look back some 15 years to see that Francis Maloney was not willing to subscribe to the then popular idea that the classics and classical language were for the "grinds"; that the increasing tempo of modern living required concentration on newfangled studies in the "art of living together." He felt that modern education must be tied to the classics, particularly Latin. He believed pleasure and profit in reading modern literature would be limited if not backed by some knowledge of the classical language. In his own profession, the science of government, he said a man was at a loss without some foundation in Latin. "An extra effort is necessary," he said, for the man who has not had the ad-

vantage of early education "tied to the classics."

Because the late Senator Maloney always regretted that circumstances in his boyhood prevented him from obtaining much formal education, the city of Meriden chose to honor his memory most appropriately by means of a living and perpetual scholarship memorial. The Maloney scholarship is awarded each year to an outstanding local student judged to have the potential for serving the community and his fellow men in the tradition of Senator Maloney. These boys and girls who might not otherwise be able to meet the cost of advanced education go out to colleges and universities grateful for the 4-year help toward tuition and other expenses proud of the honor paid them by their hometown and inspired by the example of the man whose reputation for public service earned him such a unique and continuing tribute.

Now the Senator's name is further perpetuated in the new high school which continues Meriden's high standard in educational facilities. Even under the new look beamed at high schools by educational experts such as Dr. Conant, the Meriden High School curriculum measures up most happily to the desired goal. A solid grounding in Latin, basic studies in the classics, the fundamentals of liberal arts, are readily available to young students willing to take advantage of their opportunities. It is with pride that we see the Maloney High School dedicated to its service in the years to come. It is with gratitude as well as great pride we accept its name in memory of a beloved fellow citizen who assessed so accurately the enormous value of the kind of education it makes possible for future citizens of Meriden.

Effect of Federal Interstate Highway System on Virginia's Road Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, when the Senate last year passed the bill to speed up the construction of the Interstate Highway System, I voted against it because I feared such a situation would be created that Virginia and other States would not be able to match Federal funds for the superroad system without impinging upon the very necessary work for other State highways and for the secondary road system.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Virginia's Secondary Road Fund Cut $5 Million—Highway Department Needs $25 Million Increase," published in the Virginia Farm Bureau News for March 1959. The article comments on the actual effect which the Interstate Highway System has had on Virginia's road program and confirms the fears which I had previously expressed.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VIRGINIA SECONDARY ROAD FUND CUT $5 MILLION—HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT NEEDS $25 MILLION INCREASE

Those who promote Federal aid programs as a way of solving State needs are in for a shock.

The Virginia Department of Highways finds itself forced to slice $5 million off of the secondary road fund, and the department needs an increase of $25 million in its overall budget if it is to continue normal operations next year, according to A. B. Eure, fiscal director.

The big reasons for this lack of funds are: (1) matching the Federal aid program and building Virginia's share of the Federal Interstate Highway System is taking 56.8 percent of all the department's money next year; and (2) the severe winter has caused breakup and heavy repair expenses for Virginia's road system.

Eure explained that the cost of building the Interstate System in Virginia is running over $1 million per mile. While the road is being jointly financed by the Federal and State Governments, 90 percent Federal and 10 percent State, it is still draining the Virginia highway budget to the core to put up its 10 percent. Of Virginia's total highway system of around 51,000 miles, about 1,100 miles are in the Interstate System. So, the Virginia Highway Department is being forced, under the program, to spend 56.8 percent of all its money on only 2 percent of its total highways.

FEDERAL ENCROACHMENT

Three years ago when the Interstate bill was passed by Congress, the Virginia Department of Highways was receiving 82 percent of its funds from local sources and only 18 percent came from Federal grants. But in the year beginning July 1959, only 42 percent of the highway department's budget will come from local sources and 58 percent will come from the Federal Government.

In other words, the Federal Government is now in a position to dictate where and how over half of the department's money will be spent. Under those dictates the secondary and primary highway systems in the State are suffering. These two systems include all of the highways in the State with the exception of the main arteries and city streets. Their funds for next year will be cut by about $16 million, $5 million on the secondary, and $11 million on the primary.

If the department is forced to continue diverting funds to the Interstate System instead of using them on the primary and secondary system, the State's highway system and the traditional pay-as-you-go method of financing are in danger.

Eure was asked what it will cost to match the Federal aid programs and continue under normal operations next year. "We'll need $25 million more next year," he said.

UPSETTING FISCAL STRUCTURE

Under the formula developed by the general assembly setting forth how much shall be spent by the highway department on secondary roads, the system must receive a minimum of 30 percent of all State and Federal funds, plus $2½ million, and excepting the interstate funds. Over the years, due to increased mileage and needs in the system, the department had increased the secondary system's proportion of the total funds to over 37 percent.

When the interstate bill was passed by Congress 3 years ago the Department foresaw the problem and began to whittle the percent off toward the minimum. But beginning next year the cut takes the amount back to the minimum. "We realize we're adding insult to injury to cut at this time," Eure reasoned, "but we simply can't quarter the apple anymore. We have cut to the core."

VIRGINIA PAYS

Virginia has been receiving some Federal aid on its highways for many years, but until the interstate bill was passed, the State actually paid more into the Federal Treasury through highway taxes than it received. In 1955–56, for instance, Virginians paid approximately $30 million in Federal gasoline and other highway taxes. Sixteen million eight hundred thousand dollars came back in Federal aid to our highways. But in 1959 we'll get back almost twice as much as we paid. We'll pay in approximately $65 million in gas and highway taxes and we'll get back $122 million.

It is really an ironical situation. All that the Federal Government has it must first take from the people. So the 90 percent, 10 percent matching arrangement isn't so ideal when we stop to think it all came from us in the first place. But it is even worse to think that our own money is being used to force us into a serious financial corner where it may become necessary to curtail the services to and raise taxes on a majority of the Virginia citizens.

PICK BUTLER.

Small Colleges Need Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD G. WOLF

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I am inserting into the RECORD a fine editorial that appeared in one of Iowa's northeastern dailies. This editorial concerns the financial plight of the small colleges.

It is quite clear that small colleges are not getting the kind of help they should receive under the terms of the National Defense Education Act nor are they getting the kind of private contributions which would help these colleges.

The ideals that the small colleges instill in our young people are ideals that have made our Nation great. We should do all in our power to help these colleges stay in the business of educating our young:

[From the Oelwein Daily Register, Mar. 21, 1959]

SMALL COLLEGES NEED HELP

Failure of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to approve a dormitory loan for Upper Iowa University at Fayette sounds a warning note to all small colleges in Iowa and throughout the Nation.

Although Upper Iowa's financial condition met requirements, the Agency denied the loan after preliminary approval, on grounds that Upper Iowa University's financial position could not assume this added obligation.

Dr. Eugene Garbee, president of Upper Iowa University, explains the decided necessity of maintaining small colleges when he points out that, "we give service to a local area. Many small town and farm boys and girls want to stay near home, are actually afraid of the bigness of large colleges. They want to continue their education in an environment pleasing to them." This should be a strong reason for continued support of small colleges such as Upper Iowa University, which is independent and has no church or community affiliations.

Garbee also pointed out that, "one major problem which we face is that of misinterpretation to the public of the aid received by small colleges from various governmental and foundation programs. The public thinks that such assistance is available on request of the college. The refusal to grant Upper Iowa a second dormitory loan is an illustration."

The agency required that the charter of Upper Iowa University be renewed and that the bylaws of the university be rewritten to

meet the agency's approval. The agency also advised the university on other matters and during conferences repeatedly and very pointedly made clear to Upper Iowa University officials that they had not taken the advice of the agency representatives. Subsequently the loan request was disapproved.

Being a small independent college without tax support or organized group support must have influenced the agency decision. Instances have been cited by Garbee where large and tax supported institutions in New York State were granted loans.

The public was thoroughly indoctrinated that the National Defense Education Act would solve many of the financial problems of the colleges and universities. Individual giving to the small college fell off very markedly so the only area where the small college can participate is in the loan program.

Upper Iowa University contends that the small college simply does not get effective help although the general public is lead to believe that they do get all the help they need.

Upper Iowa contends, and we agree that the small college needs a champion in Washington. Too many legislators favor the larger cosmopolitan institutions of learning, to the detriment and almost the exclusion of the smaller colleges.

We are certain that the small college plays an important part in the education of our youth. It needs and deserves our support. Without it, many, many youngsters would not be able to obtain advanced education. And with the emphasis now on the utter necessity for continued education in the light of world conditions, small colleges assume an even more important role.

Surely, they are keeping pace with larger, State and tax supported institutions. They are not fading away. Increased enrollment, improved curriculum and faculties bear out the public desire for small colleges.

But universities in the situation of Upper Iowa, with no tax support, no church affiliation, need help. Government loans are the avenue through which they can survive. We urge that the administration, through hearing from local supporters of Upper Iowa, be informed of and made aware of the need for recognition and aid.

Miss Marlene Brazinski Representing St. Catherine's High School, Du Bois, Pa., Acclaimed as Winner of the American Legion's 1959 Oratorical Contest in the Keystone State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the city of Du Bois, Pa., is justly proud of the oratorical achievements of Miss Marlene Brazinski, winsome and talented daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Anthony Brazinski, who after a series of triumphs at the local, county, and sectional levels swept on to greater victory in being declared the Pennsylvania State champion in the annual oratorical contest sponsored by the Pennsylvania Department of the American Legion.

Miss Brazinski is a senior at St. Catherine's High School conducted by the Sisters of Mercy who for over 50 years have provided the faculty for one of the finest high schools in Pennsylvania. Prior to enrolling at St. Catherine's, Miss Brazinski completed her elementary education at St. Joseph's School in Du Bois staffed by the Sisters of St. Francis. Because of the shortage of teachers, St. Joseph's school was forced to suspend high school classes in 1952, but continued its grade school. The transfer of Miss Brazinski to St. Catherine High School and her splendid achievements scholastically and oratorically reflect due credit on the faculty members at St. Joseph's and St. Catherine's since they have played an important role in Miss Brazinski's life and share her joy in the high honor accorded her.

As Pennsylvania State champion, Miss Brazinski will compete at Washington, D.C., April 10, against State winners from Delaware, Maryland, and the District of Columbia in a national regional oratorical contest sponsored by the American Legion.

It is a pleasure to join with the residents of Du Bois and especially the faculty and student bodies of St. Joseph's and St. Catherine's schools in expressing hearty congratulations to Miss Brazinski and to her fine parents Mr. and Mrs. Anthony Brazinski who have many reasons to be proud of their daughter's fine accomplishments. It is my sincere wish that Miss Brazinski will continue to add to the laurels she has earned through study, zeal, and perseverance.

As part of my remarks I wish to include at this point the prize-winning oration by Miss Marlene Brazinski titled "I Speak as the Living Constitution" together with an article from a recent issue of the Du Bois (Pa.) Courier-Express saluting the 1959 oratorical champion of Pennsylvania:

I SPEAK AS THE LIVING CONSTITUTION

(By Marlene Brazinski, Du Bois, Pa., St. Catherine's School)

Permit me to introduce myself. I was not given on a Mount by the God-Man. I am not revealed law. I am human means. I am the right to life; the right to enjoy liberty; the power to maintain liberty. I am the Constitution of the United States, very much alive, and I plead with you to learn more about me, the bloodstream of your Government. Alive? Oh, yes, my qualities are alive, for they spring from the human heart and soul, and not merely from human intellect. My framers pledged their lives to liberty, when they saw the very light of liberty fading in America as States quarreled and threatened to disunite. These framers were chosen by their States to meet together. They were soldiers, planters, lawyers, physicians, merchants, and judges. Some of them were rich and others were poor. But regardless of occupation or financial status, each was human, and being human each had human failings. They were devoted to their individual States and their own local interests. Those from large States placed their interests in exercising the great strength of the large States. Those from small States shied away from a Union that might make them slaves of States greater than they. There were many clashing interests between the North and the South. Misunderstandings, jealousies, and selfish sectional interests cut off their desperate efforts to agree. Yes; my framers were almost in despair. All of their hearts cried out "Union." But their minds seemed to be overwhelmed.

Would they give up? Would they let your light of liberty die out? Why, I too, was in despair, fearing my outcome, if they decided to call this historical meeting to an end. But, no, at this terrible crisis, Benjamin Franklin suggested that they call upon the Almighty Father for Divine aid in moving them forward together in common sympathy.

And, alas, what their hearts really desired, their minds finally discovered. They found a way to make American liberty secure forever and ever. Their hearts directed their hands, and they brought me, the Constitution, into existence—into existence with a heart and soul.

Where, you might ask, is there any part that throbs with a human heartbeat? Where is my soul? In my every paragraph. All of my parts are mighty links that bind you, the people, in an unbreakable chain of Union. Just consider my preamble. I cannot tell you just whose brain produced it, but listen. It sounds like the heartbeat of my framers. It is the expression of their souls' desire.

"We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union." And why? To make your liberties safe and secure. For what length of time? So long as a human being exists. And for whom? For each and every one of you sheltered by the great American flag.

"Establish justice." Justice—the guardian of your liberties. Justice—the highest aspiration of the soul. Justice, an attribute of God Himself, for He said: "I, the Lord thy God, am a just God."

"Insure domestic tranquility." My people longed for harmony. I insure domestic order and peace, among them and among their States.

"Provide for the common defense." The protection provided by me, the Constitution, is a protection which a wise father provides for his family. Divided, you invite invasion. United, you constitute a nation capable of defending itself in every part.

"Promote the general welfare." Indeed, the promotion of the general welfare by unification of the States is manifested in nearly all of my paragraphs.

And finally, my preamble declares that I was established to "secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity." Who are you? You are but the posterity of the great souls who brought forth your perpetual liberty. Can you say that the forefathers of America were selfish and heartless men, when 150 years ago they were thinking of you, their posterity and their heirs? Are you, John Brown, and you, Mary Smith, equally foresighted? Do you think about the posterity that will live 150 years from now? If you are ready to pledge your lives, your fortunes, and your sacred honor for your distant posterity, you are worthy of the forefathers who did that much for you.

Summed up, my preamble declares that your forefathers sought union, justice, tranquility, safety, welfare, and liberty.

Yes, it was a difficult beginning, but it was worth it, for my every word serves to safeguard you in your life, your liberty, and your pursuit of happiness.

My people, look at me and study me very carefully, and then tell me that you could not say with truth and price: "This was made for me. It is my fortress. When danger threatens my life or liberty I can take refuge in this, the Constitution. Into that fortress neither President nor Congress nor armies nor mobs, can enter and take away my life or liberty."

Look at me, my people, and tell me that you cannot be justly proud of your form of government, as you see many other countries

shifting to the right or to the left, toward communism or fascism.

Communism—a strong and fearful voice that teaches: "Nothing ever existed but matter, and that plants, animals, and men are the results of the blind interworking of the forces of matter. There is no place for religious beliefs. Atheism is the word. Capture youth with doctrines of darkness and hate. Abolish all private property. Extend this plan of government throughout the world."

Fascism—a voice that teaches: "Everything should be subservient to the national state. That among men, races, and nations there are degrees of superiority, and thus; there is one greatest nation, one greatest race, one greatest man. Private ownership should be permitted only as long as the owners belong to the superior race and obey the state. Extreme dictatorship is the only way to run a country."

Americans, which would you prefer? Communism or fascism? Or would you reject both, as any sane and sensible person would do? Do you now realize how privileged you are to be an American, and to live under your type of government, democracy, the government of which I am the bloodstream—the type of government which guarantees freedom of speech, freedom to assemble, free business enterprise, and freedom to love your God outwardly. The Communist and the Fascist both assert that all of these freedoms are drastic maladies. Each prescribes a different cure for the maladies, but either cure would produce the same result—the destruction of man's freedom. You should ponder well before answering Americans, and then say: "Thanks, but I'm not quite that sick. Besides, the condition of the patients who have tried your medicine—Russia, Italy, Germany, Egypt—show no sign of being cured. And if they are cured, then I think your cure is worse than the disease."

Being a living Constitution, I am subject, as are all living things, to error, failings, and sickness. At the same time I am able to grow and adapt myself to changing conditions. The fact that I have attained the age of 150 years, having lived through wars and turmoil of all sorts, proves that I am essentially a healthy organism. And that I can continue to serve my people for generations to come.

But, my people, I cannot do it alone. I plead with you, help to protect me from the foes that would kill me. Americans, see to it that I remain a living Constitution.

[From the Du Bois (Pa.) Courier-Express]

ST. CATHERINE'S SENIOR ACCLAIMED BEST IN STATE

Miss Marlene Brazinski, a senior at St. Catherine's High School and daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Anthony Brazinski, of 406 South Avenue, DuBois, gained the highest oratorical honors in Pennsylvania last evening when she won first place in the American Legion's 1959 finals in State competition held at Pennsylvania State University.

Miss Brazinski gained the right to compete for State laurels after having top honors in local, bicounty, and sectional competition which has covered a period of the past several months. In winning State honors, and representing the central division of the State, she competed against Gerald Miller, of the Norristown Senior High School, the eastern division finalist, and Elaine Nedlich, of St. Rosalie High School, Pittsburgh, the western district finalist.

Miss Brazinski in her prepared address spoke on "The Living Constitution" and in her extemporaneous talk on article 1 of the U.S. Constitution. Her address, as well as those of the other two contestants, was carried on WCED last evening.

The State finals in the Legion's oratorical contest were held in the Hetzel Union Assembly Hall and found several hundred persons in attendance. Judges for the competition were Prof. Robert Galbraith, professor of English composition; Mrs. Helen Hayes, representing the Federation of Women's Clubs; Dr. Paul D. Holtzman, associate professor of speech; Hon. Harry W. Price, Jr., representative in the general assembly; and Paul W. Rider, a counselor at law. Presiding was Clarence Ebert, department chairman of the oratorical contest. In addition to the judges and presiding officers there were also present official personnel of the district and State American Legion and official personnel of Pennsylvania State University.

As a result of winning the highest State honors Miss Brazinski will be awarded a 4-year scholarship in any one of four universities of her choice in Pennsylvania and will be eligible to compete for national honors in further competition under the sponsorship of the American Legion. She favors Penn State at the moment.

Sectional competition for national honors will take place in Baltimore and winners in these divisions will meet in national honors in San Francisco later in the summer.

"I want to thank the many persons in Du Bois who have encouraged me," Miss Brazinski said after last night's talk-off.

Du Bois has consistently produced winners in the district and sectional contest but this is the first State champion. Marlene transferred to St. Catherine's school after receiving her elementary education at St. Joseph's school.

So while Du Bois missed having a State champion in athletics, it snared another highly coveted State crown.

The Last Will of Capt. Henry T. Waskow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Ernie Pyle, one of World War II's best known correspondents, once wrote:

In this war, I have known a lot of officers who were loved and respected by the soldiers under them. But never have I crossed the trail of any man as beloved as Capt. Henry T. Waskow of Belton, Tex.

And Captain Waskow once wrote:

Try to live a life of service—to help someone wherever you are or whatever you may be—take it from me, you can get happiness out of that more than anything in life.

The latter quotation was from Captain Waskow's last will and testament. He was killed December 14, 1943, defending his country on a battlefield called San Pietro Hill in Italy.

Captain Waskow's final words were recently published for the first time and his feelings concerning his service to God and his country can give all Americans pause and then deep humility and inspiration.

Woody Montgomery, a reporter for the Temple, (Tex.) Daily Telegram, obtained permission to publish Captain Waskow's last will and testament in the newspaper.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the last will and testament of Henry T. Waskow along with Mr. Montgomery's story which appeared in the Daily Telegram for Sunday, April 5, 1959, under the heading, "Family Reveals to Telegram Final Letter from Capt. Henry T. Waskow."

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Temple Daily Telegram, Apr. 5, 1959]

FAMILY REVEALS TO TELEGRAM FINAL LETTER FROM CAPT. HENRY T. WASKOW—BELOVED BELTON SOLDIER, ONE OF WAR'S MOST FAMOUS

(By Woody Montgomery)

Capt. Henry T. Waskow, one of the Nation's most famed soldiers of World War II, was killed on the battlefield in Italy December 14, 1943, and he was buried where he died, along with the men who had served with and under him.

The deeds of the 25-year-old captain from Belton and the story of his death were spread over the front pages of practically every newspaper in the United States and in many foreign countries.

Ernie Pyle, the war's best known correspondent, wrote the tender and moving story of Waskow's death in a dispatch from Italy after watching scores of enlisted men—and officers—who stopped at the body and expressed their feelings over his death.

Since that time, the Captain Waskow story has been reprinted in many books and newspapers and became the basis for the movie, "GI Joe."

The Veterans of Foreign Wars Post 4008 was formed in Belton in 1948 and named in honor of the Bell County soldier.

The War Department's telegram to the Waskow family, telling of the captain's death, came on December 29, 1943. The grief touched every member of the family deep in their hearts and was too much for Captain Henry's mother, Mrs. Frank C. Waskow. She died in February of a broken heart.

Newspapers, magazine and feature writers constantly sought out members of the family for information concerning the captain. They used the smallest bit of information and finally only one shred was left—the last will and testament of Capt. Henry T. Waskow.

The family regarded the cherished letter as so personal they vowed to keep it from the prying eyes of the public until it in itself might help some mother or her soldier son.

Last December 8, Captain Waskow's father died, not in such a brief time as the mother, but just as surely, of a broken heart for a son who had given his life in the defense of his country.

Recently, I had the privilege of being the first person outside the Waskow family to read the last will and testament of Capt. Henry A. Waskow. With deep humility, I prevailed upon the family to release the text of the cherished letter to the world, so that others might know why the captain was loved by so many men.

Still living are his brothers, August, who also was in the 36th Division and was wounded the day before his captain brother was killed, Paul, John, and George; and his sisters, Mrs. Estelle Barr, Mrs. T. H. Barr, and Mrs. Albert Tippit.

The brothers and sisters consented to allow the will to be presented in the hopes it would bring comfort to someone, somewhere—perhaps a mother who lost a son, or a soldier now serving in the same defense of his country.

"It's a great relief to unburden ourselves of the last shred of personal connection with Henry and to allow others to know

why he was worshiped by so many," a member of the family said.

To most people, he was just a hometown boy, grabbed up in defense of his country—just as so many others were. But they really didn't know Capt. Henry T. Waskow, company commander at the age of 25 when he was killed in action on San Pietro Hill in northern Italy.

Few persons remember Henry graduating at Belton High School in 1935 with the highest of honors. Only the family knew what a struggle it had been to see him through Temple Junior College and how he worked long hours to pay his own way.

In 1937, he was graduated after winning second place in the State oratory contest. He took other honors, too.

Few knew the times he had hitch-hiked from Waxahachie, while attending Trinity University there, to attend National Guard drills in Belton.

Henry was graduated from Trinity with a B.S. degree, major in English and minors in Spanish, history, and speech. But for 21-year-old teachers, there was little need, so he was a substitute in his hometown.

That's what he was doing when the National Guard's Company I, 143d Infantry, 36th Division was mobilized in 1940.

He was Corporal Waskow then and was sent to Camp Bowie for training. The men of Company I sweated it out just as much as Henry or his family when he took an examination for officers' training school.

Finally, in 1941, he was commissioned a second lieutenant and returned to his old company at Camp Bowie. It was a great day for the entire outfit—officers and enlisted men alike.

Then came a bitter pill for Henry—or Lieutenant Waskow now—to swallow. He was transferred to Company B and away from his beloved I Company.

But this feeling soon eased and he worked with even more determination to make Company B one of the crack units of the famed 36th Division.

Soon there was a long period of no letters to the family and his father and mother knew he had been shipped overseas. But no one—in those days of censorship—knew where.

Finally, they knew. It was Africa, where the battle-ready 36th Division was poised for the invasion of Italy. And it now was Captain Waskow. He had been promoted just before leaving the States.

As soon as he could communicate with the family back home, they knew he was thinking of them. There were cablegrams on birthdays, little gifts he had picked up and always letters.

He was homesick—his letters said as much. His letters were filled with praise of his men. He once wrote of how they saved their coffee rations for him. Enlisted men don't often do that—especially when the coffee was so hard to get and so relished as a sort of a luxury.

The letters became fewer and more time elapsed between them. Finally, they stopped entirely. The invasion was on. Then, the infrequent letters started arriving once more. They would be headed:

"From a foxhole we just chased a Jerry out of."

He was lonesome—you could read between the lines—but these, his men, "are the greatest bunch of Americans God ever produced," he would write.

Maybe you didn't know Capt. Henry T. Waskow.

"I'm just as cold as a wet puppy," he wrote.

"We wonder how we can go on at times, but God is always with us.

"The closer we are to the enemy, the better we feel 'cause we know he is just that much farther away from our loved ones at home."

Then, on that late winter day in December came the telegram from Washington, "the Secretary of War desires me to express his deepest regrets that your son, Capt. Henry T. Waskow was killed in action in defense of his country on December 14 in Italy."

Of his death, Pyle wrote:

"In this war I have known a lot of officers who were loved and respected by the soldiers under them. But never have I crossed the trail of any man as beloved as Capt. Henry T. Waskow of Belton, Tex."

Pyle told of the full moonlight night Captain Waskow was brought down the mountain trail, his body lashed to the back of a mule. Dead men had been coming down the trail all night. In war, especially, you soon become numb to seeing dead men. But finally there came another group of mules with their human cargoes. Soldiers at the base of the mountain stood silently.

"This one is Captain Waskow," one of the soldiers said quickly.

"The men * * * seemed reluctant to leave," Pyle wrote. "They stood around, and gradually, I could sense them moving, one by one, close to Captain Waskow's body. Not so much to look, I think, as to say something in finality to him and to themselves * * * it was hard to tell the officers from the men in the dim light * * *.

" 'I'm sorry, old man'," one of them said as he looked down into Waskow's face.

"Then," wrote Pyle, "the first man squatted down, and he reached down and took the captain's hand, and he sat there for a full 5 minutes holding the dead hand in his own * * * and he never uttered a sound all the time he sat there. * * *"

Pyle's famous column went on to describe the tender scene. His column touched the hearts of millions back in the States just as Pyle had been moved by the respect and love shown Captain Waskow.

In permitting the final letter—which actually was Waskow's will and testament—to be printed, one of the family remarked:

"This is it; it's all the public can ever know.

"Not that we don't appreciate everything that has been done and the honors bestowed on Henry, but it breaks our hearts everytime the subject is revived."

HIS LAST WILL AND TESTAMENT

Herewith my last will and testament:

GREETINGS: If you get to read this, I will have died in defense of my country and all that it stands for—the most honorable and distinguished death a man can die. It was not because I was willing to die for my country, however—I wanted to live for it—just as any other person wants to do. It is foolish and foolhardy to want to die for one's country, but to live for it is something else.

To live for one's country is to my mind to live a life of service; to—in a small way—to help a fellowman occasionally along the way, and generally to be useful and to serve. It also means to me to rise up in all our wrath and with overwhelming power to crush any oppressor of human rights.

That is our job—all of us—as I write this, and I pray God we are wholly successful.

Yes; I would have liked to have lived—to live and share the many blessings and good fortunes that my grandparents bestowed on me—a fellow never had a better family than mine; but, since God has willed otherwise, do not grieve too much, dear ones, for life in the other world must be beautiful, and I have lived a life with that in mind all along. I was not afraid to die, you can be assured of that. All along, I prayed that I and others could do our share to keep you safe until we returned. I pray again that you are safe, even though some of us do not return.

I made my choice, dear ones. I volunteered in the Armed Forces because I felt it my duty to do so. I thought that I might be able and might do just a little bit to help this great country of ours in its hours of darkness and need—the country that means more to me than life itself—if I have done that then I can rest in peace, for I will have done my share to make this world a better place in which to live. Maybe when the lights go on again all over the world, free people can be happy and gay again.

Through good fortune and the grace of God, I was chosen a leader—an honor that meant more to me than any of you will ever know. If I failed as a leader, and I pray God I didn't, it was not because I did not try. God alone knows how I worked and slaved to make myself a worthy leader of these magnificent men, and I feel assured that my work has paid dividends—in personal satisfaction if nothing else.

As I said a couple of times in my letters home when you remember me in your prayers, remember to pray that I be given strength, character and courage to lead these magnificent Americans. I said that in all sincerity and I hope I have proved worthy of their faith, trust, and confidence.

I guess I have always appeared as pretty much of a queer cuss to all of you. If I seemed strange at times, it was because I had weighty responsibilities that preyed on my mind and wouldn't let me slack up to be human like I so wanted to be. I felt so unworthy, at times, of the great trust my country had put in me, that I simply had to keep plugging to satisfy my own self that I was worthy of that trust. I have not, at the time of writing this, done that and I suppose I never will.

I do not try to set myself on a pedestal as a martyr. Every Joe Doe who shouldered a rifle made a similar sacrifice—but I do want to point out that the uppermost thought in my mind all along was service to the cause, and I hope you all felt the same way about it.

When you remember me, remember me as a fond admirer of all of you, for I thought so much of you and loved you with all my heart. My wish for all of you is that you get along well together and prosper—not in money, but in happiness; for happiness is something that all the money in the world can't buy.

Try to live a life of service—to help someone wherever you are or whatever you may be—take it from me, you can get happiness out of that, more than anything in life.

HENRY T. WASKOW.

The Berlin Crisis—The Timetable of Survival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, one of the finest editorials on the current crisis of Berlin that has thus far been written.

It appeared in the Sunday Tampa Tribune, March 8, and is entitled "The Timetable of Survival." This editorial lucidly and logically presents the reasons why there is a crying need for us to step up the defense budget in the field of missilry.

I think it well summarizes the well-known assertion that if we are to err, it is better to err on the side of too much than on the side of too little.

I happen to know that this editorial was written by a young man who worked on the Washington scene for a couple of years and thereby enriched his mind and increased his qualifications to pass judgment on such momentous subjects as are presented in the editorial. The young man's name is Jim Powell, now one of the chief editorial writers of this fine paper. It is evident from the editorial that his thought processes continue to grow and flourish.

I commend the editorial to the attention of my fellow Senators who will certainly find it informative and beneficial.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TIMETABLE OF SURVIVAL

President Eisenhower's current series of high-level conferences on Berlin attests once more to Washington's increasing concern for the threat which Nikita Khrushchev has posed to western security and world peace. It is only in extraordinary circumstances that one single issue so demands the President's attention, or evokes such expressions of bipartisan accord.

In 2 days, Mr. Eisenhower met first with the National Security Council and then with the four highest leaders of the Congress, even while announcing that Prime Minister Macmillan of Great Britain will be received here on March 20. Out of the congressional conference, the leaders of Capitol Hill emerged with a declaration that they stood solidly with the President in determination to hold West Berlin at all costs.

Republican and Democrat alike demonstrated once more that partisanship vanishes at the water's edge. "The upshot is," said Speaker SAM RAYBURN, "that we are united." There was no congressional hesitation in supporting Eisenhower's position that the United States is willing to negotiate but will not yield an inch in protecting its rights and responsibilities at Berlin.

Certainly SAM RAYBURN, while speaking for the congressional leadership, spoke for the Nation as well.

But if the President's determination to hold Berlin is beyond doubt, there remains still a question if he is fully impressed with the terrible urgency of this crisis, and if it should pass, of others to follow.

From all appearances, Mr. Eisenhower still clings rigidly to the proposition of balancing the budget. His administration is obsessed with fiscal balance at a time when such obsession could be sucidal, if it fosters the slightest neglect of national defenses.

Administration leaders contend the national defense is balanced, too, and that the United States is alert and capable of defeating Russia. They contend our strength is therefore enough to deter Russia from starting a war. Defense timetables for the future are also pictured as prepared for the swiftly changing techniques of pushbutton war.

These claims may be justified, and the Nation will pray that they are. Yet there have been disturbing signs, literally written in the sky, that the United States has no such place of security.

It requires no sicentific credentials to judge the race for space as it has developed so far, and to see that Russia is winning. Russia put the first satellite in the sky. The United States followed suit. Russia put the first satellite into orbit around the sun. The United States followed suit. In both instances, the United States came in second.

Certainly it is reasonable to ponder whether the country which is ahead in firing missiles for space exploration is not also ahead in firing them for purposes of war on earth.

In developing military missiles as well as space rockets, the United States seems fearfully deliberate. Intercontinental missiles are not yet practical weapons, stockpiled and ready for quick launching. The building program for atomic submarines is restricted. Antimissile missiles are still years away.

Columnist Roscoe Drummond says that the United States has allowed Russia a 3-to-1, 3-year lead in missiles, without making an effort to challenge it. In such circumstances, it isn't hard to understand why the Soviets have become so bold in Germany. Nor is it presumptious to predict that after the Berlin crisis, if it is somehow resolved, the Soviets will proceed with calculated bravado to blackmail the Western Powers again and again, while brandishing their superior ICBM's.

For the leisurely pace of our missile program there can be but one explanation—the administration's preoccupation with balancing the budget to fight inflation and quiet cries against Government spending.

In normal times, such concern for the budget would be praiseworthy but in these times it entails a deadly gamble.

There is no question that the United States, with its incomparable living standard, can afford whatever it takes to be first, not second, in military strength.

Nor is there any doubt about the capacity of the Nation for supremacy in any field. But the national productive genius, which brought enlightened capitalism to full flower, has been turned first to creating new conveniences and luxuries. It has not been a choice of butter over guns, but of gadgets over guns.

So it is that an immediate expansion of the defense program is demanded by the urgencies of the hour and will do no violence to the economy. The mere announcement of it should help convince Khrushchev of American resolution at Berlin and in crises yet to come. Billions more are needed for missiles and atomic submarines if not elsewhere. Questions of inflation, taxes and budgetary balance must fall.

We are not suggesting a Churchillian regimen of blood, sweat, and tears, for no such sacrifices are demanded. But the timetable of easy living can—indeed it must—wait a bit on the timetable of survival.

Tribute to the Late G. Harold Antrim

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a reprint of a letter addressed to me by Mr. Samuel W. Silverman, of Point Pleasant, N. J., which appeared in the Ocean County Leader.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAUDS ANTRIM AND EDITORIAL

Samuel Silverman, national director, Department of Americanism, Regular Veterans' Association of the United States and organizer of the first American Legion post in the State, forwarded this letter to the Honorable CLIFFORD P. CASE, Senator, at Washington, D.C.:

"DEAR SENATOR: I am enclosing herewith an editorial as printed in the Leader, our only weekly paper in Point Pleasant Beach.

"This editorial concerns a great educator, who recently passed away, a very young man, but very few persons knew how he has benefited almost 8 million heroes that served their Nation in World War II.

"The following will tell you how he rendered great service to his Nation.

"On July 25, 1956, the GI bill, training veterans, came to an end. Almost 8 million veterans of World War II received additional education through the said GI bill, of which in the State of New Jersey alone, more than 40 percent of those that entered the armed services took advantage, for further schooling. Rutgers College alone had more than 30,000 students. This has cost the taxpayers of the United States more than $14 billion—money well spent. Of course, the GI bill gave the veterans other advantages which has cost our taxpayers many billions of dollars—again, money well spent.

"None of these advantages were given to World War I veterans, outside of the privilege to sell apples for a living, but true, through these hardships we were able to protect our sons and relatives and give them the benefit of our experiences.

"FOUNDER OF IDEA

"Now, as to the editorial that appeared in the Leader, there are very few of the 8 million veterans that received all of these benefits. Many of them are great men in various high political and business positions—many of them are lawyers, doctors, engineers, and what not. But just a handful knew that this little educator of Point Pleasant Beach, the superintendent of schools came to my house and spent several hours waiting for me to return from Washington, D.C., where I had attended a veteran conference on the GI bill of rights for the American Legion. He suggested that he had read in one of the papers that I was interested in veterans' affairs at Washington before Congress, and, concerned for his boys taken away from high school, he wanted to know if we could have Congress pass some kind of a bill providing for the education for these boys and others upon their return from service. I immediately left the next day and discussed this with the then legislative representative, General Taylor, of the American Legion, and conveyed to him the entire suggestion as outlined by G. Harold Antrim, and then we presented the subject to the congressional committee. 'What, spend money to educate a lot of rummies, etc.?' they asked. We wanted the education to apply to everyone, whether he went to school or not, as we believed that every veteran is entitled to that opportunity, and then after 8 months of quarreling we compromised and agreed that those who could not pass the test after at least 6 months or 1 year trial should be eliminated.

"Yes, it was the American Legion which first approached the subject and backed up by every veteran group. In fact, it was the harmony among all veteran organizations that put across this GI bill of rights, just as they did the bonus in the First World War.

"This great Nation of ours became great and received the most benefit by having an educated nation, which is our greatest asset of today. These 8 million veterans owe a great debt of gratitude to all of the leading veteran organizations in the United States as well as to the memory of that great educator, G. Harold Antrim, who actually was the father and founder of the original idea which was carried out by the American Legion and other veteran organizations.

"I believe that this editorial and my remarks should be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

"Sincerely yours,

SAMUEL W. SILVERMAN."

Abundant Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have been pleased to see in recent months more and more interest and discussion on the important role which our surplus disposal program under Public Law 480 can play in our foreign aid program.

It has been my strong conviction that our food surpluses should not be considered as a curse, but rather as a blessing. Through an intelligent and imaginative program, surplus foods can be used not only to relieve the hunger of so many underfed people of the world, but also as a means of economic development in countries which are in dire need of capital.

The New Republic has a most interesting article on this topic in its February 23, 1959, issue entitled "Abundant Opportunity." I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ABUNDANT OPPORTUNITY

As a result of bumper wheat and corn crops the estimated value of surplus farm commodity stocks held by the Federal Government will soon reach an all-time high of $9 billion. And who will even guess when the end will be in sight? Farm groups searching for ways to broaden foreign outlets for accumulating U.S. stocks of food and fiber pushed through the surplus disposal program Public Law 480 in 1954, and Congress has renewed it three times. Although the program has included some famine relief grants ($1.1 billion) and barter deals for scarce ores through private trade channels ($900 million), the biggest single item has been the sale for foreign currencies of surpluses which were not selling in the regular dollar market. Two and one-half billion dollars worth of agricultural commodities had been sold abroad for foreign currencies as of the end of 1958.

The fact that the United States sells the surpluses for local currencies is to the farm bloc simply an unfortunate temporary expedient incidental to getting rid of the stocks. But Public Law 480 has acquired an altogether different significance for the countries receiving the surpluses. The less-developed countries which are the principal recipients are short on food and dollars: thus the program has the special virtue of simultaneously easing local food scarcity (and price inflation) and releasing dollars for capital goods imports. Moreover, roughly half of the sale proceeds accruing to the United States are reloaned to the recipient countries for U.S.-approved economic development projects (the remainder is used for United States local currency procurement, e.g., in military aid programs, and for educational purposes such as the Fulbright student exchanges). What was designed purely and simply as a disposal program has become, in short, an important part of our foreign aid program.

This dual significance of Public Law 480 has long been apparent to some farsighted aid officials and aid supporters who have doubted whether Congress would ever appropriate the large dollar sums needed for an effective U.S. economic contribution to the less-developed countries, and who have seen in a redesigned Public Law 480 a means for marrying desperate necessity abroad with political reality at home—not to mention reconciling the paradox of U.S. overbundance in a hungry world. But farm bloc sentiment for a broadened Public Law 480 program did not crystallize until very recently. With Secretary Benson using the high cost of storing the surpluses as one of his main arguments against price supports, the farm groups are now unanimously pressing for a Public Law 480 program placed on a more permanent basis than the present year-to-year schedule. The administration had been considering a special report on the possibilities in an expanded Public Law 480 program by Harvard agricultural economist John H. Davis when the political winds from Capitol Hill began to pick up velocity, and the result was an apparently last-minute decision to place food for peace in the President's farm message. But although the President has designated Secretary Benson to explore anew with other surplus-producing nations all practical means of utilizing the various agricultural surpluses of each in the interest of reinforcing peace—which might mean, in specific terms, a world conference of food ministry representatives later this year—the administration has no immediate plan beyond renewing Public Law 480.

In Congress, on the other hand, there are major legislative initiatives in the making. Representative W. R. POAGE, Democrat of Texas, has introduced an amendment providing for a 10-year surplus program on a loan basis with repayments in dollars over a period of up to 50 years. Senator HUMPHREY, Democrat of Minnesota, and Representative MCGOVERN, Democrat of South Dakota, have introduced resolutions affirming congressional support for a long-term surplus program as an integral part of our foreign assistance, and Senator HUMPHREY is readying an omnibus bill which would, among other things, set up a peacetime agency comparable to the War Food Administration—thus giving the program administrative independence and, equally important politically, budgetary independence from the foreign aid and agriculture appropriations. By attributing the cost of surplus disposal programs to some agency other than the Department of Agriculture, in the name of an objective other than farm price supports, Secretary Benson's misgivings about the high cost of surplus disposal (on top of supports) might be modified.

Senator HUMPHREY is, in our view, to be commended for his leadership on the surplus issue and his omnibus program will be studied with great interest. There are, however, very serious limitations inherent in any long-term program conceived essentially, as are all of the programs contemplated, in terms of loans. The less developed countries are aware that the United States does not know what to do with its abundance. Thus in this instance the often-mentioned preference of sensitive Asian governments for loans rather than grants is less weighty than their clear recognition that the United States could quite painlessly make the surpluses available as grants. This becomes peculiarly important in the light of the enormous accumulations of local currencies by the United States already taking place in the case of India, Pakistan, and Israel—which together claimed more than half of the Public Law 480 surpluses in 1958—and of the profound and growing uneasiness inevitably resulting from that accumulation in these newly independent countries. As Matthew Kust, former legal adviser to U.S. Embassies in south Asia, pointed out in these pages in the case of India, rupees acquired by the U.S. Government under Public Law 480 (and soft-currency development loan programs) might in the conceivable future exceed those held by the Government of India. The mere thought of this is politically explosive in India, which is now in the midst of a frenzied reappraisal of its economic, which is to say political, future. The main theme of Indian Communist propaganda is that the Nehru government is mortgaging itself to Washington.

At present 48 percent of Public Law 480 sale proceeds in India are reloaned for U.S.-approved economic development projects; another 15 percent goes for grants to non-developmental purposes (e.g., education and health); 12 percent for U.S. Embassy administrative expenses, and up to 25 percent for local currency loans to U.S. business operations in India (under the so-called Cooley amendment). Any substantially expanded Public Law 480 program would mean that the 48 percent allocated for economic development would become a larger and larger sum—looming larger and larger in relation to the totality of the Indian Government budget—and a sum increasingly hot to handle. Why, Indian leaders might well ask (and this is also true in Pakistan and other surplus-recipient countries), does not the United States follow the precedent of the Marshall plan? The Marshall plan was a grant program and the counterpart funds in European currencies accumulated under the plan belonged to the recipient governments. To be sure, provision was made in the program agreements for virtual U.S. control over decisions as to how the funds were to be spent; but this would be easier for the recipient governments to justify to their peoples than direct control of large sums of the national currency by the United States with all of its implicit political influence.

The Davis report now before the State Department recognizes this state of mind in the less-developed countries and recommends that the grant portion of Public Law 480 allocations be increased from 15 to 25 percent. In our view there is no reason why the increase should not extend to the 48 percent portion now being reloaned and perhaps in later years to the bulk of the proceeds.

There is danger that in the absence of a clear definition of food for peace as something different from a bigger and better disposal program—perhaps restyled food for economic development—some of the merit of the program may be canceled out. It may become an excuse for many Congressmen to vote against vital dollar aid appropriations (e.g., for an expanded Development Loan Fund) while not having the saving grace of the grant authority so necessary in the light of political realities in the less-developed countries. The National Grange frankly urges the Federal Government to "use surplus agricultural commodities whenever practical instead of dollars as a means of aid and relief." What the farm belt politicians are perhaps afraid of is an isolationist rural reaction against giveaways. But given the facts and some leadership we suspect that farmers could be won to a grant program. They have, after all, nothing to lose.

Military Air Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, military aviation safety is of vital concern to our Nation. This is true not only for eco-

nomic and humanitarian reasons, but also for the very practical reason that we must conserve our combat capability. Every military aircraft accident diminishes our ability to defend the Nation; some take precious lives, and all cost thousands of the taxpayers' dollars. As a Member of this Congress and especially as a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I have been keenly attentive to the measures and the precautions exercised by the military to prevent aircraft accidents. I feel that too often the public is made aware of accidents but is not told of the many thousands of safely flown missions. I am pleased to note, however, that on occasion the military receives some recognition for its dedicated and unceasing efforts to prevent aircraft accidents. Therefore, I request unanimous consent that an editorial from the Baltimore Sun of April 1, 1959, concerning certain aspects of Air Force air safety, be printed in the Appendix of today's RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AIR FORCE SAFETY

The bald statement that the Air Force has lost 5,000 lives in accidents in the last 5 years makes a striking headline. But unless it is analyzed, it obscures the great attention the Air Force gives to the factor of safety and the favorable results that have been obtained.

Overall military flying is, of course, not comparable to commercial flying. But one operation that is reasonably comparable is that of the Military Air Transport Service with the domestic commercial airlines. In 1958, fatalities on MATS were actually less (0.078 per 100 million passenger miles) than on the domestic commercial airlines (0.4).

Over the last 4 years there has been a decline in the actual number of fatalities among crews and passengers in all types of Air Force flying, including also the Air National Guard. Another impressive indication of safety progress is in the drop in overall accidents which in 1958 were down to 10.4 per 100,000 flying hours. Compare that with 20 in 1954, 44 in 1947, and 506 in 1922.

As against the vastly increased speed of the modern jets and the exacting performances demanded both of planes and pilots, there is the great improvement in airplane construction. Air Force people attribute much of this progress to the intensive investigation of every accident to find out what caused it and to correct any structural weaknesses found.

Pricing Ourselves Out of the Market?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article from the March 30 issue of Newsweek, a news article from the Pittsburgh Press of March 29, and the Worthington, Oil City Division, Newsletter.

[From Newsweek, Mar. 30, 1959]

PRICING OURSELVES OUT OF THE MARKET?

In the greatest industrial Nation on earth last week, growing numbers of American businessmen were facing up to a new problem. All too often, they were being beaten at their own mass-production game. Foreign businessmen, using the same tools, techniques, and tough enterprise for which the United States is famous, were grabbing more and more markets. There was a spreading concern that the United States might be pricing itself out of world markets—indeed, even out of markets at home.

How sound are the worries? What lies behind them? What can be done?

The concern is real, and it reaches into high places. After a world tour last winter, Federal Reserve Board Chairman William McC. Martin reported that "40-odd central bankers and finance ministers that I've known for a long time," were convinced that American-made goods, "not necessarily at the moment, but in a fairly short time and more markedly in the extending future, were going to find themselves priced out of the market." Martin was not ready to accept that theory yet, but he could see lots of illustrations of the trend.

Indeed, anyone who cared to look could see examples:

Detroit exported fewer than 122,000 cars last year, down 42 percent from 1955. And 431,000 foreign automobiles moved into the United States, a 55-percent jump from last year.

West German barbed wire was selling in Cleveland last week for $40 a ton less than wire turned out by United States Steel—right in Cleveland.

U.S. cotton exports last year fed only 30 percent of the overseas market, against 60 percent during the 1920's.

International Harvester plans to bring in tractors made by its British subsidiary "to compete in Southeastern States against a tractor being imported by a competitor." The competitor? Ford, with tractors from its own British subsidiary.

Nor was that the end of it. World wheat prices regularly run 60 to 70 cents a bushel under U.S. levels, and American wheat exports—some 430 million bushels last year—might shrivel without subsidies. Japanese textiles coming into the United States in recent years have raised a cry among American producers for higher and higher protective quotas. Steel plate from Japan sells on the west coast at $20 to $30 a ton below U.S. tags. A Japanese mill has even snared an order from the U.S. Navy.

Foreign businessmen now are challenging one of the proudest achievements of American industry—the manufacture of machines for mass production. U.S. machine-tool exports skidded 33 percent last year (to $60 million). And H. G. Bixby, president of Ex-Cell-O Corp., the Detroit toolmaker, sees "portents that the years 1959, 1960, perhaps even 1970, will show similar declines." Francis J. Trecker, president of Milwaukee's Kearney & Trecker, cites one reason why: Small West German milling machines sell in the United States for $8,000 against $11,000 for American counterparts. The fact is, says Walter K. Bailey, president of Cleveland's Warner & Swasey, that "American machine tools are priced out of a large part of the world market."

For all this, American export markets, which paid for $16.3 billion worth of U.S. made goods last year and provided a livelihood for more than 4.5 million Americans, are not about to dry up overnight. Even the $3.2 billion drop in overseas trade last year was not as bad as it looked. Some 75 percent of the decline was in six commodities—oil, cotton, wheat, metals, coal, and autos. And some of these items had enjoyed unusual increases in 1956 and 1957 because of abnormal conditions. Examples: Oil shipments were accelerated by the Suez crisis, wheat shipments by a disastrous harvest failure in Europe.

NEAR THE DANGER POINT

Such a breakdown convinces experts like Economist William F. Butler, vice president of New York's Chase Manhattan Bank, that there is no evidence yet that we're pricing ourselves out of world markets in the overall sense. But even the most optimistic businessman would agree with Butler's genuine concern that if inflation isn't checked, then we'll reach that point before too long.

What has brought U.S industry so close to this peril point?

One basic cause is the fantastic recovery and modernization of the industrial machines of Europe and Asia during the 15 years since V–J Day. When U.S. Steel opened its $400 million Fairless Works on the Delaware River in 1952, Chairman Roger M. Blough recalls, "it was the last word in steelmaking efficiency." Today, he adds, "its counterpart can be found in Wales." A Simca auto plant outside Paris, notes L. L. (Tex) Colbert, president of Chrysler Corp. (which now owns part of this French company), is easily the most highly automated car-body line in the world.

COMPARISONS

One logical conclusion is that the success—or failure—of U.S. business in its struggle with foreign competitors will depend heavily on what happens to labor costs. "We have figured and figured," Chrysler's Colbert says, "and our experts tell us that 80 percent of the cost of a car is in labor" (including direct labor and the cost of the labor that produces the materials and parts that go into the auto). And the wages run high for the workers—from steel mills to assembly lines—who have a hand in turning out those cars. A Detroit assembly-line worker, for instance, averages near $3 an hour versus 65 to 75 cents an hour for a hand in Volkswagen's Wolfsburg plant. Steel-mill workers make some $3.65 an hour versus less than $1 for their European counterparts.

The steel industry has been dwelling on this theme as it heads toward its labor negotiations. One American Iron and Steel Institute advertisement, for instance, features Soviet steelworker Vladimir Petrov and asks: "Will he take away an American steelworker's job?"

Steel Union President David McDonald damns the suggestion as a smokescreen and throws up a smoke barrage of his own. If all the steel imported last year (1.7 million tons) had been made here, McDonald says, "better than 99 percent of the United Steelworkers unemployed would still be unemployed." The steel union has also taken to advertising in an attempt to convince the public of the importance of a pay boost. Sample ad, directed to auto companies: "Here is our 1959 model [contract]. One billion dollars in new money for your dealers and you."

WORDS AND DEEDS

Foreign competition is sparking more than mere arguments. It has also spurred U.S. businessmen into creating new ways of combating it. Most popular and successful: Setting up shop in the enemy camp. General Motors and Ford have long ranked among the top European auto producers and Chrysler has joined them with its Simca operation. (A good portion of the foreign cars now cluttering up the suburban commuter stations, in fact, are GM's own Opels and Vauxhalls, Ford's oversea models, and Simcas.)

U.S. automen are not alone overseas. National Cash Register last year spent $6.9 million overseas for property additions, most

of it to expand production facilities; the year before, it spent $8.9 million. Burroughs Corp. completed a 337,000-square-foot manufacturing plant in Cumbernauld, Scotland, in 1958. Atlanta's Scripto, Inc. (pens), has six oversea plants. Others hope to join the trek abroad, particularly now that Europe's common market is becoming reality. Elgin National Watch Co., convinced it can't sell U.S.-made watches overseas because of foreign tariffs, has asked Switzerland for permission to set up an assembly plant there. In all, American business had $25.3 billion invested abroad in 1957, against $11.8 billion in 1950.

Another string to the competitive bow is an old American story—the better mousetrap. Now that foreign manufacturers have about caught up with U.S. manufacturing techniques, says Robert A. Brown, sales vice president of Chicago's Borg-Warner International, "our future lies in new technological advances—in design and merchandising."

Diesel locomotives offer one example of what an efficient, well-engineered product can do. Alco Products, for instance, sold $74 million worth of diesels last year, 90 percent of them abroad. Right now, the firm claims 45 percent of the world's mainline engines outside of Europe and the United States. It expects to hold its own as the 80,000 steam engines still puffing around the world are replaced by diesels. In the past 10 years, says a spokesman for General Motors' Electromotive Division, No. 1 U.S. producer, no one has outbid the four U.S. enginemakers (GM, General Electric, Alco, and Fairbanks, Morse).

Most of these firms insist that they can handle the job without help from Washington in the form of higher tariffs (though many would like some kind of insurance or tax relief). Big Steel's Blough, despite his barbed-wire headaches, maintains that "increased tariff protection, in my opinion, is not the basic answer to this problem."

BARRIERS DOWN

Harvard economist Sumner Slichter, who thinks he may have the basic answer, goes Blough one better. Last week, he jolted a congressional committee with the sweeping suggestion that the United States abandon tariffs and all protection. This, he said, would help control inflation by making it tougher to pass on wage increases in higher prices, and hence would stiffen businessmen's resistance to wage demands. It would also put America in a better competitive position internationally.

Whatever the final upshot of increasingly strong foreign competition, some good is bound to come of it. "It will make us aware that our prices are too high," says an official of Chicago's First National Bank. The competition, he argues, is thus "a healthy one—if we believe what we are taught about competition. We'll have to change our methods to meet it."

[From the Pittsburgh Press, Mar. 29, 1959]

FOREIGN GOODS NOW POURING INTO UNITED STATES; HIGH LABOR COSTS, TAXES BLAMED FOR TRADE SHIFT

(By Ed Kandlik)

The United States, once the scourage of world trade with the outpouring of its low cost mass production factories, has become a lush market for foreign producers.

In autos, tractors, steel, and oil, this Nation once put the rest of the world to shame.

Today foreign autos sell in Detroit several hundred dollars below American makes, foreign tractors have appeared at $300 below American counterparts and foreign steel is taking a big bite of the market for fencing and construction products.

The tide of foreign oil was successively retarded by voluntary import controls and mandatory Government controls, aided by a small tariff.

FOREIGN PLANTS EXPAND

For some manufactured products this invasion of the United States has been slowed by the ability of foreign factories to produce. This market is so big foreign producers have had trouble getting a real hold on it.

Volkswagen for years limited the number of cars it would sell in the United States. It wanted to protect its other overseas markets. Now it is expanding.

U.S. demand for foreign steel has become so avid the last several months that buyers abroad have driven prices up by 10 to 20 percent.

Charges that the United States, through its spiraling of wages and continued high postwar taxes is pricing itself out of world markets appear to be well substantiated by developments of the last 6 months.

U.S. products are not only being priced out of overseas markets but more and more foreign made items are enabled to compete successfully in this market.

Hourly wage costs in the American steel industry now average about $3.22. In Germany they are slightly more than one-fourth as much—89 cents.

In Japan the steelworker gets 46 cents an hour. With such low-cost labor, the Japanese can buy scrap in the United States, ship it to their country for processing, ship it back and still sell at a profit.

In effect, they carry Newcastle coal back to Newcastle.

TAXES A FACTOR

High taxes, both at the local and Federal level, must not be overlooked as a factor in costs. To make up for inadequate depreciation charges in an inflationary economy, the large steel companies say they must make large profits. But they have to make $2.08 to keep $1 because of the 52 percent Federal income tax.

A look at the U.S. 1958 export-import figures doesn't give much cause for alarm. Exports of $17.9 billion compared with imports of $12,800 million leading to a so-called favorable trade balance of $5,100 million. Of this favorable balance, about $1,500 million was accounted for by foreign aid.

The drop of $3 billion in 1958 exports is in part explained by an abnormally high level in 1957, when domestic oil was sent overseas to alleviate the Suez crisis.

But the total of imports went down only $200 million. They should have dropped more markedly.

The trouble is in manufactured goods, which long have comprised the vast proportion of U.S. dollar exports but have been a small, and at times almost negligible, proportion of our imports.

JUST AS EFFICIENT

Many American manufacturers insist European plants are fully as efficient as ours for mass production purposes. While they use a higher percentage of labor, the American manufacturer admits he would do the same thing if he could obtain labor as cheaply.

Facing another round of steel wage rate increases and prices, U.S. manufacturers are anticipating further increases in their already disproportionate costs.

[Worthington, Oil City (Pa.) Division, Newsletter, March 1959]

In the last issue of our newsletter we listed some of the companies in this country which are direct competitors of ours.

We also face keen foreign competition. Some of the effects of this competition were described in an article published in the February Worthington Management Newsletter. We are reproducing that article on the inside pages for your information.

Foreign competition has been greatly publicized in the last few months. Probably we see the most direct evidence of it in the increasing number of small imported cars sold in America. We, however, have been unable to sell our Worthington products made at Oil City in overseas markets, particularly in Europe. Our costs and prices are simply too high to compete with European manufacturers in their home markets.

The best weapons we can use to meet the challenge of foreign competition in America are to increase our productivity and maintain our employment costs at realistic, competitive levels. In doing this we will insure continued work for our shops and so strengthen our job security.

WILLIAM F. WEINSAID,
General Manager.

SO WE HAVE OVERSEA COMPETITION, TOO

The Tennessee Valley Authority's recent acceptance of a foreign firm's bid for three generators drew much publicity throughout the country.

But TVA's action in awarding the 60,000-kilowatt generators to a Swiss manufacturer on its low bid of $2,639,000 drew not only headlines. It added to the growing realization that American industry is pricing itself out of world markets—and its home markets to boot.

Allis-Chalmers, a competitor of Worthington, was one of the concerned parties. This company had submitted the lowest bid of any American firm.

But A–C's bid was $4,290,180—or more than 60 percent higher than the Swiss firm's price.

This development, which could have meant employment for several hundred Allis-Chalmers employees on layoff, is not an isolated one on the American economic scene. Loss of business to foreign manufacturers, located in Great Britain, France, Italy, West Germany, and elsewhere, is increasingly affecting American firms, including our own.

AMERICAN AID OVERSEAS

Now for some years the United States has engaged in a massive program of pouring American dollars and know-how into foreign countries to raise the economic standards of underdeveloped or war-ravaged nations. As a result, new plants and equipment and modern methods have made many Western European manufacturers as fully efficient and mechanized—with comparable or even better tools—as our own firms here in America.

WAGE RATE DISPARITY

Meanwhile, while this rapid progress toward matching American technology has been going on apace, American employment costs (wages, salaries, and benefits paid to American workers) have risen so disproportionately over those generally prevailing elsewhere in the world that we have, for all practical purposes, become a high-cost producer in many lines of American products.

In a recent speech Ernest R. Breech, chairman of the board of the Ford Motor Co., cited this example of the problem: The cost per hour for purchasing automotive tools and dies from independent producers in the Detroit area is $7.90 per hour, as compared to $3 per hour in England, as low as $2.38 per hour in France, and $1.60 per hour in Milan, Italy.

In another recent speech delivered by E. J. Hanley, president of the Allegheny Ludlum Steel Corp., these figures were cited on wage rates paid in western European steels mills: 70 cents per hour in West Germany, 89 cents in England, and 69 cents in France.

Now let's be absolutely frank about where America's high production costs are taking us. They are leading us, rapidly, to the point where we could lose our ability to compete against aggressive, modern foreign firms in the sale of American-made products, both at home and abroad.

Restrictive measures of one type or another that frustrate world trade are not politically or economically feasible answers to this problem. Rather, the answer lies in the

ability of American industry to remain competitive in design, quality, cost, and price with foreign manufacturers.

STRENGTHENING JOB SECURITY

As a company, our part in meeting this challenge is to intensify our efforts to do things more efficiently through the use of better machinery and cost-saving techniques and methods. As employees, our part is to recognize the need for competitive costs and prices and for maintaining employment costs at realistic, competitive levels.

In so doing, we will be working for an economically sound future for ourselves by strengthening that most essential element in our lives: job security.

Missiles Are Not Everything

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I would like to include in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the March 1959 issue of Machinery. This editorial was written by Mr. Charles O. Herb, editor of Machinery, and is entitled "Missiles Are Not Everything":

There is real danger that in the excitement about the development of missiles and the race for supremacy in space, the importance of keeping this country in the forefront industrially may be overlooked. Should Russia succeed in outstripping the United States productionwise during the next decade, as predicted by Khrushchev, the situation could be serious indeed. That this prediction cannot be discounted as an idle boast becomes evident when we realize that Russian industries do have one distinct advantage over American concerns.

That advantage stems from the fact that Russia, having started practically from scratch as an industrial nation, has its factories outfitted almost completely with new manufacturing equipment. Future expansion will be based on the most modern machinery available from time to time.

On the other hand, a great number of American factories are knee deep in obsolete and semiobsolete machinery. Automobile and aircraft plants in general operate with modern equipment but the plants of other industries less prosperous or not government subsidized have countless machines over 20 years old.

This is a serious plight because of the burden that existing tax laws place on the financing of new equipment. The Bureau of Internal Revenue allows depreciation to be charged only on the purchase price of equipment and it must be charged over too long a period of years. More important, however, the effects of inflation on replacement costs are completely ignored.

Most machinery costs approximately three times what it did in 1940. This means that a machine tool which cost $100,000 that year would be priced at $300,000 today. Where must the extra $200,000 come from when a machine is to be replaced?

To buy replacement equipment for such a machine out of earnings, a company must make around $400,000 extra and pay an income tax of 52 percent. Not until then can equipment be depreciated in accordance with today's costs. If a concern plans extensive replacement of aged machines, it has to earn many extra millions of dollars.

Under such unrealistic tax regulations how is our Nation going to expand industrially to keep pace with the Soviet countries? We must not be deluded by our apparently large annual expenditures for new plants and equipment. In 1956, for example, this figure was $39,200 million. Ninety percent of this amount was for replacement, not expansion. Ten percent expansion of production will not enable us to keep ahead of the Red countries at the rate they are going.

Hitler proved how effective adequate depreciation allowances could be in stepping up productive efficiency before and during World War II. By adopting more realistic depreciation allowances, the Government could do much to increase our productive efficiency and thereby help to insure continued economic supremacy for this country. Unlike the vastly expensive defense program, more rapid depreciation would cost the Government nothing because, in the end, the same amount of taxes would be collected.

CHARLES O. HERB,
Editor.

Letter From Utah Water and Power Board Upon Receipt of Annual Report on Colorado River Storage Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which I send to the desk.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STATE OF UTAH,
UTAH WATER AND POWER BOARD,
Salt Lake City, Utah, February 9, 1959.

The Honorable WALLACE F. BENNETT,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BENNETT: I wish to acknowledge your thoughtfulness in supplying us with a copy of Senate Document No. 8, which is the annual report of the Department of the Interior on the Colorado River storage project.

In your letter you invite comments, and I would like to call to your attention a matter which has caused us some concern. The item to which I refer is found in exhibit B of the document, under "Contributions in aid of construction," wherein the State or Arizona is shown as contributing $1,635,000, the State of Colorado $35,000, the city of Los Angeles $60,000. No mention is made in this exhibit of any of Utah's contributions, and I would like to state for your information that records in the regional IV office of the Bureau of Reclamation, Salt Lake City, indicate that the contributions by the States of the upper basin, in support of project investigations, are as follows: Utah, $373,355.40; Wyoming, $1,666.57 Colorado, $60,610; New Mexico, $2,321.16. In addition, the State of Utah has made expenditures on the Glen Canyon Dam access road, and the Flaming Gorge Dam access road. As of January 22, the State of Utah had expended $460,309.27 at Glen Canyon, matching Federal expenditures of $3,289,303.13, making a total expenditure of $3,749,612.40. We contend that the heavy expenditure by the State of Utah, and the early action taken on these matters were, in large part, reflected by the low bids for the prime contract at Glen Canyon.

Similarly, on Flaming Gorge, State expenditures to January 22 have amounted to $5,488.09, matching Federal funds in the amount of $102,130.82, for a total of $107,-618.91.

We do not seek to minimize the contributions made by the States of Arizona, Colorado, and California, but we feel that at some appropriate place the record should show the contributions made by the State of Utah in connection with this project.

Very truly yours,

JAY R. BINGHAM,
Executive Director.

Federalization of Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, for 2 years prior to World War II it was my great pleasure to work as an assistant in charge of the Miami office, for the Honorable Herbert S. Phillips, then the U.S. attorney for the southern district of Florida. My association with Mr. Phillips was one of great benefit to me. I learned a lot from him as a lawyer; I learned a lot from him as a man and a distinguished citizen of our State.

With the advent of the Republican administration in Florida Mr. Phillips was retired; he is now over 80 years of age and is a most remarkable man, in that he continues to maintain a lively interest in the affairs of our State and Nation.

As one would guess for a man of his background and past experience, he has strong convictions with respect to the segregation problem in our Florida schools. Recently Mr. Phillips wrote an article which was printed in part in the Tampa Tribune and which he has asked me to introduce into the RECORD in full. As usual, Mr. Phillips presents his views with vigor and persuasiveness.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this article entitled "The Federalization of Public Schools—the Organizers, Promoters, and the Objective," by Mr. Herbert S. Phillips, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FEDERALIZATION OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS—THE ORGANIZERS, PROMOTERS, AND THE OBJECTIVE

(By Herbert S. Phillips)

The organization of a Federal Board of Education for the control of the operation of public schools and colleges in the United States was first made known to the public at its first public session held in the U.S. Supreme Court room, on May 17, 1954, at Washington.

Its organizers and promoters were the leaders of the NAACP, the Attorney General of the United States, Mr. Brownell, of New York, and other politicians and agitators who had been working to accomplish such a goal for many years.

The four public school segregation cases of *Brown* v. *Board of Education* (347 U.S.,

p. 493) and three other companion cases that had been consolidated, had been argued before the Court, but had been taken off the calendar without any decision being rendered. This condition had existed for about 2 years. The attorneys for the NAACP and their aiders and abettors were urging and demanding that said cases be put back on the calendar and set down for argument again. In the meantime Chief Justice Vinson died. The attorneys for the NAACP and their backers, including the Attorney General, realized the importance of having a Chief Justice who was against segregation in our public schools and colleges.

Mr. Brownell was the protege of Governor Dewey of New York. Mr. Warren had delivered the California electoral vote to General Eisenhower. Governor Dewey, who is credited with securing the nomination of General Eisenhower, was indebted to Mr. Warren for the California electoral vote going for General Eisenhower. The result was the appointment of Mr. Warren Chief Justice by the President. His confirmation was held up. Mr. Warren had never had any judicial experience.

Mr. Justice Vanderbilt of the Supreme Court of New Jersey, with an outstanding record as an attorney and judge, was preferred by many of the Senators, which resulted in the confirmation of Mr. Warren being held up. Mr. Brownell then flew to Sacramento, Calif., and conferred with Mr. Warren, who evidently assured him that if his appointment should be confirmed, his first judicial act would be, as it was, to order said school segregation cases placed back on the calendar and set down as the first cases to be argued.

Mr. Brownell then flew back to Washington and made known to the President and his steering committee the result of his conference with Mr. Warren. The confirmation of Mr. Warren immediately followed. Two months thereafter, to wit: on May 17, 1954, the said self-appointed Federal Board of Public Education for all public schools and colleges in the United States declared that "Segregation in all public schools and colleges must be abolished in order that Negro children be freed of an inferiority complex and thereby more properly fitted to adjust themselves to their environment."

Immediately after said edict was announced, Mr. Brownell flew back to California, and in a public address there on June 3, 1954, declared: "Communist charges of racial intolerance in the United States have been answered directly by the Supreme Court's antisegregation decision."

The question that naturally arises is why was the U.S. Attorney General so much more concerned about what the Communists thought than he was about the preservation of States rights?

In an effort to justify their action in taking over the operation of our public schools and colleges, Mr. Chief Justice Warren and his eight amen associates conjured up in their minds a fabulous interpretation of the 14th amendment based on the socialistic doctrine of the Swedish Socialist, Myrdal, who was brought to the United States by Carnegie Foundation to write a treatise on our race problems, who showed contempt for our Government when he said in his book:

"The Constitution of the United States is impractical and unsuited to modern conditions," which is exactly what Mr. Justice Warren and his eight associates held, thereby circumventing and annulling section 1 of article I and articles V and VI, and amendments IX, X, and XIV of our Constitution.

See Analysis of the Constitution of the United States, annotated to January 1, 1938, Senate Document 232 and cases cited on pages 717–722 and pages 762–770. Also the "Vanishing Rights of the States" by Joseph M. Beck, LL.D., one time Solicitor General of the United States, and also the briefs filed by Mr. John W. Davis and his associates in the school cases in which the edict of March 17, 1954 was issued, and the lectures of Chief Justice Hughes delivered to the law students of Columbia University in 1927, on the Supreme Court and its powers.

The nine men constituting the "Politboro" of Russia also valued the opinions and teachings of this Myrdal so highly that they appointed him Executive Secretary of the United Nations Economic Mission for Europe as a condition for Kremlin participation, but he became so blatant in his advocacy of socialism, which is an open door to communism, the members of the United Nations Association decided that the only safe thing to do for their political welfare was to have him resign, as they did.

In proof of my contention that segregation of the two races in our schools, churches, and homes should be preserved, and that there is no logical reason to the contrary, I submit the following:

In 1906, the Honorable Cabot Lodge, Ph.D., LL.D., as editor in chief, and 41 associate editors selected from the leading universities of the world, to wit: Oxford, Hopkins, Berlin, Cambridge, Wellesley, Kings College, London, Cornell, Yale, Brown, Wesleyan University, and the Director General of Statistics in India, prepared and had published the "History of Nations." The same was critically reviewed before publication by a number of outstanding writers and historians, all of which shows that the recitals, figures, and conclusions reached and set forth therein can be relied on as correct.

In volume 24, pages 873–4 and 5 of said history, they state with reference to the civil rights of the Negro the following: "In acquiring, holding and disposing of property, in entering into contracts, in making use of the courts, in his personal freedom, in the right to engage in any occupation, business or profession, that his inclination or capacity may allow; in short, in the right to all the benefits of equal protection of the laws, he is on equal equality with the white man." "In the benefits of the public school system, he shares equally with the white man, although he bears but an insignificant portion of the burden." "Most communities in the South today maintain public schools for the benefit of colored children and there is not a Southern State that does not maintain a university or normal college for the higher education of the young men and women of the colored race."

"It is only in social and political matters that it may be claimed that the Negro may be at a disadvantage. The Anglo-Saxon refuses to mingle with him on terms of social equality. But this is a matter that cannot be changed by legislation. The futile attempts of the reconstructionists to do this show how unavailing such legislation is."

Immediately after the edict was proclaimed, the press reported that Mr. Justice Jackson, now deceased, said: "Well, we have rendered a decision which will be the subject of litigation for the next 50 years." He could just as truly have added: or, as long as efforts are made to enforce it. His statement convinces me that he did not believe that their edict was constitutional. He knew, as did the other members of the Court, that it was a plan to destroy the last citadel of States rights; yet he, along with the other associate members, yielded to the demands of the NAACP and the hypnotic influence of the Chief Justice, to abolish the equal facilities plan that was working with satisfaction to all except the political leaders of the NAACP and their aiders and abettors.

The effect of the edict has been to inspire and create racial prejudice that had not previously existed and intensify that already existing, but dormant, and has also inspired acts of violence against property and life, which will continue in a greater and more serious degree, regrettable as it will be, as long as the Supreme Court seeks to enforce its edict, which has also inspired the leaders of the NAACP to declare with boldness and confidence, that they will have the Supreme Court declare that the laws of every State prohibiting the marriage of Negroes and whites, violates the 14th amendment because such laws deprive both races of the right of choosing a wife or a husband.

In time the NAACP and its political aiders and abettors will demand, through the Supreme Court, that every public school have as many Negro teachers as white, male and female, and that the white pupils must sit, eat, recite, play, and associate with Negro pupils in all activities of the school without any discrimination in any respect against the Negro pupils.

In short, the teachers in charge will be prohibited from seating or classifying Negro pupils in groups to themselves for any reason, and that if such is done the NAACP leaders will have a Federal judge issue a mandatory injunction against the teacher to abolish such discrimination at once, or be adjudged in contempt of Court, as has been done in connection with the operation of bathing beaches and pools, and golf courses, and everything supported and maintained in whole or in part by a city, a State, a county or an agency thereof.

Every member of the Court knew when they issued said edict that there would be thousands of white children, especially in the southern States, if it should be enforced, that would be denied a public school education unless they attended such schools with Negro children.

They also knew that white parents who would be financially unable to send their children to private schools, would, in desperation, yield to the cowardly brainwashing process approved by the Supreme Court, rather than have their children from 5 to 15 years of age, deprived of a public school education, at the most critical period of their lives.

Booker T. Washington, president of the Tuskegee Industrial Institute for Negroes, and the greatest leader, in my opinion, that his race has ever had, in a great speech delivered by him at the opening of the Cotton States Exposition, at Atlanta, Ga., on September 10, 1895, said:

"The wisest among my race understand that the agitation of questions of social equality is the extremest folly."

He had the welfare of his race at heart, which was his chief concern in preference to self-aggrandizement and self-glory. But the leaders of the NAACP of today, their aiders and abettors, including the Supreme Court, say that his teachings are out of date and cannot and must not be followed today.

No one can be justified in asserting that the nine men who promulgated their said edict are wiser and have a higher regard for the preservation of our Government than the learned men who framed our Constitution, and the hundreds of lawyers, judges, and learned writers who have interpreted and expounded it and the amendments thereto prior to May 17, 1954.

Those who advocate the gradual method of desegregation have evidently overlooked the fact that it is the same brainwashing methods that the Communists rely on to communize the world.

The gradualists are also overlooking the fact that gradual means "by degrees." They are also disregarding the well-known fundamental maxims, viz: "Environment speaks louder than words and in time is more effective and lasting." "Let me direct and control your thoughts, and I will control your actions." "As a man thinketh, so is he." "Train up children in the way they should go, and when they are old, they will not depart from it."

Justice Frankfurter, who was the policy adviser of the NAACP, with Thurgood Marshall, a Negro attorney as his assistant, for the 10 years preceding his appointment to the Supreme Court recognized the truth of

the above maxims when, in his opinion, given in the Little Rock case, he said: "local customs, however hardened by time, are not decreed in heaven. Habits and feelings they engender may be counteracted and moderated. Experience attests that such local habits and feelings will yield, gradually though this be, to education."

In further proof of the correctness of my position, I submit the following opinions given me in letters I received from able and fearless judges having the courage of their convictions, to wit:

Judge Samuel H. Sibley, of Marietta, Ga., now retired after years of service as U.S. district judge and as a member of the Court of Appeals of the Fifth Circuit, in his letter to me on July 25, 1954, said: "I have your article on the recent decision of the Supreme Court on the segregation question. I heartily endorse it and agree with what you say. The decision seems childish to me and, what is worse, a misapprehension of judicial power and principle that is alarming. The language of the 14th amendment does not fit education or require the overruling of the Plessy case. The tendency of the Court to make statutes and the Constitution mean what they think will be best is alarming to me. In the Florida case of Aubeteit (176 Fed. 2d 438), I boldly refused to enforce an opinion of the Supreme Court in said case on the ground that the Court had, by judicial legislation, added to and changed a criminal statute. My fellow judges agreed that this was true, but thought it unbecoming for them to do so. Therefore, I just had to dissent, which I did."

Judge Terrell, a long-time distinguished member and chief justice of the Supreme Court of Florida, in his letter to me on November 26, 1954, said:

"I thank you for your letter with the enclosures, all of which I have read with great interest. The more I think about the Supreme Court's opinion, the more I am convinced that it is unfounded in law; and not only that, but without any support in fact to fortify it. Anyone who has studied law, even though he be recently from a law school, is bound to come out at the point that the Court voluntarily went out and cooked up a reason to dispose of the matter on grounds that are not in the lawbooks and have no support except from books of sociologists and socialized reformers that know nothing about the practicalities of the situation."

Judge Dozier A. DeVane, U.S. district judge of Florida, in a letter addressed to me on August 3, 1954, said: "I have read your article on segregation and heartily agree with your view about the decision of the Supreme Court on the question. I consider the 10th amendment as important and as binding on the Supreme Court as the 14th amendment, and I think it is stretching the 14th amendment and negativing the 10th amendment to make the 14th applicable to the States and their administration of the school system."

U.S. District Judge Edgar S. Vaught, chief judge, Western District of Oklahoma, on March 17, 1955, in a letter to me, said: "I read your paper on the segregation question published in the Tampa Tribune on July 18, 1954, and I want you to know I agree with you 100 percent in your conclusions."

President Eisenhower, when he was a candidate in 1952, in a speech said: "The Federal Government did not create the States of this Republic. The States created the Federal Government. The creation should not supersede the creator, because if the States lose their meaning, our entire system of government loses its meaning, and the next step is the rise of the centralized national State in which the seeds of autocracy can take roots and grow."

He restated the above fundamental truth before a conference of Governors at Seattle in 1953.

After being elected and hypnotized and brainwashed by Chief Justice Warren and other aiders and abettors of the NAACP, he now advocates the sowing of the seeds of autocracy by recommending that the Congress appropriate $2½ billions for appeasing public schoolteachers and State and county school officials. To contend that such an appropriation can be used for such a purpose and leave the operation and control of public schools to the respective States and their counties, is to manifest an inexcusable ignorance of a deliberate effort to aid Federal Government officials to secure supreme control of all public schools and colleges, because it is well known that when the United States gives financial aid in support of any project or business, it demands and exercises absolute control of the project or business whatever it may be.

It is my opinion, after diligent research and study, that the only constitutional, fair and peaceable plan for the operation of our public schools and colleges is the seperate, equal facilities plan that had operated peaceably and satisfactorily until the NAACP political agitators succeded in stirring up dissatisfaction as dictators of the Negroes, and securing the said unconstitutional edict from the Supreme Court to aid them.

I know of no more destructive blow that could be dealt segregation in our Florida public schools than the closing of the Negro A. & M. College in Tallahassee, as advocated by the present Governor of Florida, because if that should be done, as he well knows, the students would have to be sent to the university at Gainsville, and the teachers turned out without employment, unless the integrationists should by some form of manipulation work out a part time plan of substitution, which would add fuel to the flame. Those who advocate the closing of existing colleges for Negroes cannot at the same time consistently, to say the least, claim that they are for preserving segregation in our public schools. If the money spent by, and in aid of, carrying out the NAACP plan to destroy segregation in our public schools and colleges had been spent in establishing and endowing schools and colleges for Negroes, something worth while and permanent would have been accomplished for the proper education of the Negroes instead of a retrogration that will continue indefinitely.

My contention is that the separate-equal-facilities plan is the only plan that will result in a fair and friendly rivalry based on the mental attainments of the two races in the elementary branches of education and the arts and sciences, athletics and initiative as advocated by Booker T. Washington.

The question that naturally arises is: How long will the Supreme Court continue to exercise such judicial tyranny? My answer is: as long as the judges of the lower Federal courts and the judges of the State courts and the county and State school authorities and the members of the American and State Bar Associations and those who privately declare they are for segregation, worship at the shrine of an unconstitutional edict on the pretext that it is the "Law of the land."

Better Forecasts—Better Farming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 13, 1959

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, thanks to the foresight of the Department of Commerce Appropriation Subcommittee, a pilot weather program has been approved for the Mississippi Delta as a means of improving agricultural weather services. The program is now beginning its first full crop year of operation.

An outstanding meteorologist, Mr. Jack Riley, is in charge of the service and has done a wonderful job of explaining its value to the farmers of the area.

The Christian Science Monitor recently published a brief article outlining the work of volunteers who are assisting in this pilot program. Under unanimous consent, I am including this article:

BETTER FORECASTS—BETTER FARMING

A Mississippi small businessman may not be doing anything to change the weather, but he certainly is doing something with it. Oliver Woods, of Tunica, Miss., is 1 of 10 voluntary weather observers who are helping to chart a pattern for vastly improved weather forecasts for farmers.

This network of weather observers in the Mississippi Delta area is part of a pilot weather program established by Congress last summer to look into ways and means of improving agricultural weather forecasts. In addition to setting up this network of miniature weather stations, the Weather Bureau expanded its existing facilities in Memphis, Tenn., and Jackson, Miss. A research agronomist began work at the Delta Branch Experiment Station, Stoneville, Mass., to study the relationship between plantlife and weather conditions.

DEPENDENT ON WEATHER

Few people are as dependent on the weather as the farmer, since his production efforts must be tailored to fit its whims. Improved information can't change the weather, but farming operations can be altered to adjust profitably to the weather.

The sprawling Delta & Pine Land Co., Scott, Miss., one of the world's largest cotton plantations, offers an outstanding example of how weather information and farming practices can be combined successfully.

BETTER FORECASTS NEEDED

The 30-day Weather Bureau forecasts are used in estimating the amount of feed pastures will produce in early spring, making plans for land preparation, deciding on planting dates and methods, timing of fertilizer applications, and estimating needs for harvesting equipment. The 5-day and daily forecasts also are followed closely in timing a multitude of seasonal production practices, such as insecticide and herbicide applications and irrigations.

While present forecasts are generally helpful, the farmer still needs better forecasts. The pilot weather program is designed to uncover ways of giving the farmer more of the weather information he needs in his own particular area. Keymen in this program are Mr. Woods and his nine fellow weather observers.

The bulk of their work consists of gathering data, such as the evaporation rate, rainfall, wind direction and velocity, temperature, and humidity, and relaying this information to a central forecasting point. They keep track of the forecasts issued and compare them with actual weather conditions.

As a side effort to serve the community, Mr. Woods provides this basic weather information to farmers and businessmen in his area when they need it for various business operations.

Paul H. Kutschenreuter, special assistant to the local chief of the U.S. Weather Bureau, said: "It is giving us a chance to put into practice many of the ideas of forward-looking meteorologists and agriculturists for better utilization of weather and weather information in farming."

The Second Battle of Gettysburg: The Fight To Save the Battlefield From Unsightly Signs and Disfiguring Commercialization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the battle of Gettysburg witnessed the high tide of Confederate courage and Union determination.

A second battle of Gettysburg is now being fought. It is to preserve the land on which this battle was fought, the land and the action which inspired President Abraham Lincoln to remark:

The world will little note or long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here.

Today some of this hallowed land is being covered by a variety of unsightly signs and uninspiring type of buildings.

More and more land of special historic and scenic value in the United States is coming under private ownership. This means that to obtain that land for public enjoyment in the future, our Government will have to pay out great extra sums of money. However, if the land is acquired now, in many cases the price will be much lower.

I feel this country should obtain land for these historic spots for the education of everyone. Our heritage inspires and illuminates our lives.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Jean White which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald for Wednesday, April 8, 1959, under the heading, "The Second Battle of Gettysburg."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECOND BATTLE OF GETTYSBURG

(By Jean White)

If they restage the Battle of Gettysburg on the centennial 4 years from now, some of Pickett's men may be making their charge through a custard stand or souvenir shop.

And the Yankees, retreating from the first day's encounter, would have to dodge through a brand-new housing subdivision amid splitlevels and ramblers.

And the laterday Gen. George Meade may have to hold a council of war in headquarters within 100 yards of a miniature golf course and manmade fantasyland.

New invaders are threatening to overrun parts of the hallowed and consecrated land where 160,000 men from the North and South fought a battle that helped determine a nation's destiny. The modern invaders are suburbia and commercialism. They already have won some firm footholds on the battleground.

To head off the advances of roadside stands and close-packed housing developments, the National Park Service is asking Congress for $750,000 for fiscal year 1960 to buy up 350 strategic acres around the Gettysburg National Military Park. The House whacked off all money for Civil War battlefield land acquisition.

The NPS is pinning its hopes on the Senate for restoration of the House-deleted funds. Hearings probably will be held this month before a Senate appropriations subcommittee.

It is going to be a race against time and the blight of progress.

An 80-acre tract of land—where most of the first day's action was fought out on July 1, 1863—will probably go on the market July 1 if the NPS doesn't get its land money. This is part of some 150 acres of farm and grazing land owned by Adams County. The county has given up agricultural operations at the county home and wants to sell the land to raise money for a home building.

Unofficially, the county commissioners have said they will hold off the sale until July. But after that, they say, they'll have to open up the market to other bidders because the county needs the money. The 80 acres of the first day's battle would be a perfect spot for a housing subdivision. The county has no zoning ordinance to control the type of such a development.

"We want the Government to have it," one of the commissioners said with a shrug of his shoulders last week. "But we also have to look out for our own problems. We can't wait forever."

Also on the market is the 125-acre Meals farm near the county home lands. Planted firmly in the center of the field is a sign: "For sale; building lots." Up to now, none has been sold, reports Franklin Bigham, one of the owners.

"The way I understand it," he said, "the Government can't even talk about the land until it has the money to buy it."

"If we lose those two tracts," says Gettysburg Military Park Superintendent James B. Myers, "the first day's battle will have evaporated. What we want is a perpetuation of the scene of 1863. As long as the county farmed the land, we had no worries. This was how it was at the time of the battle."

NPS, Myers emphasizes, doesn't want the land to raise more monuments (Gettysburg had 2,390 of these already, most the gifts of States and Civil War units). Most of the acres would be leased back to farmers to till the soil and rotate crops as others did before them back in that July of 1863.

Today the famous peach orchard, owned by the Government, still blooms and bears fruit under the care of one of the leasees.

NPS now owns 2,762 acres of Gettysburg battlefield land. Over the next 3 years it wants to buy 691 additional acres at a total cost of $2.4 million. Some of this money would go to clear out souvenir stands, beer parlors, and junkyards already edging on the battlefield site, particularly along Route 15 south to Washington.

Only last year the NPS bought 3.8 acres of land along the old Emmittsburg Road (Route 15) where a motel was already under construction. The price was $18,665 to save land over which Pickett's troops charged. Last week a bulldozer was at work covering over the foundations of the motel. The Government will lease it for farming.

The case for history at Gettysburg has to be made against a progressive town's growth and a township's need for taxes.

Businessmen in Gettysburg would like to see some light industries like electronic firms come to town to bolster the economy for the 8,000 residents. But they also recognize that tourism—some 800,000 persons came to the battlefield last year—is in itself a big industry.

The tax argument comes from Cumberland Township, where the battlefield site lies. The township is digging for school tax money, and a housing subdivision on the county home land, for instance, would pad the tax base. As county land, it hasn't been taxed up to now.

But, for the most part, residents apparently would like to see the NPS get the land. Most owners are willing to sell at a fair market price. But they say they can't wait forever and pass by good moneymaking opportunities.

Waukesha, Wis., Daily Freeman: 100 Years of Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to congratulate an outstanding Wisconsin newspaper which celebrated its 100th anniversary on March 29. It seems to me only fitting that we pause long enough today to pay our respects to this militant, dedicated and persevering newspaper, the Waukesha (Wis.) Daily Freeman.

This newspaper, founded 100 years ago on March 29, 1859, is marking its centennial with a series of special editions which depict the growth of the city of Waukesha, the County of Waukesha, and the Waukesha Daily Freeman.

The year 1959 is a particularly fitting time for the Waukesha Freeman to observe its centennial, because at no time since those first years of this newspaper has our country faced as serious a fight for universal recognition of individual civil rights as it does today.

For 100 years the Waukesha Daily Freeman has adhered to the principles of the abolition movement, and I might add that these principles are no less important today than they were 100 years ago. Through the years we have made considerable progress in the area of human rights, but recent newspaper headlines prove to us that we have not yet achieved in practice the theory of equal rights for all Americans, for all human beings.

The Waukesha Daily Freeman has made a major contribution to our democracy for its strict adherence for 100 years to its founding principles. The fact that this strength is still alive was well illustrated several years ago when the Daily Freeman, published in a community of some 28,000 residents, was nominated for a Pulitzer prize. Nomination for this coveted award throughout our land was based on the Waukesha Daily Freeman's ceaseless efforts to gain public access to local government records and meetings. In addition, this publication—though primarily local and State in news interest—has time and again stood in favor of this same free access to information at the Federal level. Its praiseworthy stand deserves the support of all persons interested in good government—at local, State, and National levels.

I wish to add only that it is my sincere hope and desire that the Waukesha Daily Freeman continue to be equally dedicated to the highest traditions of journalism in a free and democratic society for the next 100 years. This is a newspaper

which has fought for a full century for the rights of all human beings, and I have every faith in the leadership of its publisher, Mrs. J. H. Youmans. I know it shall continue to adhere to its founding principle for the next 100 years.

My heartiest congratulations go to Mrs. Youmans and the Waukesha Daily Freeman, and I know that my 435 colleagues in Congress join me in this greeting.

Government Research Laboratories Are a Waste of Money and Talent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. OLIVER
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, the furor caused by the Soviet achievement in launching the sputnik led to an agonizing reappraisal of our educational and scientific programs. It seems to me that the status of the science of oceanography needs similar reappraisal. Government laboratories have been criticized for their lack of effectiveness in the field of basic research. In view of the urgent necessity for expanded basic and applied efforts, something must be done to improve our Government approaches in these fields.

In recognizing the necessity for increased expenditures to promote an expanded program of oceanography, we must also emphasize elimination of the defects in the administration of our present program. We must be assured that additional expenditures in the field of research will be used to their best effect. Certainly, a comprehensive review of all our present expenditures for oceanographic research is required; however, we must not allow penny wise, pound foolish budgeting to becloud the basic necessity for additional concentration in this vital scientific field.

The following article, originally published in the New Bedford, Mass., Standard-Times, indicated the enormity of the problem our Government faces in revitalizing our basic scientific research programs:

SEA BATTLE 1958: KEY TO SURVIVAL, VIII—GOVERNMENT RESEARCH LABORATORIES ARE A WASTE OF MONEY AND TALENT

(By Everett S. Allen)

The Defense Department ought to get out of the basic-research business; it has a long record of wasted dollars and few results. Its laboratories, of extremely uneven quality, lay heavy emphasis on engineers, rather than scientists. The latter produce ideas; the former put ideas into application. In recent years, most U.S. Defense Department money has gone to practical application rather than into the critically important fields of new thought.

This is what many of the country's leading oceanographers, and other earth scientists, say privately and would say publicly if they didn't hope for Federal funds to insure their continued existence.

CIVILIANS CREDITED

But others say it publicly. Senator MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana, plans to recommend that all the armed services should be relieved of their responsibilities in research and development.

History reveals the reason. Nearly all this country's weapons, including the plane and submarine, and most of its communication and detection systems and firearms, have been discovered and developed by civilian agencies.

The Government needs prodding to be reminded of this; sputnik helped to do so—more U.S. funds ought to go into basic research which is where the ideas behind the weapons and systems originally came from.

Senator FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, commented: "The Russians, brutal though they are, have made their greatest progress of all in the field of educational and basic research. But the United States has developed a society in which truckdrivers, bricklayers, and factory workers are often better paid than professors, and in which an Elvis Presley makes more than the President."

U.S. LABS UNEVEN

The matter of Government laboratories is a touchy subject; they are very uneven—some good, some no good at all. Most Government labs, in the words of a topnotch U.S. scientist, "deal with gadgets that anybody could build, but they aren't good at getting new ideas. Most new ideas come from private laboratories."

A lot of the routine work which should be done by Government laboratories is farmed out to private labs, preventing the latter from getting on with the necessary basic research.

Government laboratory overhead is fantastic, compared to that of private institutions. Most private-lab research scientists don't want or need many assistants. Most private labs try to get as many full professors as possible, and as few janitors as they can get by with.

But in civil service, one's rating depends on how big an empire one can build up, so Government labs—where the pay scale depends on numbers of personnel—hire lots of janitors and few scientists. Any job costs a lot of money and, in many cases, takes a lot of time to do, too. There are plenty of Government officials with science money to spend who won't give it to Government labs because they know their dollars will go a lot further in private organizations.

VIE FOR PERSONNEL

Further, Government laboratories compete with private laboratories for personnel, to the ultimate detriment of U.S. basic research. A private laboratory director, annonymous because he depends on Government contracts, remarks, "We can't pay as well as the Government and we can find 50 darned fools who love pure science enough to work for us for less money, but if we had to find 100 darned fools, I don't think we could do it."

The U.S. Government ought to shut off the money it gives to service labs, and use these funds to establish a long-range relationship with private laboratories, which would be a mutually beneficial setup—the Government would get results, the private labs would get some of the financial security they do not now have.

Oceanography is a good example; it is about as expensive as physics these days, because of the need for ships. The national budget in this field before the war was about $350,000 a year; now it's probably $6 million, but the expansion has been only in personnel. There have been only two new buildings and no new ships since the war.

TIME IS A FACTOR

How should the Government spend its money in marine science? This depends, according to the best authorities in the field, on the amount of time available—specifically, how long is the cold war going to last?

If there is time, it would be a good idea to have more laboratories, because labs get less efficient as they get bigger. But it takes about 10 years to get a laboratory to the stage where it is producing. It takes time to staff it, too, because research is something new—it involves the new idea—and not every scientist is good at it—maybe 10 out of 100. You have to create a climate for them, sit back and hope.

Research science is built on the apprentice system, and you can't hurry it. You've got to catch these scientists young. Probably their imagination won't be fired until they've fooled around in the lab for 5 years after their university training—then, likely as not, they'll find they didn't take the right subjects to pursue what has interested them. So, they go back to school and learn what they need; then, maybe they produce, and even they don't know in advance what it may be.

ALLIES LACK FACILITIES

If there is time, probably the U.S. Government ought to spend some science money in Europe, among its allies. Science in Europe since the war, possibly excepting West Germany, has not been well-to-do; it has suffered terribly from the rise in the cost of living. Even the supply of laboratory nuts, bolts, glassware and similar equipment is inadequate; further, the tools of science get constantly more complicated and expensive.

As an example, if the United States helped our European allies might be able to build a big cyclotron, an ion accelerator used in atom-splitting. At present, they can afford only small ones and thus are losing out in the East-West science race.

In European laboratories, scientists are getting along with little in the way of electronic instruments, and the cost of building new ones continues to go up. Fully as critical, however, is the fact that the United States continues to "raid" their laboratories of scientists; about the time their graduate students get to the research age, an American job lures them out of Europe. In the common interest, it might be a good idea to halt this practice, if possible.

If there is time, the United States might finance a centrally located European laboratory for basic research, bringing to it selected European scientists from several countries. Scientists here, however, are dubious about the plan because in such research, you are dealing with unknowns—you can't put your finger on what's needed, and as one scientist remarked, "If you're going to dislocate people in that fashion, you ought to know what you hope to get out of it."

RESEARCH VERSUS ENGINEERING

If there is time, if this country is in pretty good shape vis-a-vis Russia, but perhaps the Soviets could pull ahead of us in 20 years or so, then it might be a good idea to build more U.S. labs and aid Europe in doing so.

But if the Federal administration considers America is in a real emergency, most U.S. scientists would figure we should not dilute our efforts either with new labs or by helping Europe.

Most oceanography is scientific research, not engineering. Most missile and rocket development is engineering, not research. The Russian exploits with sputnik have been principally enginering, not science. It remains to be seen whether the Soviet system is going to be good at finding out new things or merely at exploiting what already is known. Sputnik, for example, is largely a latter-day result of the German V-2 rocket of World War II.

If you figure we are to have a war tomorrow, all U.S. scientists should become engineers; for some time now, this country has been watering down its research with an eye on the practical applications of science.

But if there is time for research, let's see if the Government can't do better about providing an assured income for the laboratories that are set up to perform it.

President Clark Kerr's Observations on Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article published in the March issue of the California Monthly outlining some important observations made by President Clark Kerr, of the University of California, while on a recent tour of Asia:

PRESIDENT CLARK KERR'S OBSERVATIONS ON ASIA

President Kerr, recently returned from an extensive visit to southern Asia, expressed considerable concern over the effectiveness of American foreign aid programs in the countries he visited. The occasion of the 40-day trip was a series of seminars on problems of labor-management and social policy in economic growth sponsored by the Ford Foundation.

"Present U.S. policy as regards underdeveloped countries seems often to reflect the current political situation rather than long-range goals. Aid by itself is not enough," said Dr. Kerr. "We need a fully developed policy and first-rate personnel to go with it.

"Our Public Information Service tends to tell only half the story. The people of Asia know what we have but not how we got it. They haven't been told that our standard of living is high and we work 40 hours or less a week because back in the beginning, when we too were underdeveloped, we were willing to work 60 to 80 hours a week. To give people an impression of our riches without mentioning the work that provided them does not give a wise or fair impression of America.

"The United States had better make up its mind to accompany its present monetary aid with fully developed policy or be prepared to watch its sphere of influence continue to dwindle. There is no crisis at the moment but at the rate things are going there may well be one in 10 to 20 years."

Turning to his reception in Athens, Istanbul, Beirut, Teheran, Karachi, Delhi, Calcutta, Djakarta, Singapore, Hong Kong, Tokyo, and Honolulu, President Kerr remarked on the wonderful friendliness extended his group. "The people are eager for answers to their problems. Their greatest need seems to be a sense of their own progress. The people can still be reached, but this atmosphere of willingness to work with the West may not last too long if we don't do a better job. The black Cadillacs of the U.S. Diplomatic Corps, driving through streets lined with starving people, give a disagreeable picture of conspicuous consumption. The Russians, on the other hand, are rarely seen.

"The people we met with in Asia were satisfied with our program of military aid, but they wanted more monetary help. They also wanted information. Leaders in universities, Government, and industry wanted to know how to develop businessmen in a country that had never had any, they wanted to know how to develop manufacturers and responsible trade unions. From the things I saw, I would judge that the United States gets its greatest return on what it spends on education in underdeveloped countries. Public health programs are fine, but it really isn't fair to come in and save thousands of children at birth only to let them die of starvation later on.

"Generally it seemed as though technical people working abroad were doing the best job for America. People in routine jobs seemed to show the least interest. By and large, our best people are where they count the most."

Dr. Kerr and his colleagues, Thomas H. Carroll, vice president of the Ford Foundation; John T. Dunlop, professor of economics at Harvard; and Frederick A. Harbinson, professor of industrial relations at MIT, met in seminar with representatives of universities, Government, and industry in Istanbul, Beirut, Teheran, Karachi, Delhi, Djakarta, and Tokyo.

At a typical seminar an American visitor would give a talk on developments in his field, say trade-union organization. Then the local people explained what they were doing and the problems they had encountered. A general discussion on how to improve conditions followed. Then another American would speak on his specialty. The average seminar lasted 3 or 4 days, and many sessions ran over into the evenings. Between sessions the visitors were entertained lavishly.

"The seminars were received with enthusiasm wherever we went," concluded Dr. Kerr. "We feel that the trip was mutually advantageous. Our findings as to the state of industrialization in the countries we visited will be published in book form later this year."

Address by Ambassador John M. Cabot to Latin American Agricultural Attachés

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ALBERT
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, during the Easter recess I had the privilege of attending the market development conference of the Foreign Agricultural Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture held in Bogotá, Colombia. Present were not only those responsible for our Foreign Agricultural Service here in Washington and all U.S. Agricultural attachés on duty in Latin America, but also several representatives of agricultural trade organizations. These people met in Bogotá with a common objective, namely, to discuss ways and means of expanding markets in Latin America for the products of American farms. The potential markets for our agricultural products in that area are almost unlimited. Better markets mean greater prosperity for our own people and for those with whom we trade.

The conference was opened by a very splendid statement by our Ambassador to Colombia, the Honorable John M. Cabot. Ambassador Cabot's statement outlined the objectives of the conference and the responsibilities and opportunities open to our people in our dealings with our friendly neighbors to the south. Under leave to extend my remarks I include Mr. Cabot's address herewith:

WELCOMING TALK TO LATIN AMERICAN AGRICULTURAL ATTACHÉS BY AMBASSADOR JOHN M. CABOT, APRIL 1, 1959

All men were created equal in needing food. All men do not need and all men do not get the same amount of food or indeed, in many cases, what they need. Some eat too much; many more cannot get enough even to work efficiently. Far too many are hungry.

We are fortunate in the United States in having a surplus of food. Most of us here are of course taxpayers, and the $9 billion worth of food stored under our agricultural stabilization programs is a burden on our pocketbooks. But we have not abandoned our farmers to their economic fate, whatever it might be; and our agricultural measures have helped us to provide, for our friends and allies such as Colombia, the food which their people needed and did not have. With our surplus food we have saved many from starvation; and we have helped many more to save themselves from the spiritual starvation of totalitarian tyranny.

Tyrants can indeed feed their people on propaganda. It does not matter to them if their people starve; if, indeed, they take food from the hungry to export and thereby obtain foreign exchange. They herd them into communes, for the glorification of the State and the abasement of the individual. Notably, all of the great modern tyrannies have thought of guns rather than butter. It matters not to them if millions starve while a 5-year plan is achieved and progress is made toward subjugating new peoples to their yoke. If they achieve statistical results, what does the cry of a hungry child mean to them?

It is difficult for a half-starved man to fight for freedom. Indeed as we accumulate agricultural surpluses we should remember that a great majority of humanity is more likely to wonder where its next meal is coming from than about its freedom. If the cold war is a struggle between two ways of life, what better demonstration can we give of ours than by showing that free men eat better than totalitarian slaves?

In democracies the people decide what is to be done. We insist that the people receive the necessities of life. The food which we produce will not only make the free man a more efficient worker; it will strengthen us physically and spiritually to resist those who announce frankly that they will bury us. Sometimes we forget that they mean just that, as regards both our bodies and our souls.

Many of the people even in the free world are still hungry, despite everything that we are doing to feed them. The problem is not simply one of distributing the surpluses we have in the United States to correct deficiencies elsewhere. Great as our stocks and production capacity are in the United States, they are not remotely sufficient to fill present and future needs. We do, indeed, need to dispose of burdensome surpluses. Far greater, however, is the need to help other friendly countries produce themselves what they need. There will be cases in which this will hurt our national production. Nevertheless, it would not help the free world if we disposed of our food at the cost of discouraging adequate food production in the nations to which we exported it, or of injuring the legitimate markets of other friendly countries.

We must remember that a wise distribution of our surpluses is likely in the long run to increase both production and consumption in other lands. If in some cases this means that our exports will decrease, experience has shown that in many other cases increasing demand will outstrip increasing domestic supply. We should be happy in a prospering market if the absolute amount of our agricultural exports increases even though percentage in our share of the market drops.

You are here primarily to discuss expanding the markets for our agricultural products. I believe you will succeed primarily insofar as your efforts promote prosperous markets in this area. Latin America now buys as much commercially from the United States as it can finance by selling its prod-

ucts to the United States. We have seen in Colombia the disastrous results of buying more than can be sold and also how much can be bought if much is sold. With more mouths to feed, with more hands to work, with greater prosperity and a will to prosperity in Latin America there should be an ample market here for all that we have to sell, provided they can buy. We can stimulate demand, and incidentally, individual well-being, in Latin America, by judicious schemes for promoting the sales of our agricultural surpluses among our fellow Americans in our sister republics. But the thought I would leave with you is that their prosperity and our prosperity are inextricably linked; that if they feel themselves better off we are likely to find ourselves better off; that our food cannot only satisfy their hunger, it can help to keep them and us free.

It is in this spirit that I take the greatest pleasure in welcoming you here today. We are honored by the presence of a distinguished group of Senators and Representatives from our Congress. I am sure your deliberations will be fruitful not only in solving immediate problems but also in facing the fundamental issues which today confront freemen everywhere.

Where'd All Water Go?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in view of the action earlier this year by the House of Representatives in approving the diversion of extra water from the Great Lakes into the Illinois Waterway, I would like my colleagues to note an article which appeared March 27, 1959, in the Detroit Free Press. After reading this article, I don't believe that there should be any doubt in anyone's mind that earlier House action on this vital matter was hasty and ill-considered.

The article follows:

WHERE'D ALL WATER GO?

(By Joe Dowdall)

Boaters on the Great Lakes joked last year about "the guy who pulled the plug in Lake Erie."

The water level had dropped an inch from the 1957 level.

There's no joking now.

In both Lake St. Clair and Lake Erie, the water level is at its lowest point in 17 years. The water levels of Lake Michigan and Lake Huron are at their lowest in 21 years.

This time the old timers aren't shrugging their shoulders and explaining "It's just the 7-year cycle."

The U.S. Department of Lake Survey has charted the Great Lakes' water levels back to 1860 in an effort to determine whether there's a cycle of high and low water levels.

"The levels of the last 15 years are enough to disprove such theories," says Maj. Ernest J. Denz, district engineer of the Lake Survey.

"Not one of the lakes recorded had a high or low cycle. The only evidence of nature's effect on the lakes' water level is the amount of precipitation."

The 1958 level of Lakes Michigan and Huron has dropped 3.7 inches since the last high mark in 1952. Lake St. Clair has dropped 2.8 inches, and Lake Erie 2.6 inches in the same period.

The water level has dropped at least an additional inch in the first 2 months of this year in these lakes.

"We can't explain it," Major Denz said. "We know that unusually thick ice cuts the flow of water through the lakes, but the water isn't coming back now that the ice is breaking up."

The dredging of the Detroit River and the lakes along the St. Lawrence Seaway will help the commercial carriers. But the dredged channels must draw their water from somewhere.

The seaway project calls for an additional 2 to 5 feet of depth for 49 miles of the 78-mile stretch from the foot of the Detroit River to Lake Huron.

Some pleasure boaters contend that the dredging is siphoning water from the rivers and streams that enter into the Great Lakes.

Along parts of Fox Creek, the Clinton River and the Ecorse River the flow resembles that of a garden hose on a hot August afternoon. Just a trickle of water slips along the bed.

In St. Clair Shores many of the canals have dried up under the 30-inch layer of ice. Boaters report their boat wells are bone dry.

The condition hasn't been termed critical as yet because the first 3 months of the year are always the lowest.

The water level is expected to come back up, but it is doubtful that it will reach last year's level.

The heavy ice and snow that blankets northern Michigan is expected to bring some relief when it melts.

The boaters and the Army Engineers are praying.

Expenditures of the Executive Office of the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, recently there has been much comment in the press concerning the expenditures of the Executive Office of the President. One columnist purportedly compared projected expenses for 1960 with the level of expenses for the year 1952, which was the last full year of the administration of President Harry S. Truman. At my request the Bureau of the Budget has furnished figures concerning actual expenses of the Executive Office in 1952 and estimated expenses for 1960.

A summary of these figures reveals that personnel costs for the White House actually increased more and at a greater rate during President Truman's administration than they have during President Eisenhower's administration, and this in spite of the fact that during President Eisenhower's administration Congress has twice increased the pay rates for Federal employees.

Employment figures for 1952 and estimates for 1960 are as follows:

White House and Executive Office of the President—Average employment, fiscal years 1952 and 1960

1952 White House and Executive Office total employment 1,256

	1952	1960 [1]	Difference
Employment decreases:			
Executive Mansion and Grounds	74	70	−4
Bureau of the Budget	493	430	−63
Council of Economic Advisers	38	32	−6
Emergency Fund for the President	82	5	−77
Office of Defense Mobilization	[2] 295	[3] 225	−70
Total			−220
Additional employment:			
White House Office	252	274	+22
National Security Council	21	27	+6
Total			+28
New activities established:			
Special projects (some part by transfer from existing agencies)		101	+101
President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization		6	+6
President's Committee on Fund Raising Within the Federal Service		4	+4
Operations Coordinating Board		[4] 49	+49
Total			+160

1960 White House and Executive Office total employment (excluding personnel acquired as result of merger of FCDA and ODM) 1,224

Summary

1952 total employment	1,256
1960 total employment	2,730
Difference	1,474
Increase as result of acquisition of FCDA personnel	1,506
Actual comparative decrease	−32

[1] Estimated.
[2] Includes National Security Resources Board, later merged with ODM.
[3] ODM merged with FCDA, an established independent agency, to form Office of Civil Defense and Mobilization in the Executive Office.
[4] OCB staff is included in NSC budget.

Subject: White House and Executive Office of the President, comparison of employment for the fiscal years 1952 and 1960.

The attached table shows that employment in all units in the White House and Executive Office of the President, with the exception of employment added to the Executive Office as a result of the merger of mobilization and civil defense activities in 1958, actually decreased 2.5 percent from 1952, the last full year in office of the preceding administration, to 1960. The merger in the Executive Office of Office of Defense Mobilization and Federal Civil Defense Administration (an established independent agency) added 1,506 employees, and this tends to make comparisons in total employment misleading.

THE WHITE HOUSE OFFICE

Average employment of the White House Office increased from 252 in fiscal year 1952, to 272 in 1955. Since 1955, employment has remained close to 272, and no increases above the current 274 are anticipated through 1960.

SPECIAL PROJECTS

Certain of the policy development and policy coordinating activities consolidated under "Special projects" in 1956 had previously been carried on in the departments and by interdepartmental committees. Personnel were charged to the appropriation of the agency providing the funds rather than to the White House. This was also a practice of previous administrations.

A part of the increase indicated is attributable, however, to new undertakings which were dictated by the national interest. These include the studies in science and technology under Dr. Killian, and the airways modernization activities headed by General Quesada, which have since been transferred to the Federal Aviation Agency.

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

Employment of the NSC increased from 21 to 27 during the period 1952–58. Beginning in 1958, the Operations Coordinating Board has been financed from this appropriation. From its creation in 1953 until 1958 financing for OCB was provided by represented agencies and personnel were distributed according to source of funds. The OCB assists in coordinating implementation of national security policies. Total NSC employment for 1960 is estimated to be 76.

OFFICE OF CIVIL AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION

The consolidation in 1958 of the Federal Civil Defense Administration, an independent office created in 1950, with the Office of Defense Mobilization, within the Executive Office of the President significantly changed overall Executive Office employment. Total OCDM employment in 1960 is estimated to be 1,731, of which 225 relate to the former ODM and 1,506 to the newly merged functions from FCDA.

OTHER ACTIVITIES

Employment of other activities in the Executive Office has remained stable, with the exception of the Bureau of the Budget which will employ 63 fewer people in 1960 than in 1952.

Dismissing TVA as Socialism Is Retreating From Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as we know, the House Public Works Committee recently ordered reported a bill to permit the Tennessee Valley Authority to finance additional needed power installations by the sale of revenue bonds.

Many critics of this legislation base their opposition on the grounds that the TVA power concept is a form of socialism. A very excellent editorial appeared in the Paducah Sun-Democrat of March 30, 1959, questioning the wisdom and validity of this argument and presenting a most cogent example of the situation that can—and often does—prevail as a result of the virtual monopolistic control of the private power companies.

I should like to take this means of commending the following editorial to the attention of our colleagues:

[From the Paducah Sun-Democrat, Mar. 30, 1959]

DISMISSING TVA AS SOCIALISM IS RETREATING FROM ISSUES

Some of the critics of TVA power oppose it on the grounds that it is a form of socialism and is ipso facto evil. Such a charge is at best a general one and contains many weaknesses.

For instance, just what do we mean by socialism? To some people, anything run by the government is socialism, but is the Post Office Department socialistic, or the Census Bureau, or the Bureau of Public Roads?

Some political theorists would call our Department of Agriculture socialistic. Others would say that it is not, but that the REA's, which were created by the Federal Government, are.

It is obvious then that socialism is a word with different meanings to different people, and because of its many shadings of interpretation, it is more a tool of demagoguery than an instrument of valid debate.

Actually many of the bureaus of our Government operate under varying philosophies of liberalism. To class these philosophies as degrees of socialism is to retreat from openminded consideration of basic issues.

There were many valid reasons for inauguration of TVA. One was flood control; another was improvement of navigation; another, to provide a yardstick to determine the cost of producing electric power. These are only a few.

While there are drawbacks to having such a vast Government-controlled agency, there are also very serious drawbacks to relinquishing production of power entirely to private companies.

The private power companies are virtual monopolies. Huge power combines that control subsidiaries over a multi-state are evidence of this. The people, then, are forced to pay the rates which they are charged and have no recourse from poor service.

These are not vague, general charges; they are based on fact. An example is a copy of a letter from the pastor of the Methodist Church of Columbus, Ky., to the trustees of his church. Dated March 3, 1959, it reads as follows:

"Gentlemen: May I call to your attention the excessive cost of electricity for the parsonage. We have just received our bill for the period, December 16, 1958, to February 16, 1959. It is $45.69. This is out of all proportion and reason when compared with the service received. What's more we were not at home for 16 days of the 61-day period, and our electricity was entirely, with the exception of water heater, cut off.

"I would recommend as your minister that you look into changing the house over to gas with the exception of lights only. My wife and I have been married 39 years come June, and this is the first time we ever have encountered electric service rates that are oppressive. This is in comparison, not with TVA, but with such as Alabama Power Co., West Texas Utilities, Detroit Edison, Oklahoma Light & Gas Co.

"Some time ago I finally induced the Kentucky utilities people to put a voltmeter on this line into the parsonage, and with the exception of just a few hours the line was underpowered. I knew it was, since it takes 75–100 watt bulbs here to get a 60-watt light, and furthermore it takes just about twice as long to heat an oven here, or to heat a bath, as the places mentioned. An electrician who saw the tape on the voltmeter reading said, 'Surely they'll step this line up.' This underpowered line 'gimmick' is a well-known kilowatt hour sales tool, since the ampere drainange is about doubled when the power is low.

"For your information, we have taken all the precautions recommended by anyone we have ever known to keep this within reason. But the situation is getting worse, and I do not believe anyone can remedy it and enjoy the rational use of electricity under the present setup. That is why I recommend that you take steps at once to change it to something that can be lived with.

"LOYD HINDS,
"Pastor."

We suggest that anyone who is opposed to TVA in principle consider whether he is in favor of the principles of charging a captive market "all the traffic will bear," maintaining substandard equipment, refusing to live up to contracts, and influencing legislation to make competition impossible. These are alternatives the people of this area face.

Why the Boggs Bill Would Benefit Industry, the Nation, and the Free World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following reprint from the March 27, 1959, issue of Business International:

The most important feature of the Boggs bill (H.R. 5), the provision for the formation of a U.S. Foreign Business Corporation (FBC) which would pay no U.S. tax until it remits a dividend to its parent company, would result in little or no loss of revenue for the U.S. Treasury. This is the conclusion reached by BI editors during the past month in discussing this bill face-to-face with more than 100 U.S. manufacturers from coast to coast engaged in foreign business.

This FBC provision of the bill would make it unnecessary for U.S. firms to operate abroad through foreign base companies incorporated in profit sanctuary countries such as Panama, Canada, Venezuela, the Bahamas and Switzerland, which impose little or no tax on foreign income. Most alert U.S. manufacturers are operating abroad through base companies in these countries and pay no tax to the United States until these subsidiaries remit dividends to the U.S. parent. Most other companies doing substantial business abroad but not through foreign base companies are waiting to see if the Boggs bill passes; if it does not, they will soon organize such companies. Thus U.S. tax revenue will be much the same whether the bill passes or not.

The only practical question confronting the U.S. Government is whether it wishes to have the foreign operations of U.S. corporations directed by foreign base companies whose offices are located abroad—or by U.S. corporations located within the United States.

BENEFITS TO THE UNITED STATES OF THE FBC

This measure of the Boggs bill would advance a cardinal principle of U.S. foreign policy: the encouragement of private investment overseas. This is true because most corporations must earn from outside the United States the capital to invest abroad. They need every cent of capital they can earn or borrow in the United States for investment within the United States. Indeed, the amount of domestic private investment may well determine the duration of the present upward movement of the business curve. We have seldom had sustained prosperity without a steady, high level of investment in U.S. plant and equipment. Moreover, U.S. industry needs billions of dollars for new, modern equipment in domestic plants to achieve productivity gains necessary to stem inflation that the wage-price spiral otherwise would impose upon the country.

As a practical matter, therefore, future private investments abroad will be made largely out of profits earned abroad. Because this is so, alert U.S. manufacturers have established foreign base companies in profit sanctuary countries. Profits flowing into subsidiaries in these countries promptly flow out again in the form of new investments overseas, with little or no tax imposed while the capital is en route. In short, foreign base companies enable U.S. firms to move profits from one foreign country to another without the United States imposing a tax owing to the transfer. This is the modern way of investing and expanding abroad.

NO NEED FOR EXODUS

Ultimately, of course, dividends are paid to the U.S. parent, at which time the U.S. Treasury collects its share. In the meantime, U.S. taxes are only deferred—they are neither evaded nor avoided. But during the period of deferral, the money is put to productive use in advancement of U.S. foreign economic policy. The Boggs bill would permit this deferral to be used, and the management of U.S. business operations abroad to be directed, by a U.S. corporation—within the United States—with U.S. personnel paying U.S. income taxes, and using the services of U.S. banks, insurance companies and the like, which also pay U.S. income taxes.

The absence of legislation such as Mr. Boggs proposes is now forcing U.S. corporations to move their international offices out of the country—forcing U.S. executives to move out and to do their business and banking in foreign countries. It is forcing U.S. companies to make investments in productive facilities in other countries under Panamanian, Canadian, Swiss or other flags instead of the U.S. flag—and to lose the benefits of U.S. tax treaties, treaties of friendship, commerce, and navigation, and the protection of what is really U.S. property by the U.S. Government. Finally, operating through base companies in foreign countries is more exepnsive and less efficient than if these companies were located in the United States where they ought to be.

Here are the six major questions being asked about this feature of the Boggs bill—and the answers.

SOME COMMON QUESTIONS—AND ANSWERS

Question 1: How much revenue would the United States lose by enacting this provision of the Boggs bill into law?

Answer: Not much, if any. In the long run, the Treasury would collect more, since U.S. firms expand abroad for the purpose of ultimately paying larger dividends. When larger profits flow from the FBC to the U.S. parent, the United States would collect larger taxes. Meantime, the Treasury would have little revenue even deferred, because most U.S. firms that are not already deferring taxes through using foreign base companies will promptly organize them if the Boggs bill is defeated.

Question 2: Should the Boggs bill be rewritten to exclude export profits from the benefits of deferral?

Answer: Profits on exports constitute a major source of funds for investment abroad. Many existing foreign base companies are already engaged in handling exports, from both U.S. and foreign plants. To exclude exports would emasculate the bill and drive more companies abroad, where they would defer U.S. tax on export income in any case.

Question 3: Should the bill be rewritten to provide the benefits of deferral only for investments that flow into underdeveloped nations that are of strategic importance to our national security?

Answer: As a practical matter, most firms must earn abroad the money to invest abroad, and the place to earn it quickly and in the first instance is often in the more developed markets such as Europe. In the interests of U.S. foreign economic policy, there should be no geographic limits placed on the Boggs bill.

A GROWING LINE OF PRECEDENTS

Question 4: Will this law give unfair advantages to U.S. corporations over European competitors?

Answer: This question reveals an ignorance of what other countries now offer their businessmen. In 1957, the United Kingdom amended its Inland Revenue Act to provide for the creation of Overseas Trading Corporations whose profits are not taxed until dividends are paid to shareholders. The amendment resembles the Boggs bill. The Belgians, under certain circumstances, reduce the tax on foreign income by 80 percent. The Dutch, under certain conditions, do not tax foreign income of their corporations at all. The Boggs bill is needed to enable U.S. firms to meet foreign competition.

Question 5: Does the building of plants abroad rob U.S. workers of jobs?

Answer: No. U.S. manufacturers build plants abroad to sell goods that cannot be exported from the United States owing to tariffs, import quotas and currency restrictions imposed by other governments, or because U.S. costs and prices are too high to compete with foreign-made goods. Profits from foreign plants flowing into the United States have helped to stabilize employment as well as earnings of U.S. firms.

Question 6: Does the building of plants abroad rob the United States of export earnings?

Answer: For the immediate future, no—for the reasons given above. In the long term, higher living standards abroad, boosted by U.S. private enterprise, will create larger markets for U.S. goods. Canada's industrialization proves this to be true. Moreover, foreign exchange earnings from U.S. private investments will add further assurances that the United States will be able to balance its international accounts at a high level and permit it to import all the raw materials it will need to keep its factories humming and expanding.

By permitting U.S. corporations to operate abroad through U.S. foreign business corporations, as provided by the Boggs bill, the U.S. Government in the end would not only collect more taxes, but would make more effective use of the only instrument for foreign economic development that we possess which the Communists do not have and cannot duplicate: free enterprise building, owning, and managing plants abroad.

True, the Russians can and do build a few plants abroad for other countries. But not many. Very few countries of the free world are interested in making such arrangements with a Communist government. When the Russians build a plant, they insist that it be a socialized undertaking—that it be owned by the host government, which, in turn, is required to sign a note evidencing a long-term obligation to the U.S.S.R.

By contrast, when a U.S. firm builds a plant abroad, the host government does not promise to pay anyone at any time a single peso or rupee—let alone a dollar. It's the other way around—the U.S. firm promises to pay taxes to the host government.

When a new plant goes up, permanent jobs are created. Local industries are stimulated by the plant's purchases of raw materials, components, and services. Foreign exchange is saved by the substitution of local production for otherwise necessary imports. Sometimes foreign exchange is earned by exports from the plant. This is genuine economic development. And it does not cost U.S. taxpayers a cent. In the 3-year period 1956–58, foreign economic aid extended by the U.S. Government amounted to $6 billion. In the same period, U.S. private investments abroad increased by $10 billion.

Purchase of British Turbogenerating Equipment by TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to discuss the recent decision by the Tennessee Valley Authority to purchase certain large turbogenerating equipment from a British firm rather than an American supplier. Specifically, I will comment on the justification cited by TVA for the action it has taken in this matter.

Mr. Speaker, in a release dated February 27, 1959, the Tennessee Valley Authority undertakes to explain its award of a contract for purchase of a turbogenerator to a British concern. Parsons & Co., the British bidder, underbid Westinghouse and General Electric by approximately 31 percent.

TVA says that it was disturbed by the rising price of turbogenerators, claiming that the prices charged by the domestic bidders had risen 50 percent since 1951 while average wholesale prices had increased only 5 percent. However, if we look at wages we find an increase in the electrical machinery industry weekly wage from $61.48 in September 1950 to $85.36 in September 1958. This is an increase of 39 percent. These figures come from the Bureau of Labor Statistics and are much more in point than general wholesale prices.

The building of a turbogenerator is a custom job and labor costs represent a large part of value added.

In such custom jobs our large mass production industries lose a great part of the advantage that comes from mass production. The process of building such a generator cannot be called mass production merely because the contractor is a mass producer of other items. The competitive disadvantage of much higher wages paid in this country reflects itself precisely where our productivity is not boosted by mechanization or automation. It stands to reason that in custom-made items we enjoy little if any differential in productivity over the British.

It would therefore be expected that the British could readily underbid us by a wide margin and would do so unless they allowed for an inordinate profit. Our wage rates are in the nature of 2½ times those of the British in the electrical machinery industry.

To repeat, in custom-built items we largely shed the productivity lead that we enjoy in many mass-produced items. Moreover, wages represent a high percentage of total costs of producing custom-made items.

TVA says that Westinghouse estimated 1,080,000 man-hours to build the turbogenerators; and concludes that the difference in wages between the British and American companies would be only $1.5 million. To arrive at this result it was necessary only to multiply the number of man-hours by the wage differential. This calculation, however, covers only a part of the story. The materials used by our manufacturers also contain American wages all the way back to the mines and the soil whereas the British materials contain the much lower British wages through all the stages of production back to the raw materials.

Therefore should the domestic companies enjoy no advantage in productivity over what appears to be a highly efficient and reliable British company,

the advantage of the latter should be about 2½ to 1 costwise. If it is less than that, the British company is not as efficient as claimed by TVA; and our companies are penalized for their greater efficiency. To be sure, there is the duty of about 15 percent on the British product plus ocean transportation, marine insurance, and so forth; but none of these charges would span the 2½ to 1 ratio.

That Parsons should be able to underbid our domestic companies by only 31 percent is therefore a little surprising. That a handsome margin of profit could be hidden in such a bid seems easily possible. That possibility no doubt accounts for the company's ability to accept a penalty clause as noted by TVA whereas the American bidders would not do so even under their higher bid.

TVA's eagerness to send this contract overseas and its rationalization of its position by resort to transparent arithmetic is perhaps explained by its reference to our general foreign trade policy and our international relations.

That Executive domination of our foreign commerce, contrary as it is to the mandate of the Constitution, has now filtered through adminstrative capillaries to the various purchasing agencies is confirmed by the TVA award of the contract to a foreign company and its explanation of the fact. In the end, for example, TVA says that purchase of the power unit from Parsons strengthens the economic position of our ally, Great Britain. This, it should be noted, is an entirely different argument from the preceding ones and explains much better than TVA's ragged arithmetic the reason for the award to a British firm.

The part played by our Executive dominated foreign trade policy emerges very clearly. The State Department's diplomacy must be supported through thick and thin throughout the fabric of our Government. The totalitarian position thus given to our foreign trade policy must brush to one side all considerations of a domestic nature.

"For national security," continues TVA, "strong allies, a healthy world trade, essential industries strengthened by stimulation of competition, are likely to be at least as important as the location of specific powerplant repair facilities."

Westinghouse and General Electric had maintained that the national security would be jeopardized by creating dependence upon foreign sources for repair facilities. TVA was not impressed. It answered as just quoted.

Particular note should be taken of the fact that the view was expressed by TVA that the strengthening of essential industries by stimulation of competition, was desirable. Aside from the question whether TVA is by way of superseding the function of the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice in seeking to assure the stimulaton of competition the question naturally arises whether competition is stimulated when a 40 percent wage level is pitted against one of 100 percent; or could it be argued that such competition is unfair, particularly if wages are not to be used as a source of competitive advantage. If it is the intent on the other hand to undermine the American wage system such competition could become a useful instrument.

Are we to assume that if the British company needs the great wage advantage that it has General Electric and Westinghouse are to be penalized because they are more efficient producers? They must indeed be more efficient if they can pay wages 2½ times as high as Parsons and yet bid only 50 percent higher on a Government contract.

TVA says it was willing to let the domestic bidders go 20 percent above the foreign bidder, as can be done under the controlling Executive order.

But why 20 percent? What possible relation is there between the production costs borne by Westinghouse and General Electric and those of a foreign competitor that operates under entirely different cost burdens? Let us suppose that the bidder had been not British, but Italian or Japanese. Would the differential that might then have been recognized still be one of 20 percent? Obviously, yes, since no discrimination can be drawn among different countries. Yet the 20-percent margin might have fitted even more loosely any other foreign bidder than it fit England.

The whole TVA position comes down simply to the desire, in keeping with our State Department's foreign economic policy, to give more public contracts to foreign countries. Otherwise why does TVA argue so elaborately the extraneous economic points that it presents and why does it bring in elements of foreign policy?

It says that—

It can reasonably be assumed that these dollars (those garnered by Parsons & Co.) will be used to finance British purchases of other goods either in the United States or in third countries which will in turn use the dollars to make purchases in the United States.

Here we see TVA becoming the Department of Commerce; but it must be said that the TVA economics, like its notion of relative efficiency, will not bear the light of reality. In the past 5 or 6 years some seven or eight billions of dollars have flown overseas and, with the exception of 1957, have shown no signs of returning. In 1958 alone we lost $3.4 billion in our international monetary balance.

In fact, the economics in the TVA reply and the references to foreign policy read very much as if they had been written in the State Department.

As for the conclusion that the higher bids by the domestic concerns represent unreasonable prices and therefore presumably exorbitant profit, there is, of course, no proof. The only yardsticks used are the increase in wholesale prices, allegedly only 5 percent between 1951 and 1959, and the margin of overbid in relation to a foreign bidder. Neither yardstick is suited to the thing to be measured.

Was the American bid price unreasonable? That is all the law asks; although it must be admitted that the regulations lay down an arbitrary measure; and, further, that TVA was bound by the regulations.

It was because of the unrealistic character of the regulations that the domestic companies made their plea on the basis of national security. On that ground TVA overruled them. The result is simply that the domestic industry loses the contract on grounds that penalize relatively higher productive efficiency. This result is achieved by using an irrelevant yardstick provided by regulations under the Buy American Act, but not by the law itself.

Through this loophole TVA is able to comply with the foreign economic policy of the State Department while at the same time going contrary to the domestic economic policies of the past 25 years, especially the part of it that has had the effect of raising wages in this country to the highest level in history.

By law wages have been taken out of domestic competition. Now the Government turns around and lowers the boom on is own creation. Foreign wages are free to compete and foreign industries paying low wages are free to take full advantage of the higher American level and win awards of public contracts by simple underbidding, a very easy thing for them to do.

Mr. Speaker, still another aspect of this problem has come to our attention and I wish to mention it at this point. My colleagues may recall receiving a letter recently from the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America. Among other things, the union attempted to prove that the contract in question was lost to American firms because their bids allegedly included an unreasonable percentage of profit, thereby enabling the Parsons firm to underbid their quotations by a substantial amount.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to include as a further extension of my remarks a letter which I have just received from Mr. C. H. Bartlett, vice president of the Westinghouse Electric Corp. The information supplied by Mr. Bartlett will serve to clarify the questions raised by the union. The letter follows:

WESTINGHOUSE ELECTRIC CORP.,
Pittsburgh, Pa., April 3, 1959.

Hon. RICHARD M. SIMPSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SIMPSON: Since our dinner in Washington on February 26 at which time we discussed the problem of the import of heavy electric power apparatus, many members of the Pennsylvania delegation have shown an interest in this matter. Therefore, we feel in order to keep the record this letter in order to keep the record straight.

You have received, I believe, a letter from the general president of the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, on the subject of the 500,000-kilowatt steam turbine generator ordered by TVA from C. A. Parsons & Co., Ltd., of England. In this letter, this UE official has done a great disservice to the union's membership and to the Nation with absurd charges of 265 percent profits in the electrical industry of the United States. The letter presents an argument based on false assumptions, incorrect figures, and distortions of fact. Its resulting conclusions are ludicrous.

For example, while the UE does not deny that U.S. electrical manufacturers pay wages at least 2½ times those paid in England, they somehow calculate that our labor costs on this $18 million job are only $91,000 more than Parsons labor costs.

They calculate further that the total cost of building this giant steam turbine generator would be only $5,300,000. The fact is that this amount wouldn't cover the cost of materials—to say nothing of wages and salaries, the costs of providing and operating our factories, and their great number of machine tools, transportation, research and development, and many additional expenses.

I am sure that Westinghouse stockholders would be delighted if our profits could be a little closer to the 265 percent that UE says we earn, instead of the 4 percent or slightly less that we actually have earned in the last several years.

The UE letter bases its charges of profiteering on what it says are company figures. It then quotes a statement by Mr. A. C. Monteith which appeared in the Westinghouse News to the effect that the TVA order in question would have meant 1,080,000 man-hours of work for Westinghouse employees at the Lester and East Pittsburgh, Pa., plants and 375,000 man-hours of work for employees in plants of supplier companies.

What the UE does not say is that these figures represent only the direct factory labor which would have been involved in production of the steam turbine generator—the labor of those factory employees who would have been working full time on this particular job and who are directly affected by the loss of this order. When we cited these man-hour figures to show the possible effect of this lost order on employment, we were intentionally conservative, limiting the figure to direct labor only.

The figure does not include the host of service personnel such as crane operators, materials handlers, production clerks, plant guards, supervisors, and others. Such indirect labor costs are at least double the direct labor costs. This means that the total labor cost of manufacturing this type of giant electrical equipment is approximately three times the actual direct labor cost. And that covers only the people in the manufacturing plants. In addition, there is the cost of the people in the research and development departments and laboratories whose efforts keep American electrical apparatus ahead of the world in reliability and efficiency. And there are sales costs and administrative costs. The UE letter ignores all these.

As a second step in its series of miscalculations, the UE takes this small portion of total labor cost and multiplies it by several industry-average wage figures—which also are incorrect when applied to the Westinghouse plants involved. The skilled employees who build these giant machines earn well above the average industry wage.

Then, to muddle even more the already completely inaccurate calculation, the UE applies a mythical productive efficiency advantage which, they imply, the heavy electrical manufacturers in this country have over similar plants abroad. This, they claim, is 244 percent. If such an advantage exists in the production of heavy electric power apparatus, we are not aware of it. And judging from the low bids of foreign electrical manufacturers, they haven't heard of their great disadvantage either.

It is indeed unfortunate that the officers of a national labor union who represent thousands of American workmen spread this type of economic nonsense which can only work against the best interests of their members in a segment of industry where reduced employment has been and still is a problem.

Such propaganda is serious also in that it encourages those who fail to see the dangers involved in our Government buying heavy electric power apparatus from foreign companies which could not provide the necessary repairs and maintenance in time of war.

The UE letter dismisses the security question as a hypocritical issue raised to justify our inability to meet the low bids of foreign suppliers. We are willing to leave to your judgment whether or not the continuous supply of electric power to key defense production areas of the country during a national emergency is a real or a hypocritical issue. In 1957, TVA supplied more than half the power used by the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, for example.

Despite TVA reassurances on the ability of foreign suppliers to provide service, the fact remains that the Parsons company does not have a steam turbine generator manufacturing plant on this continent. Nor is there any plant in Canada capable of handling major repairs of large steam turbine generators. Parsons, in its bid, said it has just three technical men in all of North America to handle repairs and maintenance. By contrast, Westinghouse has more than 1,000 field service engineers, and, in addition to our major manufacturing plants, we have service and repair plants throughout the United States. Any major repair or replacement on such a steam turbine generator as the TVO Colbert Station unit would require Parsons to ship the unit overseas or ship parts from overseas—something which could be impossible in time of war or other national emergency.

This very real issue of national security should not be screened from view by the smoke of misinformation emanating from UE or any other source.

Sincerely yours,

C. H. BARTLETT,
Vice President.

NATO's 10th Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, as our international problems over the last 12 years are reviewed, one more and more realizes that NATO, the United Nations, Marshall plan, and so forth, has up to 1959 curbed the Soviets in their drive for world domination.

It has been a great sacrifice and hard battle for the United States to unite the free world against the Communist international conspiracy. Millions throughout the world today are beginning to wake up to the threat of Communist enslavement.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial:

NATO's 10TH BIRTHDAY

The Council of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization is meeting in Washington today. On Saturday will come the 10th anniversary of the signing of the treaty which brought that organization into existence.

"It has been a great week's work in the history of the world," said British Foreign Minister Ernest Bevin as the Western nations completed their 1949 sessions in New York and initiated the NATO pact. Nothing that has happened since has contradicted his words, even though the NATO alliance has not developed into everything we then hoped it would be.

Twelve nations joined at first in the North Atlantic Treaty and, at the same time, made plans for U.S. military aid to Western Europe and agreed on the basic plans for a free West German Government.

Harry S. Truman then called the compact "a long step toward permanent peace in the whole world." NATO was expected to build an armed force that, in event of war with Russia, would hold back Soviet forces until the U.S. Strategic Air Command could go into action.

This "shield against aggression," as Truman described it, has never been fully realized. Within a year after the pact was signed Russia broke the U.S. nuclear monopoly, and various factors have contrived to keep NATO military forces at far below their intended size. The original goal was 100 ground divisions by 1954; it has been cut to 30, but today NATO has ony 21 to face an estimated 175 Soviet divisions available for Eastern Europe.

Despite the fact that the NATO forces are seriously undermanned, they have been a strong deterrent against war in Europe. Each soldier has been a symbol of the common Western strategy for rebuffing aggression. And there has been no westward expansion by the Soviet Union since 1948.

No one understands better the psychological barrier raised by NATO than do the men in the Kremlin. They have tried, time and again, to break it down. Their unrelenting endeavors to destroy NATO are the best tribute that could be paid to it.

So an appraisal of NATO on its 10th anniversary finds much to be said in its behalf, even though it has not developed into the military shield expected in 1949. It has been extremely important in maintainng the peace in Europe.

But the anniversary also finds an increasing recognition that the North Atlantic compact must be developed into far more than a military alliance. It should not be only a defensive network. Ties should be strengthened in the economic and political fields, in the areas of social and cultural affairs.

Thus far little has been done in this direction. The Atlantic community of free nations is not being knit together as it should be. This is the effort toward which our NATO allies, now 15 in number, should direct themselves in the next decade. The success of their efforts will determine whether April 4 is to have significance among the free nations such as July 4 has within the United States.

Launching of the "Sea Diver"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. BURKE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, April 5, 1959, there was launched at the Quincy Adams Yacht Yards at Quincy, Mass., one of the most remarkable vessels ever to take the water. She is called *Sea Diver* and is the first boat built from the keel up especially for use in underwater exploration of historical sites. Her owner is the famous inventor of the Link trainer, Edwin A. Link, president of the General Precision Equipment Corp. He gave the vessel his personal supervision and built into it special equipment, some of which he invented himself.

I had the great privilege of being present when *Sea Diver* slid down the ways.

She is not a yacht but a work boat constructed for serious scientific purposes.

Made of heavy steel, with the care typical of New England craftsmen, she is 91 feet long, with a 20-foot beam, and will draw about 6 feet. There is ample accommodation for 14. Her cruising range, without refueling, will be more than 7,000 miles. She is powered by two diesel engines and there are two other diesel engines to operate the special equipment. She has radar, sonar, and loran for navigation. She has an underwater viewing compartment, a bay at the stern from which divers can descend, a device called an air lift which can suck sand from the bottom of a harbor so that the sand can be strained through a sieve to recover small objects and a crane capable of lifting 6 tons. In addition, she has a water jet which can be used for excavation under water or on land.

Mr. Link and his wife, Marion, already have made extensive and fruitful explorations off the Florida Keys and in the Caribbean. One of their achievements was the discovery of a 15th century anchor, possibly the anchor of Columbus' flag ship, the *Santa Maria*. Mrs. Link has told the story of their earlier explorations in a book recently published by Rineheart & Co., appropriately entitled "Sea Diver," the name of an earlier and smaller boat which they used in their adventures. She is donating her royalties toward the operating expenses of new expeditions.

The new *Sea Diver*, which I saw launched, soon will depart on a shakedown cruise to the Caribbean and will be used in the exploration of the sunken city of Port Royal in Jamaica under the auspices of the Smithsonian Institution and the National Geographic Society. Port Royal suddenly vanished under the water as the result of an earthquake in 1692. In 1956 the Links did some investigation there and now, with the new boat and equipment, will carry on a more thorough exploration.

It is possible that they will make a further contribution to history.

Upon leaving Port Royal, Mr. Link has told me, he intends to take *Sea Diver*, under her own power, to the coast of Israel, there to explore the sunken harbor of Caesarea, under the auspices of the America-Israel Society, an educational organization of which a number of my colleagues in the Congress of the United States are founders and sponsors and which has its headquarters in the Willard Hotel, here in Washington.

Caesarea was the favorite city of King Herod the Great and the port from which St. Paul sailed on his mission. The Links made a preliminary survey there in 1957, using light diving equipment. They were inspired to do so by the fact that fishermen had been bringing up in their trawls along the coast, jugs, known as amphorae, dating back more than 1,500 years before the Christian era. They found evidence that objects of great interest to archeologists lie buried in the sand beneath the harbor waters.

I am proud that a shipyard in my own State of Massachusetts was chosen for the construction of this unique vessel to be used in the cause of the advancement of knowledge. It seems to me, too, that *Sea Diver*, in exploring the historic past, hitherto hidden from us by the waters of the seas, will demonstrate, wherever she goes, the interest that we Americans take in peaceful pursuits and thus will make a contribution to good will and better understanding wherever she may drop anchor.

The Quincy Adams Yacht Yard is owned and operated by its president, Edward D. Whiting, 363 Adams Street, Milton, Mass. Mr. Whiting has over 35 years in boat building. He has been associated with the Lawley Ship Yards where he directed the boat building program for many years and has served as president of the George Lawley Ship Yard. Edward Whiting is owner and president of the Nevins Yacht Yard, City Island, N.Y., and is also owner of the Quincy Adams Marine Sales, Inc.

Born in South Boston, Mass., Edward Whiting has spent an entire life time amongst those who participate in yachting and boating in the South Boston and Dorchester coastal area.

We in Masachusetts are proud of Edward Whiting and his many accomplishments.

A great future can be predicted for the Quincy Adams Yacht Yard.

The Man From Tennessee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent article written by Mr. William V. Shannon, entitled "The Man From Tennessee." The article pays tribute to the public service of one of our esteemed colleagues, the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. Mr. Shannon has a keen insight into the fine public service and public career of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and I am very happy to associate myself with the contents of the article.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Post, Mar. 29, 1959]

THE MAN FROM TENNESSEE

(By William V. Shannon)

WASHINGTON.—The announcement this week by Senator KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee, that he would not enter next year the New Hampshire presidential primary, which he has won twice before, marks a major turning point in a remarkable career.

During the decade of the fifties, and these have been dreary years for liberalism, KEFAUVER has been an extraordinarily useful and positive figure. The failure of his long personal campaign for the Presidency, a quest he has now abandoned, should not obscure the value of his contribution.

In 1950–52, the gray fag end of the Truman administration, a period when the wrong kind of political professionalism and a few shabby scandals were putting shadows across a magnificent record of 20 years of liberal accomplishment, KEFAUVER helped keep the record straight.

His slashing attack on organized crime reaffirmed the half-ignored fact that, for liberals, good government must always mean honest government, that there can be no permissible alliance between welfare state liberalism and the gangsters' code. Being for public housing or the repeal of Taft-Hartley does not make a politician a liberal if he is also for slot machines in the corner candy store and a fast buck for the racketeers.

There were elements of sensationalism in the Kefauver committee's crime investigation and the committee indulged in some practices in public hearings that were debatable from the civil liberties standpoint, but KEFAUVER, on balance, performed an important service for our country's liberal tradition in piercing the smoggy atmosphere of complaisance and collusion between gangsters and some big-city political machines.

When KEFAUVER waded into the primaries against the express opposition of President Truman, the congressional oligarchs, and most of the State organizations, he served to remind the professionals that the party belonged to the people and not to them. Moreover, the Democratic Party in its modern incarnation has become the rallying point of a rebel, the chronic dissenter, the wayward political independent. KEFAUVER'S candidacy, in its own way, did as much as groups like the Stevenson volunteers to keep alive the picture of the Democratic Party as a place where mavericks and independents of all kinds, even the thorny Harold Ickes variety, would always be welcome.

KEFAUVER has been almost unique in his ability to make the economic case against the Eisenhower administration become tangible and readily comprehensible.

It was no small feat, for example, for him to take political charge of the incredibly complicated Dixon-Yates contract. He took this unpromising issue, kept it alive for more than 2 years and made it politically hot for everyone concerned, including General Eisenhower himself.

During much of this time, KEFAUVER had no instrument to use except the virtually paper Subcommittee on Monopoly and Antitrust which had no appropriation, no staff except Sidney Davis, its indefatigable volunteer counsel, and no support from any other Senator, except for the erratic good will of ancient "Wild Bill" LANGER, Republican, of North Dakota.

Nevertheless, KEFAUVER finally forced the President to cancel the contract, forced the Justice Department to accept his arguments as its own in defending the Government against a subsequent damage suit by Dixon-Yates, and helped build the opposition that ultimately forced Admiral Strauss out of the Atomic Energy Commission.

KEFAUVER is currently on his way to achieving a comparable success on the issue of administered prices. For more than a year, he has been plugging away at the theme that prices and wages in the basic industries are everybody's concern. He has held endless hearings and received much technical testimony from economists.

For a long time, it seemed hopelessly dull stuff and not likely to lead anywhere, but KEFAUVER has persisted. He has skillfully popularized the idea of Economist Gardner Means that prices in the big industries are administered, not set in the marketplace, and that these administered prices are heavily responsible for inflation. On the basis of President Eisenhower's remarks on steel prices at his Wednesday press conference, KEFAUVER even has the President beginning to use his language.

KEFAUVER succeeds on these issues because he is a man of bed-rock convictions, because he is a prodigious worker and because he has lots of courage. He has not hesitated to dissent from his fellow southerners on racial issues.

During the McCarthyite craze, KEFAUVER several times stood alone in voting against bad legislation that was falsely labeled anti-Communist. And when it comes to fighting for what he wants or believes in, he has had no lack of guts in defying the entrenched Senate leadership.

The congressional inner club and the southern machines paid him back at the 1956 convention by voting against him solidly in the vice presidential contest. Liberals expressed their esteem by voting for him and putting him on the ticket.

It is not likely that the Nation as a whole will have the opportunity again to vote for ESTES KEFAUVER. But if Tennessee does not turn against one of its greatest sons in next year's Senate election, the Nation can look forward to further achievement. The end of KEFAUVER's presidential ambitions ought not to mean the end of a remarkable career.

Alaska Adopts Model Court System With Independent and Nonpartisan Judiciary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, as a Senate sponsor of the bill providing for Alaskan statehood, I am proud that our great new State in the North has adopted a model code for its judicial and court system. Alaska is to have an independent judiciary with a minimum of political interference. It will be nonpartisan in character.

This whole new apparatus for courts and trials in our 49th State has been informatively described in the August 1958 issue of the Journal of the American Judicature Society by my friend, Thomas B. Stewart, who is an able member of the Alaska bar. Mr. Stewart also served as secretary of the constitutional convention at Fairbanks, which drafted the organic law under which Alaska's judiciary has been created. Thus, he is well qualified to write this article entitled "A Model Judiciary for the 49th State."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Stewart's article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A MODEL JUDICIARY FOR THE 49TH STATE

(By Thomas B. Stewart)

Article IV of the constitution of the State of Alaska, entitled "The Judiciary," sets out in concise detail the general organization of the judiciary conceived for the new State, the manner of selection and tenure of its judges and related personnel matters, and the authority for rulemaking and for a unified administration of the judicial system. The main features of this court system are unity, simplicity, efficiency, accessibility and political independence, which combine with an ultimate responsibility to the people in making the system in large measure an expression of the best in modern concepts for the efficient administration of justice.

This court system was carefully designed by the delegates to the Alaska Constitutional Convention, meeting at the University of Alaska, near Fairbanks, from November 8, 1955, to February 5, 1956, to eliminate the frustrating delays and technicalities common in the complicated court systems of many of the older States. To reach this goal the delegates sought to apply principles proposed and backed by the American Bar Association, the American Judicature Society, the Institute of Judicial Administration, and other professional and civic groups dedicated to improvement in the administration of justice. The people of Alaska, in voting to ratify the constitution on April 24, 1956, endorsed without recorded public criticism or dissent the plan for a judiciary as conceived by article IV of the Alaska constitution.

To understand the circumstances producing this design for the Alaskan judiciary and for an adequate explanation of its features, some review of the history of its making may be helpful.

In March of 1955, when the 22d session of the Legislature of Alaska by law called for the holding of a constitutional convention, Alaska was totally without a judiciary of its own and without an organized association of members of the bar. Its court system, in contrast with that of the States of the United States and of its sister Territory of Hawaii, was provided for it entirely by the Federal Government, except for magistrates courts in certain of the cities. The judges of the U.S. District Court of Alaska, sitting in four geographical divisions, were appointees of the President and often not residents of Alaska nor members of its bar.

This situation of the court system remains intact today, on the threshold of formal admittance of Alaska as a State, but in the imminence of establishment of the new judiciary lies a history of effective action by members of the Alaska bar.

ALASKA BAR AND ARTICLE IV

In that same 1955 session of the territorial legislature, the lawyers of Alaska successfully sponsored the creation of an integrated bar association, and by late May of 1955 the Alaska Bar Association was a reality. One of the first committees appointed under direction of the board of governors was assigned the duty of preparing a proposed article on the judiciary for submission to the then forthcoming constitutional convention. Members of this committee of the bar association were later to serve on the convention's committee on the judiciary, and their proposal encompassed many features found in article IV of the constitution.

Simultaneously with the work of the Alaska Bar Association toward preparing a judicial article for the new constitution, the Alaska Statehood Committee, an official agency of the Territorial Government assigned the duty, amongst others, of preparing constitutional studies for the use of the convention delegates, had engaged qualified consultants to assist in the drafting of a judicial article. The statehood committee, shortly before the convening of the constitutional convention, issued an informational news release intended to assist all the people of Alaska in understanding the issues to come before the convention; this statement both reflected the inadequate character of the existing judicial system and suggested the scheme of the new judiciary which was in the minds of the majority of members of the Alaska Bar Association and which has in fact been realized by the constitution. Because of this relation to the judiciary as ultimately designed, the statement is here set out in full:

"One of the greatest challenges, and simultaneously, one of the rarest opportunities, will face the delegates of the Alaska Constitutional Convention in the problem of designing a judiciary for the future State of Alaska. The challenge is great because in the judiciary rests the ultimate protection of the fundamental rights of persons traditionally guaranteed by our American Federal and State constitutions; only a well-designed judiciary can efficiently and fairly perform this guardianship function. The opportunity is rare because Alaska, not having as a Territory its own judicial system, is free to choose from the best of modern concepts of a judiciary without being hampered by that resistance to change which so often characterizes long-established systems.

"The people of Alaska have grown accustomed to a Federal judiciary provided by presidentially appointed judges and a system of district commissioners. With statehood, some of these services must be replaced by a State judicial system. This is a crucial changeover. Not only must the new State judiciary administer justice promptly and impartially, but it will have the added task of interpreting the new constitution. These interpretations can have an important effect on the future of the State.

"The issue of what principles and concepts might be embodied in the constitution in a judiciary article can well be considered in terms of three basic topics: (1) the organization of the court system; (2) the personnel of the system, including qualification, selection, tenure, and related matters; and (3) administration of the system created.

"In recent times there has developed a surprising unanimity of opinion among both practitioners and theorists as to the remedies for defects in existing State systems. Practicing attorneys, judges, legal theorists, and laymen, have come to strikingly similar conclusions as to the proper and necessary elements of a sound judiciary. And so it is possible to suggest such elements for the consideration of the Alaska Constitutional Convention with a confidence enhanced by a great weight of respected, supporting authority.

"As to the organization of a court system, it is generally agreed that there is need for at least three basic levels of courts. At the highest level is a court of ultimate appeal, in which parties to cases may obtain a final review of the determinations of lower courts. The issues before the Alaska delegates on the creation of such a court, often called the supreme court of a State, will include questions on what should be its composition and on what should be its jurisdiction.

"At the next level there is need for a court of general jurisdiction in which criminal and civil cases are originally brought for consideration and trial. While the authority of such a court would properly extend over the entire State, it could be set up in divisions to function in the various populated areas of the State.

"The remaining question concerns the provision of localized judicial services to consider misdemeanors, civil cases involving relatively small sums, traffic violations, and like cases. The convention delegates must determine whether these cases, which daily affect the lives of a great many more people than do the more serious cases, should be considered in terms of a lower level of courts established especially for this purpose, or whether the court of general, original jurisdiction may be expanded to handle this case load.

"But whatever courts may be created, whether on varying levels or with varying special functions, modern authorities have agreed that all courts should be a part of and within an integrated or unified system which would exercise all of the judicial powers and authority of the State.

"The constitution should also provide a basis for selection of the judges, at least for

those who will serve on the highest court of the State. Probably the principal issue to be resolved is whether judges of the highest court should be elected or appointed. Each method has its advantages and disadvantages. There is considerable interest in the so-called Missouri plan, which provides for appointment by the Governor from among nominations made by a panel selected "partly by the Governor and partly by the existing court system or laymen. The judge selected by the Governor serves 1 year, and then his name goes on the ballot, without opposition, with the voters saying 'yes' or 'no' to the question of whether or not he shall continue in office for a regular term. The delegates to the Alaska Constitutional Convention may well give careful consideration to this among other possible arrangements.

"Judicial administration is the third area which in addition to judicial organization and personnel will confront the framers of our Constitution. Inadequate provision for judicial administration, in many States, has resulted in a huge backlog of cases and unreasonable delay in adjudication of cases brought before the courts. Provisions for centralized administrative responsibility, with opportunities to assign judges according to litigation needs, plus administrative aids such as court administrative officers and judicial councils have speeded and made more effective the administration of justice in many States.

"Alaska wants and needs, when it attains statehood, an honorable and efficient court system to fill the void that will exist with the withdrawal of U.S. Commissioners and the limited jurisdiction of U.S. judges when Alaska becomes a State. Alaska can profit from the experience of other States in establishing a sound judiciary."

The suggestions found in this public statement were substantially those found in the recommendations of the committee of the bar association which worked on the problem of the judicial article. When the constitutional convention assembled and organized, there were five lawyers amongst the seven members of the convention's Committee on the Judiciary, and the first proposal offered by this group as an article on the judiciary was in substance very close to the terms of article IV. The principal changes made in the first proposal were stylistic only, to render the manner of statement consistent with other language of the constitution. Thus it can be seen that Alaskan lawyers and laymen were well prepared to accept the standards for a modern judiciary even at the outset of the deliberations of their constitutional convention.

COURT STRUCTURE

Turning now to a review of article IV and some explanation of its main features. Section 1 first establishes the basic court structure. It also provides needed flexibility for future enlargement by the addition of such local or other courts as the legislature may deem necessary. But in any case, the entire court system is to be unified for operation and administration, which is in accord with the fundamental and minimum standards of judicial administration approved and supported by the American Judicature Society and the American Bar Association.

There has been some disagreement expressed over the language of section 1 which provides that the jurisdiction of courts shall be prescribed by law. The concern is that this may render the courts subservient to the whim of legislature and make of the judiciary a relatively impotent branch of the Government on important issues. It should be noted that section 2 provides the Supreme Court with final appellate jursdiction and that section 3 declares the superior court shall be the trial court of general jurisdiction. To what extent these provisions may be held to limit attempted legislative restrictions on jurisdiction of the courts can only be known in the test of time.

The provision in section 2 for future enlargement of the Supreme Court by the legislature is qualified by the provision that such enlargement be requested by the Court. A similar provision is found in the new constitution of Puerto Rico and is designed to prevent the number of justices from being increased for any purpose other than to meet the needs of judicial business.

Section 3 places general trial jurisdiction in a single court, with as many judges thereof as may be necessary to handle the volume of cases. This is in line with modern development and is reversing the former trend toward a complex structure of specialized courts that has so greatly impeded efficient judicial administration in many States. The legislature will be free, however, to create lower or other courts as may be necessary, and to determine the jurisdiction of courts and the geographical extent of their authority.

The main features of the plan for judicial selection sponsored by the American Bar Association and embodied in the Missouri plan, are summarized in the association's handbook on judicial administraton as: "(1) Appointment by governor from list submitted by a nominating committee, the nominating and appointing authority being divided between two agencies; (2) periodic submission to the electorate with no opposing candidate, or running against the record." Both of these features are incorporated in the selection plan set out in sections 5 and 6 of article IV of the Alaska constitution.

Initial drafts of the judicial articles had provided, among the qualifications for judges, a minimum period of residency in the State of at least 5 years. The rigidity of this policy was reduced by the provision adopted, that judges must be licensed to practice law in the State. The legislature, however, is empowered to fix additional qualifications.

In order to allow time for selecting a successor as well as for completing the judicial business remaining before a judge's service terminates, a period of 90 days is allowed after the election at which a judge or justice is rejected or for which he fails to file. The provision for having a justice or judge file a declaration of his intention to be a candidate to succeed himself is a feature of both the Missouri and the California constitutions. The details of such declaration such as its form and the time limits for its filing are left to the legislature.

THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

Sections 8 and 9 of Article IV deal with the selection of the judicial council and its powers and duties. Selection of lawyer members by the state bar association and of nonlawyers by the Governor, both groups on a geographical representation basis, is a recommended feature of the Missouri plan and has been adopted in the Alaska constitution. Since the establishment of the judicial council must precede the nomination of any judges, including the chief justice, the latter cannot become an ex officio chairman until after his appointment has been effected. Thereafter he will serve as a seventh member of the council. In the event of his incapacity to serve, it is contemplated that rules of the council will provide for an acting chief justice as his interim successor.

The term of office for the members of the council is fixed at 6 years, but the initial appointments are to be staggered as provided in section 16 of article XV, the schedule of transitional measures. Since a Governor serves only a 4-year term, no one Governor will be able to appoint all of the nonlawyer members during any such term, and thereby control to that extent the personnel of the nominating body.

At the time of adoption of the constitution by the delegates, some concern was expressed over the fact that a majority of the judicial council would consist of lawyers, three of whom would be selected by the small group composing the governing body of the organized State bar. This was felt by some to be too narrow a base for determination of the persons eligible to be appointed as judges.

In addition to its duties relating to the selection of judges, the judicial council is empowered and directed by section 9 to recommend needed improvements in the structure and operation of the court system.

Retirement for incapacity is provided for by section 10. It is becoming increasingly recognized that provision should be made, as this section does, for relieving a judge from his judicial duties when, as very occasionally happens, his retirement for reasons other than age or misconduct becomes necessary to protect the administration of justice. The procedure for retirement of a supreme court justice requires recommendation of an outside board, rather than by the court itself, similar to the procedure adopted in the Constitution for Hawaii. For other judges removal by supreme court proceedings, similar to the Constitution of Puerto Rico, has been provided.

The retirement laws for State judges have tended increasingly to adopt 70 as the mandatory retirement age, and this is done by section 11. However, a retired justice or judge may still be called upon for temporary service or special assignment, and this section permits such service to be made possible by court rule.

The procedure for impeachment of judges and justices is provided by section 12 and is made to accord with that for other State officers.

Section 13, relating to compensation for judges, recognizes that this matter should be prescribed by law but that compensation should not be susceptible of arbitrary diminution during office. Under the provisions of this section compensation is subject to increase readily as future needs dictate, but it is subject to decrease only when a general reduction applying to all State officers becomes imperative.

A prohibition against the practice of law or holding other office by full-time justices and judges is fixed by section 14. Such a provision has been widely advocated and is contained in the proposed new judicial article for the State of Illinois.

RULEMAKING POWER

It is well known that one of the major factors in New Jersey's remarkable achievement in bringing its trial calendars and court business up to date, and in simplifying and expediting the administration of justice, has been the vesting of the rulemaking power in the Supreme Court, and the exercise of such power by the Court in adapting the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure to State court practice. The American Bar Association has strongly advocated, as its first and keystone recommendation in its program for reform of judicial procedure: "That practice and procedure in the courts should be regulated by rules of court; and that to this end the courts should be given full rulemaking powers." Section 15 of article IV places primary responsibility for such rulemaking in the Supreme Court, reserving to the legislature a power to change rules of procedure by a two-thirds vote.

Finally, section 16 establishes administrative authority over all courts in the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. To assist him in supervising the management and housekeeping functions of the courts, both statewide and local, and to furnish him with accurate and current statistics on court

business, he has been provided with the essential element of an administrative director, who will serve at the pleasure of the Chief Justice. This plan has proved successful not only in the Administrative Office of the United States Courts but also in nearly a third of the States, which have followed the example of the Federal system.

Many Alaskans believe that the provisions contained in article IV of the constitution of the State of Alaska place the new State in the vanguard of jurisdictions whose judicial systems typify the best and most modern principles of efficient judicial administration. And they are confident that article IV will provide a guarantee of a strong, fearless and independent judiciary.

Federal Aid: A Help or a Snare?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, the April 6 edition of the authoratative U.S. News & World Report contains a thought provoking answer to the question: Is the Government in Washington enticing States and cities along the road to bankruptcy?

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this article in the RECORD, as follows:

WILL STATES GO BROKE MATCHING FEDERAL FUNDS?

States and cities are finding: The free money they get from Washington is far from free. Every time they get a grant of Federal aid, it winds up costing them money.

Year by year, Washington's giveaways get bigger.

Now, some State and local taxpayers are wondering how much more Federal aid they can afford to accept.

This question is beginning to be asked: Is the Government in Washington enticing States and cities along the road to bankruptcy?

Michigan recently ran out of money. New York was forced to raise taxes sharply to be able to pay its bills. State governments all across the country are in trouble financially. Taxpayers resistance to higher taxes is growing.

Why? Can't expenses be cut to balance budgets?

Ask those questions of State officials, and you often get this reply: "If we don't match the free money that the Federal Government offers us, we lose out, and some other State or city will get it. We can't afford not to step up spending if that means we get more free money."

At this time, the Government in Washington holds out more than $6.5 billion in gifts to State and local governments if those governments will match the Federal spending in whole or in part. It also offers low rates of interest if States and localities will build dormitories at colleges or undertake a variety of other spending programs.

Now, if Congress has its way, these giveaway and loan programs are to be expanded still further. Congress, in turn, is prodded by State officials who continue to be attracted by the idea of cheap or free money from the Federal Government.

In proposals now before Congress, cities and towns will get bigger subsidies to build bigger airports. Depressed areas will get aid and low-cost loans to lure new industry into those regions. There will be more money for public housing. The Federal Government will help with financing of water systems, sewer systems, and other programs to help cities expand.

President Eisenhower, as well as some Congressmen, is urging States to increase unemployment benefits, which will add to payroll taxes on employers.

The facts indicate that spending programs—once started by the Federal Government—tend to grow in good times and bad. As the giveaway grows, the amount of money that States and cities must put up tends to grow, too. Result: financial trouble. Governors gradually become aware of the fact that the Government in Washington can create the funds it wants to spend simply by increasing the money supply, but that States—just like individuals—can spend only what they actually have in the bank.

RELIEF COST: RISING

Take the matter of public relief. This item has increased year after year as standards for getting on relief rolls have been relaxed, and as benefits have been increased to adjust to higher living costs. Back in 1937, when the Social Security System was in its infancy and when relief was viewed as an emergency problem, the Federal Government paid a little more than $140 million for public assistance, with State and local governments putting up about $635 million. Last year—1958—the Federal cost of these programs came to nearly $1.8 billion, with States and localities contributing about the same. This year, State and local costs for public assistance are likely to go to almost $2 billion.

These costs for relief have increased steadily, despite the fact that the country has enjoyed general prosperity through most of the period since World War II. Relief payments now are going to the aged and indigent, to dependent children, to the blind, and—since 1950—to the disabled. The program for the disabled required Federal contributions of $17.9 million in the first year, with States and localities contributing $20.1 million. Last year, this cost the Federal Government $124.6 million, with States and localities paying $113.4 million.

THE COST OF ROADS

Highways put a growing strain on Federal, State, and local treasuries. The Interstate Highway System was adopted in 1956, and for this program the Federal Government put up 90 percent of the money, with States giving only 10 percent. But, on highways built with Federal aid, States must match the Federal payments dollar for dollar.

The result is that Federal funds to highways have grown from $754 million in 1956 to an estimated $2.7 billion in 1959. Matching funds required of States have risen from $667 million in 1956 to $1.1 billion in 1959. To raise these matching funds, States have been steadily increasing their bonded debt.

Several States, meanwhile, have been forced to slight secondary-road systems that get no Federal help. These States have all they can do to raise the money necessary to match Federal payments.

AIRPORT RIVALRIES

Airports provide another example of how States and localities get squeezed when they take Federal money. Airport grants by the Federal Government were $43 million in 1958 and are due to rise considerably under programs now before Congress. Federal funds for airport development must be matched by local funds.

Actually, localities—usually cities—pay a great deal more than the Federal grant for airports. They must meet the cost of utilities, road changes, and other improvements connected with new or expanded airports.

The result is that, to get Federal money for airports, cities have increased their bonded debt and saddled themselves with continuing interest charges. Yet pressure persists for airport expansion, backed by arguments that a city that rejects aid will be at a disadvantage while other cities accept it.

HOW FREE IS "FREE"

States and cities thus are finding that Federal grants are seldom free. Even in public housing and slum clearance projects, Federal aid has strings attached. Public housing projects require cities to exempt the land from local taxes. Slum clearance and urban renewal programs call for donations from cities equal to about 50 percent of the Federal total. This may include gifts by local governments of land, improvements, and public utility installations.

Federal aid for school construction in areas heavily populated with Federal workers turns out to be not completely free. The schools are built at Federal cost, but communities find that the expense of providing teachers and other school services often outruns the Federal grant.

When it comes to underwriting school lunches, the Federal Government donates surplus foods, such as milk, eggs, flour and butter. It also offers some cash, but schools must provide $3 for every $1 contributed from Washington. Many school districts raise their funds by charging pupils for the lunches, but still must meet the expenses of operating cafeterias and other services.

OUTLOOK FOR 1960

Federal aid of various kinds has been in a sharply rising trend in recent years. Back in the 1948 fiscal year, Federal aid was reported at $1.9 billion. In the present fiscal year, ending June 30, aid is likely to reach $5.9 billion, and in the year ahead it is expected to go to $6.5 billion.

This aid, however, has been accompanied by an increase in State and local spending that has been just as great, or even greater. In 1948, State and local governments spent about $17.7 billion. Last year they spent an estimated $44.5 billion, and a sizable proportion of that went toward matching Federal grants.

This trend in total spending by governments is raising the question whether States and cities can afford any additional Federal aid. Several States already appear near the end of their financial rope.

Cannot Give District of Columbia Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following timely editorial from the San Mateo (Calif.) Times of April 2, 1959:

CANNOT GIVE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BACK

It is a sad commentary on a Nation's state of affairs when its Capital City is offered back to the State from whence it came—and is refused. That is what happened recently in a farflung congressional dissertation on what to do about the voteless status of the District of Columbia.

One solution advanced by Representative MCMILLAN, of South Carolina, Chairman of the House District Committee, was that Washington should be returned to Maryland's fold. The land was originally ceded to the Nation by Maryland in 1788.

That land would not be recognizable by those who proudly presented it to the fledgling Republic 171 years ago. Teeming population, a swollen Federal bureaucracy and neglected by the Congress which governs it have turned the picturesque farm land into a modern city of high taxation, high crime rates, and growing malcontent, with its populace trying frantically to flee to the suburbs.

It is little wonder Maryland is willing to forgo any claims to its onetime possession.

Maryland's Senator BUTLER was quick to respond to Representative MCMILLAN'S proposal, lest the idea gain favor among congressional colleagues. Asserting that taxpayers of his State were "unwilling to assume the burden of additional taxes to put Washington back on its feet," the Senator tossed the suggestion back into the laps of the House committee members. "They run the District into bankruptcy and then want to give it back to Maryland," he said.

A poor fiscal position was not the only reason given by the Senator for rejecting any intervention by his State in solving the difficulties the governing fathers have built up around themselves. As a poignant tribute to the high incidence of crime prevalent in the District, he added: "Not do we want to inherit a city where a high rate of crime drives thousands of people indoors after nightfall."

Washington—the city which above all others should be the showplace of America's political and economic systems—has become a no man's land of inept congressional management. Giving the citizens of the District the vote is not the solution. What is needed is a general overhaul of the Federal Government's role as the capital's overseer.

NATO: Still the Best Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. DURHAM
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Greensboro Daily News of of April 2, 1959:

NATO: STILL THE BEST HOPE

For all its shortcomings, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, which celebrates a 10th anniversary Saturday, has accomplished its main objective: It has kept the peace in Europe.

In the decade since that dark day in April 1949, when 12 North Atlantic allies met in Washington and banded together against threatening Soviet aggression, the Organization has lost its original, exclusively North Atlantic character. Two Mediterranean powers—Greece and Turkey—have been admitted; and a former enemy, the then prostrate Germany, has become the keystone in the defense of Western Europe.

Also in the process the United States abandoned historic and traditional isolationism, the groundwork having been laid by the late Senator Arthur Vandenberg who in 1948 called for the "association of the United States, by constitutional processes, with such regional and other collective arrangements * * * as affect its national security."

And despite weaknesses, NATO has deterred Communist expansion in Europe. This far and no farther, said the North Atlantic powers, and the NATO line was never breached. Soviet leaders raged at NATO as an aggressive alliance, but the organization's purpose—peace—has always remained the same. All the partners have specifically pledged not to use force, or threaten to use force, in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations. Ten years of peaceful actions and purely defensive designs in Europe prove the point far better than Kremlin propaganda can add or detract.

Yet for all its accomplishments NATO's record of unity within the ranks is spotty. True, the three-cornered dispute over Cyprus was healed in time for the NATO Council meeting in Washington this week, but no one in NATO could prevent the British-French-Israeli invasion of Egypt.

France, aspiring again to glory under General De Gaulle, recently withdrew the French fleet from NATO command. Even more important, De Gaulle had earlier refused to allow IRBM's to be stationed on French territory. (As a bit of good news for the 10th anniversary, Italy agreed to accept these weapons—the only continental NATO power to carry out the pledge made at the 1957 NATO Council meeting in Paris.)

Moreover, French insistence that the big powers have a larger voice in policy and strategy runs smack into the current complaint of the smaller members that they be given a greater voice in NATO decisions.

NATO, too, has failed to achieve the advance state of unified command and integrated forces once hopefully predicted. Nor have the 100 active and ready reserve divisions blueprinted some years back been called into reality. Not even the 30 divisions on the German front are fully manned and equipped.

Since 1949 there have been other changes. The United States has lost its atomic monopoly, and the missile has replaced the bomber as the principal threat to Europe. The U.S. shift to the strategy of nuclear deterrent, Dean Acheson, who as Secretary of State in 1949 had so much to do with the founding of NATO, believes, is bound to destroy the alliance. Would Americans be willing to sacrifice New York and Chicago for Berlin if the chips were down? Europeans wonder.

Still, NATO has faced changes and inner contradictions before. Adaptability, determination, all-out support, and a willingness to subordinate some national interests can yet make of NATO the kind of alliance its founders envisioned. After 10 trying years, it remains the West's best hope against Communist ambitions in Europe.

Sustained-Yield Policies in Lumber Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the importance of sustained-yield operation to our Pacific Northwest lumber industry has been effectively emphasized in an editorial in the Salem, Oreg., Capital-Journal of April 2, 1959. The editorial, written by George Putnam, editor emeritus of the Capital-Journal, is entitled "Another Ghost Town," and it describes what can happen to lumber communities when prudent policies of timber conservation are not followed.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Salem (Oreg.) Capital-Journal, Apr. 2, 1959]

ANOTHER GHOST TOWN

An often repeated story in our once heavily forested regions is being reported in Eastern Oregon where the "ghost town" of Pondosa, located between Baker and La-Grande on Highway 203 has been placed on the auction block by the Valsetz Lumber Co.

The town of Pondosa has outlived its usefulness. It includes 50 homes ranging from two to four bedrooms, a two-story hotel, a general store, a sawmill, a planing mill and other mill equipment.

Pondosa was built in 1928 by the Stoddard Lumber Co. and sale will be by individual units. Had Senator McNary's Public Law 273 passed in 1944 for sustained yield cutting of forests and establishment of tree farms been in effect when the town was built, probably it would still be flourishing.

Most of our pioneer lumbermen knew nothing and cared less about forest conservation. All they were interested in apparently were quick profits by which a large percent of future profits were sacrificed and the deforested hills left for erosion to create deserts and ghost towns which followed their operations as the night the day.

That old system is fortunately on its way out though still sought for by some timber operators, as shown by their recent opposition to sustained yield system for the Klamath Indian Reservation forests bill in Congress.

Foreign Aid for Foreign Tax Cuts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD H. POFF
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, the American taxpayers, who have been told that they can expect no tax relief this year, have just received news that the British Government has granted their citizens a 6-percent tax cut. This will be the sixth tax reduction the British people have received in the last 8 years, whereas, in that period American taxpayers have received only one tax cut in 1954. Yet, England has received from the United States more than $341 million under lend-lease arrangements and nearly $3.8 billion in foreign-aid grants. Every cent of this money, together with additional billions of dollars appropriated under the economic foreign-aid program, have been dollars which America had to borrow and which she still owes as a part of her $280 billion debt. America's national debt is not only greater than England's national debt, it is greater than the combined debts of all the nations of the world to which America extends foreign aid.

Included in the British tax cut was a reduction of 2 pence a glass in the duty on beer. Thus we find that the money of American taxpayers which apparently is insufficient to solve the unemployment problem of American workers is being

used to subsidize more beer for British workers.

I have today introduced a bill which would prohibit the loan or donation of economic foreign aid appropriations or foreign aid counterpart funds to any foreign country that reduces taxes on its own citizens during the current fiscal year.

The Two Germanys and Berlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEONARD G. WOLF

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I am introducing into the RECORD an article that appeared in the Washington Post this morning by the great columnist Walter Lippmann. The article is quite provocative and bears careful, critical thought. It is interesting to note that with others, Mr. Lippmann feels that the United Nations should be brought into the picture in Berlin. I hope that our Government will give serious consideration to those suggestions that include a role for the United Nations in the discussion over Berlin:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Apr. 8, 1959]

THE TWO GERMANYS AND BERLIN—III

(By Walter Lippmann)

(Walter Lippmann has just returned from Europe, where he has taken a look at the Berlin crisis. This is the third of a four-part report.)

The preceding articles have made the point that for the indefinite future the two German states cannot be reunited in one German state with its capital in Berlin. There will be the German Federal Republic of the West with its capital at Bonn. And there will be the German Democratic Republic of the East with its capital at Pankow, which is a part of East Berlin. These two German states now deal with one another in many economic and technical matters. Thus for example, for some considerable time West German traffic to West Berlin has been controlled by the East German Government. With the assent of Bonn it exercises the right not only to stamp the identification papers but actually to inspect the cargoes.

There is every reason to suppose that there will be an increasing intercourse and communication between the two German states. But they do not recognize each other as legal and legitimate sovereign states.

We must, therefore, accept the fact that for years to come—it might be for a generation or more—these two German states will have to live side by side with a frontier on the line fixed by the armistice which ended World War II. From the frontier of East Germany to the city of Berlin is a distance of 110 miles. The basic problem is how to protect the future of the West Berlin community, which consists of 2½ million people. They must expect to live for an indefinite future, perhaps for the rest of their lives, in the heart of a Communist state.

In my view, the future of West Berlin cannot be secured adequately by a determination to stand firm on a policy of standing pat. No doubt, we can prevent the Soviet Union and the East German Government from blockading West Berlin. We can threaten to go to war if they do. But that is not good enough. West Berlin lies in a strategic trap, and its security cannot be protected adequately by military measures alone. It can be secured against blockade and outright aggression. But it cannot be made secure against harassment and a perpetual war of nerves and the feeling that there is no hope.

West Berlin is a highly complicated economic and political community. It enjoys the institution of private property. There is free enterprise in investment and in banking and in the management of capital. If the division of Germany is to last for the indefinite future, we must find ways to provide the West Berlin community with a dependable order of things. We cannot expect the West Berliners to depend for their whole security upon what over the course of a generation or more we may be able and willing to do with our Strategic Air Force.

The West Berliners cannot go on for years waiting to hear what the Pentagon will say about going to war whenever an East German official harasses them. There has already been some considerable flight of capital since the Khrushchev note of last November, and the economy of West Berlin will wither if, whenever there is a sign of trouble, the best we can do for it is to threaten World War III.

My conviction is that the future of West Berlin must be protected not by standing pat but by our insisting that West Berlin needs and is entitled to have a new status. When Mr. K. tells us that the present status of Berlin is obsolete, it is a mistake for the West to act as if any departure from the status quo would be a defeat and a surrender. It might be an improvement. At present the status quo is from our own point of view extremely unsatisfactory. The right answer to Mr. K. is to propose that we negotiate a new charter or statute in which West Berlin is guaranteed an ordered future by the presence of Western troops acting under international auspices.

A new statute for Berlin is needed because the existing arrangements were improvised, rather incompetently, by men who regarded them as temporary. Nobody planned them for a long future. Nobody supposed that there would be two German states with Berlin in the middle of one of them. Only last week we had an example of how ramshackle are our agreements about access to Berlin, when Soviet fighters buzzed an American plane, which was flying, apparently for the first time, above the customary ceiling of 10,000 feet.

In negotiating a new statute, we should begin by establishing the principles under which we have a right to be present in West Berlin and to participate in determining its future. For some extraordinary reason we have chosen to argue that our rights in Berlin rest upon the right of conquest. That is, if I may say so, a poor reason for the defenders of civilization to invoke. If we choose to stand on the right of conquest, we shall live to regret it. It will boomerang. For where would we be if the Soviet Union, which is also a conqueror of Germany, chose to invoke for itself the right of conquest? The whole of Germany was surrendered to the conquerors, and if there is a right of conquest, it is not limited to West Berlin.

There is no need for us to resort to so primitive and brutal and repellent a principle as the right of conquest. We have good and sufficient civilized reasons for being in Berlin and for remaining there. We are in Berlin because it is the capital of Germany. We are entitled to stay there until it is once again the seat of a united German government. During our stay in Berlin we have in the course of time acquired a special moral obligation to the 2½ million inhabitants of West Berlin. This obligation we intend to honor and we could well say to Mr. K. that he would despise us as we would despise ourselves if we did not honor it.

For us, negotiation must start from these two fundamentals: The need for a long future of steadfastness and stability, and the need for a change which reflects the new realities. This can best be done if a new statute is negotiated in which the future of Berlin is put in trust with the United Nations. The new charter or statute should begin with an explicit declaration that the United Nations trust will last until the two German states agree to restore Berlin as the capital of a reunited Germany.

Then, in the new statute the right of access, the conditions of coexistence, the relations between the two Berlins and the two Germanys, the presence of Allied and United Nations token military forces, should be spelled out. Though it is a complicated thing to do, it is not an impossible thing to establish a city within a city and within a foreign state. The most striking example, which could well be used as a suggestive model, is the treaty signed in 1929 between the Holy See and the Kingdom of Italy. This was the Lateran Treaty which established the Vatican City. The state of the Vatican is a quite separate sovereign juridical entity although it is in fact entirely surrounded by the Italian city of Rome. The treaty regulates the whole problem of access across Italian territory, and it does so with a precision which anyone must envy who knows something of the fuzziness of our position in Berlin.

I think I have reason to say that a solution of this sort would be acceptable in West Berlin. Whether the Russians would accept it there is no way of knowing until we try to negotiate it in concrete terms. But the signs are not altogether unfavorable. Mr. K. has mentioned the U.N. in connection with Berlin, he has acknowledged that the West has rights and obligations in Berlin, and he has not rejected the idea of a western military presence.

Both sides have much to gain from such a settlement. For us it would mean that the West Berlin community was guaranteed physical security under a new and much more authoritative statute than exists today. It would mean also that the future was not foreclosed, and that the prospect of Berlin's becoming again the capital of Germany would be reaffirmed with the sanction of the world society. The West Berliners would have a reason for carrying on. For they would have hope, which, in affairs of this sort, is as important as hydrogen bombs.

The Russians for their part would get a good deal too. They would get, as we would get, the relief that comes from straightening out a dangerous muddle. They would get a provisional but durable acceptance of the fact that there are two Germanys. Since a United Nations statute would have to be agreed to both by the Soviet Union and by the Pankow government, they would get a de facto recognition of the East Berlin state by the U.N. This might mean much to them in that it would help to stabilize their situation in Eastern Europe.

Neither side would win. But neither would lose. Each side would hold within its sphere of influence what it now holds, and neither would surrender to the other any territory or any people. But we would get a new legal, political, and moral foundation and framework which takes account of the hard facts of life—that there will long be two Germanys and that Berlin must be protected in a special way while Germany remains divided.

Welcome to Italian Foreign Minister Pella

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 9, 1959

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, it is noteworthy that an agreement has been concluded between the United States and Italy to permit the setting up of Jupiter intercontinental ballistic installations on Italian soil. This is a good omen, especially at this time, when we celebrate the 10th anniversary of the signing of the North Atlantic Treaty, of which Italy is an important component. This momentous event is also accompanied by the arrival on our shores of Guiseppe Pella, Italian Foreign Minister and famous diplomat, who comes here to participate in Washington ceremonies commemorating this anniversary.

The decision of Italy to set up these intercontinental ballistic stations within her territorial confines required tremendous courage. It is the result of the foresight of men such as Premier Antonio Segni and Guiseppe Pella. It was only natural for the Italian Communists and Moscow to criticize Italy for this action.

Foreign Minister Guiseppe Pella has been a consistent champion of the Western Alliance among European statesmen. It is interesting to note that despite changes in the heads of the Government in Italy, that country has consistently lived up to her commitments in NATO and the Western alliance. That fact should be taken into consideration by the executives in our own Government in this forthcoming conference of Foreign Ministers prior to the so-called meeting at the summit. Italy should be a successful candidate for one of the positions at the Foreign Ministers' conference table.

I had the proud distinction of meeting Giuseppe Pella during one of my visits to Italy. Here we have a peasant's son who has risen to one of the highest official positions in the Italian Government. His life story is a most interesting saga. He was born in the foothills of the Alps—in Valdengo—in 1902 and as a mere stripling, helped his parents who were sharecroppers. He attracted the attention of the village priest with his brilliance of intellect and industry and the prelate induced the lad's parents to continue his education. He made the decision to work in a cotton mill, to help him pay his tuition. He kept his nose glued to his books and received a diploma as an accountant at the University of Turin, where he won high honors in finance and economics. When Giuseppe Pella was 30 years of age, he was more than self-sustaining and made considerable money as an adviser to large firms on their financial and other business matters. He entered politics at the end of World War II and became a member of the conservative wing of the Christian Democratic Party. He was elected a member of the Chamber of Deputies in 1946. His ability as a Deputy and a student of government attracted the attention of De Gasperi and he became Foreign Minister in his Cabinet.

He held that position until the fall of the De Gasperi Cabinet and thereafter, became Prime Minister of Italy, Minister of Foreign Affairs, and Minister of the Budget. He again became Foreign Minister in the present government on February 15 last. I am sure we are all glad to have him in our midst. We roll out the carpet for him and wish him and his dear ones well.

Chicago Pays Tribute of Appreciation and Affection to Hon. Thomas J. O'Brien

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will be pleased to learn of the tribute of appreciation and affection given the Honorable THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, beloved dean of the Illinois delegation at a notable luncheon in his honor at the Palmer House in Chicago on Friday last. The luncheon, sponsored by the president and the board of trustees of the Metropolitan Sanitary District for his leadership in lake diversion legislation, was attended by the leaders in the public and civic activities of the city of Chicago. It was an outstanding event, marking the great esteem in which the dean of our delegation is held in the city of his birth and of his life-long devotion.

Following is the resolution passed by the Metropolitan Sanitary District, an engrossed copy of which was presented to Congressman O'BRIEN in a speech by Trustee Casimir Guiglik:

Whereas the Honorable THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, Congressman from the Sixth Illinois District, dean of the Illinois House congressional delegation, has consistently and with persistence and outstanding ability in the 83d, 84th, and 85th sessions of Congress led the fight for the vitally needed diversion of water from Lake Michigan at Chicago to improve the polluted conditions in the Illinois Waterway; and

Whereas the diversion bills in the 83d and 84th Congresses, having both been approved by the House and Senate, were vetoed by the President, and Congressman O'BRIEN's bill in the 85th Congress (H.R. 2) was approved by the House in the first session but failed of passage in the Senate in the closing hours of the second session; and

Whereas despite these discouraging actions, Congressman O'BRIEN, on aJnuary 7, 1959, at the opening of the 1st session of the 86th Congress, on behalf of the Illinois House delegation, again introduced the diversion bill patterned to meet the objections heretofore raised to the preceding bills by the various opponents, which bill was given the significant designation of H.R. 1 in respect to its sponsor, Congressman THOMAS J. O'BRIEN; and

Whereas at Congressman O'BRIEN's urging, the House Public Works Committee conducted open hearings on said H.R. 1 on February 17 and 18, 1959, and March 3, 1959, to enable all proponents and opponents ample time to present their respective views, and thereafter said House Committee on Public Works favorably recommended the adoption by the House of H.R. 1 by a vote of 19 to 11; and

Whereas the House of Representatives on March 13, 1959, after due debate on the merits of said legislation, concurred in the recommendations of the House Public Works Committee and adopted H.R. 1 by a vote of 238 to 142: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the board of trustees of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, in regular meeting assembled this 19th day of March 1959, That we do hereby formally express our sincere personal and official appreciation to Congressman THOMAS J. O'BRIEN for his outstanding labors in Congress on behalf, not only of all of the people of the city of Chicago and of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, but the people of the entire State of Illinois; and be it further

Resolved, That, in recognition of Congressman O'BRIEN'S outstanding services, particularly on behalf of this vitally needed additional diversion legislation in view of the impressive opposition, these resolutions be spread upon the official records of the permanent proceedings of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, and a copy hereof suitably engrossed be presented to the Honorable Congressman THOMAS J. O'BRIEN.

Board of Trustees: Walter S. Baltis, John A. Cullerton, Vincent D. Garrity, Casimir Griglik, John G. Henneberger, Wm. S. Nordburg, William F. Patterson, Christopher C. Wimbish, Frank W. Chesrow, President.

I am further extending my remarks to include TOM O'BRIEN'S heart-to-heart, straight from the shoulder talk to his fellow Chicagoans who had met in this imposing gathering to pay him honor. I am sure that every Member of this body in which TOM O'BRIEN has served so long and with such distinction, and in which he is beloved and respected by all, will wish to read his remarks in this memorable occasion. Here is the full text:

Mr. Chairman and friends, I want to thank all of you for the many nice things you have said about me and for this testimonial.

I am particularly proud of the many gracious things said to me by Dick Daley. I have lived in the city of Chicago all my life, and it has been a long life. I have been in politics a long time—as a matter of fact, I was elected to the Illinois Legislature over 50 years ago. I have known all the mayors of Chicago during my political life and I want to say here and now that the city of Chicago never had a better mayor than Dick Daley. I mean it. Those of you who know me know that I speak directly and to the point. I say without a doubt that Dick Daley has been the best mayor the city has ever had.

I am being honored today, and yet a goodly portion of the honor which you bestow upon me today is attributable to the mayor. He has worked unceasingly for the lake diversion bill and it is because of his wish that I filed it. He has cooperated and worked with me and with the other members of the Illinois delegation like no other mayor ever did. As a matter of fact, until Dick Daley came into office, the Illinois congressional delegation never knew officially that a mayor of Chicago existed. They never asked us to help them with any legislation; they never communicated with us as Dick Daley has done, on the housing bill, on the airport construction bill, on the lake diversion bill, on the National Medical Library bill, on public housing, on appropriations for urban renewal and development—Dick Daley has been in the center of the fight of all of these bills, and has been working with us. That is why I say I

am particularly honored that the mayor should say the nice things he did about me.

I really didn't want this ceremony—but that doesn't mean that I am not grateful for it. I must say in all honesty, right at the start, that although it is I who am being honored, the testimonial should go to all members of the Illinois congressional delegation—Republicans and Democrats alike. Mrs. CHURCH and HAROLD COLLIER fought just as hard for this bill as any of us did, and deserve as much credit for its passage by the House on March 13 as any of the Democrats. This is a nonpartisan bill. I once heard President Truman say that the Illinois delegation in Congress is the best congressional delegation in the country. That is still true today.

Yes, we have the bill passed by the House. And before we came home for the Easter recess, Sid Yates and I went over to the Senate and asked Senator KERR to set the bill down for hearing before his committee. He promised us that he would do it as soon as the Congress reconvened. I know we will get a fair hearing from Senator KERR.

But I would not be fair with you if I did not tell you that I believe the bill is in trouble—in much more trouble than it was in the last session of Congress, because at that time the Government of Canada had declared that it had no objection to the bill. The entire executive branch was with us then—the State Department, the Bureau of the Budget, the Army Engineers—as a matter of fact, it was at the suggestion of one of the representatives of the executive branch that the 3-year period of diversion was cut down to 1 year. It was represented to us that if this was done we could obtain the approval of the State Department and the President would not veto the bill.

And we did it—we changed the bill in accordance with that suggestion. Nothing has changed since that time. The conditions are exactly the same. The present bill provides for 1-year diversion and yet, for some unknown and mysterious reason, the Government of Canada is against it, the State Department is against it, the Bureau of the Budget is against it, and the Corps of Army Engineers is against it. What has happened to make all these people change their minds? I don't know, but I shall certainly ask Senator KERR to try to find out the reasons for this reversal.

I cannot understand the attitude of the Government of Canada to this bill. Canada is a great country. Its people are among the finest in the world. We have enjoyed the friendliest relations with our great neighbor to the north in every respect. I read in the paper on Wednesday night that the Canadian Consul General had declared that "Chicago is more closely tied to Canada than any other part of the United States." He said that "Chicago has become the very hub of this great American-Canadian trade and industrial relationship. * * * There is more trade flowing back and forth between the Chicago Midwest and Canada than any other area in the United States." That is what the Canadian Consul said the other night and I agree with him. There is no reason for any difference between Canada and Chicago on any matter—and that includes the lake diversion matter as well.

The experiment which we are proposing in the lake diversion bill will harm no one and can only bring beneficial results, because the problem of sanitation and water pollution is of tremendous importance to every metropolitan area in the country. This experiment may very well furnish the basis for new methods of disposing of wastes.

I cannot believe that Canada is serious in contending that this study will be harmful to navigation and will injure its shipping and power interests. We do not propose a permanent diversion in this bill. We seek only to divert an additional 1,000 cubic feet per second for a period of 1 year to permit the study to be made. The Corps of Engineers—certainly, a most reputable agency—has declared that the experiment would have no significant effect upon navigation and the lowering of lake levels. The most that any lake level will fall as a result of the additional diversion of water contemplated in my bill is a quarter of an inch or less. How can it possibly be said that this will be hurtful to navigation or shipping.

There is an additional point which must be made and which demonstrates conclusively that navigation and shipping need not be affected. The report of the Corps of Army Engineers printed in the Senate as Document No. 28 of the 85th Congress, 1st session, declares, in paragraph 197, that "lowering of lake levels resulting from an increase in diversion considered herein could be compensated for on Lakes Michigan, Huron and Erie. Such compensating works for Lakes Michigan and Huron could be built in the St. Clair River at an estimated cost of $1,530,000. The gated control dam above the cascades in the Niagara River now under construction under the supervision of the International Joint Commission could be operated to compensate for the reduction in the Lake Erie level. The levels of Lake Ontario will be regulated in connection with the St. Lawrence Seaway and power project. The plan of regulation can be modified as required to accommodate the reductions in outflows within the range of stage established for Lake Ontario levels under regulation."

The Engineers' report says, further: "Coordination and agreement with Canada would be required to accomplish either of the above."

So, you see, Canada has it within its own power by agreement with the United States to regulate the levels of the lake and to prevent any damage to navigation and shipping. Even if the sill is in the St. Clair River, to which the Army Engineers refer, is not constructed, the damage to Canada's navigation and shipping interests can be eliminated almost entirely during the period of diversion proposed in my bill. Therefore, there is no basis for protest on this score.

The other objection raised by Canada, namely, the loss in power revenues, is similarly subject to adjust. The report of the Corps of Engineers indicated that over the 15-year period during which time the proposed diversion is supposed to have an effect, the loss in revenues to both Canadian and American interests would average $36,000 per year. I ask you—how badly would Canadian and American power interests who are protesting this bill—how badly would they be hurt when their projected loss of $36,000 per year compared with total power revenues accruing to them of $100 million per year? One hundred million dollars is the anticipated annual earnings of the Canadian and American powerplants.

When one compares this small most uncertain injury with the tremendous earnings of the huge power operations, how pertinent becomes the statement made by the House Committee on Public Works in its report on my bill, when it said: "The value of helping to solve one of the most pressing problems of a great metropolitan area far outweighs whatever slight temporary loss, if any, might be sustained by adjacent areas."

But the possibility of minimizing this loss even further exists for the power interests by adjustments in the rate of flow over the Niagara Falls. Amounts of water are apportioned at certain times of the day in greater quantities because of tourists. Why could not the possible damage be compensated for by adjusting the flow to permit slightly longer diversion of the water for power purposes? The amount of loss to the tourists would be infinitesimal in terms of their enjoyment of the grand spectacle.

Thus, there are a number of ways in which parties willing to work together can find a solution to this problem. We want to work together with Canada. I agree with Counsel General Newman that "Chicago is more closely tied to Canada than any part of the United States"—and we want to keep it that way. That is why we ask Canada to keep an open mind on this matter which is of such vital importance to the people of Chicago and Illinois, rather than permitting the historical antagonisms of the past to shut out any possibility of coming to an agreement.

I hope we can persuade the Government of Canada to withdraw its protest. Chicago is destined to become the No. 1 city of the world, and its growth must not be impeded by what must be described as an illogical and unwarranted protest by the Government of Canada. If Canada holds dear Chicago's friendship—as Chicago does Canada's—it will not arbitrarily throttle the natural expansion of a thriving metropolis by filing a stony and final protest, rather than seeking a meeting place where the minds of friends may agree upon a reasonable solution of a pressing problem.

Chicago will never stop growing. It will never stop because its people are so vital and dynamic—because its people have pride and confidence in themselves and in their community—and because we have leaders like Mayor Daley.

I want you to know that I will continue to fight for the people of Chicago and for the passage of the lake diversion bill. I am sure that all of my colleagues in the Illinois congressional delegation join me in that pledge.

To all of you, to Mayor Daley, to President Chesrow, to all the members of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, I say in the words of Speaker RAYBURN: "Thank you from the bottom of a grateful heart for your graciousness and generosity in bestowing this great honor upon me today."

Rear Adm. Leonard Frisco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert an article published in the February 1959 issue of the Rudder Club News of New York. The article is entitled "The Man of the Port" and is about my very good friend, Rear Adm. Leonard Frisco.

Here is the story of a man who put in a total of 48 years of service for his country, 23 years on active duty in the U.S. Navy and 25 years with the merchant marine. This is a record which very few can match. Admiral Frisco was raised in his youth in a cosmopolitan neighborhood in New York, like myself, and had to fight his way up the ladder of success every inch of that long and tortuous road. His diploma comes from the school of hard knocks.

Admiral Frisco is the best example of rugged individualism that I know of. He was a tough youth, a tough seaman, and a tough officer, yet always a man with a kind heart. He was generous to his boys in the service and sought to inspire them to leadership and responsibility. He is beloved by all of them and by his

many good friends, who wish him long years of health and happiness.

The text of the article is as follows:

[From the Rudder Club News, February 1959]

THE MAN OF THE PORT: REAR ADM. LEONARD FRISCO

From apprentice seaman to rear admiral, U.S. Navy, and from third mate to master in the U.S. merchant marine, a total of 48 years of service connected with ships, and served 23 years on active duty in the U.S. Navy and 25 years connected with the merchant marine, having entered the merchant service after resigning from the U.S. Navy in November 1921. Returned to active duty in the Navy as a lieutenant commander in 1940.

After performing 5 months of service as third mate in 1922, with the Moore & McCormack Lines, he entered the Black Diamond Lines service as second mate in January of 1923, chief officer in 1924, and master in 1926 and left the Black Diamond in 1940 to reenter the U.S. Navy. Retired from the Navy on January 1, 1953, and reentered the Black Diamond Lines as marine superintendent and promoted to operating manager in January of 1956.

Upon reentering the U.S. Navy, he served as executive officer of the U.S.S. *Henderson* for 1 year and in November of 1941 was ordered to duty on the U.S.S. *Wright*, serving on that ship as navigator, executive officer, and commanding officer in that order for a period of 15 months and then ordered to command the attack transport *Ormsby*. All the above service performed in the central and south Pacific and made all the landing operations from Tarawa to Leyte, Philippine Islands.

Having completed 4 years in the Central and South Pacific, he was detached and reported to New York in January 1945 to command the U.S.S. *Monticello* (ex-Italian luxury liner *Conte Grande*). Fitted to carry 7,200 troops and, after several voyages to Europe on the *Monticello* finishing out the war at sea, was transferred in August of 1945 to Washington, where he served in several capacities at the Bureau of Personnel and in his first shore assignment.

Upon completion of his Washington duty, he was detached and ordered to duty at the Third Naval District, New York, as the merchant marine Naval Reserve program officer, with additional duties as president of the general courts-martial board in the district, and numerous details on promotion selection boards in Washington, D.C.

As head of the merchant marine Naval Reserve section of the New York district, he was instrumental in having over 200 American merchant ships staffed with sufficient Reserve officers for the ships to fly the merchant marine Naval Reserve flag, such ships including the steamships *United States, America, Independence, Constitution,* and numerous others that made New York their port of call. He was also instrumental in having many Reserve officers retain their commissions and keep up with Reserve matters in which case such officers now receive a small or modest retirement fund from the U.S. Navy, believing such legislation would be passed, and as a matter of fact did.

During the summer of 1946 he was given command of the Point Barrow, Alaska, Resupply Expedition and with the crews of the ships consisting of young recruits put ashore in landing boats a total of 12,000 tons of cargo in 6 days. Some pieces of equipment weighed as much as 38 tons.

Again in the summer of 1947 he was assigned as senior technical adviser to Commander Amphibious Transport Division 12 and to command the task unit that took an icebreaker and an LST to Barter Island near the Canadian border across the Arctic Ocean through the ice field and through the Islands Lagoon where the LST was beached and secured to remain as living quarters for the island's detachment. He organized the expedition in that it landed at Point Barrow 24,000 tons of cargo by the use of landing boats and pontoon barges in less than 6 days and also landed at Barter Island 1,500 tons of equipment.

Retired from the Navy with a total service of 35 years, 24 of which were performed on active duty. Holds many letters of commendation and campaign ribbons all the way from Mexico 1914 to Korea, plus the Legion of Merit for combat in World War II—served on destroyers all through World War I.

Holds membership in the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Legion, the Marine Society, Council of American Master Mariners, where he held the post of president of that organization of experienced master mariners for 2 years. He is also a member of the Downtown Athletic Club, and most all of the associations connected with shipping, including the Maritime Association of New York and the Rudder Club.

Strange as it may seem, the admiral spent 34 years on actual sea duty before coming ashore and is the only one of a large family that went to sea. However, his own son is connected with the merchant service, holding a chief engineers license and a daughter married to a captain in the U.S. Navy. Two grandsons bless the family.

A resident of lower Manhattan most all of his life, left Public School No. 21 in Manhattan at the age of 13 to obtain work, joining the Navy in 1911 at the age of 16, married to Margaret O'Brien in 1914 and both now reside in lower Manhattan.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer, plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

Appendix

Lincoln Day Address by Hon. Barry Goldwater, of Arizona

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me on Lincoln Day, in Phoenix, Ariz.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mayor Williams, Governor Fannin, and Congressman Rhodes, distinguished guests, and fellow Americans, fellow Republicans, fellow Arizonians, I can't tell you how good it is to be home, but, tonight it is a better feeling than I've ever had. The warmth of Arizona's sun is surpassed only by the warmth of its people and tonight after days of the freezing cold of the east both sources are more welcome than at anytime I can remember.

This evening as we gather to honor the memory of Abraham Lincoln and to ponder our responsibilities to him and to our Republic I am reminded of a story. President Lincoln, you know, wore a tall silk hat. One day as he got up to speak he put it down in a chair and a rather large lady came along and sat down on his hat. When Lincoln was finished speaking he came back and saw this crumpled topper of his, he merely looked at it and said, "Madam, if you would have just asked me first I could have told you it wouldn't have fit." The question that comes to my mind now is can we fill Lincoln's hat, shoes, and most important, his ideals? I think that is the question that is in front of our country today. I think we are at a crossroads pretty much as we were at a crossroads in the days of Lincoln when unity was needed in the country; when the people of America were faced with the task of either keeping the Republic alive or having it torn apart by people who refused to see and understand the need of unity. I think tonight that unity is equally important not only to the country but to the Republican Party as well. I think we have to strive to create unity within this party just as Lincoln strove to create a Republican Party. We now cannot see the Republican Party die because there are some small differences of opinion as to what this person should be doing or how or what that mission should be accomplished.

Now let me illustrate what I am talking about. I travel around this great country and speak to a lot of Republicans. In fact, this is the fourth night in a row and I have three more left before I finish this week. And this is one of the few places in America where I can stand up before a Republican group and say what Republicans think and not go away feeling I have stepped on somebody's toes. When I go into some other communities I feel pretty much like I'm having to walk on a crate of eggs. I'm careful to ask the chairman whether this or that will upset my listeners and then I am careful to ignore the touch subjects.

We have reached a pretty disturbing period in our history as Republicans, when a Republican who has been a Republican all of his life has to worry about his remarks before a group of people who travel under the title "Republican". Now I realize that in this country there are people who accept me suspiciously; and some not at all. Now why is this true. And I think this is the important part, not because it's Barry Goldwater, but because I am a conservative and I'm not ashamed of it and I talk about it. The opposition in this country, not the opposition in the Republican Party, not the opposition of Jeffersonian Democrats, but those radicals in this country who intend to destroy us have made a very bad word of "conservative". Bad to the point that conservatives won't stand up and be counted. They have put an onus on this word that actually should be on their philosophy and not on ours. So I think tonight as I start, I would like to outline briefly to you what I believe in as a conservative republican. I have been attempting to do this across America recognizing that there are people in this audience, people who will hear this, who now classify themselves as liberals and say "Oh, I can't agree with anything that fellow says, he's too conservative, he's too reactionary."

I have asked audiences to bear with me and compare their philosophies of being a Republican and an American with those of mine and then see if the word "conservative" doesn't pretty much describe their own feelings also. Now what does my conservatism encompass?

First, I believe in the full concept of the Constitution, as it was written 180 years ago—not as it is being interpreted today. I believe, and accept with a full heart, the words of Thomas Jefferson in the Declaration of Independence when he said "We hold these truths to be self evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights, and, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

I accept our freedoms as coming from God and I recognize that we've become a great people because we've been a spiritual people and we have been materially strong only because we have been individually spiritually strong. I believe in decentralized government. I believe firmly that the 10th amendment to the Constitution is the bulwark upon which our form of government is based. Individual freedoms rest with the freedoms of the State and I decry the fact that we are drifting more and more away from States rights into the concept of centralized government. I, as a conservative Republican desire the preservation of individual liberties rather than seeking paternalistic security for the people in this country. I believe it was intended that this great Government was to be built upon the idea that you and I are free people because God intended it that way, and that we are not free people because we belong to this or that church, or because we are black, or we're white, or we're yellow or red, or because we come from this country, that country or some other country. We are free because God intended it that way, and we are free as individuals, not as members of a collective group. That I firmly believe in. Those of us who believe in that, or in those basic principles are called reactionaries. Now it is hard for me to understand how a person who believes in those things can be referred to as a reactionary. This, ladies and gentlemen, is the new idea. There is nothing old about this. It's only 200 years old. In fact it has only been written about 180 years. This is the new idea, that man as an individual has dignity and has freedom, and he doesn't obtain those things by being a member of groups. He obtains them from the Lord himself. So I defy those who say that conservatives who believe in the freedom of the individual are reactionary. No, its the radicals of this country who want to return to the day of group identity, pigeonhole life if you will, that are the reactionaries of our country, and they wrongly call themselves liberals.

I believe in the free enterprise system. Good men, well intentioned, controlled by a limited number of rules and regulations, can make work well at all times. It has produced more for more people than any other economic system in the world and yet today there are those people who decry it and want to see it done away with.

Having outlined these few brief points, I don't think there is anybody in this room who can fundamentally disagree that these concepts are wrong for America, and yet, I know there are people here who are as proud of their liberal interpretation of Republican philosophy as I am of a conservative interpretation of the same philosophy.

I think it's time now to look at what the liberal of today is, and I'm not talking about the honest liberal, the man who builds his liberalism on the concepts of Thomas Jefferson or even a Bob LaFollette in the later years. I am talking about those people in both parties who have more or less bastardized the name "liberal," and have tried to hide the real meaning of what they are, "radicals."

Now, what is a liberal supposed to be? He is supposed to be a man who is constantly looking for more freedom for the individuals of this country, but in looking for it he pursues the Constitution; he pursues the American thinking and the American ideals. The conservative, on the other hand, is a man who wants to go ahead on the proven factors of the past. He doesn't want to experiment as much as the liberal: that is why the man is called a liberal. Now, let's see what we have in the country today, and I might say here and now that I believe firmly, that we need in this country a strong, true liberal movement, and we need a strong, true conservative movement. But let's see what these so-called liberals preach in this country and let's make up our minds whether or not they are liberals. They are the ones who are preaching minority versus majority. They say that freedom rests in minority groups or majority groups. They don't recognize that the individuals of those groups are the ones whose freedoms we should be constantly aware of and constantly fighting for. They are the ones who want to régress. They are the reactionaries who want to go back to the group, to tribalism; they are the ones who preach the "common man." When I ask, who is the common man in this country, they will say, "well, he is the farmer." And I say, "Well, what does

he farm." "Well, he farms cotton." All right, so I ask "Does he farm long staple or short staple." And when they begin to see the light I say, "Now who is the common man." Well, they say, "The common man is the miner." So I say, "What does he mine." "Well, he mines coal." I ask, "Does he mine hard coal or soft coal." That about ends the argument. The truth of the matter is, folks, that we're a 170 million of the most uncommon people that were ever placed on the face of the earth. And if we ever succumb to this idea of oneness, and commonness, this country will be through.

I am glad today, in reading the remarks of people whom I recognize as real liberals, to see that they are interpreting the actions of so-called liberals as dangerous in this one area among others because the so-called liberals are tending to preach the idea of commonness. Now what else do they preach? Whether they like to admit it or not, they preach government control. Get in a little trouble in this country. They want the Federal Government to help out. They want centralized government and they want the concentration of governmental power on the banks of the Potomac and not in Phoenix or any other capital of this Nation. Federal aid—oh, there is the most dangerous siren of them all. Federal aid to everything. We've got one suggested now—Federal aid to distressed areas. That means that this great State of Arizona, the thriving city of Phoenix, all of us going ahead on the initiative of men and women, going ahead with courage, recognizing that we have to make advances on proven policies, will have to begin to pay for the backwardness, the laziness and dependency on a Federal paternalistic attitude of people in other parts of our country. I don't like that. I don't think anybody likes to pay for the shortcomings of other people unless those shortcomings be caused by conditions over which they have no control, and yet we are proposing today Federal aid to distressed areas; Federal aid to schools. Now why should taxpayers in Arizona pay for the school buildings in the South where they refuse to build buildings of their own. Why shouldn't we say to those States, "Grab your own boot straps, Buster, and pull yourself up." Federal aid to the farmer. Federal aid to farms in ruining one of the greatest economic opportunities in Arizona by closing the foreign markets for cotton, and yet we can't make our brothers in the South and the North see that Federal aid to farming is killing the farmers of America. And let me tell you, far more than the economic damage is the moral and spiritual damage it is doing to the people of this country as they say to themselves, "I can't do it, but Uncle Sam can do it for me." That wasn't the way our Nation was built. The so-called liberal, the radical and real liberals along with all of us are concerned with the civil rights of the Negro in the South, and I say that that is rightfully our interest no matter what our philosophy may be. But at the same time, these people are ignoring a civil rights problem of the North. You say, "What's he talking about." This is what I'm talking about. The Republican member of a union in Detroit who has his money taken away from him in the form of dues to be spent on a Democrat candidate. Now if that isn't tampering with the franchise of Americans, I don't know what is. And let's apply it to the South where nomination in the primary is tantamount to election in the general. What about the Democrat member of the union who pays his dues only to see that money go to defeat a Democrat that he would vote for. Those are the things I talk about when I talk about the so-called liberals who refuse to see the whole problem, but who again are playing race against race, color against color, creed against creed, only because it might produce a few votes come election time. That, I remind you, was not the philosophy of Lincoln. Who then today, I might ask you, is the party of special privilege. I think the Republicans at one time could have rightly been called that, but it has been a long, long time. I ask the so-called liberal of today, "What difference is there between the corporate baron of the early 1900's buying elections for the Republicans and the union barons of 1958 buying elections for the Democrats?" What difference is there? There is none.

Let us look now at their attitude toward fiscal soundness. I call it on their part, "massive irresponsibility." You have on a card tonight, a new penny. If that penny were worth 1 cent it would be fine, but it is worth about 48.6 percent of 1 penny now, and it's worth that because of the irresponsibility of the opposition party. And I might say that yesterday I got quite a laugh out of my good friend LYNDON JOHNSON. I like LYNDON. He is a very able, capable man. But he comes from Texas, and you know that down in Texas they aren't satisfied with anything small. I think that LYNDON just got to thinking the other day that "Well, by golly, I'm down in Texas and this can't be true; we couldn't have cost these people all of this money. We're not fiscally irresponsible." And he got that Texas mind of his going around and around and he came up with the suggestion that the Democrats had cut $22 billion off the Eisenhower budgets in the last 6 years.

Well, I wish that I were back there to remind him of it, but if he is talking about what has been cut, $12 billion of that was cut by the Republican 83d Congress off of Truman's budget. Now I will have to admit that in the 85th Congress the Democrats did cut about $5.6 billion from the amount that was requested. But then we get into the fiscal slight of hand. We find that 1⅓ billion of that was only a paper cut and that they turned around and authorized the expenditure of it from existing capital. And then offsetting further the 5.6 billion, was action that totaled more than that. For instance, 1 billion for housing that wasn't asked for; 1.8 billion for further appliances on the housing act. Two hundred thirty five million dollars direct to the highway act. And then there was legislation requiring more spending than what was authorized. For instance $444 million in retroactive Federal pay increases. A hundred million dollars for a super liner, and then by failure to adopt the President's suggestions we went $700 million more in the hole in the Post Office and $725 million more in the hole in the Federal highway fund. And in addition to that they wanted to spend another $6 million. So as a result of the action of the irresponsible radicals in the Congress, you are going to have about a $12 billion deficit this year. In fact, Congressman RHODES will tell you that last year in the House of Representatives alone, there were almost $156 billion of bills introduced that, had they been passed, would have added that amount to your tax rolls in the next 5 years. And while it's not according to school-tie etiquette to mention names in the other House, a tall thin man slightly bald, who wears glasses, whose father was a President, introduced almost $33 billion worth of these bills. And I don't want to ignore the Senate. We totaled nearly $43 billion in the bills that were introduced by eager radicals, eager and ambitious to deflate the value of the dollar in this country.

That's probably their greatest hallmark. The fact that these radicals have absolutely no conception of what a dollar is worth. And you know the surprising thing to me, and I think Congressman RHODES will comment on this. I have always been amazed at the rich Socialists we have in this country. It very rarely fails that a man who inherits money, suddenly gets ashamed of it, and he has to think of ways to deprive everybody else of their money, just because his father was a success. But that's true across this country. It's a sad commentary. One other thing they do that I think you and I can disagree with. They have been very successful in selling this Republic of ours as a democracy. We hear speech after speech by people who should know better exhorting the virtues of our great democracy. Now ladies and gentlemen, find me the word democrat, democratic or democracy in the Constitution of the United States and I'll sit on the top of John Mills great flag pole up here on Saturday afternoon and eat the Constitution. But it does mention Republican, in a small case. Not the Republican Party but the republican type of government, our form of government.

I remember here just a few years ago when my nephew Timmy came home one night. He said, "Uncle BARRY will you help me write a theme 'I Speak for Democracy.'" I said, "Timmy, let's have some fun with your teacher. Go back tomorrow and tell her that you can't do it because we are not a Democracy." Well the next night he came back and he said, "Uncle BARRY, don't ever tell me to do that again." But they have been able to teach our young people and many of our old people that we are a democracy when we are a republic. And if we want to go part way, we are a democratic-republic. Both small case.

I don't think there's any question in the minds of anybody in this country, who will soberly think over our history, and you have to think of history in evaluating present position and future position, who will not agree that under conservative government, mostly under Republican government, this country has been better off. Therefore, a conservative approach of some type is best for America.

But we haven't been doing a good job of getting that story told. We have conservatives of all hues and we can go from the middle of the road to the extreme right. In that category we have not been telling our story and I think that it's time that we do. Why? Because we, in this country, whether we like to admit it or not have gone a long way toward socialism. It's very difficult for us to think tonight of a business that isn't touched in some way by governmental support. It is very difficult for businessmen of any type to think of a day or a week that doesn't go by without the hard, hot hand of the Federal Government on their books and in their business. And let me remind you of what Lincoln said, I don't recall the exact words, but it has been said down through the history by all great philosophers of government that "freedoms are not lost overnight." You are not going to wake up some Sunday morning and read in the Sunday morning paper or hear it over the Sunday radio or see it on the Sunday TV, that we are no longer free people. No, it doesn't happen that way. It happens like termites eating in a house, and the first sign of trouble you see is when grandma put her foot through a step. That's the first inkling you have and it's usually too late. We will lose our freedoms, ladies and gentlemen, by being attacked from within. We will never lose our freedoms, as long as we believe in them, by any force outside the United States. There are some other signs that are disturbing in these days that I want to mention as to what the radicals have wrought. The growing dependency on the Federal Government for the solution of all of our problems, from the home to the top levels of government. Solutions that once were made at home. Why, I can remember, and I am certainly not old by any standards except by

possibly physical standards, when they built the first hospital here and they met in a man's house right across the street from this hotel and as a result the hospital was built. It wasn't as expensive in those days, but it was comparatively so. We did things then. We had the same obstacles. We had the same troubles to contend with; the same apathies; the same lack of interest. But things got done and today we say write our Congressman. He'll solve our troubles. Oh, he will. He'll trade your troubles for something real.

What's another sign? What's happening to patriotism in this country, folks. You know, there is a sign up at West Point on the parade grounds, "When the flag passes, gentlemen will remove their hats." Watch the coming rodeo parade. See how many hats you see still on when the flag goes by. And you ought to walk up and knock them off. How many new buildings have flagpoles? How many flags fly on the days they should? How many people talk with feeling in their hearts about America and what it stands for. Those are signs, ladies and gentlemen, that we might be further down the road than we like to think or admit. They have derided free enterprise and the American businessman is so beaten down he won't rise up and fight back. And I watch them come to the Halls of Congress as John does and testify before our committees as whipped dogs. You businessmen have made America and will keeping making it, but not when you are cowards. You are in business to make a dollar. Don't be ashamed of it. And the free enterprise system is the only vehicle that can provide profit and can provide jobs for the millions and millions of American workers who along with management, have made this enterprise work. Don't be ashamed of it. Talk about it. Preach it to your employees. Preach it to the young people in the schools and the young people in the communities.

Now, those are some of the signs. I think that right now we might have a short estimate of our situation as Republicans. I always liked that part of the military when you stopped and took a look at what you were doing; what the enemy was up to; and what you might do to get around him. Lincoln said something about it too. He said, "If we could first know where we are, and whither we are tending, we could then better judge what to do and how to do it." Now let us Republicans look at ourselves very quickly. We have won only one national election since 1928, and that was in 1946. I don't think we can call the elections of 1952 or the election of 1956 a party triumph. I think that it was a deserving recognition of a great American who had served his country well in time of need. And I think that he could be relected again if he cared to run and if we didn't have an amendment preventing it. We must dismiss the Republican victories except for 1946. Now, answer then, this question. Why? Starting back with the creation of the Civil Service Act we started to deprive both parties of patronage. Now, I'm not arguing for the patronage system as such. I think it has a place in politics. But I don't think that it has the massive place that it once had. I think that it would be disrupting to modern government. But nevertheless a great void was created in both parties, where we couldn't say to our loyal precinct workers, "there's going to be a job for you." Well, he would get out and work like the devil to get that job, to see that his man won or that his party won so that he could have that job. As a result, in the early thirties the Republican Party and the Democrat Party had no great pool of workers. Now, there has stepped into the Democrat side though, the newly created force of organized labor and their politically minded leaders, and they filled the void in the Democrat side to the point where the Democrat Party today in many States exists only as a hollow shell and in it work the people of the Committee on Political Education, financed by the vast sums available to the organized union movement. Now, this has been more and more evident as we have been losing elections across America in the strong Republican States like New York, Pennsylvania, Indiana, Ohio, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, Colorado. All of these States that for years would never tolerate a Democrat being elected to office at any level. We have seen, for almost 25 years a loss in county seats and a loss in State legislative seats and it was only a matter of time until we lost Governors, Congressmen, and Senators, and come 1956 and 1958 we saw that occur.

I suggest the answer to that, nationally, is what we did in Arizona in 1958. We are imploring our party nationally, and as you can see, they are taking steps to do it, to do precisely what we did when Dick Kliendienst and Jim Wood and the other leaders of this party recognized that we had division in our party and then called Republicans together and formulated an eight-point statement of principle on which we could all stand. They did away with the divisive effects in a political party and in 1958 we marched to the polls united, even though there might be some people who wouldn't agree entirely with everything their candidates stood for, they worked for the Republican Party because they knew what the Republican Party in Arizona stood for.

Now, what to do. I'll say first that I'll echo what John Rhodes said, what Jack Williams said, what Paul Fannin said. Let's not yield to the temptation of the opposition philosophy. Let's not look at their grass and say that it's greener than ours. It isn't. It's dead, dirty, dried-up grass that should have been swept out of both political parties years and years ago. We cannot compromise with principle. I think the Republican Party and Republican candidates should take the attitude that this is going to be a long haul; this isn't going to be done by magic; but if we recognize we're in for a hard rough job, I am convinced that by sticking to principle the Republican Party can put itself across. And if we forget our principle, ladies and gentlemen, there will be no more Republican Party. I think that we must remind the people that we are a party of peace. Now by that I don't want to imply that the opposition party is a party of war, but under the Republican Party by peculiar coincidence we have always managed to have peace. Yet this peace now is one that you and I and all Americans don't like; we have to recognize that we are in a cold war with a philosophy that does not recognize God where ours does. We are at odds with a philosophy that doesn't recognize the freedom of the individual where we do, and that this isn't a war that is going to be fought and won on the battlefields or in the skies or on the oceans or under them. It's a war that's going to be fought in the minds and hearts of men. And when the American people can demonstrate to this world that the concepts of Jefferson and Franklin and Washington and all of those great men who founded this country, are as true today as they were then, then I suggest to you that the idea of freedom will prevail over the dirty idea of communism. We have to come to it; we can't do it by force anymore than they can subdue our ideas by force. We have to tell the people, and remind them and prove to them that we are a party of all the people. We are not a party interested in dividing the American people into cataloged groups so that we can pull them out at election time for this purpose or for that purpose, but that we are constantly interested in the individual freedom of every American living in this country. We have to remind the American people that under a conservative approach to the fiscal problems of government, good business exists and that under the spend and spend philosophy of the radicals we have in the opposition party today disaster is the only end result. No, good business, long prevailing good business, comes under our philosophies.

In closing I want to mention one thing: one area where this party, or the other party, or both of us have to provide corrections. Some party has to stand up to the illegitimate use of power by some of the union bosses in this country, and that party should be the Republican Party, and I hope and pray that it is.

I might remind you that Walter Reuther made a statement yesterday decrying the amount of unemployment in this country, and everybody should be concerned with unemployment, but he proposes a vast new program and nobody knows what it is, but if you want to see the result of the political and economic philosophy of Walter Reuther, look to the once glorious, industrious State of Michigan where I spoke 2 nights ago. A State that is so bankrupt that they are asking their businessmen to pay their taxes in advance so that they can pay their governmental employees. A State that is asking $140 million more in taxes from already overburdened taxpayers, never thinking for one moment that they might stop some of their foolish spending in order to get their State in order. You need no other example, ladies and gentlemen, of the end result of the socialist political planning of Walter Reuther than to look at the once great State of Michigan, and as I told them up there that night, "You keep your solidarity house and Reuther; we'll take your water." Here is the unbridled power of one man able to destroy a sovereign State of the United States and nobody seems willing to stop him.

And then we have James Hoffa on the other side with his economic power, thumbing his economic nose at decent citizens all over this country, threatening to organize all means of transportation and if need be, tie up the business of this country to get it done. Now, ladies and gentlemen, power was never a part of the concept of government under our Founding Fathers. It's something we fled from, to get away from, as it existed in Europe and yet tonight, in 1959, it is working to the detriment of the American people and we cannot get a political party with the courage to stand up and say "This has to be done." Now I know about this power.

I sit on the Labor Committee. I am the ranking Republican member. And if you think for one moment that any bill that is before that committee is going to stop Jimmy Hoffa or Reuther or any other power-mad union boss—stop fooling yourself because it won't happen. We are flirting around with the symptoms, not the disease. The disease is unbridled, illegitimate power given to these bosses by the law of the United States and we have to make it equal to the power of the rest of the citizens.

I want to close by reminding you that we faced these times before in our history and we have come out of them. Back in the Revolutionary days we were faced with problems worse than we are faced with today, but it took courage as it's going to take today to solve them. I recall some place in history the question was asked, "Where do you stand?" We don't ask that question tonight of Republicans and Democrats. We ask it of Americans. "Where do you stand?" Do you want America to remain a free Republic so that our two-party system, our economic system and the theory of individual freedom can exist or are you going to be a member of the lazy, indifferent throng that says, "It can't happen here." It happened to Rome, to Egypt, to Greece, it al-

most happened to France and it might yet, it almost happened to England and it might yet, and there's nothing historically different, ladies and gentlemen, in 1959, than there was 500, 1,000, or 2,000 years ago. The problems are wrapped up in human beings. And it is up to people to say what they want in government; not organized groups or masses by the people themselves. And I have faith in people. I think the answer to "Where do you stand, sir?" will be a resounding "With freedom, sir."

Address by Under Secretary of the Army Hugh M. Milton II, at the Conference of the Military Government Association in Augusta, Ga., October 25, 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, last year's annual conference of the Military Government Association was held at the Bon Air Hotel in Augusta, Ga., October 24–25, 1958. The speaker for the banquet on the evening of October 25 was the Honorable Hugh M. Milton II, Under Secretary of the Army. Secretary Milton delivered a very able and outstanding address. It is so important and timely that I think it would be of interest to many people throughout the Nation and the world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Secretary Milton's address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. HUGH M. MILTON II, UNDER SECRETARY OF THE ARMY, BEFORE CIVIL AFFAIRS AND MILITARY GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION CONFERENCE, AUGUSTA, GA., OCTOBER 25, 1958.

Gentlemen, it is indeed an honor and a distinct pleasure to be with you tonight to address the annual conference of the Military Government Association at the conclusion of its meeting here in Augusta. As I looked over your most impressive program which you have followed since you opened your conference yesterday, I could not restrain a feeling of utter humility for being included as a participant since, although I have been associated with many aspects of civil affairs and military government, particularly in the Reserve components for many years, it is my colleague and good friend in the secretariat, the Honorable George H. Roderick, to whom I must defer as the expert in this field. So, Senator Thurmond, General Gailey, and Colonel Newman, thank you so much for including me on your program.

By the way, I observed from your agenda that you have been addressed by several eminent and knowledgeable authorities in the field of military government who, I am sure, have covered much more adequately than I could their particular specialties. So with your permission, I will limit my remarks to how you, as influential citizens who hold important positions in local, State, and National Government, as well as in the Military Establishment, fit into the overall scheme of our Nation's defense.

But, if I may digress for a moment, I think it altogether fitting that this conference is being conducted here at Augusta, Mayor Beckum, for you have a city of which you, its citizenry, and the entire southland may be duly proud. Widely known as the watering place of Presidents and for its preeminence as the golfing capital of America, it is also a booming center of business in the agricultural and industrial heartland of the great Southeast. Nearby is one of our Nation's most vital centers devoted to insurance of our survival in the atomic age—the Savannah River atomic energy plant. And nearby, too, is located Fort Gordon which has played a significant role in World War II and thereafter by developing many of our Army troops into a high state of combat readiness. And last, but not least, among other activities at Fort Gordon is the school of civil affairs and military government which is imparting to CAMG students the latest in doctrine and techniques which are applied to this highly significant field under conditions of atomic warfare.

As we winged our way out of the beautiful city of Washington—and, having seen many of the world's major cities, I am convinced that our Nation's Capital is the most beautiful of all—I was overwhelmed with the mosaic of brilliant color that unfolded beneath us all along our route. To me, autumn is the loveliest season of the year with nature trying to outdo itself in one last burst of glory before winter's cold fingers caress mother earth into restful slumber. I believe it was Ralph Waldo Emerson who said, "The beauty that shimmers in the yellow afternoons of October, whoever could clutch it? Go forth to find it, and it is gone; 'tis only a mirage as you look from the windows of diligence." Again, it is our pleasure to share the beauties as well as the hospitality of the city of Augusta.

My friends, with your experience and training in government, complemented by your military background, you, I am sure, have brought to this conference a better understanding of the philosophy of civil affairs and military government in modern warfare. Your knowledge, your ability, your willingness to take time out from your day-to-day duties to assist in the development of a sound defensive structure are urgently needed, as has been so ably pointed out to you today by your other speakers.

Today our country requires the support and the assistance of its leaders in every field of our national life. We are engaged in building a protective means of resistance against the possibility of our destruction by a form of social existence totally foreign to us. We are threatened by a way of life which is completely different and absolutely opposed to all of the fine concepts and beliefs on which this great Nation is founded.

There is nothing that we stand for in America, no resource that we can possess, no future plans that we can make, nothing material or spiritual that we can hope to pass on to our children and our children's children that is not under attack this very moment by the supranational concept called communism. Is it any wonder then, that you have been asked to put aside your personal affairs briefly and assemble here in Augusta for the purpose of bringing yourselves up to date on new developments in the field of military government and your role in future warfare?

A number of you are members of our Reserve components. I have often said and heard said that our reservists are dedicated men. In my position where I deal daily with Reserve component affairs, I have a better vantage point than most to see evidence of that dedication, that devotion to duty, that desire to maintain a strong and virile Reserve which members of the USAR are demonstrating.

I would remind you, however, that the Communist is also a most dedicated man. He has no life apart from his organization and his rigidly systematic ideas. Everything that he does, everything that he has—family, job, money, beliefs, friends, talents; yes, even his life—is subordinate to his unswerving devotion to communism. He is not a Communist just on election day or at the party headquarters; he is a Communist 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, and 52 weeks throughout the year. And, if by some misstep, he falls from favor and ends up before a firing squad, he probably dies still believing in communism. This is what we are up against.

I was not invited, nor did I come here today, to lecture you on the theory of communism, but we would be remiss in our thinking if we did not consider the dangers of communism. For it is this threat constantly confronting us that demands the vast expenditure of money, time, effort, and materiel which we must drain from our national economy and apply to our defenses if we are to remain free.

It follows quite logically that the only force which can restrain them, which they will respect or fear, is a power so evident and so real that they have certain knowledge that to attack it would bring upon themselves certain destruction. Our free world will exist only so long as we have that strength ready and quite visible. World domination is the undisputed goal of the Kremlin. Khrushchev's threat to bury us was no empty, meaningless boast. He means to do just that if he can, and just as certainly we mean to stop him and prevent communism from continuing its insidious encroachment upon the free world.

In the United States our military forces are instruments of our Government, which is to say, our people. It might be said that our military constitutes an instrument of policy. But, because we are a peaceful people, God-loving and trusting, we have in the past always permitted both our Active and Reserve Forces to remain at low strength and to consume only a minimum of our resources until a shooting war has required a sudden buildup. Now we are engaged in a costly and dangercus cold war that may suddenly erupt into a shooting conflict on any one of a dozen faraway fronts where communism and freedom stand face to face.

Of course, all of us realize that should war come, there would not be time for the previous hasty expansion which we were permitted in the early days of World Wars I and II. We have had to develop a military system that our economy can sustain on a permanent basis and out of that requirement has come the Reserve components as we know them today, and in which many of you are playing such a significant role. You have come here to better acquaint yourselves with the many changes that are constantly occurring in the technological and organizational structure of our Armed Forces. The concepts you have considered here during the course of this conference should add immeasurably to your understanding of the problems of modern warfare.

Although all of you occupy positions of responsibility in your various walks of life, your professional growth must continue if you are to be effective in assisting in the defense of our Nation. And you realize, I know, that the unending search for an effective defense is the primary reason for the existence of your organization. If it ever becomes necessary to fight another war, you gentlemen are destined for important assignments in the various areas of our defense efforts. It is vital that you be informed in your respective areas of interest in order that you may be prepared to cope with the tasks that lie ahead. While the added knowledge that you have received here will be a

valuable aid in that direction, we realize, of course, that it is an unceasing task to keep abreast of our specialties in this constantly changing age. It is my fervent hope that your knowledge will contribute immeasurably to the continued professional growth of the realtively young field of military government. You must particularly concern yourselves with the many new and complex problems that face us in the future. Of course, we have no idea what our future portends. As military men, we must consider the impact upon our defense posture of the many important advances that have been made in warfare during recent years. These changes are having a profound influence upon our organization, our supply problems, and upon the strategy and tactics of actual combat.

In the past when the changes that our scientists evolved were mainly improvements or refinements of existing weapons and equipment, it was possible with a fair degree of accuracy to predict the direction and scope of the impact resulting from the change. Today, the magnitude of our technical advances is so great that the guidelines for the future are not as clear as we might wish. Experiences of the past are of little help, in many respects, in planning for the next war. The importance of accurate foresight is more critical than ever before. Never before in history has there been a greater need for men of vision, of courage—a need for leaders with the ability to overcome the obstacles which lie in the path of freedom, right, and justice as we understand these concepts. The skill and training that you bring to your particular assignment is, therefore, of extreme importance to our national welfare.

I have been asked to discuss with you tonight some of the aspects of our Reserve program. I know each of you is interested in the overall Reserve program as it is presently constituted within our Army. In your busy day-to-day activities, it no doubt is most difficult for you to keep abreast of trends affecting our Reserve components, so I would like today to briefly outline to you and bring into sharper focus the mission of the Army Reserve and its current organizational structure.

Let us first examine the mission of our Reserve components and then take a look at what we have done and are doing to carry out this mission.

Our Reserves have a dual mission to perform; first, to provide units in accordance with Department of the Army mobilization plans in such a state of strength, training proficiency and so equipped as to be prepared for deployment within a minimum of time after mobilization. The second mission is to provide trained individual reinforcements, both officer and enlisted, in the numbers required by current mobilization plans to replace initial combat casualties, to reinforce Active Army units, and to provide trained reinforcements for Reserve units called to duty after M-day.

You will note that I said "current mobilization plans." To maintain these plans up to date requires a continuous reexamination of our program. We must never feel satisfied with what we have done. Yesterday's preparation for today may be as obsolescent as the horse and buggy. We must continually prepare for tomorrow. Our troop program units of the Ready Reserve must be manned, well-trained and adequately equipped; individual replacements must be equally ready and available. Of course, this requires that we make the most effective use of our limited funds and drill-pay spaces. Our No. 1 problem, then, is for our Reserve units to be ready when they are needed. To insure this readiness, the responsibility is placed on the Active Army to provide the means for training, the facilities with which to conduct that training, and supplies and equipment necessary to fully round out the program.

You may ask how far we have come along in the Army in this get-ready program. You and I know in the last 5 or 6 years the Army Reserve has expanded to a remarkable degree. If we measure this progress by the distance we have come—by what has been accomplished in recent years—our record is good. But, if we measure our progress by the distance we have yet to go, it will readily be seen that we still have a stupendous job ahead for all of us.

Just a few short years ago, the Army Reserve consisted almost solely of officers. We had very little in the way of enlisted strength. We had many paper units. There was no such thing as USAR schools, and when officers went on active duty, for training, the Active Army units with which they served were often confused as to how properly to use their services for the 2 weeks' tour. We have come a long way since we first got our troop basis, since we first instituted the system of drill-pay spaces, since enlisted strength began to build up in our units, and since money was allotted and plans made for our first Reserve training centers.

Today we have 10 combat divisions, 13 training divisions, two maneuver area commands, and several thousand company-size units of a support nature. We are now engaged in carrying out the same pentomic reorganization of the Reserve troop structure that the Active Army has just completed.

It should be remembered that, while the reservist is frequently associated with the long historical traditions of the citizen-soldier, he is in fact a member of a very young organization which because it is growing so rapidly is suffering growing pains.

The Reserves require manpower, dollars, equipment, and training facilities. Formerly, when they lay dormant, they caused no strain on our national budget. When the Army Reserve was only a paper organization represented by thousands of cards in filing cabinets, it posed no fiscal problems, and was a headache only to the filing clerks. Today Reserve units must have meeting places, hardstands for their trucks and tanks, gasoline for the engines, storage space for weapons, and ammunition to use in those weapons. Today, we have Reserve cooks operating messes, Reserve AG's making out reports, Reserve finance sections preparing payrolls, and, of course, the Reserves are playing their part in the maneuver areas and training fields.

We have high priority units in being which are ready upon mobilization to join our Strategic Reserve for immediate deployment wherever needed. We now have over 280,000 Army reservists participating in drill-pay status or in the 6-month training program on active duty for training. This represented a gain of some 40,000 over the November 1957 figure—a direct result of an aggressive recruiting program in which many of you played an important part. Attendance at annual unit training was over 90 percent last year, and I am confident that the reports will show that it will be even higher this year. In fact, I feel sure that this year we will see the largest number of reservists on active duty for training that we have ever had in peacetime history.

We have established a goal for both units and individuals to be self-sufficient, and I am happy to say that this goal is being met in many areas. For instance, our Reserve units now handle nearly all of their training requirements, a large percentage of their administrative requirements, and I believe this year they will exceed last year's figure of 50 percent of the handling of their mess operations. The reason for this improvement can be found in the high percentage of enlisted strength with both basic and MOS training now in our units. Also, the increased issues of equipment have made possible better training during the precamp cycle.

During this last fiscal year, our Reserve construction program saw a total of 81 Army Reserve Centers placed under contract—the laregst number so far contracted for in any 1 year. These training centers plus those already constructed, combined with leased facilities, provide training quarters considered adequate for more than 135,000 reservists. Slowly but surely, we are approaching our goal in this field. It must be kept in mind that without facilities, we cannot properly store and safeguard the equipment that is required for training. Without proper equipment we cannot give our personnel adequate training, and without a sound training program it is difficult to maintain the interest of our personnel in their duties.

There is one plain fact that we must face. Our beloved country is the main barrier in the Communist path to global conquest and the enslavement of mankind. The Soviets have clearly demonstrated their technological capabilities, and we are thoroughly convinced that no moral considerations will slow their efforts toward world domination. The grim reality of this danger makes it imperative that all of us exert our best efforts toward the maintenance of an effective defense posture.

George Washington, our first President, set the example in our fight for freedom. He helped establish this Nation. He helped to make the Declaration of Independence the guidepost for our way of life, until today it is an accepted principle of a way of life which we of the western democracies desire.

None of us can follow the career of George Washington, who strode his solitary way to greatness, without a warming glow in our hearts. He sought no royal road to achievement; he traveled no short-cut to success. He had a great mind, a keen ambition, and an earnest and humble heart. He was a strong leader of unshakeable will and tireless patience.

That cold winter at Valley Forge was truly a struggle; almost a fourth of Washington's army became casualties from freezing and starvation. Because of their suffering and their defeats, the American troops were sorely tempted to abandon their cause, but this great leader, George Washington, never lost faith. As a result of his victories at Trenton, Valley Forge, and Monmouth, there is little chance that the march toward freedom which he inspired will ever be halted.

In one field of military technology, years of pioneering experience are paying handsome dividends in the development of guided and ballistic missiles and rockets. One of the outstanding examples of the U.S. Army's achievements in this area is the great Jupiter intermediate range ballistic missile which is now in production and will soon take its place in the line of American defense, and it was the Jupiter C rocket which hurled into orbit the free world's first earth satellite in January of this year—followed by Explorer III in March and yet another—Explorer IV—in late July.

Yes, we are focusing our eyes into space, but we are still keeping our feet on the ground, for with all the advancements of modern science—in this era of orbiting satellites, rocketry, ultra sonic speeds, nuclear weapons, the myriad of innovations in modern warfare—it is still the man; yes, the individual soldier, sailor, marine and airman possessing the strong moral fibre, the intestinal stamina and fortitude and the clear-eyed intellect to employ those complex tools properly, who holds the key to victory in any war of the future.

I see before me today a stirring example of the type of leadership ready to fill this need, drawn together in mutuality by a bond

of common belief in the cause which we are dedicated to defend. You and other splendid Americans like you, both in service and out, are the ultimate weapon. In you and your fellows rests the fortune of our great heritage in any future conflict in this nuclear age.

Recently, I had called to my attention, a formula credited to Chairman H. W. Prentis, Jr., of the Armstrong Cork Co., which reduces the rise-and-fall cycle of great civilizations to the following simple pattern:

From bondage to spiritual faith;
From spiritual faith to courage;
From courage to freedom;
From freedom to abundance;
From abundance to selfishness;
From selfishness to complacency;
From complacency to apathy;
From apathy to fear;
From fear to dependency;
From dependency back to bondage.

Ladies and gentlemen, this formula is not mathematical or so rigid to the extent that it cannot be arrested at the "freedom and abundance" level. That decision rests with you and me—all of us—to see that it does not run the full cycle for our democratic civilization.

And, I say to you today, as I have said on many occasions, that upon the plains of apathy bleach the bones of the victor who sat down to rest.

My friends, I have described to you briefly during these few moments with you the mission of our Reserve forces and the progress which is being made to build those forces into a virile and effective organization as a vital element in our Nation's scheme of defense. Our Armed Forces today stand ready to discourage further aggression or to respond to it promptly wherever it may occur. I know that each of you here joins me in praying that this Nation shall never be called upon to wage another war; however, I know that you are equally as determined in your belief that we must never be in such a position that we could not win a war if one were forced upon us. In your hands and those of all our great American people rests that decision. By heroic leadership, loyal and courageous devotion, and intrepid example of men of character imbued with an unflinching belief in Almighty God, the men of our Armed Forces—backed up by the American people—will strive as a team to perpetuate for future generations the way of life which abounds so freely in this wonderful land.

Minshall Opinion Poll Shows 23d District Ohio Supports President's Defense Budget, Berlin Stand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, tabulation is complete on the fifth annual Minshall opinion poll. This poll went to the home of every registered voter in the 23d district, 108,000 homes in all. Response was truly remarkable: more than 20,000 questionnaires were completed and returned.

Mailing of the poll was timed so that a sampling of opinion was possible before and after President Eisenhower's televised speech on the Berlin crisis and his defense budget. Prespeech returns showed 75.5 percent support of his Berlin stand; postspeech returns showed that support had risen to 77 percent. Before the President's speech, returns indicated 61.8 percent were satisfied that the defense program is adequate; after the speech, the total reached 63.5 percent.

Both foreign aid and Federal aid to school construction slipped in the voter's favor. Foreign aid support dropped from 50 percent in 1958 to 48.5 percent this year. Support of Federal school aid fell off from last year's 45 percent to a mere 36.8 percent.

Many of the returns carried marginal comments in which the voters further amplified their views both on national issues and on their own individual problems with the Federal Government. They were very nearly unanimous in calling for sensible economy in Federal spending; many, in particular, deplored the huge farm subsidies doled out under our antiquated agricultural laws.

The results of the poll follow:

Results of 1959 Minshall opinion poll

	Yes	No	No opinion
1. If the fiscal 1960 budget is not balanced, would you favor increasing taxes to eliminate the deficit?	34.4	60.6	5.0
2. Do you favor a higher Federal gasoline tax to maintain a pay-as-you-go basis in Federal-aid highway construction?	48.8	47.9	3.3
3. From information available, do you believe this country's defense program is adequate?	62.5	22.2	15.3
4. Do you favor Federal aid for local school construction?	36.8	58.0	5.2
5. Are you in favor of amending the Social Security Act to include all medical expenses, the financing to be shared by the employers and employees?	37.4	56.9	5.7
6. Do you favor repeal of that section of the Taft-Hartley Act which presently permits States to enact their own right-to-work laws?	22.3	69.2	8.5
7. Should the cost of air passenger terminals be paid by the airlines rather than from Federal-local funds as at present?	75.1	16.9	8.0
8. Do you believe we should continue our foreign aid program which calls for expenditures of $3,200,000,000 in military and economic assistance during fiscal 1960?	48.5	46.8	4.7
9. In case of a blockade, do you believe we should employ military force to maintain our position in Berlin?	76.1	13.3	10.6
10. Do you favor repeal of the 22d amendment, which limits the Presidency to 2 terms?	25.1	69.3	5.6
11. Do you favor expansion of public power against private power (for example, TVA)?	25.1	65.4	9.5
12. Are you in favor of stronger civil rights legislation?	39.0	40.5	20.5
13. Do you favor removing the Federal Government's present regulatory control over prices producers can charge for natural gas?	18.3	70.9	10.8
14. Are you in favor of a law guaranteeing union members the secret ballot in the election or removal of union officials, and in other vital union matters?	91.4	5.2	3.4

Taxation of Cooperatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made by former Representative Jerry Voorhis on the proposals of the President of the United States and the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the taxation of cooperatives. Many of our friends will remember Mr. Voorhis, who is now executive director of the Cooperative League of the U.S.A., as a Representative from California for 10 years.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT, JANUARY 21, 1959, OF JERRY VOORHIS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, COOPERATIVE LEAGUE OF THE U.S.A.

In his budget message Monday, President Eisenhower proposed that cooperatives pay corporate income tax on some of their members' income.

Under this unusual proposal, the administration declares it is opposed to co-op members' investing their refunds in their own businesses for longer than 3 years. The administration similarly declares it is opposed to co-op members investing their refunds in their own businesses at less than 4 percent interest.

If co-op members go ahead and do either of these things—(1) invest their refunds for more than 3 years or (2) pay themselves less than 4 percent interest on these invested refunds—then their co-op must pay a penalty. The penalty is for the co-op to pay corporate income tax on these refunds as if they had never been made at all.

The President didn't indicate how much additional revenue this penalty tax would produce—or even whether it would produce any. He did say that this change plus some tightening of other taxes would yield $50 million in added revenue. This is six-hundredths of 1 percent of the Federal budget.

At best, co-ops have only limited access to capital markets. Investors aren't interested in co-op securities because their value never rises above par. Nor do they care for fixed-interest-bearing equities, such as co-op shares.

So co-op members have little choice as to how they will finance their joint enterprises. They have done what they can, and this is to finance their co-ops by investing some or all of each year's refunds. For all practical purposes, the President's proposal would destory such financing. It would mean that the people's principal means of capitalizing their co-ops is gone.

The President has recommended his budget as one that will encourage people to work, to save, and to invest. Yet in this same budget he proposes to penalize the 13 million families who own U.S. co-ops if they choose to invest their co-op refunds for more than 3 years or at less than 4-percent interest. What kind of encouragement is this?

The President's proposal would affect nearly every kind of co-op. It would hit farmers' marketing and purchasing co-ops hardest. A recent study shows that more than 60 percent of their equity capital comes directly from members' invested refunds.

More than 70 percent of these co-ops pay less than 4-percent interest on any money their members invest, and in virtually none of the co-ops do members invest their refunds for less than 5 years.

The President's proposal would also wipe out the capital credits plan that most electric co-op members use to finance their systems. For these rural people are now investing their annual refunds for longer than 3 years and they pay themselves no interest at all on such investments.

Nor would the President's proposal leave consumer co-ops in our cities unscathed. A co-op supermarket would pay income tax on refunds its members invest for more than 3 years or at less than 4-percent interest, without regard for whether these refunds, if not invested, would be taxable income to its members.

This indicates to me that the President is no proposing to plug a tax loophole nor to correct any tax inequity. What he is proposing is to destroy the principal means that co-op members have found to finance their co-ops and, in the process, to destroy co-ops themselves.

The President's proposal seems particularly high-handed because of the extremes to which his administration has gone to coddle investors in any other kind of business. If Congress should by some stretch of the imagination adopt it, ordinary people of small means who want to invest their co-op refunds in their own mutual, self-help enterprises would find a new tax obstacle thrown in their path. Nor would they receive any of the tax deductions and credits that investors in profit motivated businesses have enjoyed since 1953.

When Dwight D. Eisenhower was a candidate for the presidency in 1952, he told an audience in Superior, Wis., that the matter of co-ops and their taxes was "well and soundly settled by the Revenue Act of 1951." This pledge was evidently campaign oratory. In fairness to the President, I think he has been victimized by bad advice. He has permitted himself to be imposed upon by people who lack appreciation of the great role that cooperatives have played in preserving a free economy.

Last week in New Orleans, one of the three remaining members of the President's original Cabinet, a man in whom he has placed unlimited confidence—Agriculture Secretary Ezra Benson—said: "I have little patience with those who argue that cooperatives do not pay their fair share of taxes." Yet within 6 days of the Secretary's statement, the Chief of this administration was arguing before the Congress of the United States that co-ops should pay more taxes than they do. "Let not thy right hand know what thy left hand doeth."

Reduction of Price Supports on Peanuts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the statement before the Subcommittee on Peanuts of the House Committee on Agriculture made by Hon. John P. Duncan, Jr., president of the Georgia Farm Bureau, on Tuesday, April 7, 1959. Mr. Duncan is one of the most able and conscientious farm leaders in the country and his statement effectively demonstrates that Secretary of Agriculture Benson's reduction of price supports on peanuts by $19.70 a ton now has the farmers producing peanuts below the cost of production.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, and other members of this important Subcommittee on Peanuts. On March 4, 1959, the Secretary announced that peanuts would be supported at an average price of $193.50 per ton reflecting 75 percent of modernized parity (this includes 1959 administrative changes in the parity index), as compared with a 1958 average support price of $213.20 or 80.8 percent of parity. This means that peanuts will be supported in 1959 for $19.70 per ton less than they were supported in 1958. In the United States this would mean a loss in income to our peanut farmers of approximately $16 million.

We fully realize that the Secretary has rather broad discretion in determining the support price and that he no doubt is in the limit of the law. We doubt very much, however, that he has used the best of judgment in estimating, which is the basis of such announcement, the amount of peanuts that will be consumed this year, or the carryover as of August 1, and certainly his estimate of production appears to us to be out of reason.

The Secretary has spent a good part of his time lately traveling throughout the country and in many of his speeches, he speaks of peanuts. He made the statement at Cornell University on March 24, 1959: "The farmers are producing more peanuts than consumers will buy at the prices which peanuts must be supported." In other speeches he has said that if the prices of peanuts were substantially reduced, there would be an increase in consumption.

By using the trend of only the last 4 months, the Secretary has estimated that the consumption of peanuts for the coming year would be about 713,000 tons. Since 1954 the consumption of peanuts has increased approximately 40 million pounds (shelled basis) per year. From last August 1 until March 1 of this year, the near record level of 426 million pounds were consumed as compared with 415 million for the same 7 months during the 1957–58 season. We contend that the consumption figure should be 733 million pounds based on the chart shown in exhibit B. The peanut farmers of the southeast and the Virginia-Carolina area are paying out of their pockets approximately $500,000 per year to increase the sale and use of peanuts and to expand their markets. With this in mind, we do not believe the Secretary's action, in reducing the price of peanuts, an exhibition of cooperation or a source of encouragement to farmers.

The manufacturers of peanut products are completely satisfied with the price they paid for the 1958 crop. They do not request any reduction in the support price and have no complaints.

In the Secretary's estimate of production for the crop year of 1959, the crop year of 1954 was completely left out. Therefore, his estimate of production for 1959 does not run true with actual production over the past 5 years. It is true that the average production per acre for 1958 was good but there is no fact to back up that the same will exist for 1959. Why should he leave out 1954 which was a bad year when we produced only 727 pounds to the acre and put in 1958 which was an exceptionally good year when we produced 1,213 pounds to the acre? We could very easily have another year like 1954 as much so as we could have another good year such as 1958.

The Secretary is estimating that the 1959 production of peanuts will be 820,000 tons, which is estimating that the production of peanuts will be greater than during any year except 1958, even going back as far as 1951.

In studying the production of peanuts one can easily see that there is no consistency in one year compared to another, either in yields per acre or total production.

Over the years the Secretary, in estimating the production of peanuts, has used the figure of 91 percent of the total allotment (1,610,000 acres) would be planted and harvested. This being the case, and we have no reason to doubt it, and using his own figure of 1,118 pounds per acre yield (which appears to be much too high) would not come out to his estimated total production of 820,000 tons.

In the Southwest, for example, the Secretary, out of the clear blue sky, has increased the estimated production per acre some 20 or 30 pounds per acre just because they have had a rain or two in the last few months.

Farmers are in no position incomewise or otherwise to sit idly by and let someone, not connected with production of peanuts, determine their income just because they think it might rain.

Actually the actual average production of peanuts per acre since 1952 through 1958 in the United States is only 997 pounds per acre. The Secretary is estimating that the 1959 average per acre production will be some 1,118 pounds per acre.

With such estimates as these, the Secretary will cause the income of the U.S. peanut farmers to drop some $14,875,500, based on average production since 1952 or a drop of $18,647,240 from 1958, based on 1958 production. (See exhibit A for the production figures and average in the United States since 1952.)

By observing the production of peanuts by years, it is very obvious that his estimates are much too high.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in the determination of the 1959 support level one can easily see that by just a mere stroke of a pen a farmer can be completely put out of business.

The Department of Agriculture has been buying from shellers No. 2 stock peanuts and placing them in cold storage, at tremendous cost, in order that they might be on hand August 1 to help justify his action. However, we understand that this process has been slowed tremendously in the last 2 weeks since this hearing was announced. We realize that in the crushing of peanuts for oil that we must consider also what this will do to the price of cottonseed oil and soybean oil. We realize that these other commodities should be taken into account but we firmly believe that there is still plenty of time before August 1 to divert all surplus farmers' stock peanuts and No. 2 shelled peanuts purchased by CCC to oil without affecting the price of these other oil products. In the last few days there has been a reconcentration of approximately 10,000 tons in 2 warehouses to help get ready for the August 1 carryover.

Gentlemen, I am sure all of you realize that the farmer's cost of production is steadily increasing each year.

Are we farmers to continuously pay more for the items we purchase and continuously take less for the products we sell?

Back at alltime high as reported by the U.S. Department of Agriculture last week, the Department said the index of prices paid by farmers for commodities, interest, taxes, and farm wages rose one-third of 1 percent during the month ending March 15. The advance, due primarily to high prices for production goods, lifted the index back to the record high first established in January of this year. It was nearly 2 percent higher than a year earlier.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I would like to give the members of this committee some actual figures on the cost of producing an

acre of peanuts. These figures are the average given to me by good peanut farmers in Georgia. These farmers keep accurate records and these figures are based on a 5-year average.

Preparing land	$5.00
Preemerge weed control	3.00
Fertilizer	8.00
Seed	24.75
Cultivating (4 times)	8.00
Hoeing	6.00
Harvesting	21.00
Hauling to market	3.00
Dust	4.00
Lime and land plaster	4.50
Taxes, land rent, interest on investment	6.75
Total	95.00

Now using the U.S. average yield for the past 5 years of 997 pounds per acre and based on the announced price by Mr. Benson of $193.50 average per ton, this will mean a margin of only $3.50 per acre. The above figures you will notice do not consider repairs on machinery, cost of procuring the above items, and so forth.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this $193.50 is the average price for all types of peanuts, and several types will be supported at a much lower price. For example, I estimate the supports on runner peanuts will be $180 per ton, and after $9 is deducted a grower will receive a net of $171, which is $19 less than the actual cost of production.

Peanut farmers, like other farmers, in times of national emergency have been called upon to produce, and I believe everyone will agree that the farmers have responded to the needs. Now that an all-out emergency does not exist, the farmers are being told that you should do the best you can do.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the members of this committee realize that peanut farmers have not been receiving the announced support price dollarwise in the past. For example, if the support price is to be $193.50, the farmer will only receive $184.50, because of what we call a $9 deduct that is deducted for storage, insurance, etc., for 8 months, even though a warehouseman may move the peanuts in, say, 30 days.

Peanut producers have taken a drop in price for peanuts of some $50 or more per ton in the last 3 or 4 years, and during the last 5 years costs of production have increased approximately 20 percent. The Secretary's action clearly indicates that this is a further move to completely destroy our peanut program. Earlier the Secretary completely revised the parity index in order to lower the price. I am sure you are familiar with this action.

We further realize that such moves by the Secretary does not, as he so often indicates, give the consumer a cheaper product at the expense of the farmer.

Gentlemen, on behalf of the peanut farmers we would greatly appreciate any relief from this deplorable situation.

We appreciate the opportunity to appear before your committee and express our views.

EXHIBIT A

U.S. production of peanuts, 1952–58 [1]

Crop year	Acreage picked and threshed	Yield per acre	Total production
	Acres	*Pounds*	*Tons*
1952	1,443,000	940	677,900
1953	1,515,000	1,039	787,088
1954	1,387,000	727	504,248
1955	1,669,000	928	774,005
1956	1,385,000	1,160	803,905
1957	1,481,000	970	717,972
1958	1,537,000	1,213	932,362

[1] Above figures obtained from U.S. Department of Agriculture, Oils and Peanut Division.

EXHIBIT B

Shelled peanuts used in peanut products

[Pounds]

Year	Peanut candy	Salted peanuts	Peanut butter	Total
1948–49	104,015,000	120,557,000	250,279,000	481,663,000
1949–50	124,128,000	116,771,000	251,544,000	501,779,000
1950–51	119,927,000	132,653,000	276,009,000	534,957,000
1951–52	120,806,000	140,650,000	275,803,000	543,727,000
1952–53	119,197,000	147,450,000	286,821,000	560,147,000
1953–54	118,935,000	149,118,000	297,539,000	572,401,000
1954–55	110,843,000	143,254,000	299,929,000	563,302,000
1955–56	118,597,000	146,327,000	325,661,000	600,096,000
1956–57	136,061,000	163,382,000	317,424,000	646,251,000
1957–58	138,149,000	170,881,000	355,818,000	693,768,000
Estimated increase in consumption				40,000,000
Total				733,768,000

1. Peanut butter sandwiches and other minor products not itemized, but is included in the totals above.
2. Figures for 1958 will not be available until August or September, but the figures for Aug. 1 to Mar. 1 show a near record level of 426,403,000 pounds as compared with 415,857,000 pounds for the same 7 months during the 1957–58 season, or an increase of over 10,000,000 pounds.

American Parents Committee Calls for Adequate Federal Aid for Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the extremely able journalist, Mr. George W. Oakes, who has written and published numerous articles on education in the United States, recently testified before the Senate Subcommittee on Education on behalf of the outstanding National Council of the American Parents Committee, of which he is a member. Mr. Oakes delivered a brief but cogent statement pointing out the responsibility of the Federal Government for insuring that our future citizens are able to obtain the education which will fit them for the complexities of the missile age. He emphasized that provision for adequate academic training is not only a national duty to fulfill our obligations to individual citizens, but a necessity if we are to survive successfully the cold war with the Soviet Union. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Oakes' testimony be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TESTIMONY ON FEDERAL AID FOR SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION, BY GEORGE W. OAKES, OF THE AMERICAN PARENTS COMMITTEE, INC., BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Gentlemen, I am George W. Oakes, a free-lance journalist writing on education and a member of the national council of the American Parents Committee, Inc. I am here today to testify at the request of George J. Hecht, chairman, who regrets that he could not come in person.

The American Parents Committee is what its name implies, a national committee concerned with Federal legislation for the health, education, and welfare of the Nation's children. The position of our organization on legislative items is determined by majority vote of its board of directors. Last November the board decided that one of the committee's top priorities should be to work for legislation providing for Federal aid to relieve the shortage of classrooms throughout the Nation. Consequently, I am not here to oppose or support any one of the particular bills before your committee, but rather to urge that you report as soon as possible a bill which will provide adequate financial assistance for school construction.

The American Parents Committee has consistently advocated that the Federal Government assume its full share of the responsibility for educating its future citizens. It has maintained that since the Federal Government collects three-fourths of the tax revenues, education must not depend on insufficient local and State funds.

Last summer Mr. Hecht, the chairman of the American Parents Committee, took the leadership in forming an Emergency Committee for the National Defense Education Act. That committee composed of Eric Johnston, former Senator William Benton, Mrs. Albert Lasker, and Mr. Hecht, helped to coordinate the support behind that bill into the strenuous last ditch effort which finally put the bill through just before the session ended.

We think the National Defense Education Act can provide great assistance to education, providing Congress appropriates sufficient funds to carry out its provisions. But that act cannot provide the desperately needed classrooms.

Two years ago the Senate passed a substantial school construction bill which the American Parents Committee supported. Today the shortage of 140,000 classrooms is almost as great, but 2 crucial years have been lost. The United States has made no real headway in providing adequate school facilities for our children.

We all know the seriousness of the world situation. We all know what Soviet educational and, as a result, remarkable scientific achievements have accomplished during these same 2 years. We all know what the chances for this country to survive and meet the worldwide challenge in the future depends probably more on our ability to set and maintain the highest educational standards for as many children as possible than on any other single factor.

The American people realize that education is the key to our future. Billions for defense will prove meaningless without properly educated and trained manpower.

We cannot educate our children adequately when 4 million are studying in dangerous firetraps, in overcrowded classrooms, under conditions whereby the school day must be cut to permit half-day sessions. What

chance has a gifted pupil if he is buried in a crowded classroom of 50 or more students?

The need is urgent. The situation has hardly improved at all, while we have deferred action. You know that the school age population is rapidly increasing. The past 2 years have proved that this problem cannot be solved by the States and local communities. At the present rate of construction there will still be a major shortage in 5 years according to Secretary Flemming.

The School Construction bill which the Senate voted 2 years ago will undoubtedly require more funds today because of rising building costs. Every day we wait makes the task more expensive and means that it will take that much longer to put our educational system in shape.

Does anyone think that education of our children is less important than roads or housing or airports or urban renewal? Does anyone think that this country cannot afford today the school construction program that failed by only five votes in the House in 1957 when our future was less threatened than now?

The American Parents Committee calls for sizable and adequate school construction legislation now, this session. We urge a Federal grant program to the States at least as large as nearly passed 2 years ago.

We face a big educational job. We will not meet the issue by ducking facts which the administration presented and Congress almost accepted in 1957. Only through large scale Federal grants can this school construction program get under way quickly. And speed is made more imperative with every passing day. We cannot risk waiting another year until the next session. In February of last year Senator LYNDON JOHNSON said education should be the first order of business for Congress. This is even more true now. What are we waiting for?

We urge that Congress pass such legislation this session and place it before the President. We do not believe the President will veto what he supported less than 2 years ago.

Mr. Chairman, we are confident that your committee will do its part to prevent another precious year being lost in giving our children the school facilities they require and deserve.

In the Right Direction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, in the Birmingham Post-Herald of March 30, 1959, there appeared an editorial captioned "In the Right Direction." The editorial was most thoughtful and timely, and dealt with the matter of hazards to our people from radiation and radioactive materials.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE RIGHT DIRECTION

A proposal to give responsibility for radiation control-fallout, X-rays, industrial usages, disposal of radioactive wastes, etc.—to the Public Health Service seems to make sense.

This suggestion by a national advisory committee on radiation should receive careful consideration by Congress—not only because of the continuing controversy over fallout from nuclear weapons tests but also because of the lesser known hazards of radioactive materials in many fields.

So far the Atomic Energy Commission has been the principal evaluator of radiation hazards—from tests and other means. At the same time it has been the principal producer of radiation. Thus it has been its own policeman—deciding what information to release and how much emphasis to place upon it.

The advisory committee's suggestion is that the Public Health Service be given top responsibility for evaluating information which would continue to be collected by various organizations, including the AEC.

There seems to be only one certainty about the long-range effects of fallout—that the information available is too sparse to form a solid judgment.

Thus the committee urges that a major program of radiation control be started under PHS auspices. The objective would be to increase research on radiation hazards and formulate regulations for handling radioactive materials and machines.

The committee, for example, is concerned about the very sharp increase in X-ray usage and the lack of adequate rules for operating such machines.

By the time the Joint Congressional Atomic Energy Committee starts its new set of hearings on radiation this spring, we assume it will want to discuss this advisory committee's proposal in detail.

After years of confusion and controversy over radiation, it is encouraging to see movements in a constructive direction.

NATO's Future and Ours

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial entitled, "NATO's Future—and Ours." This excellent editorial, which appeared in the Chattanooga Times, summarizes in a most effective manner the accomplishments of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization during its first 10 years.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATO'S FUTURE—AND OURS

The greatest case that can be made for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, on the eve of its 10th anniversary, is its own success; the greatest argument that can be made for its continued maintenance and constant strengthening is the simple acknowledgment that the future remains of greater importance than the past.

When the treaty was signed April 4, 1949, British Foreign Minister Ernest Bevin commented on it as the result of a "great week's work in the history of the world."

And indeed it was. Twelve nations, whose shores are washed by the same tides and whose people are buoyed by the same great ideals of human worth and freedom, agreed to consider an attack on one as an attack on all. For the United States, especially, it was an historic departure from a long tradition of avoiding peacetime alliances.

Russia then said NATO was openly agressive. It has not changed its mind. President Truman called the alliance a shield against aggression. NATO has not altered its purpose.

Militarily, NATO was designed to become a deterrent to the massive Russian armored thrusts until the U.S. Strategic Air Force could strike at the Communist heartland with atomic bombs. That concept withered with the American monopoly on atomic weapons.

Now, NATO's proposed strength on paper is still far greater than its strength in being, which may be likened more to a spear than a shield. But its "essential purpose of halting the expansion of Soviet imperialism in Europe without the need to resort to force," as Secretary General Paul-Henri Spaak points out, has been attained.

"Soviet imperialism, which chalked up one conquest after another in the period from 1939 to 1948," he said "has made no further progress in Europe since the day the Atlantic alliance was born."

But if the field forces of the present cannot be considered perfect protection against an attack, they are an enduring pledge that the whole partnership remains ready to risk World War III rather than accept Communist domination of any NATO area. What other meaning could be read into President Eisenhower's March 11 statement that "we certainly are not going to fight a ground war in Europe"?

More hopefully, there has emerged from the continually closer collaboration within the alliance a common strategy with substantial agreement on the problems closest at hand and a willingness to work for the same degree of cooperation on those more distant. This is a result of meetings of NATO's permanent council, held without fanfare and at frequent intervals.

Here, then, is an example of collective diplomacy at work, matching the concept of collective security with which this Nation entered into the alliance. It is, perhaps, the most hopeful aspect of the whole picture, for out of such consultation and agreement can come the resolute firmness the Atlantic community needs to match the single-mindedness of Red Russia.

Prize-Winning Script of Mr. Sanford Orkin in the 1958–59 Voice of Democracy Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH S. CLARK
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the National Association of Broadcasters recently named the winners in the 1958–59 Voice of Democracy scriptwriting contest. I am happy to note that a young man from my own State, Mr. Sanford Orkin, was one of the four finalists. I was especially impressed by his achievement when I read his prize-winning entry.

To renew our perspective as to the wonderful heritage we enjoy as Americans I can suggest no better way than to read the script written by this young

Pennsylvanian. I ask unanimous consent, therefore, Mr. President, that the text be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the script was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY SCRIPT

(By Sanford Orkin)

I am a Hungarian immigrant.

My mother and father died fighting in the streets of Hungary. Freedom fighters they were called.

This, you see, is one of the greatest mysteries of all. My mother and father found it necessary to give their lives in the great fight for freedom, a freedom which they were never to witness.

I now live in America, the land of freedom. I have lived in this great democracy for almost 3 years and yet I don't quite understand it, for such words as liberty and freedom are very bewildering to me.

Listen to my words, America, and perhaps you'll understand. Among the many books in this country, it would not be unusual to find two of entirely different character. Books with different political and social attitudes toward America and its people. Yet, the men who read these different books and who are in accord with them, live together in peace and happiness.

In America, there are two major political parties. During the campaigns before the elections, one party may speak out against the other. Now one might think these men are bitter enemies; but after the election, they shake hands and live together in peace and happiness. For, these men realize that their political parties are not an end in themselves, but merely a means of choosing the best qualified individuals to perform the tasks required in a Government which benefits all Americans, regardless of political affiliation. These men also know that America's Government will remain constant and fluid at the same time, constant toward basic law and order, and fluid toward improvement of human life.

In one part of the city in which I live, there stands a Catholic church, while in other parts of the city there is a Jewish synagogue, and a Protestant church. Many religions with many ways of worshipping one God. Yet, as Americans, these men live together in their community in peace and happiness.

In this country, there is no distinction made between a man's physical power, financial ability, or social standing; and although these differences in fact do exist, these men live together day by day in peace and happiness because they are reasonable men who possess a great deal of understanding of their fellow man.

Now, at first glance a stranger might think this democracy inconsistent and illogical in some ways. But, perhaps this lack of logic is America's very greatness, and perhaps one word might characterize this greatness, "energy," a spontaneous energy, as individuals seek individual pursuits. Men unrestrained by one way of doing things, realizing that by experiment, trial, and error come the very things that make their great freedom possible.

This energy then results in movement, tiny sparks becoming big fires dotting the land all over.

A very bewildering sight, this bright bursting activity; but then this is democracy and the greatest words of praise might be: "This is the land of happy surprises; of bewildering differences."

So, my happy, my peaceful, my freedom-loving Americans, this is my conclusion: my bewilderment and yours, my happiness and yours, is the voice of democracy.

Legislation for Relief of Economic Conditions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two editorials from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch relating to proposed legislation passed by the Senate before the Easter recess be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Mar. 25, 1959]

TOO CLOSE A CALL

The most remarkable thing about the vote in the Senate in favor of the bill to provide Federal assistance for economically depressed areas with chronic unemployment was its closeness—49 yeas to 46 nays. This of course is far short of the two-thirds majority which would be required to pass the bill over a veto by President Eisenhower. Since the Senate bill provides some seven times the funds recommended by the White House, a veto is a probability if the lower chamber does not reduce the extent of the assistance.

Substantially the same bill passed Congress last year by the much wider margin of 46 to 36. How then was it that the 1959 bill had the 49–46 close call in a Senate reflecting the Democratic landslide for Congress last fall? The answer is in the voting on the Republican side. This time the only Republican Senators to vote for the bill were BEALL of Maryland, COOPER of Kentucky, LANGER of North Dakota and Smith of Maine. Seven Republicans who voted for the counterpart bill last year voted against the 1959 version. They were DIRKSEN of Illinois, ALLOTT of Colorado, MORTON of Kentucky, YOUNG of North Dakota, JAVITS of New York, CASE of New Jersey, and AIKEN of Vermont. Excepting only DIRKSEN, these Republicans all are in the progressive wing of their party.

The explanation for this reversal by these seven Republican Senators must be pressure from the White House in some form or other. Apparently the administration hoped to defeat the bill in Congress and therefore spare the President a second veto. The tactic almost worked but not quite. We hope the House of Representatives will recall the margin by which it passed the bill last year. The relief of those who live in the depressed areas deserves more than narrow, grudging support.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Apr. 1, 1959]

WITH POLITICS ON THE SHELF

President Eisenhower's signature on the bill to extend for three months the payment of Federal emergency unemployment compensation benefits comes in the nick of time. Had the bill not been passed by Congress and approved at the White House, more than 400,000 jobless workers would have been cut off at midnight, March 31, the period of their benefits having been exhausted. The legislation is no more than simple justice and it is inconceivable that it would not have been enacted. Even so it shows how easy it is for a Congress of one party and a President of the other to work together when the cause is right and partisan politics is relegated to the shelf.

Milk Resolutions by Delegate Body of Land O' Lakes Creameries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD certain resolutions with reference to milk passed by the delegate body of Land O' Lakes Creameries at their annual meeting on March 13, 1959.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAXES ON PATRONAGE SAVINGS

Whereas the net proceeds from returns after deducting expenses of a cooperative belong to the patrons on a patronage basis; and

Whereas any amounts retained by the coerative are for operating and fixed-capital purposes only, and are not in any sense income to the cooperative; and

Whereas in the form of patrons' refunds such amounts are taxable to the recipient patron: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Congress be urged to continue and, if necessary, clarify the purpose and intent that earnings or savings through the cooperative are income to its patrons only, and are not income to the cooperative; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress be urged to recognize the fact that capital requirements for cooperatives vary widely depending on the nature of the business in which the cooperative is engaged, value of products handled, and the type of plant and equipment which are necessary to conduct this business. Because of the wide variation in capital requirements, there can be no fixed period for the return of retained capital to patrons; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Secretary of the Treasury and other interested Government officials.

PRICE RELATIONSHIPS FOR MILK

Whereas the spread between prices for milk for fluid consumption and prices paid for milk used in manufactured dairy products has generally increased from year to year for several years: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of Agriculture be requested in the administration of programs for milk, under the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, and programs for milk under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1937 as amended, to give consideration in pricing to the use of criteria which will:

1. Improve the price of manufactured dairy products in the interests of farmers; and

2. Stabilize the price of milk for use for fluid consumption and products in fluid markets in the interest of consumers; but

3. Maintaining in the combination of these prices a narrower margin between the prices for milk for manufacturing and the price for milk used for fluid consumption in those markets where the spread has been increas-

ing and maintain a blend price which will provide an adequate supply of pure and wholesome milk for all uses.

MANUFACTURED DAIRY PRODUCTS

Whereas the use of manufactured dairy products for reconstitution for the production of low-fat milk, and the manufacture of cottage cheese, ice cream, and other products in the various markets has increased; and

Whereas it is in the public interest of consumers and producers that the use of such manufactured products for these purposes should be increased both from the point of view of reducing the cost of food to consumers, and from the point of view of increasing the size of the domestic market for producers of milk: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we request the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture, in the administration of Federal Market Orders and Agreements, to review his program and adjust it to the end that both whole milk and skim milk products manufactured from grade A milk, and acceptable for human food under suitable quality standards administered by the United States Department of Agriculture, shall be acceptable for such reconstitution and for manufacture into dairy products in all markets without economic, geographic, or health limitation either by the imposition of quotas or by the imposition of any other regulation including compensatory payments of any kind.

SANITARY MILK STANDARDS LAW

Whereas milk of superior quality is produced in many areas; and

Whereas the use of this milk for fluid consumption is sometimes limited either to regulated or unregulated markets, by the rulings of the local public health officer; and

Whereas the bases for such rulings are sometimes arbitrary and open to dispute; but

Whereas, in the marketing of milk, there is no procedure for the arbitration of disputes or the redress of unrealistic and arbitrary decisions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we are in favor of the passage of national milk sanitation legislation which will set up a public health standard for milk in interstate commerce applicable to all markets, and place the supervision and administration of this law in the hands of a qualified authority of the U.S. Public Health Service to be administered by existing qualified public health authorities.

PUBLIC LAW 480 AND THE MUTUAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Whereas Public Law 480, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, and section 402 of the Mutual Security Act have been useful in moving substantial quantities fo dairy products into foreign markets; and

Whereas during the foreseeable future, there will be need for markets abroad for the disposal of surpluses, because it is in the interests of the American consumers that surpluses should be produced in order that supplies for domestic consumers will at all times be ample; and

Whereas the present instability of value of foreign currencies and inflation of prices within the United States retard development of such foreign markets; and

Whereas citizens of the many new nations which have come into being since World War II will need assistance in the development of their food supplies and living standards; and

Whereas the long-time interest of American dairymen as well as American consumers lies in the production of products for the development of these markets which can best be accomplished under Public Law 480 and the mutual assistance program: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we recommend that Public Law 480 and the mutual assistance program be continued with adequate funds both for the disposal of existing surpluses, and for the development of new markets in those areas where public sentiment and rising standards of living over the years will make such markets useful.

PROTECTION FROM IMPORTS OF FARM PRODUCTS

In a nation such as the United States, where farm products are produced in surplus, it is inconsistent that imports should be allowed to damage or obstruct the proper working of programs designed to further prosperity for both farmers and the national economy.

We recommend the revision of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, to provide positive and mandatory protection from imports whenever such imports endanger, penalize, or retard the accomplishment of the objectives of farm price support under any of the operating programs.

AGRICULTURAL PRICE SUPPORTS

The need for price supports for farm products has been continuous for many years including all of the period between World War I and World War II. During this period, a very severe and prolonged national depression showed the need for support for the entire national economy in several sectors to prevent widespread lapse of personal income with attendant hunger and sickness.

The Congress, in its wisdom, created economic supports for the national welfare including old age and survivors pensions, minimum wage rate increases, bank deposit insurance, and farm price supports. These and other programs were considered good and proper for the long-time benefit of the economy and the citizens of the United States. In this field, these supports have been successful to the end that no comparably long and disastrously severe depressions have occurred.

The present price support programs on a few commodities have been instrumental in preventing much greater price declines on all agricultural products. Farmers' purchasing power and nonfarm purchasing power in many instances have been maintained at a higher level for the benefit of everyone than would have been the case without such price supports. It is therefore considered desirable that the price support programs be continued at a level which will:

1. Provide an adequate standard of living for farm families.

2. Promote and provide incentive for technical progress and efficiency within agriculture.

3. Conserve our national agricultural resources, and

4. Provide a reserve supply of food for all the citizens of the United States in order that an adequate supply will be available to everyone at all times and at a reasonable cost in the best interest of the entire national economy.

FARM PRICES AND INFLATION

Whereas inflation is a national problem which requires solution. Food costs to consumers since 1951 have increased, but payments to farmers for this food have remained relatively unchanged; and

Whereas the number of persons to be fed increased by 17 million since 1950, but a declining number of farmers provided food for 11 percent more persons in 1957 for approximately the same number of dollars as in 1951; and

Whereas farm prices for milk used in the production of butter and cheese have not contributed to the rising cost of food or of inflation in any way, but have in fact contributed to stability in domestic food prices; and

Whereas it is in the best interests of consumers that price supports be continued since a surplus of production assures an ample supply of milk and dairy products; and

Whereas in the management of surpluses by CCC the costs would be reduced if more surplus were in dairy products and less in feed grain: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That price supports for milk have not contributed to inflation or been a burden to consumers, but in fact are a proper form of compensation to farmers for their stabilizing contribution to food costs during the inflationary years; and be it further

Resolved, That an increase in the price for milk used in manufactured dairy products is in the best interests of both producers and consumers. Such price should be at least the price support level in effect during the marketing year 1957, or higher.

MARKET ORDERS AND AGREEMENTS

Whereas an adequate supply of pure and wholesome milk is in the public interest; and

Whereas the provision of this supply of milk in the national interest should be by those dairy farmers most efficient in milk production and distribution; and

Whereas in the administration of market orders under the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, limitations on supply areas are sometimes unnecessarily restrictive, to the detriment of other dairy farmers and local consumers; but

Whereas marketing orders and agreements under the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 have, in the long run, been conducive to stability and orderliness in marketing: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we favor the use of marketing orders and agreements in the marketing of milk; be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of Agriculture be asked to review his program of market orders and agreements to consolidate wherever feasible, and thereby increase the supply areas under each Federal order to recognize the existence of improved transportation knowledge and equipment in hauling of both raw and processed milk and make the administration of Federal orders more consistent with the advance in research and development which has become operative since World War II.

THE FARMER COOPERATIVE SERVICE

Whereas cooperative marketing associations have contributed extensively to farmers' prosperity as well as to the appreciation of consumers' needs in buying and using the products of the farms, and

Whereas the development of good principles and practices in cooperative marketing and management are essential to effective cooperative growth and efficiency as well as to the extension of this highly desirable business relationship between farm producers of food and their nonfarm customers; and

Whereas the principles of cooperation in the conduct of business are in accord with the high national objectives of our constitution with reference to the pursuit of life, liberty and happiness; and

Whereas the Farmer Cooperative Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture has contributed broadly and effectively to the provision of information useful to farmers in developing and managing their cooperative marketing associations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we commend the Farmer Cooperative Service for valuable work and assistance and recommend to the Congress and to the Secretary of Agriculture the support and strengthening of this cooperative marketing activity.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Whereas there are bills before the Congress to raise interest rates on loans to rural electrification cooperatives; and

Whereas the authority of the REA Administrator has been limited in approving loans within the Department of Agriculture; and

Whereas many dairymen, members of Land O'Lakes, are served by REA-financed cooperatives: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Land O'Lakes Creameries, Inc., is opposed to restriction of the field of operation of the REA, and therefore request that the interest rates not be raised; and that the REA Administrator regain the full authority to approve loans, which authority was granted to him in the original REA Act of 1936; and it is therefore

Resolved, That a city of this resolution be sent to Senators and Representatives of the States in which Land O'Lakes has members, and that a copy be sent to the REA Administrator.

Compensation of Retired Service Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the members of the Armed Forces of the United States have always answered this country's call in time of need and have done justice to their undertaking.

However, America is not doing justice to her retired service personnel. The current payment plan for military retirement allows some personnel to receive more money than others who served the same length of time.

I believe all will agree this is unfair. So I am cosponsoring S. 541, a bill which would equalize the pay of these retired service personnel and correct the injustice done by the Career Compensation Act of 1958.

To illustrate the current inconsistency in payments to retired personnel, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which was printed in the San Antonio (Tex.) Light for February 3, 1959, under the heading "Shortchanged," and an article by Col. E. Ernest Dupuy which appeared in the Army-Navy-Air Force Register for February 21, 1959, under the heading "We've Two Classes of Retirees Now."

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

[From the San Antonio (Tex.) Light, Feb. 3, 1959]

SHORTCHANGED

Retired officers and other ranks from all branches of the U.S. Military Establishment are understandably concerned over a provision of the armed services pay act which, in effect divides retired personnel into two economic classes.

Those who retire after June 1, 1958, benefit from the customary method of computing retirement benefits as a percentage of active service pay.

But those who retired before that date were given only a token 6 percent increase of their previous rate of pay.

How this works out in practice is cited in the cases of Colonel A and Colonel B, both with identical service of more than 30 years.

Colonel A retired on May 28 and Colonel B on June 3. But because of the arbitrary June 1 date, and in spite of their equality in rank and service, Colonel B automatically gets $1,560 more a year than Colonel A.

This cannot be dismissed as merely an instance of the way the calendar flips. It has connotations far more important than the personal feelings or fortunes of the two officers.

The Armed Service Pay Act was designed to make military careers more attractive to able and highly trained men who, because of low pay, were being attracted in large numbers to private industry.

Now this development is bound to make them feel that they may be subjected to similar treatment in the future.

If this double standard in retired pay were to save the country a vast amount of money, it would at least have financial justification.

But actually it saves only .03 percent of the Department of Defense budget, and there is no assurance whatever that the saving might not be offset by increased costs of replacements.

For the first time since 1861, retired armed services personnel has not been included in pay increases equivalent to those still in service. Confidence in the security of retirement benefits, until now considered explicit, has now been cast in doubt.

The best way to correct this unfortunate situation, and the consequences it threatens, is to restore the just and proper rate of retired pay to length and service and to all members of the Armed Forces—without regard to arbitrary dates and the discrimination they inevitably impose.

[From the Army-Navy-Air Force Register Feb. 21, 1959]

WE'VE TWO CLASSES OF RETIREES NOW

(By Col. R. Ernest Dupuy)

Isn't it about time we come right down to cases on the subject of retired pay?

The Military Pay Act has arbitrarily divided retired personnel of the Armed Forces into two classes—the haves and the have-nots. Let's go military and dub them "Retired 1st class" and "Retired 2d class," depending upon the date of retirement.

All individuals already on the retired list prior to June 1, 1958, have automatically become "Retired 2d class," True, beginning June 1 their pay—calculated on 75 percent of past pay schedules, was upped 6 percent.

But all those retiring as of June 1 or later receive 75 percent of the new and—justly—increased active duty pay. They become "Retired 1st class."

Its as simple as all that. So what's the fuss?

Well, this reporter, for one, having become a "Retired 2d class," doesn't like it. From the military ghetto he sounds off upon the peculiar circumstances surrounding the drafting of this bill.

The present pay act was charted by Pentagon planners. In its original form it contained no provision whatsoever for people already retired. They, it seemed, were to stew in their own juice, regardless of living costs. Had it not been for remedial congressional action there would not even have been that 6 percent sop.

So let's look at the Pentagon. Obviously, those uniformed inmates concerned were not retired. The way they drafted the bill their own futures would not be affected. The civilian Pentagon inmates were, of course, creatures of the administration. The administration was resolved upon economy, particularly such economy as would not result in awkward repercussions.

There were, in effect, no repercussions. Those individuals slated to become "Retired, second class" saw the dark cloud rising, but most of them laughed it off. "They can't do this to us," was their slogan.

Their ranks included officers and men who had fought in two world wars; many of them had helped win World War II for the very people now running the administration. They felt (how stupid can one become?) that loyalty would run down as well as up.

So Humpty Dumpty came tumbling down.

Our "Retired, second class," include many of the people of whom Winston Churchill, in generous recognition, said:

"I saw the creation of this mighty force * * * victorious in every theater against the enemy in so short a time and from such a small parent stock * * * [with] leaders and vast staffs capable of handling enormous masses and of moving them faster and further than masses have ever been moved in war before * * *."

Our "Retired, second class," also include individuals who, following the great depression of 1929, for several years suffered payless furloughs with loss of 8⅓ percent of pay and an additional 15 percent pay cut together with a freeze of all longevity pay increases.

Unjust as that might have seemed, it was taken without a whimper. The Nation was in trouble; everyone was feeling the pinch. So the Armed Forces made do, as they always have, and they continued to build for the future protection of the United States. There was no mention then of under-the-salt status for retired folk.

The present situation is something else again. It has shaken the entire structure of our regular services. It constitutes a flouting of both custom and of contract.

That statement requires some explanation.

The question of retirement and retirement privileges goes back more than a century, when Lt. Gen. Winfield Scott, in the 1840's, started working on the problem.

Scott, who during his long service, did more for the betterment of the regulars, commissioned and enlisted, than any other officer before or since, lived in a period when no thought was given to retirement.

Superannuated fuddy-duddies remained in harness until they died; embodyment of Kipling's much later excoriation of "heavy-sterned amateur old men, who 'amper and 'inder and scold men." Yet these were men who had devoted their entire lives to their country's service.

Not until August 3, 1861, did Scott's long-continued efforts to stimulate promotions and at the same time to recognize and reward long and faithful service bear fruit. The Congress, faced by Civil War emergency, established Army retirement, with pay proportioned upon active duty pay. In 1862, an omnibus bill similarly established Navy retirement.

From that time until 1958, this proportional relationship between active duty and retired pay has persisted. Never has Congress tampered with it, as pay bills of various sorts came through the hopper. [The disproportionment between pay and allowances is something else again.]

And one of the most efficient sales talks for military careers has been the certainty that the retired man would, for the remainder of his life, receive three-fourths of the current active duty pay of his grade and length of service.

There is not the slightest reason to believe that Congress would have deviated from this principle had the Pentagon included it in the present bill. But the administration pulled the chain. There is no reason to believe that administration approval will be granted the present efforts of a number of Members of Congress—well-wishers of the Armed Forces—to remedy this injustice.

Let both Pentagon and administration take heed to the words of an English writer of 500 years ago, John Skelton:

"That byrd ys not honest/That fouleth hys owne nest."

Address by Hon. Barry Goldwater, of Arizona, Before Edison Electric Institute, at New Orleans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me before the Edison Electric Institute, in New Orleans, on April 6.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, members and guests of the Edison Electric Institute, I am happy and privileged to be with you today.

This morning I want to discuss what I consider to be this Nation's most fundamental problem and to relate that to the difficulties facing your industry.

History—the experience and lessons of the past—should help us as we analyze and search for the right answer to current political problems.

Just a couple of weeks ago there was an interview in the Washington Post quoting that wonderful classical scholar of ancient Greece, Edith Hamilton. Here is what she said about the reasons for the collapse of that once great democracy:

"I think it was mostly because Greece no longer cared to fight for anything. In the end the Greeks wanted security more than they wanted freedom. They wanted not to give to the state but to receive from the state. They just wanted to be comfortable."

Today we may feel a comfortable sense of security under the protective cloak of our Constitution and Bill of Rights. History, however, should dispel any feeling of complacency we might have. We are not the first people to have written sacred contracts to protect the rights of the individual. Governments in times gone by have thrown up even stronger safeguards than ours against dictatorship, only to see the barriers first lowered, then destroyed, as the people permitted more and more power to be concentrated in a tyrant or in an all-embracing central government. And even we, I fear, have forgotten the centuries of fighting and conflict that led to the freedom we enjoy today. The one clear lesson to be learned from the total experience of mankind is the folly of believing that any government, given excessive power, will for long remain benevolent. Government has nothing to give except that which it has first taken away.

America's way in tomorrow's world will depend greatly on the outcome of the contest currently waging between those who believe in "belly politics"—the materialists—and those who believe that man's needs go deeper than material things alone. So much depends on the strength of our belief in principle and our willingness to fight for the things we believe in. I personally have great faith that the dignity and rights of each human being will be preserved even as government itself grows and expands to cope with problems properly in its domain.

Your industry and what happens to it at the hand of government will provide an important clue to our future course. In covering this subject, there is no need for me to take you back over the history of Federal encroachment in your field. One single fact tells the whole story. A short generation ago the Federal Government produced less than 1 percent of the power consumed in the United States. Now it produces almost 15 percent, and the ratio mounts steadily.

This trend continues even though the electric companies have made a tremendous contribution to progress in the past and are destined to do even greater things in the future as we move into a new era of electronics and electrical living. You are doing and are capable of doing a good job for the people of this country, yet government is constantly moving in on you.

Why?

Electricity is a complex subject—something very difficult for the people generally to understand. Few recognize or regard it as a manufactured commodity. It does not package and sell like soap or carry a brand name. It has its own particular method of delivery which is unlike other commodities.

Its technology and economics are highly complex and, therefore, difficult to explain. Even the framework of regulation—State and Federal—within which you operate is not clearly understood.

Moreover, when a man buys or rents a dwelling, electricity is a necessity and taken for granted. Therefore, people seem to have a different economic attitude in buying electricity than they do in buying, say, a pair of shoes, or an automobile.

These characteristics, unfortunately, make the function of supplying electricity easy prey for those who believe government should do more things for people. They argue that electric service can be provided cheaply only by government. This is pure propaganda, of course, for you are providing the American consumer with excellent low-cost service.

Yours is one of America's truly great industries. I have had the pleasure of knowing some of your leaders and I have found them to be outstanding examples of what businessmen should be. I have found your industry to have a standard of ethics unexcelled by any other and equaled by few. Maybe you have been forced into that, I do not know, but the fact remains you have it.

From my observations, your companies usually take the lead in community development. Your officials are either heading up or assisting in drives for local charities and community betterment. I know of your efforts to create new industry. You have anticipated our future electric requirements for years ahead and are ready to provide it. You have provided us with adequate capacity during every national emergency. You have helped the local and national economy by courageously investing and building for the future at times when more timid souls would have pulled back.

But how much credit does the American public give you as an industry for those splendid accomplishments?

When your company is largely responsible for bringing a new industry into your service area, does it get the credit or does that go to some other group of citizens?

Does the public know that it has been industry and not Government that has made the technological advances which have kept the price of electricity at 1939 levels?

Does the public know that electric companies serve over 40 percent of our farms directly and furnish power for more than 50 percent of the remaining ones?

Do your customers understand that they pay heavy Federal taxes when they buy electricity from you, taxes that are avoided by those who get their power from Federal or public power bodies?

My point is this: If you received the credit you justly deserve, your troubles would diminish. The public is not going to permit an industry which is a valuable citizen to be kicked around. But it does not realize your value. It appears you have a job to do here.

Another obstacle you face is that your opponents speak with one voice on all issues, whereas you do not. Maybe it is impossible for you to achieve the same unity of action and thought. Perhaps this is as it should be, for the nature of private enterprise is such that it does not lend itself to regimentation and, certainly it proves there is no power trust.

But in facing up to what unquestionably is a public power trust, you must strive for singlemindedness of purpose.

Your opponents are one for all and all for one. They are for Government power in any section of the United States and help each other whether their area is affected or not.

I am sure that some electric companies have taken no interest in national affairs that affect the industry as a whole. Others have become active only when some Government operation starts breathing down their necks.

If you do not make an all-out effort every time a company is faced with Government competition or encroachment, even if it is 3,000 miles away, you are going to be picked off piece by piece, company by company. Although a company may not seem in danger now, there is no telling when it might be.

There was a time when the vehicle used for Government competition and expansion was hydroelectric development; but that time has passed. You now have the atom. That puts the threat of a Government powerplant in any area, be it Maine or Chicago.

Why are Government power advocates so active in supporting Federal development of power from the atom? It is not because of a present or foreseeable shortage of power from conventional fuels. It is not because it means cheaper power.

Look at it this way—the Federal Government has constructed steam electric plants in only one area—the TVA. Today it would be very difficult to pass legislation authorizing Federal construction of conventional steamplants in any other area; but the atom is something else.

It is argued, and many people think it is logical, that the Federal Government should take the lead in constructing atomic powerplants. So the atom may replace hydro as the vehicle to get the Government into the steampower business. Your opponents know this; that is why they are working so hard toward that end. Therefore, no single company enjoys the security it once thought it had from the threat of Government encroachment. For that reason, it is even more important today that you present a united front in opposing Government power developments.

As a businessman who has spent the last 6 years as a U.S. Senator with more than a passing interest in your affairs, I have sometimes felt there is a timidity on the part of some utility executives in making contacts in Congress and in participating in utility legislative efforts.

You cannot expect the employees you send to Washington, or those you have permanently stationed there, to work without benefit of your help. This is your job—your responsibility—and you need never hold back or apologize in defending the position of your company and your industry in Washington. In this respect public power is not the least bit modest.

Without question, you are concerned about the efforts being made in Washington to silence you. I would only say this: If Congress doesn't grant some tax relief for your advertising and legislative effort, I hope this won't deter you from participating up to the hilt in such programs. There is no place in this fight for timidity. Those who are timid will lose their shirts.

We are talking here of matters you can do something about. You have top-flight executives to head up your operating, engineering, financing, and other divisions. Since politics now is one of the most important, if not the most important activity that confronts you, is there any reason why you should not select a top official to handle this field as his primary responsibility? I do not believe you can leave this to an already overworked executive or to your lawyer. It requires full-time attention.

An advantage you have is your coverage. You operate in every State in the Union except Tennessee and Nebraska. I know of no other industry with this same advantage. You have responsible representatives in almost every congressional district who are, or should be, well acquained with local officials and opinion leaders.

One of your opposition groups has organized what it calls minutemen to work for its legislative objectives, many of which are designed to put you out of business. It would appear to me that you already have your minutemen. The question is, are you using them?

Talking with your Congressmen and Senators is a very important function. We are busy people, so never assume that we are fully informed on the subjects in which you are interested. If we are busy and tied up, talk to our administrative assistants. They will get the word to us. But do not be hesitant about coming to see us. Most of you do not come around often enough. Some come only when they want something. So long as your visits are informative and helpful, you cannot visit our offices in Washington too often.

To continue in this practical vein, you are not going to win issues or stave off disaster without votes, and you do not have them now. Although the climate of opinion with regard to your industry in Washington has improved compared to earlier years, it has not improved enough to prevent your industry from losing ground. I must say you have been remarkably successful on the whole in Washington. And this, in spite of the fact that your industry has only a minority of stanch supporters in the Congress.

It will take votes to stop the trend. I am not suggesting that you run for political office or support candidates of one particular political party. But I do suggest you maintain a continuing interest in the philosophy of those who seek office.

Most legislators who continually support ideas and legislation that lead us nearer the welfare state would be highly indignant if accused of undermining our free-enterprise system. But their votes are the more detrimental because the result chisels away at our system of government a little at a time while pretending to support it.

So far we have not even touched on labor and I am sure you would not expect me to speak to you without mentioning the subject. Certainly it ties in with some of your problems that we have been discussing.

Some labor leaders and some of my colleagues consider me a labor-baiter. I am not. I defy the contention that any man in the labor movement or in Congress has any more concern for America's working men and women, both union and nonunion than I have. My concern is for the worker. I fear some of my critics—those who parade as the champions of labor—are more concerned with the personal power of the labor boss and the influence he may have on their political fortunes than they are in the welfare of the worker.

I am not against the labor leader so long as he is the duly elected representative of labor and confines his activities to those things that concern the ones he represents. Where we part company is when the labor boss uses his position to defraud those he represents and to promote his own political ambitions.

As you know, I am a member of a select committee of the Senate—the McClellan committee—investigating labor-management affairs. Some of the things we have turned up are scandalous. Laboring people—members and nonmembers of organized labor—have been intimidated, beaten, and murdered. Money extracted from union members has been borrowed, never to be returned, or stolen outright. Union money has been used to elect or defeat candidates for public office. Criminals have held high office in labor organizations. Criminals, thugs, and other racketeers have used organized labor to force their will on employers and employees who wanted no part of them. Unfortunately, some employers have connived with unscrupulous labor leaders to sacrifice the welfare of the working people.

These things should be corrected by Federal law and yet as widely as these sickening atrocities have been publicized over the past 3 years, remedial legislation has yet to be enacted. You wonder why? The answer is very simple. The leaders of organized labor have become so politically powerful they are able to stop or to tone down proposed legislation to where it will not do the job.

Do not infer from what I have said that I think all leaders of organized labor are bad. Quite the contrary. The rotten apples we have dug out of the barrel comprise a very small percentage of those connected with labor. But the disturbing thing to me is that even upright leaders oppose corrective legislation because they are afraid it might infringe on their power.

Let any organization once acquire power, it will fight to keep it—that goes for either business or labor. There was a time in this country when business became too powerful politically. It abused that power to the extent that the people in righteous wrath clipped its wings. Now labor has reached the point where its powers must be controlled, otherwise we will soon be under a labor government, irrespective of what political party brand it may use for the purpose.

The State of Michigan has been taken over by labor through its control over the Democratic Party in that State. But labor is not satisfied with Michigan. It spent millions of dollars last year to influence elections in other States, including my State of Arizona, and overall it enjoyed an alarming degree of success.

Now where does all of this fit in with electric company problems? Organized labor should have no specific interest in promoting government power. Its interest really should be with the electric companies. You furnish 85 or 90 percent of union members with their personal power requirements, to say nothing of the power they use on their jobs to increase their productivity. I understand the unions representing your employees have publicly opposed any expansion of government power—Federal, State, or local. They have found their members fare much better under company ownership and operation than they do under government.

One would think with this being the case, other unions not directly connected with the electric power industry would take the same position. But they have not. They oppose the things that might benefit workers in your industry and support all types of government power. They do this in their publications and before committees of Congress.

Why do they? Obviously this stand fits into the general pattern of seeking political favor by seeming to give people something for nothing. Too often people seeking power are willing to cast principle aside in the interest of political expediency.

Government power is paraded as giving something to the people as their due. It matters not that the majority have to pay for it through taxation to give to a minority.

This giveaway theory is bait for votes. There is nothing new in it. It was used in ancient times and it is being used today. Votes win elections. If union leaders can influence election of public officals, they build up their own political power and that is their objective. If you have to be sacrificed in the scramble, that's it.

These are among the reasons why it is so important for us to redefine and restate our values. We can do this and we must if we are to survive.

Where have we fallen down? Why is it that conservatism—belief in the ultimate importance of the individual human being—or free enterprise—call it what you will—finds itself on thin ice today? It is not that our principles have failed, but rather that we have failed to translate them and make them meaningful in terms of today's problems. As certainly as we sit here today, if we don't find the answer to this, we won't be here tomorrow and there won't be any private electric companies.

The core of this problem, it seems to me, is to decide, and to help people decide, where to draw the line on what the Government should do and should not do. The answer is not to have the Government do nothing, but to have the Government do the right thing.

One thing we have failed to point out convincingly is that Government programs are always directed at the group and tend to submerge the individual. Yet when we lose sight of the individual we destroy all the important values we cherish.

We only have to look around us to see how far we have gone in this respect—growth of conformity, the decline of individual incentive, the search for security at all costs—these things are everywhere.

The philosophy of some leading labor officials is the perfect example of what happens when the individual is lost sight of in the search for security for the group. Labor has directed its attention at getting the most benefits, the most security for its group, and within its own framework has deprived the individual of liberty, freedom, and individuality. Where laws permit, the laboring man is deprived of his right to work unless he joins a union In many unions he has no control over his union dues and is often deprived of the right to elect his own officers. He is deprived of recourse to law and justice through fear of brutality from union leaders. Often he is deprived of his right to feed his family when ordered out on strike, no matter how hard pressed he might be financially and irrespective of his individual desires.

It becomes urgent for us, therefore, to swing the focus of attention back to the individual as an individual.

Obviously we cannot lose sight of the material needs of people, but until we rediscover the individual, we will not make progress. Government cannot be a friend of the people if it ignores the individual.

Where, then, do we draw the line between Government doing things for all the people and the individual doing things for himself? It seems to me this administration has developed at least one standard to guide us: namely, if people can do something for

themselves, then there is no need for Government to do it.

Now the electric power field is one clear-cut area in which this line can be drawn. You know as well as I do that there is no need for the Government to assume a full and complete utility responsibility. Here, without question, people themselves are able to supply the Nation's electric power needs.

This is where your interests merge with national policy and this is where your most vital problem of communication lies. And this is why it is important that you continue to exist within the framework of free enterprise, not because you are free enterprise, but because you are not government.

As long as you are not government you still stand for those values which place the individual first, which offer him the greatest opportunity for material and intellectual growth and, consequently, the most freedom and progress. Government cannot do this.

If at times I have given you cause for pessimism, don't think for 1 minute that I am pessimistic. In what I have been outlining I see hope for the conservative cause. We know with unshakable certainty that what we believe in is good. The pseudoliberals, who argue continually for greater government responsibility, have nothing to offer except more and more government. This is the only road they can take if they remain true to their philosophy. The ultimate result of this course is so obvious it needs no elaboration.

We conservatives, on the other hand, offer the only opportunity to go forward. Our beliefs are founded on proven values—values which have never failed in the past. Conservatism is based on the belief that only to the extent the individual's whole personality is developed to its ultimate potential can society advance in the best interests of all the people. The reason I am optimistic is because I know that what we stand for is sound. Let us never weaken in this belief.

Capt. Donald K. Slayton, U.S. Air Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, America stands on the threshold of the awesome age when man will travel through outer space. In the vanguard of this new development in our civilization are seven men from our Armed Forces, handpicked for the special training that will make one of them the first American, and, we dare hope, the first of all mankind to orbit the earth.

I am proud that one of these seven brave men of destiny comes from Sparta, Wis. He is Capt. Donald Kent Slayton, of the U.S. Air Force. I ask unanimous consent to have his biography, which appeared in today's issue of the New York Times, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the biography was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAPT. DONALD KENT SLAYTON OF THE AIR FORCE

His home town is Sparta, Wis., where he was born March 1, 1924. His wife is the former Marjorie Lunney of Los Angeles, Calif. They have one son, Kent, 2.

He attended primary and high schools in Sparta, graduating from Sparta High School in 1942. He entered the University of Minnesota in January 1947, and was graduated with a degree in aeronautical engineering in August 1949.

He entered the Air Force as an aviation cadet in 1942 and after instruction at Vernon, Tex., and Williams, Ariz., won his wings in April 1943. He flew 56 combat missions in B-25's in Europe with the 340th Bombardment Group (Medium). He joined the 319th Bombardment Group (Medium) and went to Okinawa in April 1945, where he flew seven combat missions over Japan.

Following his graduation from the University of Minnesota, he was an aeronautical engineer with Boeing Aircraft Co. in Seattle until recalled in early 1951 to active duty with the Air National Guard.

He spent a year and a half at 12th Air Force headquarters as technical inspector and a like period as fighter pilot and maintenance officer with the 36th Fighter Day Wing in Bitburg, Germany. He returned to the United States in 1955 and attended the Air Force Flight Test Pilot School at Edwards Air Force Base, Calif. Since January 1956, he has been an experimental test pilot at Edwards, where he has flown all jet fighter-type aircraft built for the Air Force. He has 3,400 flying hours, 2,000 in jets. He holds the Air Medal with cluster.

Patience Pays Off

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, recently an interesting editorial concerning the industrial empire of Krupps' appeared in the Cape Girardeau Southeast Missourian. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PATIENCE PAYS OFF

When the war ended in 1945 the giant industrial empire of Krupps' lay practically in ruins. The firm which from a small plant in Essen founded in the days of Napoleon had grown into a vast complex of steel, coal, and armament enterprises, was laid low.

The Allies decided that this company which had supplied gun barrels with becoming reluctance to Bismarck, Kaiser Wilhelm, and Hitler should be dismembered and robbed of its power to become the tool of warlike leaders. Krupps' was ordered to dispose of its coal and steel interests. In future it should make typewriters, bridges and other peaceful things.

Now Krupps' has purchased a steel plant. The European Coal and Steel Community has given its sanction and the Allies have shown no angry reaction. Indeed, Herr Alfried Krupp has declared quite openly that the original dismemberment of the industrial empire was forced upon him under duress.

Herr Krupp has proved the value of patience. Resentments do not endure forever among nations. A new generation grows up. Leaders change. Old foes become valuable friends as new enemies appear on the horizon.

Russian Trade War Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Lawrence Fernsworth, entitled "Russian Trade War Problem," which appeared in the April 8 issue of the Concord Daily Monitor, Concord, N.H.

This article will be of interest to those who are concerned about the Communist threat to our economy.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RUSSIAN TRADE WAR PROBLEM—ECONOMIC NATO PROPOSED TO COUNTER SOVIET MOVES

(By Lawrence Fernsworth)

WASHINGTON, April 8.—Plans for an Economic NATO to counter the Russian economic offensive are hatching in the minds of Members of Congress and of recently appointed Secretary of Commerce Lewis L. Strauss.

This idea has floated as a kind of trial balloon out of the rather rough-and-tumble hearing on the Strauss nomination which the Senate Commerce Committee started before the Easter holidays and which is being resumed this week.

Strauss told the committee that he accepted the President's recess appointment because "I believed I could counter the gravity of the Russian economic offensive." He made it plain that he considered this the big job cut out for him as the new Commerce Secretary to succeed Sinclair Weeks.

Senator COTTON, a member of the committee, has been an attentive participant in the hearings and was particularly concerned about those aspects of the Russian offensive that had bearing on New England industry—the Russian threat to the cotton and wool markets.

BRIDGES CONCERNED

Senator BRIDGES has also expressed his concern with the Russian trade war. As the hearings began, he said in a speech:

"If we want to substitute the Communist system of slave labor for the American system of free labor, then we might as well substitute the "Volga Boat Song" for "The Star Spangled Banner."

BRIDGES' ire was particularly aroused by the revelation that the Russian trade war is now threatening to invade the American school system by the sale of Russian-made laboratory equipment to American high schools and colleges.

"Just for a starter," he said, "the Russians are sending to this country 6,000 pieces of school laboratory equipment to help us educate our youngsters. Things like microscopes and projectors and electronic devices we are told are being sold, or are scheduled to be sold, to our schools by the Russians at prices as low as one-fifth for comparable American-made items."

BRIDGES said it would be well to consider an amendment to the National Defense Education Act to forbid the use of funds provided by the act to buy the Russian-made equipment. This act, passed last year, provides for $280 million in grants to State educational agencies for, as BRIDGES put it, "just this very thing—laboratory equipment, on a dollar-for-dollar matching basis."

LOW AS ONE-FIFTH

He informed the Senate that the first sample lot of 26 items has already arrived, and that Russia proposes to sell it proffered educational wares "at prices as low as one-fifth of the prevailing prices for comparable American items."

"And what is more distressing," he said, "those who viewed these samples say there is no question as to their quality."

When a Johnny Smith is told that the American schools can't afford anything better than the Russian equipment, "what does Johnny Smith think next?" BRIDGES asked. "Will he go home and think about it, and then come up with the conclusion that maybe the Russians are better than us? If he does God help us."

BRIDGES warned the Senate that the plan for American schools "is just another step in the overall Communist plan to unbalance first one then another segment of the United States business community. It is another instance of the economic war which the Soviets have declared.

"Only 3 weeks ago the Communist textile mills priced their goods to get the business—cost or profit being no object. It's the same thing here—only instead of American textile industry it's the American educational system."

HURT ALUMINUM

Another aspect of the Russian trade offensive brought out at the Strauss hearings was the disruption of the American aluminum industry by Russian dumping of aluminum in American markets abroad, and especially in England. Although Russia itself is short of aluminum, it resorts to dumping as a means of striking at American trade.

Indiana's new Democratic Senator VANCE HARTKE said that as a result of this dumping "the jobs of 18,500 American miners for a year have gone out of the window."

The trade offensive is also due to receive the attention of the subcommittee of the Commerce Committee.

The Soviet Deputy Prime Minister Anastas Mikoyan has acquired an American nickname as one of the hearing's byproducts. When the question of various ways of pronouncing his name came up, Chairman WARREN G. MAGNUSON, a Washington State Senator, remarked:

"Let's call him Mickey."

"I wish I had thought of that," countered Strauss.

Addresses at Annual Washington, D.C., Dinner of the Iowa Farm Bureau Women

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, on Wednesday, April 8, about 90 farm wives from Iowa, members of the Iowa Farm Bureau Federation, took part in their annual dinner in Washington, D.C., which is a feature of the trip they make each year. In connection with the dinner, three of these outstanding farm women leaders delivered addresses.

First, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by Mrs. H. L. Witmer, the chairman of the delegation. Mrs. Witmer is a farm wife from Iowa.

Next, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by Mrs. Herbert Johnson, of Charles City, Iowa. The address was made at the same meeting.

Third, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by Mrs. Lyman Greiner, of Blairsburg, Iowa, who is also a member of the delegation, and who spoke at that same meeting.

I may say the addresses delivered by these outstanding ladies contain a great deal of food for calm consideration and thought, especially as they express some considered and experienced views of farmers in the State of Iowa with regard to economic and social conditions which now exist.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF MRS. H. L. WITMER, CHAIRMAN OF THE DELEGATION AT THE ANNUAL WASHINGTON, D.C., DINNER OF THE IOWA FARM BUREAU WOMEN, APRIL 8, 1959

Mrs. Johnson has ably expressed the views of this group on the Federal budget and inflation. Mrs. Greiner has left little to be said about our concern for the future.

One of the great needs of agriculture as well as other groups in our concern for the future is that of perception or a real understanding in advance of the eventual consequences of policies and recommendations.

With the clear vision of hindsight we can now look back to the 1930's when farmers requested and not government programs, Government agencies, and all that experience has shown goes with these things.

We were in a hurry to do something, but it is clear now that there was too little concern for tomorrow and too little perception of the long-run implications to agriculture of efforts to seek political solutions to questions essentially economic in nature.

There is no market system in the world to compare with that of the United States and it has been dramatically successful over the years. Are the right answers to the farm problems to be found in this very system?

Another of the qualities we covet is the ability to maintain sustained indignation. All through history, the righteous indignation of upright citizens has swept the Nation periodically but subsided all too quickly without anything actually being brought about that would eliminate the cause of the public's indignation. One of the old-time politicians was quoted as saying, "Reformers are like morning glories, they bloom in the morning and fade away before dark."

We farm bureau women are not reformers, but we are concerned and indignant about some of the things we hear and observe. With your permission, I would like to list a few causes to which it is our intention to maintain sustained indignation until something is done. I will not attempt to put these in order:

1. Racketeering in any field. We are more indignant with the local government officials who aid or condone racketeers for profit and political reasons than the racketeers themselves. Government officials have accepted a public trust. There is nothing worse than violating that trust and confidence.

2. Dishonesty in government. In repetition of what I have just said, a government official who betrays the confidence of his constituents is, in our opinion, much worse than the common thief who enjoyed no such confidence.

3. We are indignant at violence and racketeering in labor unions. This indignation, of course, is directed toward labor union officials who have been selected by their fellow union leaders and used their hard-gained funds for personal gain and riotous living. Again our indignation extends to politicians who for political reasons refuse to enact legislation tough enough to clean up the situation which exists.

4. We are indignant at the continuation of monopoly, whether it is in labor, agriculture, business, or government.

5. We are indignant at the waste of our personal and natural resources through excessive and unwise Government taxes, expenditures, and programs.

6. At attempts to compel us to accept services we do not request or to join organizations by other than our own free will and choice. We believe in voluntary membership only for our own organization and for all others.

7. We are indignant with those who attempt to buy our votes with public money—with our own money. At those who would jeopardize the private enterprise system in order to perpetuate themselves in office.

8. We are most indignant with those dictators who threaten the peace and freedom of the world.

The specific purpose of our organization is to improve farming as a business and the farm as a place to live.

Our country offers unlimited opportunity for a high standard of living, for spiritual achievement and for world leadership to benefit all mankind. To be leaders we must honestly demonstrate the qualities of leadership.

In summary, we will sustain our indignation to combat public acceptance of the uncondonable. We are determined to direct this indignation at the selfish, the dishonest, the thugs, the racketeers, the demagogs, and the dictators who threaten those things we hold most dear and important.

Our organization carriers on an active citizenship program. We intend to be increasingly active in the future in encouraging individual farmers to participate in the political party of their choice and to have influence in governmental affairs. We want to help build public respect for legislators and Congressmen. However, if we are to do this, we must insist that these public servants not shut their eyes to or condone the causes of our indignation just to be reelected or to further any political party's program.

Our program is to advance and improve the economic, educational, social, and cultural interests of the farm family. Implied in this are our State, national, and international responsibilities and our determination that private enterprise, democracy, and freedom shall be the legacy which, at all costs, we will preserve and pass on to our children and grandchildren.

We are depending on you, our elected representatives to perform your duties steadfastly to bring this about.

It is a well-known fact that the number of farmers is decreasing but there is an ever-reincreasing interest in government and a desire to keep that government and our country a shining symbol of freedom in a world where to many people freedom is a dream of the past or a seemingly unattainable goal of the distant future.

BUDGET—TAXES AND INFLATION

(Address by Mrs. Herbert Johnson, of Charles City, Iowa, before the annual Washington, D.C., dinner of the representatives of the Iowa Farm Bureau Women, April 8, 1959)

Distinguished guests and Farm Bureau friends, we are concerned about the threat of inflation. This is obvious by the fact that we have it as one of the topics we would like to discuss with our Congressmen here

tonight. It is my understanding that the men also discussed this subject when they were here a month ago.

I would like to discuss this subject of inflation from a woman's viewpoint. While this is not materially different than a man's we are especially concerned about some areas. We know that the dollar is worth only about half of what it was 20 years ago and probably a little less with these undesirable results:

First, we women are very much interested in the insurance program for the family. Our concern is not so much for ourselves as for our children in case something happens to the breadwinner. Farm women probably tend to be closer to the family business than women in general. But too often even the farm wife does not feel capable in the field of investments and business activities, if the husband is taken away.

Consequently, an estate administrator will usually recommend that a widow put her savings in fixed investments such as mortgages, bonds, and similar types. Many a widow has seen the purchasing power of her savings cut in two in the last 20 years. In many cases where the husband thought he had provided adequately for the family, they are now perilously close to poverty. This is unfair. It is a cruel and inhuman tax. We cannot justify voting for huge Government expenditures to put money into the pockets of the strong at the expense of widows, orphans, and old people.

The second area we women are especially interested in is the education of our children. Usually it is necessary for farm families to start putting away money for a college education from the time a child is born to make certain that the money is there. Here, too, it is customary to put the money into fixed investments. If we continue the present trend of inflation, there are going to be some bitter disappointments 15 or 20 years from now when the children are ready for college.

Thirdly, there are no company pensions for farmers. They must do their own saving. We want it that way. But a part of this saving for our old age should prudently be made in fixed investments. Again, the same cause for concern about the value of the dollar in 1975.

And, ladies and gentlemen, if we ever reach the point where the people believe that to speculate is safe—but to save is to gamble—then we are indeed in trouble.

Inflation has been almost continuous for the last 20 years. Of course, it received its greatest impetus from the war effort. That inflation was probably largely unavoidable. It seems evident to me, however, that we have not faced up to the problem since the war. And that our governmental policies now and in the past 15 years have encouraged inflation rather than combating it.

Of course, there are many causes of inflation, but we believe the fundamental one is deficit financing by the Federal Government. Now, you and I know that deficits are not something new to our Government. We've had a lot of them particularly through the past 30 years. Yet, we seem to have learned to live with them.

During the 1930's some people who were conservative—perhaps ultraconservative in financial matters—proclaimed that, if the Government did not stop spending money like a drunken sailor, the public debt would hit $50 billion and the country would be broke. That didn't happen. The peak of the World War II debt was reached in February 1946—it stood at $279.8 billion. That didn't break us. We've had a number of deficits since then. They didn't break us. Maybe that is what has put us to sleep concerning the dangers of continuing inflation.

And some of you might ask, "Why, now, of all times this emphasis on balancing the budget?" Some of our productive capacity lies idle, we have an undesirably high level of unemployment. (I might say here that the trend of unemployment both absolutely and as a percentage of the labor force, has been slowly rising ever since 1945.) Also, consumer prices have leveled off. So your question might be, "What inflation would you have us fight?"

The answer is, "The psychological reaction to the inflations of all the yesterdays in which this has occurred, and the potential inflation that lies in prospect for tomorrow—particularly that which will ensue if Congress fails to repair the finances of this country promptly. Fear of future deficits can keep people from saving because of the possible shrinkage of the purchasing power of these savings through inflation. And, let me repeat, if we ever reach the point where people think it is safer to speculate than to save, then we are indeed in trouble.

In addition to what I have said about the unfairness of continuously reducing the purchasing power of the dollar is the even greater fear that inflation might become uncontrollable sometime in the future. I know of no government in history that has been able to stand firm after its currency became worthless. From a leading dealer in government bonds, Aubrey G. Lanston, I qoute, "The budget must be balanced." It is the only way to restore confidence in the dollar and in Government bonds, which is one of the most vital of the fixed assets I mentioned earlier. He says that anything less than a clear-cut determination by Congress to turn its back on Federal deficiteering as a way of life will lead to some pretty uncomfortable developments in the Government security market.

If the Government's needs to finance are large and repetitious—as has been and seems likely to continue to be the case—we eventually find that the Treasury is obliged to confine its financings largely to securities that will mature within a short time. There, we may see sharp, overnight increases in short-term interest rates.

Such prospects or events would raise some troublesome problems for the Federal Reserve System, for the capital and credit markets in general, for businessmen, and the economy as a whole.

A dictator could come to America—and probably would come to America if inflation got completely out of control. We see enough indications of a lack of faith in the value of the dollar to, in my opinion, give us cause for alarm.

So we think it is high time to balance the budget and we would like to see this done without increasing taxes. We urge, and will actively support economies in government, as long as it does not mean endangering national security, or affect vital services. It means limiting Government spending to services which are truly necessary, cutting out those that are unneeded and wasteful.

Any other course is fiscal and moral irresponsibility.

If we Americans, through you, our representatives in Congress, do not have the discipline to pay our way in good times, it is unlikely that we can do so in poorer times. This would make deficit spending permanent. I don't think we want that.

What We Want in the Future

(Address by Mrs. Lyman Greiner, Blairsburg, Iowa, before the annual Washington, D.C., dinner of the Iowa Farm Bureau Women, April 8, 1959)

What do we want in the future?

What did the early farmers want so badly that they endured loneliness; long, hard-working hours; physical hardships, and deprivations?

Many of us in this room are living on farms that our ancestors homesteaded. We are handing down to our young people stories of the adventurous trip westward in muslin-covered wagons. We tell them stories of wintering in overturned wagons or in hastily erected cabins and lean-tos. After our March storms we can visualize cabins and stables buried for weeks beneath heavy snow. We know why farmsteads on the sunny slopes of the hillsides were moved and built high on the hills and knolls.

My husband's 95-year-old grandmother loaned me a clipping from an April 1915 Iowa Homestead. Her father, age 82 then, had written from his home in Story County a "Reminiscence of Pioneer Life."

He speaks of the fertile prairie which was a land of promise to the wide-awake newcomer. He speaks of children and of training them to honesty and industry.

Further, he says, and I quote: "The people's right to choose and not the divine right of king's. We paid Uncle Sam $1.25 per acre. God ruled then, as now, in this fair land in material and spiritual blessings."

We glory in our rich heritage of men and women who believed the motto they adopted: "Our liberties we prize and our rights we will maintain."

What is the vision that has led us to travel to our beautiful Capital City at this rush season back home on the farm? What do we want?

Our values, our visions are essentially the same as those of our ancestors. The average of 44 rubber tires that each farmer owns on our high-powered machinery has not cushioned and softened our resolve.

We want America to remain free; we want to preserve our freedoms. We assume, expect, and insist upon freedom of religion, freedom to came and go as we please, freedom of speech, and freedom to save or to spend.

We have come because we are afraid that our freedom is tarnishing as people take America and our luxurious prosperity for granted. Perhaps a visit to Washington will rub off the tarnish from our awareness of our heritage. We hope that our visit will help our representatives gain a brighter vision of how our democracy must be protected, our privileges cherished, and our freedom defended.

Recently the morning news report contained the statement, "Russia is rattling her sabres." At the Workshop on Economic Growth and Social Development being sponsored by our extension service, we heard talk of the fear of total annihilation of the world. Russia's threat contained the statement that the economic world would lose its head.

We are farm women, unskilled in rattling sabres or uneducated in economics, but we know about the rise in prices. We know that it costs more when we go to the grocery store, or when we buy clothing for our families. We know that the cost to produce our farm products has increased. We know that our dollar's purchasing power has been cut in half in 18 years.

We cannot sit here tonight and not admit that current stocks of storable farm products are excessive. That puts a squeeze on us, but we are proud that our modern research programs, our machinery, our intelligent application of farm technology has given us the most efficient agriculture in the world.

We believe that our Government needs to keep its proper role. We feel spending should be limited to services which are truly necessary. We feel that any threat to private enterprise is a threat to freedom. Inflation is one such threat. Russia is expecting inflation to destroy America's free enterprise system. If we run to the Government for help on things which we or local governments should take care of, we are en-

couraging inflation. Truly, we can lose our head by too much bureaucracy.

It was Ralph Waldo Emerson who said, "The less government we have, the better—the fewer laws, and the less confided power."

We want security for our families. It is not queer to talk of security and freedom in the same breath. Real security is within one's self. Freedom opens up opportunity to develop one's self.

We want our children to have an equal opportunity—not equality, but equal opportunity. We think education is one way to give them this. Education helps develop ones' self-confidence, ability, and drive. We are interested in improving the quality of education. We think this should and can be handled by State and local governments, and are in the process of reorganizing school districts as a first step.

As mothers, we pray for peace. We believe that peace is possible if we preserve freedom. Freedom spreads if it works. It works if we do our part.

We want America to be strong. We want America to grow—economically and spiritually. We believe it will if we preserve our freedom.

Looking steadily at the past and present, and also ahead to the future, we have a vision of the loyalty, integrity, education, and moral fiber of American citizens.

With our hands on our hearts, we say, "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

We believe that you as Congressmen will recognize in the past, present, and future, the importance of individual initiative and price. If we can keep our goal and vision under the will of God, America will move to an energetic role in free world development. We know that you will have the courage to consider the effects that any proposed legislation will have on our goals. We know your efforts and deliberations will shape a proud future for America.

Fortieth Anniversary of the American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Tom Hargis, past post commander of the L. A. Engle, Jr., Post No. 16 of the American Legion, at Bisbee, Ariz.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BEFORE L. A. ENGLE, JR., POST NO. 16, BISBEE, ARIZ., AT THE AMERICAN LEGION 40TH ANNIVERSARY BANQUET, MARCH 21, 1959, BY TOM HARGIS, PAST POST COMMANDER

Tonight we are gathered here to celebrate the 40th anniversary of the American Legion. I am not going to review the history of our great organization, but I would enjoy the opportunity to look to the future of our Legion.

It is said that "Life begins at 40" and as the Legion has attained that age, I truly believe that we should look to the future and through concentrated efforts exert our energies toward a better and more honored organization.

Ordinarily, I don't go in much for slang expressions, but I'm going to use one now—for, it's being tossed about these days as a description of a trend that seems to be sweeping this country. Behind it is an idea, perhaps a plan, that we Americans can take almost anything more easily than we can take ridicule.

The slang expression is this: "It's corny." It is being applied more to anything that is part of the American tradition. In short, It's corny to be an American. It's quite the fashion to find fault with everything that relates to our homespun ideas and beliefs, to haul our Government over the coals and make fun of our lawmakers, to crack jokes about Congress, and laugh at cartoons of our President.

It's smart to admire things that have a foreign flavor because it's corny these days to be an American. In fact, what most of us know as the American way has been twisted into all sorts of propaganda that goes by the name but hasn't the slightest resemblance to the original product.

Uncle Sam used to be a symbol of men who were willing to work and struggle and speak up good and loud for our democratic ideals. Nowdays, you're narrowminded and filled with outworn prejudices if you think of Uncle Sam as anything but a broken-down old man who lives in the past.

Nowadays you're a flag waver or sentimentalist or Redbaiter or some other kind of a baiter if you believe all it has stood for since 1776 means anything today. And if you stand up now and then and speak in defense of the old-fashioned American way as prescribed by our forefathers, you are emotional.

As for me, I don't mind being called corny. I don't mind being old fashioned and conservative. I am proud to be called a flag waver and all the sarcastic smarties of the propaganda line can't swerve me from my beliefs and ideals. I'm an American.

What does the word "corn" mean anyhow? It is a particular American grain—the grain that grows tall and green across our prairies in the summer—and incidentally that gain isn't too corny to help feed a hungry world.

In a democracy, society must recognize that the individual has rights which are guaranteed, and the individual must recognize that he has responsibilities which are not to be evaded.

Freedom is like a bag of sand. If there is a hole anywhere in the bag, all the sand will run out. If any group of our people are denied their rights, sooner or later all groups stand to lose their rights. All freedom will run out.

I deem this a fitting time to remind all that peace is not merely a vacuum left by the ending of wars. It is the creation of two eternal principles: justice and freedom.

The goal of a great democracy should be fulfillment, not ease. It should be adequacy, not serenity.

Are we to be like the people in the village of Sham? A triumphal feast was scheduled. And to insure adequate liquid refreshments, each villager agreed to pour one bottle of his best wine into a great cask. "If the bottle that I contribute is filled with water," reasons one, "the dilution will be so slight, who will notice?"

But when the feast commenced and the cask was tapped, nothing but water poured forth. Everyone in the village had figured alike: "My bit will not be missed."

The harvest we reap comes from the seeds we sow. You can't leave patriotism up to the other fellow. The individual must contribute his bit by evaluating his actions in the light of how they will affect not only himself but how they will affect the other fellow.

America did not get to be the great Nation she is today by just the fact she is a country. It is the people in the Nation that have made America great. And so the same is true in the American Legion. We should all contribute our bit, renew our faith and be bold in our decisions, take courage of things to come, and ever be watchful in order to insure that our way of life, our homespun ideals, and our American ways will forever endure.

The American Legion has not changed in its patriotic character. In its ideals, in its objectives, and in its integrity. Keeping America always American is still its continuing goal. It is still true to the original purposes set forth so vividly in 1919 in the preamble to its constitution.

The good impact on the American scene of the American Legion is immeasurable. It has been an important factor in the defense of our free institutions, in keeping love of country at a high premium, in raising the popular level of education, in the great increase of home ownership, in the enlightened streamlining of child welfare, in pioneering modern care of the disabled and physically handicapped, and in the Nation's preparedness against aggression.

We salute our local post and wish it many happy returns as this great organization starts on its fifth decade of service to God and country.

Lowell Mason's Grace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, for a number of years Lowell Mason, former member of the Federal Trade Commission, has been host at a luncheon on the opening day of the ball season. At the luncheon yesterday were members of the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Government.

Mr. Mason, as usual, opened the luncheon with a grace which was an inspiration to all of those present.

I ask unanimous consent that the grace be made a part of these remarks and printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the grace was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOWELL MASON'S GRACE

O God teach us to repay our debt to Thee by the quality of our lives not by the quality of our words.

Grant us such a measure of thy spirit, that the fellowship of man one with another (at this luncheon, the baseball game and all places where we gather together in comradeship) may be an echo of the fellowship of the spirit Thou hast taught us in the quiet of cathedrals, the solitude of woods, and the majesty of sea and mountain.

Here in the Capitol (the busy marketplace of ideas) where men seek the greatest good for the greatest number.

Teach us, O God, to respect the feelings of others more than our own rights and the rights of others more than our own feelings.

Teach us to differ without anger, to know the best not just the good; to know that it is better to earn liberty than to praise it. Amen.

Secretary Strauss and Mikoyan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the April 7, 1959, issue of the Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader. The editorial pays tribute to Secretary of Commerce Lewis L. Strauss for his realistic attitude in dealing with Soviet Deputy Premier Anastas Mikoyan during the latter's recent visit to this country.

Secretary Strauss' past and present monumental services in behalf of this country are well known; but the service he performed through his principled and forthright talk with Deputy Premier Mikoyan should add even greater laurels to an already highly distinguished career.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECRETARY STRAUSS AND MIKOYAN

Looking back at Mikoyan's recent visit to the United States the whole affair seems even more disgraceful than it did at the time. The picture of prominent American industrialists and financial people falling all over themselves to wine and dine and shake the hands of this Communist lying murderer is certainly one of the most nauseating in American history.

This newspaper would now like to add to the small roll of honor of American leaders who refused to be taken in by Mikoyan, the name of Commerce Secretary Lewis L. Strauss, former chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission.

It seems that Commerce Secretary Strauss, when he was forced to meet Mikoyan as part of his official duties, bluntly told the Communst leader that the Soviets had brought slavery back into the world. Admiral Strauss acted as all Americans should have acted. He proudly represented the American heritage.

For instance, when Mikoyan came to his office he brought Strauss a present of a box of caviar, a luxurious food for the belly. Admiral Strauss in return presented Mikoyan with food for the mind and spirit. His present to Mikoyan was a copy of Washington's Farewell Address.

Secretary Strauss had underlined the passage where Washington said: "Reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle."

Mikoyan is supposed to have said: "You know, you talk about religion, but we have a religion, too, and we think it is the highest type. We send our sons off to battle. Khrushchev sent off three and one didn't return."

Admiral Strauss properly pointed out that that wasn't an example of religion but a desire for self-preservation, a virtue of pagan nations that has nothing to do with religion.

Mikoyan was then supposed to have got mad and said: "You have preached the brotherhood of man for 2,000 years and you have achieved absolutely nothing."

Admiral Strauss then answered: "That is an indictment of man, but not of religion. You overlook the fact that the brotherhood of man was successful in that it eliminated slavery, until you reinstated it."

At that point Mikoyan got up and left.

Thus Strauss joins the small role of honor consisting of Richard Cardinal Cushing, AFL–CIO President Meany, Styles Bridges, Congressman Judd, and General Trudeau who spoke out boldly, stating what Mikoyan is and what the nation he represents stands for.

The fantastic thing about it was that there were so few—that the rest of the people fell all over themselves to fawn on Mikoyan.

Some of these people, of course, were dedicated pro-Communists but the big majority weren't. As you read the dinner list of the people who welcomed Mikoyan the situation becomes even more incomprehensible. These men are the leaders of American business and finance. They have been very successful in handling their own affairs.

The only way you can explain the whole affair, apparently, is that in this age of specialization, many of these business leaders are specialists. They do not understand our politics and apparently do not pay much attention to religion. So they have no immediate moral revulsion toward a man such as Mikoyan.

This must indicate a degeneration of the American spirit.

Thank God that Admiral Strauss has not forgotten what this country stands for and is not afraid to pass moral judgment on Mikoyan.

The Democratic Advisory Council: Spenders Without Portfolio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, one of the interesting phases of American life is the presence of self-styled advisory committees who prance around the fringe of political parties, telling both the legislative and the executive branches of the Government what ought to be done to save the country.

One such committee is the Democratic Advisory Council, which issues a number of advisory statements on a great number of questions. Interestingly enough, this council does not have the present leaders of the Democratic Party in Congress among its membership. I think a reading of the advice that is passed out pretty well explains the reluctance of the legislative leaders to join the group.

The Washington Daily News of April 7 has an interesting comment on the most recent pronouncement of the Democratic Advisory Council. I believe that most Americans will be interested in knowing that this Democratic Advisory Council still holds to the "spend and spend" theory of government. The Daily News points out, quite correctly, that some of the members of the council, who have been failures in the art of balancing their governmental books, are now trying to steer the National Government into the disastrous groove of bankruptcy which they have carved for themselves.

I ask permission to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the editorial entitled "Spenders Without Portfolio," from the Washington Daily News of April 7, 1959.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPENDERS WITHOUT PORTFOLIO

By its own count, the Democratic Advisory Council in the last couple of years has put out 26 statements telling the Eisenhower administration and Congress what to do. It is fair to report that the administration and the Democratic leadership in Congress have ignored this advise in 26 instances.

The advisory council was appointed by the party chairman and proclaims at will, having no other responsibility. Its latest pronunciamento is designed to make political capital out of the people who presently are out of jobs. After we wade through the usual cliches and misstatements of fact, we come to the remedies which add up to one theme: If the Government would just spend more.

The Eisenhower administration, says the ghost writer for these 27 politicians, is trying to "balance the budget without balancing the economy."

In other words, the way to balance the economy is to run up bigger and bigger Government deficits. This creates inflation, which makes it easier for more people to lose their jobs and raises the price of everything for those who manage to keep their jobs.

One of the 27 advisers is Gov. Foster Furculo of Massachusetts, a State whose debt has gone up nearly $1 billion in a dozen years and which is desparately hunting new taxes to keep up with the spending.

Another advisor is Gov. G. Mennen Williams of Michigan, a State which even Mr. Williams belatedly admits is facing financial disaster, a State going broke.

These are some of the reasons President Eisenhower and the Democratic leadership in Congress are not likely to pay much heed to the Democratic Advisory Committee. There is always something to be thankful for.

The Southern Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, my attention was called to a letter appearing on the editorial page of the Washington Evening Star of today, entitled "The Southern Way." I do not know the author of the letter, Mr. Powers. I have not had the pleasure of meeting him. If I ever heard of him, I do not remember it.

This letter is a very powerful argument in favor of protecting the individual rights of our people and the individuality of our people against the present drive for conformity at any and all cost.

I regard the drive to compel every segment of this country to conform, in its social order and in its cultural arrangements, and the concurrent drive to compel the individual to conform to what is regarded as the norm by the majority, as being one of the greatest dangers to what we have long boasted of as the American way of life.

This letter appeals to me, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SOUTHERN WAY

In the national controversy raging over segregated schooling, we often hear of the southern way of life. This phrase is used with too little understanding both by those who wield it for defense and those who hurl it in attack. It is true that the South has a way of life, but the point missed is that a way of life is a normal social phenomenon. Way of life is, in fact, our everyday translation of the old term "regime." And regime is a word rich in social meaning.

Of all regions, the South has maintained a regime in the clearest and most enduring form. It has a society more unified by imponderables, more conscious of self-definition, more homogeneous in outlook than any other region. It should be recognized that these are conserving forces. The effect of a regime is to conserve and stabilize.

The South has had the enormously difficult problem of accommodating a large minority distinct in race and culture.

The South is the natural prime target of those who hate the very idea of regime. Anyone who looks beneath appearance to reality must see that the attack upon the southern school system is but one front of a general attack upon the principle of an independent, self-directing social order, with a set of values proper to itself. It is the one pushed most vigorously now because for a variety of reasons it can draw the most publicity, and it is the kind of action for which the liberal's sentimentalism makes him most gullible.

No long memory is needed to recall other fronts on which the attack against the South has formerly been active. Not very long ago the issue was fundamentalism, and the South was being crucified for holding a religious belief not terribly different from that of respectable contemporary neo-orthodoxy. Later it was the sharecropping system, which certainly brings great wealth neither to owner nor cropper, but which is nothing to get excited over from a distance, unless one starts with a strong initial prejudice. Still later it was the poll tax, again nothing to get excited over unless you believe that adding to the number of votes automatically adds to the amount of wisdom. Thus the attackers have said by their actions, "Any stick to beat a dog." This is the reason we urgently need to look for the real impulse behind their militancy.

The modern liberal has confused liberty with power, but the only use he has for power is to destroy. If these fanatical destroyers are allowed to have their way, the next thing to be challenged will be the basis on which the more general American way of life is forming. The same charge of inequity leveled against the southern regime will be leveled against capitalism, private property, the family and even individuality. The liberal's rage is directed against all restraints which allow things to grow in their own native character. He has a verdict of guilty against everything that stands in the way of certain ideas which are themselves life-denying.

Most of us readily admit that this Nation owes both its independence and its happiness to the principle of self-determination. That principle is now in danger of being suppresesd by a blind zeal for standardization and enforced conformity. To oppose that trend, we do not have to become sectionalists. We need only to grant the right of distinct groups to exercise some liberty of choice in the ordering of their social and cultural arrangements. If that liberty is denied, there will be no ground left on which to assert any other liberty.

W. A. POWERS, Jr.

White House Ceremony Lists Antarctic Feats of Tucker Sno-Cat, Manufactured in Medford, Oreg.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on February 4 there took place at the White House a most impressive ceremony. The President of the United States presented the Hubbard Medal of the National Geographic Society to the U.S. Navy Antarctic Expeditions of 1955–59, and also to the British explorer, Sir Vivian Fuchs.

It is my understanding that the President asked many questions about the details of the great expeditions which were being honored. In reply to one of these questions, Sir Vivian Fuchs described the remarkable vehicles which carried himself and his comrades across the tractless waste of the Antarctic—barren icy steppes which long ago claimed the lives of the heroic British explorer, Capt. Robert F. Scott, Royal Navy, and his party. Let me quote a sentence from an article appearing in the National Geographic magazine for April 1959. The sentence is as follows:

In response to a question from Mr. Eisenhower, the British explorer briefly described the Sno-Cat, the tracked vehicle that provided his principal means of transportation across the icy pole.

Mr. President, we of the State of Oregon are inestimably proud that the Sno-Cat, heralded by Sir Vivian Fuchs in his conversation with the President, is manufactured by the Tucker Corp., of Medford, Oreg. We are pleased that the U.S. Navy and the British Government have made effective use of the Tucker Sno-Cat, and we commend a similar decision to other units of the Department of Defense, such as the Army and the Air Force.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From National Geographic, April 1959]

SOCIETY HONORS THE CONQUERORS OF ANTARCTICA

On February 4, before a distinguished audience gathered at the White House, President Dwight D. Eisenhower presented the National Geographic Society's Hubbard Medal to British explorer Sir Vivian Fuchs and to the U.S. Navy Antarctic Expedition of 1955–59.

The ceremonies took place in the green-draped Cabinet Room adjoining the President's private office. A proud, smiling Lady Fuchs looked on as the coveted gold medal was bestowed on her husband.

Secretary of the Navy Thomas S. Gates, Jr., accepted the Hubbard Medal for the accomplishments of his service in the exploration of the White Continent. For their roles in the conquest of Antarctica, gold duplicates went to Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, and Read Adm. George Dufek.

MEDAL FOR TRANSANTARCTIC LEADER

Melville Bell Grosvenor, president and editor of the National Geographic Society, introduced the medal recipients to the President.

"I speak for the trustees," he said, "and nearly 2,500,000 National Geographic members when I thank you for your interest in our work—the increase and diffusion of geographic knowledge. We are proud, Sir, that you are a longtime member of our society.

"Mr. President, the Hubbard Medal is one of geography's highest honors. It commemorates Gardiner Greene Hubbard, a founder and first president of our society—and, incidentally, my great-grandfather. Adm. Robert E. Peary, discoverer of the North Pole, received this medal first in 1906.

"Today we honor the Commonwealth Transantarctic Expedition for its extraordinary achievement of the first crossing by land of the southernmost continent. In a period of 99 days, from November 24, 1957, to March 2, 1958, Sir Vivian Fuchs and 11 other hardy men traveled 2,158 miles over the South Pole from the Weddell Sea to McMurdo Sound. They accomplished what Shackleton called the last great polar journey that can be made.

"Conditions facing Sir Vivian and his men were cruel. White-outs blinded them. Crevasses threatened to swallow them. Strange illnesses slowed them. And finally, the cold was so bitter that—I am told on best authority—even the penguins turned blue.

"To have made the journey at all is a feat of unprecedented valor and leadership. But, Mr. President, at the same time they carried out some of the most valuable scientific work of the International Geophysical Year. Despite hardships, the explorers stopped every 30 miles to make seismographic shots, and they made gravity tests every 15 miles. Our cartographers will have to remake our maps of Antarctica as a result of these surveys.

"For his mastery of a continent, the National Geographic Society has awarded the Hubbard Medal, with this citation:

" 'To Sir Vivian Fuchs for brilliant leadership of the British Transantarctic Expedition 1955–58 and for his extraordinary contributions to geographic knowledge of Antarctica.'

"NAVY'S ACHIEVEMENTS RECOGNIZED

"Now, Mr. President, as a sailor and classmate at Annapolis of both Admirals Burke and Dufek. I am especially pleased—and I know you are—that the trustees of the National Geographic Society have also awarded the Hubbard Medal to the U.S. Navy for its outstanding contributions to science through its IGY Antarctic Expeditions.

"Under the leadership of Secretary Gates, Admiral Burke, and Rear Admiral Dufek, more than 10,000 men of our Navy have built the many outposts from which the unknown lands of Antarctica are being studied.

"The logistics would have been impossible for any organization but the U.S. Navy.

Everything had to be shipped or planed in, from delicate instruments to lumber for shelter. Through the world's most dangerous waters, our Navy brought hundreds of thousands of tons of supplies into Antarctica.

"To build and supply the famous station at the South Pole itself, where Sir Vivian and his men received rest and refreshment from American scientists and Naval officers, the Navy and Air Force flew in 1,450 tons of supplies.

"The 4-year effort—which is continuing—was in the highest tradition of the Navy, Mr. President. Lt. Charles Wilkes, who first sailed to Antarctic water in 1838, would have been proud. His successors, whom we honor today, have continued and enhanced the Navy's great tradition of discovery and exploration. The citation on the medal reads:

" 'Awarded to the U.S. Navy Antarctic Expeditions 1955–59 for outstanding service to science in exploring vast south polar regions and establishing scientific stations for the International Geophysical Year.'

"Gold duplicates have been struck for Admiral Burke, your great Chief of Naval Operations and father of the nuclear-powered Navy, and for Rear Admiral Dufek, who is still in command of Operation Deep Freeze."

News cameras whirred and clicked as the President received the gold medals from Dr. Grosvenor and presented them in turn to Sir Vivian Fuchs, Navy Secretary Gates, and Admiral Burke. Each received as well a firm Presidential handshake. In response to a question from Mr. Eisenhower, the British explorer briefly described the sno-cat, the tracked vehicle that provided his principal means of transportation across the icy pole.

The formal ceremonies concluded, the President turned to Lady Fuchs, who was chatting with Sir Harold Caccia, British Ambassador to the United States. Offering her his congratulations on her husband's historic achievement, the President flashed the famed Eisenhower grin. "I'll bet," he said, "you're mighty glad you stayed home."

The Benson Farm Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the February 21, 1959, issue of the Washington Report of Representative GEORGE MCGOVERN, of South Dakota. Representative MCGOVERN competently and briefly reviews the Benson farm policy record and points up the existing situation in farm legislation. It is worthy of our attention.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman GEORGE MCGOVERN)

WASHINGTON, D.C., February 21, 1959.—Dear friends, Secretary of Agriculture Benson came before the Agriculture Committees of both the House and Senate in mid-February to ask broader authority to flex farm prices downward.

BENSON FARM POLICY RECORD

What the Secretary said in effect was a playback of the theme he has been preaching ever since he took office in 1953. That is: lower farm prices will discourage farmers from producing surpluses and will, therefore, produce higher farm income.

Unhappily for many farm families—as well as small businessmen and workers who rely heavily on agriculture for their own livelihood—the results of the last 6 years have disproved the Benson theory.

Since the beginning of 1953, farm prices are down 16 percent. Farm income is down 25 percent. In the 1952–57 period, farmers absorbed an aggregate loss of nearly $18 billion in income. Four million farm folks have left the land, and 600,000 farms have disappeared. Meanwhile, Government stocks of farm commodities have quadrupled since 1952. Benson does not seem to realize that lower prices lead to greater production, as farmers seek to offset their loss of income.

NEW PRICE-FLEXING AUTHORITY ASKED

Yet, the Secretary told the Agriculture Committees he needed: (1) New authority permitting him to set price supports at zero if he deems necessary; or (2) discard the parity principle and support prices between 75 percent and 90 percent of the average market price in the immediately preceding 3 years.

In my opinion, Congress will not accept the administration's farm recommendations. I, for one, cannot accept any such proposal. But a showdown is in the offing. The first round will probably come as we consider wheat legislation in the next few weeks.

WHAT ADMINISTRATION FARM PROPOSALS MEAN

To give Secretary Benson authority to drop supports down to zero would be to invite return to the chaos of 30 years ago. If Congress were to approve the plan providing for supports somewhere between 75 percent and 90 percent of the average market price for the last 3 years, manufacturing milk supports could slump to as low as $2.45 a hundredweight, compared to the present $3.06. Butterfat supports could drop to 47.6 cents a pound, compared to 59 cents a pound. Corn supports could fall to 96 cents a bushel, instead of the prospective $1.12, and wheat supports could plummet to $1.43 a bushel, compared to the announced level of $1.81. This latter figure will probably drop to $1.77 a bushel for 1959 even if the program remains as it now is. This is because of the Agriculture Department's new method of calculating parity.

PRICES DROP BUT PARITY RATIO RISES

The new parity computation went into effect at the beginning of this year. When the parity ratio was figured for the month ending in mid-January, it showed it had risen 2 points. The parity ratio was reported at 82 percent. In mid-December, it stood at 80 percent.

In reality, however, farm prices had actually fallen 1 percent by the old standards, toppling to 79 percent of parity, the lowest since August 1940.

Even with farm prices hovering at their lowest level in 19 years, consumers have not benefited by lower food prices. In the final 3 months of 1958, the Department of Agriculture announced that retail food prices rose 3 percent. At the same time, the farm share of the food dollar has dropped from 47 cents in 1952 to 39 cents today. We need to remind ourselves that on a loaf of bread, for example, the farmer receives only about 2 cents for the wheat involved.

ONE-SIDED PICTURE OF FARM COSTS

Much has been made of the cost of the farm programs, and to be sure, they have skyrocketed tremendously under Secretary Benson. But so often, only one side of the picture is shown.

The administration, for instance, has made a great deal of the $1 million a day storage cost for farm commodities. This is no small figure, but it costs more than $23 million a day to finance the Federal debt. Yet, we have had no recommendation to reduce interest rates which have been pushed higher and higher as a direct result of administration policy.

How many people know that of the total $6,872 million estimated agricultural budget for 1959, $3,022 million will be expended for programs which have multiple benefits going far beyond agriculture?

FARM BUDGET NOT ALL AGRICULTURE

Some $1,383 million will go toward programs related to foreign aid—Public Law 480 and the International Wheat Agreement, for example. Every American benefits from these expenditures, whether he lives on the prairie lands of South Dakota or in a Fifth Avenue penthouse in New York City.

Here are a few other programs listed as agriculture expenditures which benefit other segments of the public: $145 million for school lunch program; $53 million for disease and pest control; $21 million for meat inspection; $74 million for school milk program; and $26 million for dairy products for the armed services and Veterans' Administration.

All of these are fine programs. But is it fair that the farm budget should be charged with all of the cost? Shouldn't some of it be shifted to the State Department, Defense Department, etc.?

In spite of the implications that farmers enjoy a favored subsidy position, records show that of all Government subsidies paid in the last 50 years, agriculture has received only $5 out of every $1,000.

HOPEFUL SIGNS FOR NEW LEGISLATION

Obviously, we need a change in farm policy. There is no reason why a Nation that has the brain power to put satellites into orbit around the earth and send atomic-powered submarines beneath the polar ice cap cannot solve the problems of agriculture to the benefit of the farmer and the general public.

I believe there are hopeful signs in this Congress. Senate Majority Leader JOHNSON has called for an improved farm program. Under serious consideration is a bill offered by Senator TALMADGE, which by the way is similar to a measure I offered 2 years ago. Senator HUMPHREY is working closely with him on this legislation. In the House, I believe chances have also improved. Many of my colleagues share my determination to work for passage of a more adequate farm bill.

On several previous occasions, Congress has passed strong farm legislation, only to have it vetoed by the President at Mr. Benson's insistence. Let us hope that this will not be the fate of farm legislation in the next 2 years.

Your friend and Representative in Congress,

GEORGE MCGOVERN.

Review of the Book "The Communist World and Ours"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in the continuing struggle between capitalism and communism, it is interesting to note the different appraisals of Communist objectives as seen through the eyes of professed authorities on this subject.

The well known newspaper writer, Walter Lippmann, after a 2-week visit to Russia last fall, has written a book on this general subject entitled "The Communist World and Ours."

A penetrating and succinct review of this book appeared in the April 6, 1959, issue of the New Leader magazine. I commend the reading of the review to my colleagues, and ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the review was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIPPMANN'S COMMUNIST WORLD

("The Communist World and Ours," by Walter Lippmann; reviewed by Myron Rush, Soviet affairs analyst, Rand Corp.)

"The rulers of Russia * * * are drawn toward Asia and away from Europe." Moscow faces east with the air of being the capital of a new order of things among the Asian peoples. So reported Walter Lippmann in a series of newspaper articles following a 2-week visit to the U.S.S.R. last October, highlighted by a 2-hour interview with Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev. The most learned and experienced of American publicists found the "basic issue," and at the same time the "most pressing issue," between the Communist world and ours to be the Russian and Chinese challenge for the leadership of Asia and Africa.

It was not to be supposed that the leader of the Communist world would lay bare his innermost thoughts to the bourgeois journalist; but apparently he failed also to reveal those foremost in his mind. A few days after their interview Khrushchev pronounced his ultimatum to the Western Powers on Berlin, thus assuring that the most pressing issue, at least for the 6 months following Lippmann's visit, would be a Soviet challenge in Europe, not in Asia.

Nevertheless, Lippmann has made no effort to fit the Berlin crisis to his findings, which are reprinted with amplified conclusions in "The Communist World and Ours." Apparently the present Berlin crisis, in his view, does not illuminate the mainsprings and the controlling ideas of Soviet foreign policy, which are the objects of his study.

The main challenge to the West is in Asia because that is where communism's strength lies. "The main power of the Communist states lies * * * in the force of their example" to countries which are economically undeveloped. The Communist leaders in Moscow and Peiping are certain that they will win primacy in Asia if only they can avoid war, which would ruin their economic achievements. Since they need peace, our military measures appear to them as preparations for an attack designed to halt their revolutionary rise to world leadership.

This explains their unwillingness to negotiate any concession which might give us even a slight tactical advantage in case of war. Observing the bellicosity of our generals and the propensity of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles and the President to treat the conflict as a religious war, the Communists regard hostilities as inevitable unless they make themselves so powerful that war cannot take place.

The West, too, has grounds for suspicion. "Insofar as the Soviet Union and Red China gain in military power, they are certainly bound to use it as an instrument of policy in order to complete their domination of Asia and of Africa." Europe is not mentioned here as an object of domination, evidently because Lippmann believes the chief purpose of Soviet military power, after defense, is to reinforce the political attraction of the Communist system, and that system holds little attraction for the more advanced countries of Europe.

True, there are Communist regimes in east Europe, but they were imposed and have been maintained by Soviet military power brought on the scene by the war against Nazi Germany. Lippmann feels that the Soviet leaders know that in east Europe they are not followed and admired and imitated. Aware that their domination of the area is precarious and impermanent, they would withdraw if they knew how this could safely be done. We should help them find a way.

If Communist military power serves these limited objectives and lacks an aggressive spirit, does it pose a serious threat to the countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization alliance? Lippmann is confident that there is no military threat to the United States—nor, unless something very stupid or desperate or reckless is done, to our principal allies in Europe. This oracular pronouncement follows an equally ambiguous phrase: He is confident, provided we maintain the balance of deterrent power.

But Lippmann gives little hint as to what this may require. He at once deprecates the notion that we cannot afford to keep up the race, and cautions against scare campaigns and becoming obessed with weapons. He records that nothing Khrushchev told him implied the view that "the U.S.S.R. has long-range missiles which have broken, or are about to break, the existing military stalemate with the United States." Subsequently, however, after precipitating the Berlin crisis, Khrushchev began to boast of Soviet ICBM production and to imply a somewhat different estimate of the strategic balance than the one he conveyed to Lippmann in October.

The Communist leadership appeared stable and united. Khrushchev's professed unconcern about the future of Soviet-Chinese relations seemed genuine, a product of his conviction that "applied science can solve all human problems," and of his "basic revolutionary faith that a Communist man is a new kind of man."

This, in brief summary of Lippmann's short account, is the Communist world as he sees it. Many of the features which Western political observers conventionally stress are missing here. There are Communist states, but no Communist parties, and policy is made by the "powerful government." Although the interview with Khrushchev makes up half the book, nothing is said of his position in the leadership. Neither is there mention of a dictatorship, whether of Khrushchev, of the proletariat, or of the party.

Lenin's authority is noted, but not his precepts for waging the struggle to decide "who [will destroy] whom?" (Marshal Zhukov, whom early partisans of disengagement once looked upon as an advocate of withdrawal from East Europe, actually used the phrase in a published speech to justify the Soviet intervention in Hungary.) He appears only to warn his ideological descendants against trusting the capitalist world, whose masters would launch a "preventive war" rather than submit to the loss of world dominion.

While the Communist world fears and distrusts ours, within their world evidently trust abounds. Doubtless Lippmann is right in warning that we ought not to rely for our salvation on divisions in the Communist world. But is it really necessary to this end that we disregard the fissures that exist and describe the Soviet system as one that does not work perfectly and has private discontent? Is it really to be supposed that Khrushchev's revolutionary faith protects him from doubts about Red China's leaders, as though a Communist man could not in a moment become a despicable deviationist like Vyacheslav Molotov, or even a renegade like Marshal Tito? Is the Communist revolution as it has developed during 40 years in Russia and 10 years in China, best described as a "revolution of the submerged masses * * * demanding a better life for themselves?"

If communism in Russia and China has such popular strength and the masses of Asia seem likely to rally to communism, if the Soviet and Chinese social structures harbor merely private discontent and their rulers implicitly trust each other as a new kind of man, what then are the grounds of Lippmann's confidence that the Communist movement is not destined to expand until it has conquered the whole world?

There is, first, the fact that "the Soviet system does not work * * * in eastern Europe." In the face of Khrushchev's repeated warnings that the clock will never be turned back in East Europe, despite the stepped-up socialization of the satellite economies and the plans for their increased specialization and subordination to Moscow's planning and direction, Lippmann suggests that in the long run nationalist forces will induce the Soviet Union to end its hegemony. A second reason for confidence is his evident belief that the Soviet leaders do not have in view the subjugation of west Europe. Since popular support is in Lippmann's view essential to the Communist revolution, there is little danger of communism's spread to west Europe unless, contrary to its leaders' strategy, there is war.

Lippmann's prescriptions for western policy flow logically from his analysis of the Communist world. In Asia we should meet the Communist challenge by underwriting India's development, thereby demonstrating that there is a more humane way to overcome poverty. In Europe we should capitalize on Soviet political weakness by seeking to end the military occupation of the Continent. At one point, Lippmann poses the problem of how democracies like ours can be induced to support armaments without scare campaigns which alienate the many millions of neutralists and pacifists. He nowhere resolves the question, but his last word is to relax and to avoid hysterics.

Although these views were first set down for the daily newspaper, their distinguished author always looks to the distant prospect: The future may still prove him right. Yet, considering the small place occupied by struggle, violence, deceit and evil—in brief, the virtual absence of bolshevism—in the Communist world of Walter Lippman, and bearing in mind bolshevism's large role in Communist history, the future seems more likely to reveal deep flaws in his analysis and predictions, and in the policy he recommends.

The United States and Israel Have Common Roots of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Chief Justice Earl Warren as it appeared in the April 1959 issue of the National Jewish Monthly:

THE UNITED STATES AND ISRAEL HAVE COMMON ROOTS OF FREEDOM

(By Hon. Earl Warren, Chief Justice of the United States)

In Philadelphia's old Independence Hall, our Declaration of Independence was pro-

claimed 182 years ago over the signatures of patriots who preferred death to bondage. The United States of America was then the ugly duckling in the family of nations. But it was built upon principle by men who placed their reliance on the wisdom of the ages. It has prospered because it has adhered to simple truths and to the teachings of the scriptures.

The Liberty Bell bears the inscription "Proclaim liberty throughout the land to all the inhabitants thereof." It is appropriate to recall that these words were taken from the Hebrew writings Leviticus xxv: 10). Our Founding Fathers were conscious of their debt to the Hebrew tradition as the source of their own ideals. It was characteristic of Benjamin Franklin to suggest that the seal of the new Union should portray the people of Israel fleeing across the parted waters of the Red Sea on their way to a new life of independence.

The exodus was more than a revolt against physical servitude. It was a manifestation by ancient Israel that she was the guardian of spiritual ideas which could not flourish in the idolatrous despotism of the Pharaohs. These ideas were the freedom of the individual conscience—"Refuse the evil, and choose the good" (Isaiah vvi: 15); social justice—"Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" Leviticus xix: 18); and universal peace—"Nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither thall they learn war any more" (Isaiah ii: 4). The Hebrew people developed these ideals through prophecy and law into a moral system universal and eternal. On the foundations of this Judaeo-Christian tradition, the Fathers of the American Republic built the legal system and the political direction of the Union.

It is natural, therefore, that Americans should think of the land of Israel as the source of our law and ethics. When the restoration of Israel as a nation became an active international policy in the sequel to the First World War, the United States inevitably became associated with it. Today Israel is firmly established in the life and law of nations.

In the first year of her second decade Israel still faces many obstacles and dangers. Many of these she faces in common with the rest of us. But amidst her political and economic anxieties she will doubtless recall the undying ideas which she has carried across history. These ideas are not obsolete or outworn. Science has brought mankind to a crossroads from which the paths fork outward to vast alternatives of salvation or disaster. Only the humanities can solve the problems which the physical sciences have created.

This challenge faces every free nation today, none more so than ours. But the people of Israel illuminated these issues many generations ago. For thousands of years this people has been restlessly seeking an answer to the question of purpose in the mystery of nature and the journey of man. Restored to the conditions of her former glory, surrounded by the scenes and memories which her literature has immortalized, modern Israel may be facing a great destiny.

She had to fight for nationhood every inch of the way. Her precarious sovereignty, her small territory, her industries, her commerce, her access to the maritime waters, her very survival as a nation—all have been beset with difficulties, which to others would appear insuperable.

There was a sense of drama and an atmosphere of improvisation in everything about her rebirth as a nation. Independence was proclaimed in a little museum, too small and too bare for so solemn an occasion. The very furniture for the ceremony, ironically, was obtained from a ship stuck in Jaffa, out of a cargo consigned to, of all people, no less than Emir Abdullah, of Transjordan. The proclamation was not written on parchment for lack of material, but on a synthetic scroll still hot from a duplicating machine. It reached Ben-Gurion's hand a few minutes before the proclamation and only after a car was commandeered—there being no cab available.

An Israeli writer recalled that Sharett, the man who commandeered the car and brought the text to the museum, told the driver upon arrival: "You have a rare honor, I am holding the declaration of independence of the State of Israel in my hand." "Oh," said the driver nonchalantly, "I only stopped because I was driving without a license. I thought you were a cop."

Out of such grim drama and high comedy the independence of Israel was proclaimed, hours after the Palestine High Commission and the British had departed and a few hours before the massed Arab legions converged in the fateful attack on Israel.

The Israel declaration of independence is a veritable epitome of the historic struggle of a people inspired by a Messianic vision for their return. It recounts the tragedy and travail of their dispersions. But far from bringing hate and rancor to their hearts, it offered peace and amity to all people, especially to their Arab neighbors.

No longer shall we associate the Jew with the forlorn and wandering character with which he has been identified in ages past. The wandering Jew is no more. He has found his historic home at last. In this new home the Israelis, as technicians and farmers, have shown new capabilities, not only in extracting the best that the good earth could provide, but more, the capability to turn desert sands into flowering gardens, to carve modern cities from stony hills, and to build democracy where men could walk in dignity and freedom.

Men like Allyon, Yadin, Dayan, Josephtal, Eban, Shimon Perez, and hundreds of young, brilliant and dedicated people like them, with their elders like Ben-Gurion and Sharett, provide the motive force and spirit behind Israel's will to statehood. With men of this caliber to guide its destiny, the new State of Israel may well rise to great achievement. The promise in the Old Book is slowly but most assuredly on its way to fulfillment.

The Honorable Sol Blatt, a Great American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therewith an address by the Honorable Solomon Blatt, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of South Carolina, made to the 175th anniversary dinner of the Hebrew Benevolent Society of Charleston, S.C.

Mr. Speaker, you have compiled an enviable record as Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States. Like you, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Blatt has been the Speaker of the House of Representatives of South Carolina longer than anybody in the history of our illustrious State. Mr. Blatt is a Jew. He is the son of a Russian Jewish immigrant. Mr. Blatt is proud of the fact that he is a Jew. He proclaims his faith to the world. He spoke to one of the most outstanding organizations of South Carolina and he advised them well when he cautioned them to avoid the hypocrites who are leading the Negro on the treacherous path of deceit and deception. He cautions his people against these modern Pharisees who have no real interest in the welfare of the Negro; he reminded his entire audience, in which were many men of all faiths, that in South Carolina the Negro is one of the most highly respected citizens and one of the best prepared in mind, body and estate, and the most satisfied of our people.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this magnificent address to all Americans who are interested in the truth.

No occasion could give me greater pleasure than to participate in this, the 175th anniversary celebration of the Hebrew Benevolent Society.

The distinguished record of this organization, coupled with the whole history of the Jewish race in America's most historic city, makes me proud to be included among you.

Not the least of the pleasures I have experienced as a result of your kind invitation has been the delving back into history, the studies I have made of the records in Charleston, dating back to 1695 when the first Jews settled here.

Those were the days of the lord proprietors. Joseph Blake was Governor through one-half of 1695, being succeeded by John Archdale in August of that year. The culture of rice had just been started in the province, and the State was just beginning to be called South Carolina, instead of "the southwest portion of the Province of Carolina."

Many Indian tribes inhabited the State—some friendly, some hostile.

The last years of that century tested the courage of all inhabitants. There was an epidemic of smallpox, killing many settlers and Indians. The epidemic was followed by a great fire that destroyed about one-third of Charles Town, as the city was then called. There was an earthquake, a siege of yellow fever, and during the yellow fever plague a violent hurricane struck Charleston. The sea came in with a tidal wave which forced the people to take refuge in the second stories of their homes.

South Carolinians began to talk about leaving a country that seemed marked for ill-fortune, but few actually left and the development of the Province really took root about that time, with Jewish people as part of the pioneering inhabitants.

I have been impressed by reading Thomas J. Tobias's booklet on "Tombstones That Tell a Story," a history of the Coming Street Cemetery, the first burial place of Jews in Charleston.

I have read with great interest and enlightenment the book on the bicentennial celebration published by the Charleston Jewish Community in 1950, under the brilliant editorship of Mrs. Jeanette Pearlstine.

The preface in this book by Rabbi Allen Tarshish cited the fact that Francis Salvador of Charleston was the first Jew to hold an important elective office in the United States. He was a member of the First and Second Congresses of South Carolina in 1775 and 1776, and on August 1, 1776, he was the first Jew to die in the War for American Independence.

Having been somewhat of an officeholder myself, it was particularly interesting to recall that a Jew had served in the legislative halls in South Carolina nearly 200 years ago.

During the intervening years many more of our race have served with honor. At the present time, the Senator from Marlboro, the Honorable William C. Goldberg, is a highly respected man. One of the old timers in the House, Matthew Poliakoff of Spartanburg, is one of our most popular members.

I recall during my time in the legislature others of our faith including Julius B. Ness of Bamberg, and Isadore Bogoslow of Colleton, have served with us.

Mr. Ness is now a circuit Judge, and making an outstanding record as a South Carolina jurist.

We all know that many, many members of our faith have attained national acclaim for their talents in many fields of endeavor.

In the judiciary, we look with justifiable pride upon the records of Associate Justices Benjamin Nathan Cordozo and Louis Brandeis.

We are proud of such great figures in medicine as Jonas Edward Salk.

In business and finance, we in South Carolina revere the name of a native son, Bernard Baruch.

An outstanding figure in the development of atomic energy and now the Secretary of Commerce, we pay our respects to Adm. Lewis L. Strauss, who previously had distinguished himself in the Navy.

Another great naval man, Adm. Hyman Rickover, is recognized as the father of the atomic submarine, and is a national inspiration to those who see the imperative need for constructive changes in public education, especially on scientific subjects.

In music, no other man today stands above the distinguished conductor-composer Leonard Bernstein, whom many of us have enjoyed recently in national TV broadcasts.

In opera, Richard Tucker is one of the foremost contemporary singers.

In the lighter forms of entertainment, we point with pride to veteran performers Eddie Cantor, Jack Benny, George Jessel, and many others.

We have read of the contributions made by Solomon to President Washington in the American Revolution.

Down South we remember that Judah P. Benjamin was widely recognized as "the brains of the Confederacy," serving as both Attorney General and Secretary of State in the Confederate States.

We could go on and on calling the names of distinguished members of our faith, both in the past and in the present American scheme of things.

The Jewish citizens of Charleston have contributed much to the progress of this fine city and county. I could, if time permitted, call the names of many of our faith in Charleston who are good citizens and who have had a part in this progress. I want to pay public tribute tonight to one of South Carolina's most outstanding citizens. He is a gentleman of the highest character, a man of integrity and outstanding business ability. He is always thinking of how he can help his fellow man, whatever his faith. He is charitable and civic minded. I know of no finer citizen anywhere than Ed Kronsberg, and I am happy to call him my friend and publicly pay him this well-deserved tribute.

It is right and proper that we should take personal pride in the accomplishments of Jews throughout the history of this wonderful Nation. We should sing their praises at all times, but we must also be careful to remember that their greatness came, not because they were members of any particular faith, but from their merit as individuals. That is true of all outstanding men and women, no matter what their origin.

People become great because they are endowed by God, born with certain sparks, and because they take advantage of their talents, working against any and all odds to perfect and apply the good that is in them to the welfare of human beings everywhere.

Not all of us, of course, can be great and distinguished doctors, scientists, composers, or writers. Many of us simply do not have the mental and physical attributes; others simply fail, often due to unfortunate circumstances, to develop themselves to the fullest extent.

The important thing, however, is that all of us in this great free country have the fullest opportunity to become whatever we can make of ourselves, not because of any particular national or racial origin, but because of the dedicated contributions we are able to make to a freer, happier, healthier, and more prosperous Nation.

I dwell upon this particular theme for a definite reason. I have endeavored to show that from the early times in South Carolina and in the Nation the Jewish race has enjoyed the rights and privileges which comes from living in a free country.

I have singled out a few of the Jews who have become great national figures, and a few who have especially earned and received the honor and respect of the people of our own State. I did not pretend to call the whole roll, but simply wanted to illustrate, through the use of some names, the fact that, like members of all other races, we are recognized as individuals according to our worth and our performance.

There are dangerous inclinations among some of the Jewish people in America today, out of the goodness of their hearts, to establish themselves as a minority force in the tragically exaggerated storm of political propaganda which surrounds and confuses the Negro question in the South.

Let is be clearly understood that if there were indeed conditions anything similar to those which prevailed during the Hitler persecutions of Jews in Germany—if there were any such persecutions against any particular race in America, I think that all good Americans should and would rally to defend the oppressed, whomever they might be.

But let us examine the statutes of the Negro race in South Carolina. We all know about our own problems better than we do about the problems elsewhere in the Nation, and by the same token we know better about our own problems than do people who live elsewhere in the Nation.

The fact is that nowhere else on the face of the earth are Negroes happier, more prosperous, more contented, more a part of the general way of life than in South Carolina.

During the last 25 years especially, the Negroes have made tremendous strides in this State politically, economically, professionally, and otherwise.

Never before in any other part of the world has so much relative progress been made by the Negro race as has been enjoyed in the South during the present generation.

Where else in America are such a large proportion of Negroes actively participating as respected ministers, teachers, lawyers, doctors, businessmen, and citizens in general?

About 40 percent of the school teachers in South Carolina are Negroes, teaching school in the most modern buildings, receiving the same State aid salaries as white teachers in their classifications, and otherwise becoming more and more a large and constructive force in our way of life.

Where else in America, outside of the South, are Negroes able to afford to become such extensive and prosperous participants in all phases of life?

There are more Negro teachers in the schools of South Carolina today than there are in any five or six States combined, outside of the South—and in that respect this includes such States as New York, Michigan, California, and others where political propaganda is rampant, where the South is being used as a whipping boy for ambitious propagandists who have no genuine interest in the real progress of the Negro.

We know that in South Carolina the already excellent relations between the races have been so sound and friendly that all of the misrepresentations in national newspapers, magazines, and over television and radio have not so much as dented the good will existing down here.

That, to me, is the finest evidence available that our good relationships are based on proper understanding, proper treatment, a proper and rapid rate of progress, and a proper perspective for the future.

If our relationships were not based on strong and deep-rooted good will, we would be in a state of utter chaos because of the unwise, unfriendly, and generally deplorable and deliberate misrepresentations which have been heaped upon us.

Make no mistake about it—our racial relationships in the South have been put to the acid test, and we have not been found wanting.

Still another strong evidence is the fact that, as we have good reason to believe, the truly thoughtful and sincere people over the rest of the Nation are beginning to understand, despite the false and tragic curtain of propaganda, that the South does indeed live in a much more healthy and promising atmosphere of racial good will than any other section of the country.

We do not have in South Carolina the kind of gangs, and mobs, and misunderstanding, and social conflict, and teenage terrorism which prevails in States like New York, Pennsylvania, Michigan, and California—the very States from which have come the most abuse against the South.

So I say, that every race living in South Carolina has equal opportunity for happiness and progress, that the members of every race living in South Carolina have the wide open opportunity, as individuals, to prove themselves for what they are worth.

No group of people is entitled, as a group, to be given special treatment.

If I had to select the one outstanding element in this Nation's rise to becoming the greatest Nation in all the history of the world, I would say that the freedom of the individual to express himself and to gain recognition according to his worth ranks ahead of all other blessings and attributes.

No, my friends, the Negro race, nor any other race, is oppressed in the South Carolina way of life today, and I am a living example of the tolerance of the people of this great State.

People of all races in South Carolina can look forward with confidence to the future, knowing full well that if they have character, talents and abilities, and if they exert themselves intelligently and constructively, they will be recognized and appreciated.

The Jewish people who moved into the Carolina colony in 1695, moved wisely into an area where their descendants have become respected and responsible parts of the communities and States in which they live.

Members of the Jewish race have fought in all of the wars in which our people have been engaged.

Seven Charleston Jews who served in the American Revolution are buried in the Coming Street Cemetery.

Four veterans of the War of 1812 are to be found buried in this same cemetery.

More than 180 Charleston Jews served in the Confederate forces, of whom some 25 were killed.

Thousands of our faith served in World War I, World War II, and the Korean war.

Many of them died on the fields of battle, but their sacrifice was not in vain.

Quoting Mr. Tobias: "During the century prior to the fatal firing on Fort Sumter,

Charleston prospered from the thriving plantation economy it served, with a heritage of religious freedom from its founding. Charleston's Jews participated in their city's prosperity and shared in its culture, developing men who contributed to the community and left their mark in all walks of life.

"Such a man was Mordecai Cohen who died in 1848, but who had risen from a peddler to the second wealthiest man in South Carolina. He was noted for his civic leadership. His tombstone best summarizes the kind of man he was: 'He was a good citizen, an enterprising merchant, and one of the largest contributors to the improvement and revenue of this city. By his strict integrity, his just and charitable disposition, he won the confidence and esteem of the community.'"

Now, not all Jews have risen to become the second wealthiest men in South Carolina, but to me the story of Mordecai Cohen, on a lesser but equally as commendable basis, applies to literally thousands of Jews who have lived in Charleston and the rest of South Carolina since 1695.

My personal feelings toward Mr. Cohen are doubly sympathetic, because my own father came to South Carolina from Russia many years ago. Like Mr. Cohen, my father was a peddler, but because South Carolina is a wonderful State of opportunity, my father was able to overcome all handicaps and to become a substantial merchant in the town of Blackville in Barnwell County.

Many, many times, especially in recent years, I have thanked God that my parents did come to this country, and to South Carolina, escaping what was then a tragic plight in Russia, and what now—in a godless nation—would be far worse than any plight I can imagine.

Now let's talk about the subject I happen, through experience, to know best—the government of South Carolina.

Though, at times, public service seems to be a thankless job—especially when as at present we are faced with imposing new taxes for desirable public services, public service nonetheless is one of the most compensating experiences to which men and women can devote themselves.

Twenty-seven years ago, in 1932, I was elected to the House of Representatives from Barnwell County. Two years later I was elected Speaker pro tempore of the House without opposition, and then in January 1937, I was elected Speaker of the House over one opponent.

Except for 4 years, it has been my great honor to have served ever since as Speaker. It is my information that no other man has ever served so long in this capacity in this or any other State.

And so, as a Jew, and proud of it, I feel that I can speak from full experience when I emphasize again that there is no intolerance in public life in South Carolina.

In the beginning, I pointed out that no other generation has enjoyed more progress in South Carolina than has the generation of which most of here tonight are a part.

In 1933, South Carolina was in the throes of the great depression.

For a moment, let's pause to make several pertinent contrasts between then and now.

Listen to this: In 1932 the legislature had appropriated $9,500,000 for general purposes, and the highway department, whose funds were separately accounted, had received $9,900,000 in revenue, a grand total of $19,400,000 for all State purposes as compared with more than $200 million a year at this time.

We were concerned only with the $9,500,000 for general purposes, and the State had, mind you, a deficit of $9 million. We were running, therefore, almost exactly a year behind in finances. Our credit had been exhausted and we could not borrow a dime.

The Farmers' and Taxpayers' League met the new legislature with mass demonstrations on the statehouse steps, demanding that we cut 1933 appropriations in half. As a matter of fact, during the opening week the house, by a vote of 79 to 34 resolved to hold appropriations below the $5 million level. That was less for all purposes than the single item in our current appropriations of $6 million for the State hospital.

State aid to public schools had amounted to only $3,600,000 in 1932, but the budget commission, under pressure of the Farmers' and Taxpayers' League, was recommending just $2,042,000 for 1933. Think of that. Today for public schools alone the State appropriates more than $85 million a year.

Conditions were like that 27 years ago.

But we had weathered the depression, and in every year since, during war and peace, we have weathered problems, all of the time moving forward into eras of greater development.

The restoration of South Carolina most certainly has experienced its realization during the past quarter of a century.

We believe that South Carolina taxpayers get as much, if not more value received from tax dollars, than those of any other State of the Nation.

It has taken a tremendous amount of working together, and of putting first things first. The taxpayers demand services from the State Government and if these services are to be given the people, then they cannot and must not complain about the imposition of additional taxes to provide the demanded services.

What has been accomplished already, and what we have reason to believe will continue to be accomplished in the future, as a result of the solid foundations which have been laid, could not have been attained without the services of dedicated men and women in Government, without free and loyal citizenship in general, and without the contributions made through such essential services as improved public education, public health, and highways.

Probably in no other State has a better balance of Government and private enterprise been reached. Our progress has been rapid but sound and our accounts are being balanced without backbreaking taxes on anyone.

South Carolina, for a decade now, has been enormously conscious of the industrial development which has been enjoyed, bringing with it the blessings of payrolls, revenues for government, and money in circulation for all types of business and the professions. All over South Carolina, the additional money in circulation is reflected in new school buildings, highways, hospitals, and other desirable and necessary public institutions. These businesses and industries should and must be protected from those who would destroy them.

From an agricultural viewpoint, within a relatively short time, a considerable transition has occurred, complicating the general ecenomy of the State.

Agriculture will always be a major factor in our economy, but mechanization, irrigation, pest control, and artificial fertility have brought about extensive changes in the methods of farming. The result has been much larger yields, much better produce and wider diversification.

But, while these good things were taking place in agriculture, the other side was not nearly as bright—because the modern trends have resulted in declining employment. We get heavier production with fewer human hands.

In many counties of the State, no employment was available for thousands of people who could no longer find jobs on the farms. New industries have helped in many areas to fill this void, but still there are many counties, especially in the low-country, the midlands and the Pee Dee sections which do not have either new industry or enough existing industry to employ the people.

The future prosperity of South Carolina, especially in those areas without industry, unquestionably will depend upon the continued development of new industry and the expansion of existing industry.

Decisively important in the attraction of new industry is the constant improvement of governmental atmosphere, both statewide and in the counties and municipalities. We feel that excellent progress has been made already, but much remains to be done. We not only have conditions which need legislative adjustment and correction, but we must continually be alert to constructive new ideas.

Not only is more industry developing, but more and more of the larger industries are dispersing their operations, locating additional plants in various parts of the country. This is a healthy trend, both from the standpoint of bringing further balance to the whole economy of the Nation, and in the area of national defense. Where industry is too concentrated, an attack on this country might easily disrupt production unless plants are widely scattered throughout the Nation.

As industry shows a growing tendency to spread, the competition among States, particularly in the Southeast, has become more aggressive.

Your native son, the new Governor of South Carolina, our mutual friend Fritz Hollings, has clearly recognized the need of the State and the pulse of our citizens on the subject. Throughout his campaign and during the early months of his administration, he has placed major emphasis upon the subject.

First, however, it was necessary to solve the temporary financial deficits, and the Governor took hold and courageous action from the outset to assure a balanced budget. In all of my service in the State government, I have never seen a Governor act as forthrightly on financial problems. It would have been much easier for him to have passed the buck to the legislature, but he realized that if we were to get on with constructive economical development, we first had to put our financial house in in order.

Every citizen of South Carolina should applaud his willingness to place first things first so that the way would be cleared for greater progress.

Please remember this, that the current session of the legislature is not imposing new taxes for extravagance in Government. It simply is balancing the budget for the kind of government the people have demanded, and our financial crisis resulted from a slowing down of industrial development during the recent national recession, plus a 5-year drought in profits for our largest industrial resident, the textile industry.

If the textile industry had been enjoying just normal profits during the last 5 years, it would have been paying enough in income taxes and additional employment, with the benefit of extra payrolls, to have kept us on a balanced basis.

Our textile leaders tell us now that they have strong hopes for a return to reasonable profits within the near future. It this develops, then we will have considerably more revenue from existing taxes, and we will be able to do more for education, public health, and other humanitarian causes without additional and increased taxes facing us at every session.

Now, in my opinion, one of the prime reasons why South Carolina has boomed in recent years has been the whole-hearted spirit of good government. I do not believe that business, professional and other substantial citizens are yet exerting themselves enough,

but I do believe that the active interest they have shown in recent years in proper government has had a remarkably healthy influence upon those who try to perform public service.

I cannot urge you enough to extend even further your good citizenship. For too many years substantial citizens seemed to think that their responsibility as citizens was to complain about everything that happened in Government.

In the legislature, we have noticed in the last 5 or 10 years that business people especially are showing a more constructive interest in what goes on and a greater appreciation for the proper services of government. If you continue to do that, and if you acknowledge the good things about government, and if your criticism is sincere and intelligent, then we in government welcome your criticism.

All over South Carolina there has been a much better statewide acceptance of both blessings and responsibilities. No longer do we hear petty arguments of sectionalism. Charleston, perhaps more than any other community, should recognize this change in attitudes because there were times in our lifetime when other sections of the State looked upon Charleston with suspicion and jealousy.

What finer illustration could I use here tonight than to point the fact that both houses of the legislature voted for the $21 million ports' development program for Charleston, Georgetown, and Port Royal. I was proud and I know you were proud that one of the foremost leaders in this great development has been Milton Pearlstine. Enactments of the port's program demonstrates that insofar as economic development is concerned, fulfilling the advantages of one area is important to the whole State.

Let me thank you again from the bottom of my heart for this opportunity to be with you tonight. It is truly one of the highlights of my lifetime. I will never forget your kindness in inviting me and I assure you that everything I do, I will do as a South Carolinian, as one of your faith interested in the welfare of all of our people and I believe I will be a better man because of this experience. May God bless and keep you, each and every one.

Let's Get Tough About Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by John B. Hollister, former ICA Director, which appeared in a recent issue of the Saturday Evening Post. This article clearly indicates to me the very real need for a thorough reappraisal of our foreign aid program, especially with reference to the giveaway aspect of this program:

LET'S GET TOUGH ABOUT FOREIGN AID

(By John B. Hollister)

Once, during my early days as Director of the International Cooperation Administration—I served from July 1, 1955, to September 13, 1957—I was asked to assign about $1 million from our foreign-aid funds for the construction of a Buddhist temple in a certain Far Eastern country.

The request came from the head of my ICA mission in the beneficiary country and bore the enthusiastic endorsement of the U.S. Ambassador there. They pointed out that an important anniversary of the birth of Buddha was to be celebrated the following year and our gift of a shrine would win numerous friends for the United States among the deeply religious members of that sect in the Far East. I was, I confess, startled by this curious recommendation, but not too startled to disapprove the project promptly.

I recount this minor incident only because it illustrates, somewhat flamboyantly, a vital, fundamental difference of approach to our foreign-aid program which exists in the Congress and in the administration itself, including the staff of the State Department. This strong divergence doesn't involve the size of our effort, but rather the all-important question of how the money should be spent.

There is, of course, another basic dispute going on currently between extremists on the subject of foreign aid. One group protests violently that the nearly $4 billion requested for the mutual security program by the President in his budget message to Congress in January is completely inadequate and should be increased several times. The other group, which would abolish foreign aid entirely, objects just as violently to including the item in the budget at all.

Neither extremist position is likely to be effective in the present Congress. I don't believe the Congress will appropriate more money than our economy can safely afford, and there is no possibility of abandoning this work. The important problem, as I see it, is not the exact size of the program, but rather what should be the objective in our foreign-aid spending.

Let me make my own viewpoint clear: When, at President Eisenhower's request, I resigned as executive director of the Hoover Commission to become head of ICA, there was considerable criticism of my appointment in the liberal press and from some Members of Congress. The assumption was that I had taken over the work in order to do a hatchet job on the agency.

Later, when I defended the President's budget request before congresisonal committees, many of my old friends declared that I, a lifelong conservative Republican, three-term Congressman, and law partner of the late Senator Taft, had become a New Dealer.

Perhaps there was a certain justification for each of those opposing beliefs. Certainly I did my best to effect economies in ICA and to hold the program within strict limits. But I also realized that if we are to play the part in world politics into which, somewhat against our will, we have been thrust by the inexorable march of events, this expensive foreign-aid program must continue into the foreseeable future.

I had one guiding principle in my conduct of ICA affairs. Each proposed project had to be tested by a single standard: Will the spending of money for this purpose increase the security of the United States? In the use of taxpayers' money, my sole concern was, and is, the self-interest of this Nation.

In my meetings with leaders of countries which were receiving ICA funds, whether in Washington or on my extended travels, I was always perfectly frank in expressing the objectives of the United States in giving the aid. I made it clear that I was negotiating mutually advantageous security arrangements, not purveying gifts. I never noticed any shocked surprise from the generally realistic people with whom I dealt, although there was frequently disappointment because I insisted on this tough approach.

Our situation in Libya is an example of a mutually beneficial agreement. Libya, thought twice as large as Texas, has about 1 million people living along the fringe of the Mediterranean. Most of the country is desert. However, Wheelus Field, one of our largest air bases, is located near Tripoli; and the country, furthermore, acts as a buffer zone between Egypt and French north Africa. Libya is a desperately poor country, and her economy would collapse almost immediately without our financial shoring. Thus our money, which Libya badly needs, provides us with a dependable air base in north Africa, which we badly need.

There is, of course, powerful opposition in both Congress and the administration to this quid pro quo concept of ICA's purpose. One group, for example, is constantly attempting to divert an increasingly larger percentage of our foreign aid funds to the improvement of undeveloped parts of the world, regardless of our national interest. Because we are rich and powerful, the proponents of such a policy say, we should continue this program even if the cold war should come to an end. This is an entirely praiseworthy attitude of the majority of Americans in their private lives, but our administration, in my opinion, was not elected to act as agent for our philanthropies.

Among the allies of this philanthropic school of thought are many important public figures who would radically alter the present ratio of military and economic spending. Today, more than half of ICA's funds go for weapons and training for the armies of our NATO allies and friendly nations in the Middle East and Far East. Some Members of Congress and the administration would drastically cut this item of the budget.

A few days after the last ICA appropriation bill had been passed by Congress late last summer, eight leading and influential liberal Senators advocated this course in a long letter to the President. The essence of their argument is contained in part of one paragraph:

"It is in the political and economic realm that the concepts of freedom are now undergoing a universal trial * * * study has led us to the conclusion that the principal and most costly shortcoming of the mutual security program remains as it has been for some time—the failure to emphasize military aid less and to stress economic aid and technical assistance more."

Given a total appropriation of about $4 billion, which is about the maximum we should spend at present, this proposed shift of emphasis would seriously undercut the military strength of our allies and, by projection, of ourselves. Many countries have, at our behest, built up their armed forces far beyond the point where they can be supported without our help. To reduce sharply the various amounts they receive not only would shake their confidence in us but also would encourage the Communists to attempt further military adventures.

Admittedly, when the Soviet Union began using economic means to infiltrate the uncommitted nations of the Middle East and Far East, the problem of maintaining a clear-cut relationship between our security requirements and our spending became infinitely more complex. It is clearly self-interest to equip a willing but impoverished fellow soldier on the barricades. The amount and kind of help to give a neutral to keep him from being forced into the enemy's camp is a far knottier question.

An especially tough kind of realism is needed in this area of ICA's activities. The United States does have a real stake in keeping as many uncommitted nations as possible from being drawn into the Communist orbit through too much dependence upon Soviet aid. We cannot permit ourselves, however, to be lured into the fool's game of trying to outbid the Russians everywhere. That way lies bankruptcy.

The basic weakness in the position of both those who would make the ICA a global

philanthropic organization and those who would sacrifice military for economic aid is a lack of understanding of the real problems of economic development.

When the Marshall plan, or Economic Cooperation Administration, was started soon after World War II, we were faced with a partly devastated and completely exhausted Western Europe. Some of the European counties, in their weakened condition, were in danger of falling into the waiting arms of the Communists. Had this happened, our position in the world would have been seriously threatened. Therefore, the spending of our money to reestablish industrial Europe had a direct and obvious relationship to our own security. These were our allies, and they would be of considerably more value to us when they regained economic health.

This is not the place to discuss the unnecessary waste in the administration of the Marshall plan. We must admit that ECA played a large part in the quick recovery of Europe. Becauses of this, some Members of Congress and the administration believe that the same kind of precipitate and lavish spending would achieve comparable results in the Far East and Middle East. Understandably, political leaders in those parts of the world, who are anxious to industrialize their countries, endorse this reasoning.

In addition to the fact that the United States cannot again afford such a vast outpouring of its wealth, there is a major flaw in this concept. In Europe we were dealing with nations with excellent transportation and communications systems, skilled technicians, a huge reservoir of trained workers, sound tax laws, and stable governments. The rehabilitation of plants and adequate credit were all that was needed to revitalize industry.

The situation in the Middle East and Far East is vastly different. To begin with, there are hundreds of millions of people living in those parts of the world, and even our vast resources are inadequate to affect quickly the economic lot of such masses. But even more important, almost no nation in those parts of the world is, as yet, capable of absorbing massive doses of industrial development. There is no point in increasing production capacity faster than demand can be generated and technological skills can be learned. The road to economic health and success is uphill and arduous.

In a conversation in Vietnam not long ago, for example, I was discussing the many problems of that nation with the Minister of Finance. At one point in our talk he said earnestly, "What I really wish you could send us are a few clerks. Right now we need people who can do simple office work more than anything else."

He then went on to explain that the French colonial government had done almost nothing about educating the native population of Indochina and that, as a result, with the withdrawal of the French, there was only a handful of people in the entire country with even the equivalent of a high school education. "We have so few who can do even the routine tasks of running a government," he said.

Lack of education and technological experience is endemic in most of the Middle Eastern and Far Eastern nations which are receiving ICA assistance. Therefore, it becomes doubly important for us to scrutinize every proposal we receive in terms of its feasibility and economic advantage to the petitioning nation. A good banker will not make a plant expansion loan to a company merely because it wants to double production. He will insist on knowing something about the market for the company's products, the ability of the officers and the probabilities of profit from the new facilities. ICA should be no less thorough and analytical in handling taxpayers' money.

The present situation in India is a case in point. India is in the middle of a second 5-year plan, a highly ambitious effort with goals which seem unrealistic. About $1,500 million of foreign exchange will be needed to buy materials during the 5-year period.

Although we were not consulted about the plan in advance, a number of leading "liberals" in this country are demanding that the United States provide the necessary financing to make it a success. They don't ask whether or not the undertaking is sound. I concur in their desire to keep India a part of the free world, but I regard their advocacy of a massive plan of dubious worth as an advanced case of fiscal irresponsibility. Nor do they ask whether or not private capital could do a large part of the work if only the Indian Government would encourage such activity adequately.

In addition to selecting with care the projects it will support abroad, ICA also has a responsibility, both to this country and to the nation receiving the aid, to make certain that our aid money will not be lost through the incompetence or lack of experience of those who plan, build and operate the projects we finance.

Yugoslavia, for instance, tried for some time to secure financing from ICA for a fertilizer plant. This request precipitated a battle royal in our Administration. One group would give the money to Yugsolavia subject only to the provision that adequate engineering drawings were made. The other side, with which I was in hearty agreement, argued that a single, capable contractor should be employed to do the work under the supervision of a competent engineer and that arrangements be made for the training of operating personnel before we even embark on the project.

Naturally, the Yugoslav Minister concerned wanted complete authority over the project, and his supporters in this country said that he should not offend Yugoslav pride by imposing conditions. International amenities, however, must be sacrificed if they interfere with proper use and proper accounting of all our mutual security funds. By following this course, we may not be liked, but we will be respected for our money will not be wasted.

This is no isolated instance. Again and again we must deal with technologically undeveloped nations which, understandably enough, are fiercely nationalistic and keenly resentful of any reflection upon their abilities. Yet, if the United States is to use foreign aid properly—that is, to increase our own security—we can't permit this hypersensitivity to be a dominant factor in our decisions.

Occasionally we will lose a battle in the cold war because we will not yield to pressure. Colonel Nasser has taken Egypt at least to the periphery of the Soviet empire because we would not accede to his demands for arms and for Aswan Dam financing. Aside from the fact that giving substantial arms to Nasser would have been politically inadvisable, the two undertakings could not be supported simultaneously by the Egyptian economy. Had we acted upon the theories of the giveaway group in this country, we would not only have failed in our duty to our national self-interest but also have damaged the recipient as well.

The prmanent loss of Egypt to the free world would be serious, but Nasser's present disenchantment with his Russian partner indicates that the defection may prove to be only temporary. The Aswan High Dam is no closer to being built than it ever was. Perhaps Nasser's experience will show some of the other neutrals the truth of the adage, "He who sups with the devil must have a long spoon."

However, those who would convert ICA into an altruistic organization are not the only group which endangers the original purpose of our foreign aid program. Another influential body of opinion holds that more and more of our foreign aid money should be given to various United Nations agencies for distribution. We are already allotting about $75 million per year from our ICA funds to various international groups.

Again I must ask the basic question, "Would increasing our appropriation to these international organizations enhance the security of the United States?" My answer is "No." These agencies are controlled by secretariats appointed by the General Assembly of the U.N., where we have but one vote. This means that the expenditure of our money is controlled by nations which contribute negligible amounts and which, in many instances, are themselves beneficiaries of the spending.

In the United Nations technical program, for example, we contribute more than a third of the funds, and yet we have no more to say than any other nation. Not only is our contribution by far the largest but also our dollars can be spent anywhere in the world, whereas some of the other countries, including Russia, give only their own currencies, which usually can be spent only in the issuing nation. Thus, Soviet money hires only Soviet technicians to do U.N. work, whereas our money can be used to pay men from any part of the world.

In addition to following a hard line of self-interest in the use of foreign aid funds and strictly limiting the amount we give to international organizations, we should take definitive action to lighten the heavy burden on the U.S. taxpayer and, eventually, to obviate the need for the assistance program entirely.

One of the first steps we can take in this direction is to insist that we, as a Government, will do nothing which private enterprise can do as well or better. Next, ICA and the Development Loan Fund should sharply increase the amount of money now being spent to subsidize plant construction by American private enterprise in undeveloped countries. Third, we must convince these nations that it is to their advantage to welcome these investors and to adopt tax laws and operating regulations which will make it possible for both domestic and foreign capital to work efficiently and at a profit.

All of these objectives are more easily stated than realized. Many Government officials have come to expect the Federal Treasury to supply the solution for all of our problems. Private enterprise in the international field is viewed by many of the rank and file of the State Department with suspicion and often outright hostility as a complicating factor. Also, all too often the average U.S. ambassador, eager for the good will of the country to which he is accredited, is unwilling to fight for the cause of private capital. It is so much easier and more popular to offer a grant or loan from some U.S. agency.

The task of creating a favorable climate for our brand of free enterprise abroad does indeed present formidable difficulties, especially in the Far East. Few of the political leaders have a genuine understanding of our economic system, and the trend toward varying forms of state socialism is strong.

During a recent trip that I made to India, for example, the Finance Minister told me about some steel mills which his Government was building. The nation's future needs for steel, he said, had been determined in the current economic plan, but the private steel companies had refused to embark on an expansion program sufficient to produce the required tonnage. State-owned plants, he explained, were therefore necessary to supplement private production.

I asked him what would happen if the estimates in the plan proved to be too high. Would the Government mills close, so that private companies could continue to operate profitably, or would private organizations be forced out of business?

Neither, he said. A price would be fixed for steel, and production would be controlled, and state-owned and privately owned mills would both be able to make a profit. Such a statement is, of course, nonsense. As we know from our own experience in this country, the Government's invasion of any field of business forces out private industry. Government officials, good or bad, seldom recognize the actual cost of operating a state-owned business. Free enterprise can't compete.

Despite the major obstacles to be overcome both at home and abroad, the utilization of domestic and foreign private capital to relieve the U.S. taxpayer is far from a hopeless cause. Congress, in general, has been urging greater use of this powerful force in our aid program. An aroused and insistent public in this country can bring about the necessary change of bureaucratic attitude in Washington. Persuasion, practical demonstrations of the benefits to be derived from private capital and economic leverage exercised by our Government can effect a similar change abroad.

This is a comparatively long-range plan for lightening the burden on our Treasury. However, we could greatly increase our efficiency and effect enormous savings throughout the whole field immediately if we coordinated the present efforts of the numerous U.S. and international agencies which, along with ICA, affect the economies of foreign nations.

It is axiomatic that government is wasteful and inefficient. This condition is inevitable because there is no competition to require efficiency for survival. However, the manner in which we conduct our foreign economic activities seriously aggravates the situation.

Admittedly the size and complexity of the job of operating in some 60 countries should not be underestimated. Lines of communication are often inadequate. Limiting legislation, frequently unreasonable, complicates the problem. In many instances we are working with officials of newly developed countries who are hopelessly unequipped for their position and are often politically motivated or venal, or both.

Working under these handicaps, we obviously have a great need for unity of purpose and action. We should speak with one voice around the world. Unfortunately the tendency in Washington, both in the administration and Congress, is to fragmentize the aid program.

Let's take a cursory look at the financial jungle which has grown up in the last decade or so. Among the many agencies under international auspices, there is the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development—also known as the World Bank—which, with funds largely supplied by American investors, makes hard-money loans to other governments. Then there is the International Monetary Fund, to which the United States is by far the largest contributor, which makes short-term loans.

In this country we have the Export-Import Bank, which was started back in the depression to finance American foreign trade. The Bank has departed far from this field and is now engaged in budget support and balance-of-payment loans to foreign governments. The Development Loan Fund also makes loans, mostly in "soft" currencies—that is, not freely exchangeable—for long-term development projects, usually in neutral countries. The Fund was originally set up as an integral part of ICA, but now operates almost completely independently.

The Agriculture Department is also part of this tangled scene. Under the surplus commodity sales legislation, we sell to foreign countries, for soft currencies, those products which our agricultural price-support program requires us to buy from our farmers. Then we lend the proceeds of the sales abroad to those same countries for development purposes.

Our Defense Department also has a role. It plans military aid programs for various nations without adequate consideration of the continuing cost to the countries involved in supporting the arms efforts. The Defense Department also makes deals for bases in other countries which involve large expenditures by us and greatly affect the economies of these nations.

Remember that all of these organizations are in addition to ICA, which makes grants and loans, usually in soft currencies, for various types of assistance, chiefly the support of economies of countries with which we have military alliances.

Certainly we don't need any new agencies. We already have too many. Yet the President recently gave his support to the establishment of two new international lending organizations—the International Development Association and the Inter-American Development Bank. Also, there is constant pressure from "giveaway" groups to found various international development funds such as SPUR (Special Projects for Underdeveloped Regions) and SUNFED (Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development) plus additional regional lending institutions, all of them to be financed largely by the United States.

If we are to eradicate overlapping, duplication, waste, and inefficiency, a contraction—not an expansion—of our present structure of agencies must take place. First, the Development Loan Fund should either be abolished or be placed completely under the direction of ICA. In its present independent status, the Fund seriously weakens our overall control of lending.

Next, the Export-Import Bank should be restricted to its original purpose—financing American foreign trade. Our surplus-commodities-disposal program should be better controlled and more closely coordinated with our other activities abroad.

The most important step to be taken however, is the establishment of close-knit cooperation between all U.S. groups which affect our foreign aid program.

It is essential, of course, that the Secretary of State, acting for the President, should set the foreign policy of the United States. The Secretary, therefore, must have final authority over our foreign aid program. However, he is already doing the work of several men, and he has no time to oversee the day-to-day activities in order that we will speak with one voice.

This authority should be delegated to his Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, who should be a czar in this field with full power to act within the limits of existing legislation. Equally important, he should be a tough "no" man. Few U.S. Ambassadors ever think that the countries to which they are accredited receive enough money. No Regional Assistant Secretary of State is ever convinced that his area is getting its share of assistance. And, of course, there is the constant cry of "more," never "less," from each country on our foreign aid list.

If appropriations for the mutual security program are not to increase steadily and if we are to have an adequate reserve for new and pressing needs for aid which will inevitably arise, we must cut down on some of our existing programs and teach our friends abroad that our assistance is an emergency measure, not a continuing subsidy.

Foreign aid has been a tremendously expensive, but indispensable, weapon in maintaining the security of the United States. There are a few principles which will increase this security greatly. We must spend the money available for foreign aid for the safety of the United States without any giveaway aspects. The money should be spent by those with our interests at heart—and not by some international group. Funds should be allocated only where private capital, either local or foreign, cannot do the job under reasonable encouragement. Finally, the program should be closely coordinated with all other economic activities of the U.S. Government. Only by following these principles can the enormous drain on the American taxpayer be justified.

Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two items from the April 8 issue of the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette. The articles appear on the same page, side by side. One of them bears the headline "U.S. Jobless Drops Sharply," and the other item is entitled "Jobless Claims Up 10 Percent In West Virginia."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. JOBLESS DROPS SHARPLY

WASHINGTON.—Employment rose over one million in March while unemployment declined almost 400,000 in a substantial improvement in the Nation's job picture.

The changes were about double the normally expected springtime improvements. They reflected a sizable dent in the idle-worker problem that has been the only major bad spot in the Nation's recession recovery.

These are the exact new Government job figures, announced Tuesday:

Employment—63,828,000, up 1,106,000 from February. This is a 1,517,000 increase over March last year.

Unemployment—4,362,000, down 387,000 from February. This is 772,000 less than in March 1958.

The figures, also showing a rise in the available work force, followed rosy predictions by President Eisenhower and his Cabinet members that the new data would be gratifying to all Americans.

The March unemployment improvement was the best since 1950, the employment improvement the best since 1951.

Union leaders minimized the changes, saying they were chiefly seasonal and failed to provide any cause for celebration.

George Meany, AFL–CIO president, said that despite what he termed Eisenhower administration "ballyhoo" the idle total still is the highest for any month of March since World War II, except in last year's recession.

"There is no appreciable improvement in the overall picture," Meany said. "Certainly, well-staged propaganda announcements will not solve the problem or bring relief to the 4,362,000 unemployed workers and their families."

Meany said the AFL–CIO intends to make it clear at a rally here today, of more than 5,000 union leaders and idle workers, that unemployment is a problem of people.

rather than a mere statistic. The conference is intended to draw attention to the plight of the jobless.

Besides giving the new data a careful advance buildup, the administration unveiled them at an unusual news conference, held by Seymour Wolfbein, head of the Labor Department's Employment Statistics Division. In the past newsmen were simply handed printed releases containing the statistics.

Wolfbein displayed colored charts and used a pointer to maintain that the March figures represent a solid extra seasonal job recovery gain. But he frankly said there are serious job trouble spots in many major areas.

A hard core of 1½ million, or a third of the idle total, Wolfbein said, have been jobless 15 weeks or more. This group of long-term unemployed has not experienced much improvement, he said, underscoring "that we are by no means out of the woods."

Among nonwhite persons, mainly Negroes, there is 13 percent unemployment as contrasted to 5½ percent among whites.

The overall ratio of unemployment to the total work force declined from 6.1 percent in February to 5.8 percent in March.

A significant feature was that practically all of the nearly 400,000 drop in unemployment was concentrated among males 25 years or older, the group with heaviest family responsibility.

Factory-worker earnings rose during March to a record $88.62 a week, reflecting both more pay and longer hours. The workweek rose to 40.1 hours. Wolfbein said one third of all factory workers are earning more than $100 a week.

JOBLESS CLAIMS UP 10 PERCENT IN WEST VIRGINIA

Regular unemployment compensation claims increased 10.2 percent in West Virginia last week.

A report Tuesday from the Department of Employment Security showed regular claims totaled 23,689, an increase of 2,197 from the previous week. The total included 4,426 initial claims, up 1,582, and 19,263 continued claims, up 615.

By contrast, total claims were down slightly under the program of temporary unemployment compensation for jobless workers who have exhausted their eligibility under the regular program.

TUC claims totaled 4,431, down 157 from the previous week. The total included 524 new claims, down 176, and 3,957 continued claims, an increase of 19.

Poison in Your Water—No. 53

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Bisbee (Ariz.) Review on January 14, 1959, entitled "Flagstaff Has Sewage Trouble; Fear Epidemic."

FLAGSTAFF HAS SEWAGE TROUBLE; FEAR EPIDEMIC

FLAGSTAFF.—The Coconino County Health Department Tuesday said inadequate sewage disposal facilities in Flagstaff could touch off a serious epidemic.

In its annual report, the department said the sewage problem was a serious menace to Flagstaff and the unincorporated area of East Flagstaff.

The report—prepared by Dr. Lucy Sikorsky, department director, and W. E. Stanfill, chief sanitation officer—said that in one section of East Flagstaff more than 70 percent of the sewage systems were defective and many were overflowing.

Dr. Sikorsky and Stanfill also criticized garbage collections controls and the lack of building and zoning restrictions in East Flagstaff.

Meanwhile the city council approved a proposal for water and sewage expansion plans which will cost about $925,000.

The proposal calls for bond issues of $450,000 to improve the sewage system and $475,000 for water line improvements.

Final approval of the bond issues will be up to Flagstaff voters. The election date has not been set.

The county health department also recommended that East Flagstaff be annexed to the city as a step in the solution of the health problem. The unincorporated area, the department said, does not have the financial means to eliminate the sewage problem.

Annexation petitions now are in circulation in East Flagstaff.

A Bill To Amend Title II of the Social Security Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted from $1,200 to $1,800 yearly without deductions from benefits thereunder.

The purpose of this bill is to liberalize the allowance of earnings of old age beneficiaries without the loss of benefits. Under the present law, persons who are 72 years of age and older may earn any amount without having social security benefits reduced. Those persons under 72 years of age, however, may only earn a maximum of $1,200 per annum, without penalty. For each $80. or fraction thereof over $1,200 in yearly earned income, one month's benefit is lost.

I believe that our people after working and toiling through life should live out their final years in comfort and human dignity. In the past several years, the cost of living has risen higher and higher, thus reducing the purchasing power of the dollar. One group of our people most seriously affected by this inflationary spiral, has been our older citizens. The present limitation of $1,200 on earned income per annum is unjust and unfair. I am certain that all Americans are desirous that our senior citizens shall maintain and enjoy a decent and respectacle standard of living.

By increasing the income limitation from $1,200 to $1,800, as my bill proposes, a social injustice of the present law shall be corrected.

Improved Relations Among the American States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a resolution adopted by the Foreign Trade Council of the Worcester Chamber of Commerce relative to actions which it believes should be taken to improve our relations with Latin American countries. Events in recent years make clear that there is room for much more resolute attention to be given by the United States to our relationships in Latin America. The suggestions for action in the resolution merit careful consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION TO ENCOURAGE ACTION TO BE TAKEN BY WASHINGTON TO IMPROVE RELATIONS AMONG THE AMERICAN STATES

Whereas the Foreign Trade Council of the Worcester Chamber of Commerce believes that the economic stability of the other American States is essential to the economy of the Western Hemisphere; and

Whereas the council believes that expansion of their trade and the development of their human and material resources will enable these countries to strengthen their agriculture, industry, health, and education, and thereby gain to each one a fuller share of the products of man; and

Whereas the council believes that fulfillment of these endeavors and the free communication and trade with all of the American States will result in greater hemispheric strength, solidarity, and mutuality; and

Whereas Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower has prepared and submitted to the President of the United States a report on January 4, 1959, containing findings and recommendations designed to achieve these purposes: Therefore, be it

Aesolved, That the board of directors of the Worcester Chamber of Commerce, finding the Eisenhower report to be in its opinion a sound and progressive step in the achievement of these objectives, authorizes the foreign trade council to communicate its hearty endorsement of the report to the President of the United States, and the Massachusetts Representatives in Congress, with its recommendation that the steps proposed by this report be implemented without delay. Particular emphasis should be placed on the following proposals:

1. To develop a commission under the auspices of the Organization of American States to promote better mutual understanding by their respective peoples.

2. To take steps to improve public and private credit of the American States by helping each nation to encourage private investment and tourism, plan projects through the U.S. International Cooperation Administration, the Inter-American Regional Development Institute, and to work out loan arrangements to be repaid in dollars and local currencies.

3. To take steps to render technical and financial assistance in order to improve sanitation facilities and to confer with each na-

tion on the monetary and fiscal measures to be taken to provide these necessary funds.

4. To encourage the proposal to create a regional common market in the five Central American nations and the extension of the proposal to all the American States including the United States.

5. To join groups from the other American States on an equal basis to study ways and means of stabilizing hemispheric prices of basic commodities.

6. To increase the technical assistance programs and to put such programs under the direct supervision of the U.S. Ambassadors, with the Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs being given authority to coordinate these technical cooperation programs with the diplomatic, social, cultural, and related activities within his jurisdiction.

7. To set up a council on inter-American affairs to advise the Secretary of State on all matters of hemispheric importance. This council is to be made up of representatives from the executive department, the Congress, business and cultural life within the United States.

8. To set up within the Organization of American States, an information agency to be directly responsible for keeping the peoples of the country members fully advised on the implementation of this program and its immediate effects. The functions of this agency shall be totally unrestricted to facilitate the dissemination of its reports through the free press of the Western Hemisphere; it shall be further

Resolved, That the steps here set forth shall be considered in conjunction with other agencies national or international, so that a unanimity of effort of all the American States can be realized.

The Supreme Court and Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the editorial entitled "The Supreme Court and Women," by the noted columnist, David Lawrence. This editorial was published in the Washington Evening Star of Wednesday, April 8, 1959.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SUPREME COURT AND WOMEN—RULING FOR SEGREGATION OF MEN OR WOMEN IS COMPARED TO INTEGRATION DECISION

(By David Lawrence)

Segregation of men or women in schools controlled by State authority has just been upheld, in effect, by the Supreme Court of the United States. Two white women were denied enrollment in an all-male State college in Texas.

This ruling would not have occasioned any surprise 5 years ago, because the States previously were allowed to use their own discretion in deciding what pupils should be admitted to public educational institutions.

But in view of the fact that the Supreme Court, in 1954, said that discrimination on account of race or color could produce a feeling of inferiority and that mixed classes are beneficial from an educational standpoint, the query now is whether women haven't just as much right to use that argument with respect to discrimination against them because of sex. In fact, in appealing the current case to the Supreme Court, the two women cited the 1954 decision and argued that a woman is a person just as much as is a Negro. They pointed out that the 14th amendment says "All persons born or naturalized in the United States" are citizens.

"Are Women People?" was the heading of a weekly column by the late Alice Duer Miller, famous novelist, more than 40 years ago in what was then the New York Tribune. The question was finally answered by the adoption in 1920 of the 19th amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which declares:

"The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex."

Many of us true liberals—or progressives, as we were known in those days—had not thought an amendment was necessary because the 14th amendment had already forbidden the States to deny the equal protection of the laws and had said the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States cannot be abridged by any State. Certainly women were entitled to be classified as citizens.

But, since neither voting nor sex nor color nor education was mentioned in the 14th amendment, the Supreme Court of the United States by its decisions indicated that these subjects would have to be treated separately in other amendments. In fact, the 15th amendment—which declares that voting rights shall not be denied or abridged on account of race or color—was adopted a year later than the 14th because it was desired by Congress to make clear that voting rights, usually prescribed by the States, should not be abridged because of race or color.

So, inasmuch as there was no tendency in those days to rely on the Supreme Court to amend the Constitution to give women the equal protection of the laws in respect to voting rights, even though they are citizens, many of us enthusiastically supported the adoption of the 19th amendment that would at last—as we thought—put women on a basis of equality with men.

But the Supreme Court this week has dashed our hopes once more. Evidently, because discrimination in educational institutitutions of a public character by reason of sex was not mentioned in the 14th amendment, it will be necessary to seek a new amendment that will forbid the exclusion of any female citizens from such schools.

It is, to be sure, the principle of the thing which is bothersome. Many women prefer to go to separate schools—in fact, some believe their opportunities for an education are much better when what they consider the lower intelligence quotient of the male sex is not present in the classroom. But even those women who may feel that way about their superiority will not relish any court ruling which says, in effect, that they can be barred by law from associating in the schoolroom with members of the opposite sex. They have never believed that any physical characteristic should diminish their rights as citizens.

There may be some men, too, who will object to the discrimination and who would prefer desegregation of the sexes. But the Supreme Court has spoken, and its decisions and rulings must be obeyed, for they are the law of the land. These are days, moreover, when the Supreme Court as an institution must not be undermined. Indeed, there have recently been outcries that the rulings of the highest Court must not even be subjected to severe criticism.

So the alternative is to abide by the ruling and try for a constitutional amendment which will give women the equality they had long thought they already possessed as citizens. But they must be careful not to agitate too vigorously, lest they be charged with massive resistance.

How Will You Meet Sickness After 65?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Washington Evening Star on April 9, 1959, "Golden Years" subtitled "How Will You Meet Sickness After 65?" by Thomas Collins. A similar article appeared in the Detroit (Mich.) Free Press on April 5, 1959.

That article sets forth one of the grave problems of our older citizens, the cost of adequate health protection, hospitalization, doctor, and surgical care, and medicine.

These are the people who have the lowest income, the highest incidence of medical care, of any age group in our country except for the very young.

This problem of poor, hungry old folks eking out their lives in poverty, hunger, and misfortune without adequate medical care and even bare necessities must be approached vigorously.

This article sets forth some incontrovertible reasons why Congress must enact legislation providing adequate health insurance for our old people along the lines of the bill authored by our distinguished friend and colleague, the Honorable Aime Forand, H.R. 4700.

THE GOLDEN YEARS—HOW WILL YOU MEET SICKNESS AFTER 65?

(By Thomas Collins)

"My wife and I retired in 1952," he said, "and our income was something over $1,750 a year.

"We got along fairly well. I was still able to do some work that brought income. We owned our home and were able to keep it in repair. We owned a car.

"Then, after a few years, I developed a chronic illness. This required doctoring, hospital and surgical bills and no small amount of medicine.

"The situation has continued, and I am now 72 years old. We are spending $75 a month for medicines and doctor bills. Many of the medicines are outrageously high priced. I make four or five trips to the doctor each month, at around $5 to $10 a trip.

"So far we are making out, by the hardest effort. Have you anything to offer in the way of bettering such a hopeless outlook as ours?"

ONE AFTER ANOTHER

Thus, they come, one after another, seeking escape from the medical quicksand that has trapped them after retirement. And

with them come those who are well padded and not yet trapped:

"I will retire later this year, I have about $37,000 in good investments and from them get nearly $1,600 a year. In addition, I will have a total retirement income of $2,700 a year. This aggregate of $4,300 would be fine.

"If both my wife and I can escape the grave illnesses we can do all right. Arthritis, funny stomach, even a little heart trouble wouldn't be disastrous. But if either of us gets cancer or has a stroke that produces mental or physical disability, we could be ruined. Our $37,000 could be wiped out by doctor and hospital bills. Our remaining $2,700 a year could be so mortgaged to pay medical expenses that we would go to our grave as paupers.

"And there is no defense against this. Absolutely no way to know you won't wake up in the morning with cancer.

"This is not begging trouble . . . just look around at the people past 60 who get the bankruptcy diseases."

Some Members of Congress are trying to enact various forms of Federal health insurance for older people. Others in Congress and some labor unions are urging some form of socialized medicine for them. The American Medical Association is taking steps to provide medical care for the aged. Some insurance companies are seeking to meet the problem with health insurance that retired people can afford.

POOR GO HUNGRY

Still, the poor go hungry to pay $75 a month for medical help. And people with $37,000 grow old scared.

It's difficult to understand.

We will pay a farmer money to take care of his corn and wheat. We will pay huge sums to foreign people to maintain them as allies in case we go to war. We will enact laws to provide a minimum wage a worker must be paid, and maximum hours he can be made to work.

Yet once a person retires at age 65 we do not make the effort or pay the money to see that he or she stays alive to enjoy this American bounty. Before 65 there is workman's compensation, company health insurance, a salary and, with youth, a fighting chance to whip disease. After 65 there is little but praying.

You can get angry about this. You can also break out in a cold sweat if you think about it too much. What to do? Get the name of your Congressman and write him what you think. If enough of you write, something will be done by somebody.

Past, Present, and Future Convene for the Oregon Centennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, Oregon's 100th birthday celebration means a great deal to its residents and to the companies which serve Oregonians. Under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the April 1959 issue of Mainliner, a magazine for United Air Lines guests.

The article was brought to my attention earlier this month by Mr. Robert M. Ruddick, vice president and assistant to the president of the company. Mr. Ruddick tells me that over 500,000 people read the Mainline magazine each month. Oregonians hope each of them hurry out to Oregon to take part in centennial festivities.

I should add that this month's magazine carries a full color cover picture of Oregon's Mount Hood taken by Ray Atkeson.

PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURE CONVENE FOR THE OREGON CENTENNIAL

In 1843, some 900 men, women, and children loaded their hopes and worldly possessions in cloth-covered wagons and headed west from Independence, Mo. With them they brought a volatile mixture of religious zeal, desperation, vision and greed.

For nearly 5 months the wagon train creaked its dusty way westward, up the Missouri Valley, along the Platte River, through the Rockies at South Pass to the Columbia River, down which they floated to the fertile Willamette Valley of Oregon.

Their arrival increased the American population of the Oregon Territory to nearly 1,100 and established the Oregon Trail as the route to a new land of springy green turf and gentle winds, of soaring mountains—and opportunity.

The land beyond the mountains lived up to its billing, and soon the Oregon Trail echoed to the cry of a hundred wagon drivers and the rumble of wooden wheels. By 1859, there were some 50,000 Americans in Oregon, and on February 14 of that year Oregon became the 33d American State.

Time replaced the deep wheel ruts of the Oregon trail with steel rails, then with concrete highways. Ultimately smooth airways followed the historic westward course, reducing the grueling 5-month trip to a smooth flight of a few hours. This summer, over this historic pathway and a hundred more recent routes, thousands will trek to Oregon for the celebration of its 100th birthday.

Not since the San Francisco World's Fair of 1939 has the West known such an event as the Oregon Centennial Exposition, which will offer its varied wonders for 100 summer days beginning June 10.

Eight miles from Portland, where U.S. 99 crosses the Columbia River, a 65-acre fairgrounds is abuilding, dominated by a sweeping 11-acre central exposition building—the largest one-level exposition structure in the Nation. Exhibits will encompass every phase of trade and industry—domestic and foreign. Special areas will dramatize products and arts for which the State is justly famous—lumber products, paper, farm produce, electronics, power, food processing and fishing, to name but a few.

History, which Oregon has in romantic profusion, will be served with reproductions of Lewis and Clark's Village, a frontier town, a pioneer logging camp, covered wagon camps, stagecoach rides and pony express riders. Entertainment will include water sports, fairyland amusement park and dozens of special events throughout the summer. Scenery, that significant commodity which cannot be exported, will lie as usual all about the State, augmented by special landscaping and floral displays for the centennial season.

The first 2 weeks of the exposition, June 10 through 24, will include an international trade fair, displaying the wares of 35 foreign nations. It will be the largest event of its kind ever held west of the Rockies and the largest in the Nation since 1950. Only buyers will be admitted to merchandise exhibits during the morning, but the public is invited to inspect the displays during the afternoon.

From the blooming of the rhododendrons in June to the pear harvest in September, the centennial fair will present appealing spectacle for visitors young and old. It will epitomize the State at its centennial milestone, juxtaposing the lore of a vibrant past, the achievements of the present, the industrial promise of the future and the eternal grandeur of one of America's most beautiful States.

Possible Solution to Our Farm Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the text of the following letter I recently received from a farmer of my State of Michigan in which he presents an interesting plan and possible solution to our present farm problem.

MARCH 22, 1959.

Congressman BENTLEY,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This letter to you is confidential as far as my name and address is concerned.

I am not looking for publicity but I would like to give my views on what I believe would be the quickest, best, and cheapest way to get out of the mess we are in regarding our farm program. For 3 years I have been trying to get the bushel allotment plan before the taxpayers of America but on account of fear of antagonizing the interests who are making financial gain out of the acreage program, I have seen slow progress even though Secretary Benson stated to a reporter for a national farm magazine last year that we may be forced to the B.A. plan, but he hasn't got the intestinal fortitude to take the problem to the American taxpayer. The pressure apparently from other interests is greater than the farmer pressure because very few farmers have heard what the real bushel allotment plan is.

I am writing to you because Chas. Figy of the USDA sent me a copy of H.R. 3275 which you introduced. I would like to see you introduce a bill including the provisions I will set down here.

Instead of acreage allotments I would use bushel allotments as you have indicated in H.R. 3275.

The Secretary of Agriculture would determine the number of bushels of wheat needed in 1960 for consumption. He would use the number of bushels of wheat sold by each grower in 1958 or an average of 1958, 1957, 1956 sales to determine a base quota for each grower. The total of all sales would be compared with the estimated total of needs for 1961. If the total of sales for 1958 was greater than the need for 1960 (no doubt they were) then if the sales were 20 percent greater than the need for 1960 each grower base allotment would be scaled down 20 percent.

This method should be very equitable. If the Secretary wished to leave room for new growers or wished to reduce the surplus faster he could cut more than 20 percent.

The B.A. plan would be easily enforced by giving each grower a marketing card showing how many bushels he could sell or put under loan and space would be provided so each sale would show date sold, number of bushels sold and signed by purchaser.

There might of necessity have to be some changes made but the above is my idea of how the B.A. plan would be set up. I do not believe the B.A. plan would be needed over 2 years. By that time I believe all the surplus would be disposed of and changes could be made to suit the circumstances at that time.

Here is what it would do for the farmer.

It would allow him to plant as many acres as he wished. It would allow him to use the wheat in any way he wished except sell or otherwise dispose of it.

It would allow him to grow enough wheat in a year to fill his marketing quota for 2 years.

The reason for the latter is because almost every farmer has some fields that are better suited for wheat than other fields and some seasons conditions are such that he cannot plant these better fields to wheat, and perhaps the next year the opposite is true.

Most farmers will always try to produce enough wheat to meet their marketing quota so he might have more produced than what his quota is and if so it would constitute a reserve supply. This reserve supply would be a wonderful thing in case of famine or war but would not be great enough to depress the market, the same as the surplus has done since 1958 harvest and would not cost the Government one cent for storage.

A support price and a loan could be retained from the present acreage allotment plan.

The soil bank plan could be eliminated or not. Personally I would eliminate it because it is costing a lot of money, is no good to the better class of farmers because few of them put good land in the soil bank and is allowing weeds and quack grass, etc. to take over much of our land.

The person that puts the land in the soil bank mostly is someone that owns some land and has an outside job and does little or no farming. With his land in the soil bank he draws enough to pay his taxes and his neighbors all get free weed seed. Most of this land will be so thoroughly overrun with quack grass in 5 years that it will cost as much to get rid of the quack grass as the owner received in soil bank payments so the owner has not benefited, although his taxes helped to make all the soil bank payments.

Millions of dollars could be saved through curtailment of the expenses in county A.S.C. offices.

Under the present plan fields have to be ground measured, farm maps made by township reporters, acreage determined by aerial photographs, etc. If you wish to determine this cost you have only to contact the A.S.C. office in your county, and also contact some of the fieldmen in each township. I guarantee you will be surprised, if you contact 2 or 3 of these township fieldmen and find out what their work is and what the costs are. I believe you will find the manager of the county A.S.C. office draws $5,400 per year. (The one in our county does.) The supervisors, the office staff, and the township fieldmen about $15.00 per 8 hour day. Please let me hear from you.

Why Minnesota Opposes a Sales Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY W. WIER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the very fine editorial appearing in the weekly newspaper, Circulating Pines, published in Circle Pines, Minn., a town in my congressional district, and which services northwest Ramsey County and southeast Anoka County.

This editorial gives constructive arguments against a sales tax for the fair State of Minnesota and is well worth the attention of my colleagues.

The editorial follows:

WHY WE OPPOSE A SALES TAX

All of the high powered propaganda for the sales tax is being released upon the citizens of Minnesota through the big cities daily and conservative weekly newspapers of Minnesota. It reminds us so much of the "slick" campaign in Illinois waged for this same tax. Then, we were in the midst of the great depression of the 1930's. Then, the tax was to be used only to provide funds for the relief of the needy. Then, it provided for the exemption of food, clothing and basic necessities and the rate was only 1 percent. But once the principle of a sales tax was accepted, the exemptions vanished, the rate rose to 3 percent, and the purpose for which the tax was collected was changed.

The same thing will happen in Minnesota. The credits that are being proposed, the exemptions that are suggested, be they food, clothing, feed, seed and fertilizer or whatever you choose, the lure of eliminating personal property taxes are all offered as sugar coating for a bad pill—the sales tax.

The sales tax is bad because it is a tax proposed by the greedy at the expense of the needy. Let's take a couple of examples to show what we mean. Studies have shown that a family of four having an income of $3,000 spends 82 percent of their income on sales taxable items. Their tax bill would be $73.80 or almost 2½ percent of their income in a state with 3 percent sales tax. The same study showed that a family of four with an income of $15,000 would pay only $171 in sales tax or a little more than 1 percent of their income. This family spends only 38 percent of its income on sales taxable items. But the percentage paid in taxes is just the opposite of the established principle under income tax—from each according to his ability to pay.

The sales tax is sneaky. It deprives you of a penny at a time without ever giving an accounting of the total amount paid. With real estate, personal property or income taxes you see in black and white what your total tax bill amounts to. And if you don't like it as a free American you can start to do something about it. And that's what makes for a healthy democracy.

The sales tax is bad because it is shifting to the individual the burden of taxes now being carried by businesses and corporations. Why should businesses want exemption from personal property taxes since we all include the tax as a cost of doing business.

But reduction or elimination of the personal property tax is only bait being used by the proponents of the sales tax. Two years ago Governor Freeman proposed elimination of the personal property tax for Minnesota firms doing business out of State in competition with corporations from other States who paid no personal property tax. This proposal was not passed by the conservative senate.

The argument is offered against withholding the income tax that it makes every businessman a tax collector. The sales tax makes every businessman a tax collector on every business transaction.

No matter how we analyze the sales tax we always come up with the same answer—the sales tax is unfair, expensive to the family of small or moderate income, a windfall for the big corporation, and a nuisance to the small businessman and Mr. Average Citizen of Minnesota. We are against the sales tax.

Reds Now Travel on Their Subversive Errands—by Supreme Court Decree

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the April 4 issue of the Saturday Evening Post:

REDS NOW TRAVEL ON THEIR SUBVERSIVE ERRANDS—BY SUPREME COURT DECREE

During the convention of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in February, Dictator Khrushchev flung insults and threats at the United States. Marshal Malinovsky, the War Minister, also threatened the United States, bragging that the Kremlin's missiles can strike precisely any point in this country.

At that same convention in Moscow, was an American citizen who himself made a lying, anti-American speech. He was James E. Jackson, representing the Communist Party of the United States.

How did Jackson get there? He got there openly and legally. And so did other U.S. Communist leaders who went to Moscow at the same time. These characters were present because the Supreme Court ruled last June that the Secretary of State had no right to withhold passports from members of the Communist Party.

Jackson had been convicted by a jury in a Federal court as a conspirator against the United States. But last August the court of appeals reversed the conviction, on the ground that the Supreme Court in a similar case had freed several convicted California Red leaders. Thus Jackson was saved from prison.

Meanwhile, the Supreme Court had issued its decision that Communists must not be denied passports. President Eisenhower quickly sent a special message to Congress, urging legislation authorizing the Secretary of State to withhold passports from supporters of communism. The bill was passed in the House, but when it came to the Senate it got tied up in the jam of legislation just before adjournment. So the Communist Party was free to send Jackson to represent it at the convention of the Soviet Communist Party.

Also present in Moscow was the best-known member of the Communist Party U.S.A., Paul Robeson. He, too, had received a passport after the Supreme Court decision. And who should show up in Moscow, almost immediately after Jackson, but Harry Bridges, president of the Communist-controlled International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union? Years ago a split decision of the Supreme Court saved this Australian-born citizen from deportation.

A few days earlier, Khrushchev received Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois, 91-year-old scholar, former professor and intellectual leader of the pro-Kremlin forces among Negroes in the United States. Both Du Bois and his wife were identified long ago as members of the Communist Party. Although not a member now, he makes no secret of his devotion to the Soviet regime. For years his efforts to get a passport failed. Then came the Supreme Court decision—and Du Bois was free to go to Moscow. From Moscow, Du Bois and his wife flew to Peking, defying the State Department regulation that U.S. passports are not valid for travel to Red China.

Another U.S. citizen in Moscow was George Morris, labor editor of the Communist Party's misnamed paper. The Worker, and member of the Communist Party's Labor Commission. After months of delay, the State Department had unwillingly given him a passport.

Meanwhile, Dr. Alpheus Hunton, another identified Communist Party member, had gone to Africa. Hunton used to be director of the Council on African Affairs, which Attorney General Brownell called a Communist front.

The State Department has been forced to grant passports to scores of important Communists and fellow-travelers. The Department even felt obliged to give passports to a precious pair one of whom on a previous trip abroad made speeches charging the United States with germ warfare. Who can check on what harm such people do to the United States abroad? Congress should adopt the bill which President Eisenhower urged last summer, unmistakably authorizing the State Department to deny passports to Communists and their willing instruments, and to cancel every passport now in such hands.

Resolution Passed by New Jersey General Assembly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include herein the following resolution which was sponsored by my good friends from the New Jersey General Assembly, William V. Musto and Frederick H. Hauser. The resolution which was adopted March 23, 1959, points up the need for consideration of the problem of immigration in order to bring about the reunification of families. My bill, H.R. 4404, is aimed in that direction. I hope that the Congress will soon take action in this area.

AN ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE MEMBERS OF CONGRESS ELECTED FROM NEW JERSEY TO SEEK LEGISLATION TO ALLEVIATE AN IMMIGRATION PROBLEM

Whereas there are many Americans who have filed petitions with the immigration authorities of the United States for the entry of their sons, daughters, brothers, and sisters, which petitions are classified in the fourth preference quota of the Immigration and Nationality Act; and

Whereas of the four preference quotas established by the Federal Immigration and Nationality Act, the first, second, and third quotas are allotted 100 percent and thereby exhaust total annual entry quotas; and

Whereas as a result, those persons who fall within the fourth preference section must depend for entry into this country upon deficiencies in the first three quotas; and

Whereas there is frustration and despair resulting from the law that gives hope to Americans by permitting them to file petitions, getting them approved, and then compelling them to wait for their kin who may never be permitted to come; and

Whereas thousands of discontented people abroad, whose hopes are first raised and then dashed, certainly cannot believe in the good will we try to engender through our foreign policy, and thus become easy prey to the propaganda of unfriendly nations; and

Whereas in the past Congress has recognized and alleviated a similar problem through Public Law 85-316, which includes a provision for reuniting spouses and minor children of aliens legally residing in this country whose petitions were approved prior to July 1, 1957: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey, That:

1. The members of the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey respectfully request the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States to amend the provisions of Public Law 85-316 to include cases which fall within the fourth preference quota, in order to provide for entry into the United States of the many thousands, petitions for whom have piled up in a backlog in prior years.

2. In order not to create another problem of separated families, those approved applicants who are married and have families be permitted to bring them with them.

3. An authenticated copy of this resolution be forwarded by the clerk of the General Assembly to each Congressman and U.S. Senator elected from the State of New Jersey.

Statement by Msgr. Bela Varga, Chairman of the Hungarian Committee, in Connection With the Forthcoming International Negotiations on Berlin and the Related Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Msgr. Bela Varga, chairman of the Hungarian Committee and former President of the Hungarian Parliament—1946-47—in connection with the forthcoming international negotiations on Berlin and the related problems.

This statement was submitted to me by Mr. Ferenc Nagy, former Prime Minister of Hungary in 1946 and 1947:

STATEMENT BY MSGR. BELA VARGA, CHAIRMAN OF THE HUNGARIAN COMMITTEE, IN CONNECTION WITH THE FORTHCOMING INTERNATIONAL NEGOTIATIONS ON BERLIN AND THE RELATED PROBLEMS

As the chairman of the Hungarian Committee, a national representation for a free Hungary, which includes postwar democratic politicians and the representatives of the 1956 revolution and freedom fight, I am deeply concerned about the proposal of the Soviet Prime Minister, N. Khrushchev, as conveyed by Prime Minister Harold Macmillan, that he will agree to a new arrangement for Berlin if he can extract some concession bolstering the position of the East European satellites.

Furthermore, I am deeply disturbed by the recent offer of Khrushchev to sign a nonaggression pact between the NATO and Warsaw Pact powers.

What would this mean?

A new arrangement for Berlin at the cost of the freedom of the East European peoples? Certainly, it would be the dirtiest deal in history abandoning a hundred million people, among them the brave Hungarians who fought so gallantly for their freedom and independence.

The Hungarian Revolution proved that the Soviets could not consolidate their hold and the Communist rule over our country without the deployment of Soviet troops. Since their brutal crushing of the freedom fight all the combined Soviet and Communist puppet efforts have failed to win over the Hungarian people to their side. Hungary still remains an unsolved problem for Moscow.

Mixing generosity and terror, the Soviets offered financial and technical aid after the revolution. Soviet political and cultural delegations continuously visit Hungary to indoctrinate the people. Prime Minister Khrushchev himself agitated among the Hungarians in 1958; but parallel to this wooing, special courts were established for the punishment of those who dared to revolt, meting out death sentences by the hundreds to be carried out immediately, sentencing thousands of brave freedom fighters who raised their voices and arms in defense of their country's freedom and independence.

We are reliably informed that terror is still the order of the day in Hungary. There is presently a centrally organized and directed campaign to undermine religion and to promote atheism. All Roman Catholic bishops and the theological seminaries of all denominations are under police surveillance and many priests are being imprisoned in order to break the spiritual resistance of the nation. The Communists are working very hard to eliminate the resistance of one of the most important segments of Hungarian society—the peasants. A shrewd collectivization campaign, applying the old Stalinist tricks and pressures, is in progress to force into kolkhozes the independently farming peasantry who until recently owned 80 percent of all arable land. The third organized Communist campaign is against the intellectuals whose resistance is still very strong and who were influential in igniting the 1956 Revolution.

Against this background it would be tragic and immoral to abandon Hungary in return for a new arrangement in Berlin offered by Mr. Khrushchev. Considering all the aspects of European security and their implementation, the Hungarian Committee believes that any non-aggression pact between the NATO and Warsaw Pact Powers would result in accepting the continuation of Communist oppression in East Europe.

The Hungarian Committee, therefore, solemnly protests against such proposals and plans and is of the opinion that there must be a clear declaration of support of political and human rights guaranteed to Hungary in the Yalta and Potsdam agreements, in the peace treaty with Hungary and in the obligations imposed upon the Soviet Union by the United Nations General Assembly in 18 resolutions accepted by the overwhelming majority of the member nations.

During the present session of NATO foreign ministers the Hungarian Committee suggested in a memorandum addressed to the participating governments the consideration of a proposal for the international negotiations calling upon the Soviet Union to honor her obligations, namely: withdraw the Soviet forces from Hungary, allow the Hungarian people to choose freely their government and to decide the internal and external political course they wish to follow.

Want Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the text of the following letter written by Harold D. Draper, a prominent businessman in Saginaw, Mich., which appeared in "The People's Forum" of the Saginaw News. I have received many letters in support of the views as expressed in Mr. Draper's letter which clearly indicates to me the people's demand for economy in Government. I, therefore, felt this letter should be made available to all members of the House.

THE PEOPLE'S FORUM—WANT ECONOMY
(By Harold D. Draper)

Our country is spending itself bankrupt. Inflation is pauperizing millions of people with fixed incomes and pensions.

The rest of the world is looking questioningly at the soundness of the dollar and our international credit. Our national fiscal policies are unsound and bid fair to get worse.

Great segments of our business, agricultural and cooperative enterprises are being supported by subsidies or tax exemptions. The necessary taxes to support this program are paid by the rest of us.

The outstanding and most flagrant example of this socialistic program is the agricultural subsidy, which costs over $7 billion per year.

Every employed person in the country pays over $120 per year in taxes to pay for it, plus higher prices for the agricultural products bought for food.

The most vicious part of this subsidy is that most of it goes to great corporate type farm enterprises in the wheat raising group and not to the supposedly helpless small farmer.

Getting an automatic profit through price protection and a guaranteed market is a very big and secure business.

This subsidy, the largest by far of all the special favors granted by the Government to powerful minority groups is greater than the interest on our debt or veterans benefits.

Eliminate it and at once our budget is balanced and our national economy and credit are secure.

The reverse of this situation exists in the motor industry. This gigantic business employs one in seven people in the United States, pays fantastic amounts in income and excise taxes and all of the welfare taxes, yet, this industry is penalized by a 10 percent excise tax on all of its cars and trucks and 8 percent on all the replacement parts.

The industry that contributes more than the farm economy and supports more people than the farm economy is penalized for its ability to take care of itself.

Five hundreds dealers went out of business every month in 1958. That's very bad, but they couldn't make a living, so very likely 20,000 employees were thrown out of work each month. A total of 6,000 dealers and 240,000 employees are looking for work. That too, is bad, but it is part of the chance you take in this business. In addition, 500,000 employees in automotive production are out of work.

We do not want subsidies and we do want to pay our share of taxes for every necessary governmental expense, including defense, no matter how costly, but we do not want to pay for subsidizing farmers, oil people and tax-free co-ops and many others, and especially we do object to do-gooding projects all over the world and at home run by wastrel bureaucrats.

We want our Government to economize; stop spending money like it was going out of style and live within our national income, just like we as individuals must do. If necessary, for a year, in order to get solvent, we should be willing to pay higher taxes.

I, for one, am tired of all these pigs at the public trough, getting something for nothing. It's about time the welfare of our Nation came first.

If you believe with me, write to your Congressman and Senators—right now—today—and express your views. If you don't know who they are, call your postmaster, he will know.

Get everybody to write—Democrat or Republican—it doesn't matter—this is a problem that must be handled by thinking Americans before Congress spends us into bankruptcy.

If you do or do not agree with me—write me too.

The Hope for Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, soon on the floor we will be debating the omnibus housing bill, a piece of legislation with great impact upon those expanding urban areas in which 70 percent of our national population now lives.

It was a most fortunate coincidence, therefore, that the April issue of the Progressive magazine published an article by Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, of Pennsylvania, entitled "The Hope for Housing."

If we were to search both of these great legislative bodies, it would be difficult to find a Member with greater interest in and knowledge of the problems of our urban areas, particularly in the field of housing, than Senator CLARK. He began this interest as mayor of Philadelphia and continues it as the senior Senator from Pennsylvania.

In his article, Senator CLARK tells precisely why we have not carried out the adequate housing goals enunciated as a matter of national policy in 1949, and lists the steps which must be taken if housing and urban renewal are to proceed in a manner befitting the future of our great cities.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD this well-conceived and effectively executed article:

THE HOPE FOR HOUSING
(By Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK)

A decade ago, in the Housing Act of 1949, the Congress wrote a declaration of national housing policy which said, in part: "The general welfare and security of the Nation * * * require * * * the realization as soon as feasible of the goal of a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family." Ten years later this statement could hardly be improved. The only trouble is that, as an expression of our national policy today, it is a dead letter.

What the 1949 language suggests is a simple and logical procedure. First count our families. Then project population growth. Then count the number of decent homes in good environments. Then subtract. The remainder is the number of homes needed. With that as a goal, adopt a program for reaching it. Simple and logical, yes; but perhaps too much so—because that is not the way our national housing policy is made today.

If we were to follow through on this arithmetic, this is what we would find:

The number of substandard housing units, according to the Census Bureau's 1956 inventory of housing, is 13 million—24 percent of a total inventory of 55 million. Of the remaining 76 percent, not all are "in a suitable living environment"; but for purposes of our calculation that factor can perhaps be disregarded. We know, then, our backlog of need.

Meanwhile, our population is increasing. We need close to 1 million additional homes a year just to take care of new families. Approximately 300,000 more are required annually to make up for houses which are burned or bulldozed to make way for new highways or cleared for urban renewal or otherwise lost to the housing inventory.

The net of all this is that we need 1,300,000 homes a year just to hold our own. To make any substantial dent in our backlog of 13 million substandard homes would require a building rate in the neighborhood of 2 million new homes a year.

Figures such as these have never been reached in the history of American homebuilding. Only twice has the rockbottom replacement level of 1,300,000 new units been achieved—in 1950 and 1955. Last year, with the stimulus of the antirecession Emergency Housing Act, 1,200,000 units were built. The rest of the time it has been a struggle to stay above 1 million.

No wonder that mayor after mayor who has appeared before the Senate Housing Subcommittee has testified that we are not gaining ground in our fight against slums; we are losing ground.

Are those responsible for executing our national housing policies looking hard at these figures? Are they mulling them over and devising programs which will raise the production of housing in America from 1,200,000 units up toward 2,000,000?

Not at all. They do not even think in such terms. To put it bluntly, whereas the 1949 law talked of homes for families, what is talked of these days is the budget, the preservation of the status quo (which is usually referred to as free enterprise despite the massive governmental intervention through the Federal Housing Administration and the Federal National Mortgage Association), and the limits of what is acceptable to the housing industry—especially that part of the industry which lends on housing. The people who live in housing are incidental.

If we ask, what are the needs, who are the families who are ill-housed, the answer comes: the low and lower-middle income groups, and most of all our minority group families. If we start from there, then we must devise government programs which, using the channels of private enterprise wherever possible, would bring decent housing within the reach of the families who need it.

Because need has not been our guiding consideration, our governmental housing programs have become badly skewed in favor of the upper-income groups. On the one hand, the FHA-FNMA complex, which insures mortgages on suburban homes for those who can afford them, is flourishing. At the other end of the scale, the public housing program, which serves the lowest income groups, has slowed to a trickle. And there is no effective program for the families in between.

I belong to an old-fashioned school of thought which holds that the Government should concern itself first of all with those least able to help themselves. I have no objection to helping the well off through FHA and FNMA, so long as we do not ignore the housing needs of those who are less well off. But in the past 6 years, this conception of Government has been inverted. In the case of housing, the administration's bill this year would have completed the inversion: it proposed to remove the ceiling on the volume of loans which FHA might guarantee, and to push the services of FHA even higher into the upper-bracket income groups by raising the individual mortgage limit to $25,000. At the same time, it proposed to administer the final blow to the one program which builds houses for low-income families—the public housing program.

The Senate, happily, paid little attention to the administration bill. We wrote our own bill, which gives public housing another 1-year lease on life. This is a degree of progress. But without Presidential leadership, it is at least unlikely—and probably impossible—for the Congress to go much further in bringing balance to our present housing programs so that they serve all income groups equally.

If we could achieve such balance, and thus broaden the housing market, we could approach the 2 million-a-year rate of building that is called for by the measurement of need. Otherwise, we will live with our slums as far ahead as population data can be projected.

Suppose we approach the problem from another viewpoint: the future of the central city.

The slum problem of the cities is broader than just the problem of slum housing. In many cities, the most blighted areas are those with dilapidated commercial and industrial structures which stand on valuable land and drag down the economy of the entire area. As blight—both residential and commercial—spreads, the tax base of the central city declines in relation to the need for services. Then the services themselves decline. Wealth and leadership flee to the suburbs. A vicious circle is set in motion, and the very life of the central city is threatened.

Obviously, in the national interest, our central cities cannot be abandoned to decay. Even if we want to, it is physically impossible for us all to escape to the suburbs and take our offices and businesses with us. The balance wheel of the urban economy and its social and cultural life will always be the central city. A rational pattern of metropolitan growth is simply impossible without assigning the highest priority to the development of the core city, commercially, industrially, and culturally as well as residentially.

Fortunately, the ingenuity of legislators has devised the means to make that possible. That means is urban renewal, and almost 400 cities in 44 States and Territories now have projects underway. These cities are of all sizes; one-third have a population under 25,000.

Urban renewal is tedious and complex in execution, but its principle is simple. Blighted areas are replanned to provide for better uses and a higher tax base. The city buys the land, clears it of structures which cannot be restored, and sells it to developers. The difference between the cost to the city and the usually lower sale price is financed by Federal and local subsidies, the Federal Government paying two-thirds. If no Federal subsidy is needed, as in the case of Pittsburgh's Golden Triangle, there is no need for Federal participation. But there are few Golden Triangles.

An important aspect of the program is the rehabilitation of existing structures—in so-called gray areas—that are on their way to becoming unsafe or unsanitary and which can be saved as decent housing by the expenditure of a little private money. Here, the Federal assistance is mainly to help defray the costs of public improvements that serve the renewal area.

Urban renewal works. Blight has been cleared. New buildings have risen. Private investment has taken place which could have been stimulated in no other way. Urban tax bases have been improved. For the first time cities can take hope that blight can be conquered, slums can be cleared. The light at the end of the tunnel is faintly visible at last.

But, to reverse a metaphor, the silver lining seems to have its cloud. That cloud is housing. In itself, clearing of slums does not build houses for the slum dwellers. In itself, urban renewal cannot solve the housing problem. In some respects, indeed, it intensifies the problem. The urban renewal law contains, quite properly, a provision that a project may not proceed unless decent, safe, and sanitary housing is available for the persons displaced.

What happens in the case of a typical city is this:

The urban renewal planners, initially, carve out a relatively modest project as a community experiment. The existing vacancy rate in private housing, and the turnover in public housing, are sufficient to take care of the families displaced. The project proceeds. Presently, cleared land replaces slum, and, shortly afterward, bright new buildings rise.

The impact on the community is immense. The pilot project has served its purpose. It has fired the imagination of the civic leaders. It has united conservatives and liberals, Republicans and Democrats, management and labor, behind the inspiring goals of rebuilding their community. These leaders, in turn, spur the planners to lay out a truly ambitious program. Together, they map boundaries for new projects, they count the families to be displaced, and then run abruptly into a cold stone wall: where do they put the families?

Sometimes a city will not encounter the wall on its second project, or even its third, but the logic of the statistics is inexorable. Sooner or later, before they have bitten very deeply into the slum problem, most cities will find that urban renewal itself will be blocked unless low-income housing is provided.

The figures show that half of the families displaced by urban renewal are of the lowest income level—the lowest sixth, who are within the income limits of public housing. Of the remaining half, a large proportion are just above the public housing level. Some will disappear during the relocation process and leave no trace. Some can be absorbed by the other slums in the community. A few will get trickle-down housing from persons moving to the suburbs. But beyond that, the only feasible way to bring into balance the need and the availability of low-rent housing is to achieve a major acceleration of the public housing program.

And yet the Eisenhower administration has chosen this particular moment to recommend that what remains of the present de-vitalized public housing program be laid to rest.

Perhaps there is more consistency to the administration's program, however, than meets the eye. The President also has proposed that the urban renewal program itself be held back. He asked $250 million a year in Federal funds to cover applications beginning at the rate of $500 million and going up. He also recommended that the Federal share be reduced gradually from two-thirds to one-half.

If we have less urban renewal, of course, we will need less public housing. We will, instead, retain our slums and congratulate ourselves upon the "soundness" of our fiscal policies.

It is ironic to recall, once more, that the authors of the Housing Act of 1949 were Senators Wagner, Ellender, and Taft—and that the last of these is none other than the man who lost the Republican nomination in 1952 because he was considered too conservative.

Where do we go from here?

I suppose we must start from the assumption that we can't go anywhere much until 1961. Even the modest bill the Senate has passed is being greeted with rumblings about a veto. Clearly, any measure truly geared to eradicating slums and rehousing slum families would never get across the White House threshold. But what should be the elements of a housing program for 1961? I believe it should have four:

1. Upper-income housing. For families above the median in income, the present FHA–VA–FNMA programs are relatively adequate. FHA has done far better, however, in promoting suburban sales housing than urban rental housing. Some of the improvements needed can be accomplished, I am sure, through administrative regulations; beyond that, legislation may be useful. A constructive proposal has been presented to establish a central mortgage facility to stabilize the flow of mortgage funds. Other recommended measures would extend the insurance principle to some loans now made on conventional terms and facilitate the trading of old houses for new. All these should be considered.

The various branches of the housing industry will present, as they have each year, proposals to bring the Government further into the job of assisting building for the upper and upper-middle income groups. These should be sympathetically considered, on the principle that whatever accelerates the building of homes for any income group increases the total housing inventory. But this is the easier part of the job of legislators; the hard part is devising measures that will work for the lower-income groups for whom the housing industry as now organized does not speak.

2. Middle-income housing: For housing purposes, middle-income (or moderate-income) families are defined as those whose incomes are too high to permit them to be admitted to public housing projects, and too low to be able to afford new privately built housing—the exact income limits varying from one market to another, as both incomes and housing costs vary. This gap between the top of public housing and the bottom of the private market was not an unknown factor at the time of the passage of the Housing Act of 1949. But the problem was held in abeyance until 1950, when a solution in the form of long-term loans, with interest rates set at the cost of money to the Government, came within five votes of adoption by the Senate. The bill has been introduced in subsequent years, with modifications, by former Senator Herbert Lehman and by myself, but has not been brought to a vote on the Senate floor. The problem, however, is still with us—increasingly so as urban renewal proceeds and the Federal highway program bulldozes its way into the core cities, displacing families by the thousands.

3. Low-income housing: In 1949, Senator Taft and his colleagues estimated that one-tenth of the need for new housing should be met each year through public housing. Accordingly, they authorized 135,000 units a year. Given the current need projection

this rate would be raised to 200,000. Not even the 135,000 has been approached, but there is no reason to believe the need is any less than estimated a decade ago.

The difficulty with public housing appears to be twofold: apathy or antipathy in the cities and gradual strangulation by hostile Federal administration. Both can be cured, to a large extent, by certain changes in the program: decentralization of management decisions, the use of existing housing and scattered units in lieu of large institutionalized projects, and the raising of income limits so that public housing is not confined exclusively to problem families. Important steps in this direction are written into the housing bill approved this year by the Senate.

4. Urban renewal. The urban renewal program also needs both improvement and expansion. To keep up with the current rate of applications would require an annual Federal authorization of $500 million. Personally, I would prefer $600 million, to allow room for the participation of additional cities and the acceleration of the program, and to authorize this rate for a long-term period, so that cities can plan ahead—say, 10 years. The Senate bill represents a good compromise, however, for this year. It allows an authorization of up to $500 million a year for slightly more than 4 years, if applications are filed at that rate.

Many improvements are needed to provide flexibility, to cut the long period between the conception of a project and its execution, and to adapt the program to industrial and commercial as well as residential areas—changes too technical to be enumerated here. Again, the Senate bill points the way forward, with further changes in order from year to year as experience accumulates.

The case for urban America is briefly summarized: nearly 70 percent of our people live in metropolitan areas, and the proportion continues to grow. As an urban nation, our national ability to govern ourselves and solve our problems is being tested in the cities. Many basic tools are at hand. Others can readily be fashioned. National purpose and will are also present. The need remains only for enlightened and courageous leadership.

Ruling From Olympus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 13, 1959

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include the following editorial from the Memphis Commercial Appeal. The refusal of the Supreme Court to make available its public pay records will be another indication in the minds of the American public that the Court considers itself to have very little accountability to the American people.

RULING FROM OLYMPUS

It came as hardly a surprise that Chief Justice Earl Warren would refuse to permit examination of the Supreme Court's payrolls. The fact that taxpayers' money is involved and the documents should be properly considered public records seems not to impress the imperious Chief Justice.

In view of the casual disregard for the rights of State governments or the inarticulate majority, as frequently demonstrated by the Court, it was foolhardy to hope it might let us know where the money was going. What cheek. To think citizens and taxpayers would have the temerity to ask.

Considering the lavish hand with which other branches of Government are greeted by the Congress, the money involved is not great—$1,703,335 for the fiscal year ending June 30. But for the Court, haven of equity and defender of the right of people to know, to assume this lofty attitude must certainly strengthen the determination of the legislative branch to bring the judicial demigods down to earth.

The Story of Danville, Ill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, the Congress and the country should know the inspiring story of the city of Danville, Vermilion County, Ill., which I am privileged to represent. It is a story of how a resourceful people who, in spite of all economic adversities, built and maintained a thriving community. I speak of this with pride beyond measure.

In truth, the story of the city of Danville, Ill., is the story of America and what has made our country great and strong. It is a factual account of what individual community initiative and ingenuity, self-reliance, and determination can accomplish.

In the course of its history, Danville at one time was a depressed area. It suffered, as all communities do from time to time, to national economic changes, resulting from the development of new products, new manufacturing techniques, labor cost differentials, transportation facilities and costs, and a number of such economic factors.

There were occasions in the history of Danville that doubtless many thought at the time it would become a ghost town. But it did not. Its people decided to make it a thriving city with a prospect for continuing growth. They pooled their ideas. They pooled their resources. They devised plans and put those plans into effect.

Mr. Speaker, it is well that the Congress and the country know the history of the city of Danville, particularly at this time when so many communities are looking to the Federal Government to aid them in their present difficulties. The history of the city of Danville says in words much better than I can employ the true meaning of local responsibility, self-reliance, initiative and ingenuity. It emphasizes what can be accomplished by following the true American traditions. They did not look to the Federal Government to solve their problems. They did it themselves.

I am inserting in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a memorandum, based on fact and not fiction, based on truth and not theory, of what one city itself accomplished on its own, without relying upon Federal aid and dictation.

This memorandum presents the story of a city that must be told over and over again—and there are doubtless other such communities who have and continue to do likewise but, unfortunately, they are becoming fewer and fewer. As we consider proposed legislation to establish a Federal agency to aid depressed areas bear in mind what Danville did for itself. If you take the proposed course of extensive Federal aid, you say to communities like Danville: Who exercise your own ingenuity, why risk your financial resources, why spend your time and effort—the Federal Government will do it for you? When that day comes, when the Federal Government attempts to do everything for us, then our American system of government is no more.

The following story of Danville was prepared by the local chamber of commerce, a truly progressive and aggressive organization:

THE STORY OF DANVILLE, ILL.

"Cities do not grow and prosper by chance. They are the result of the vision, the sacrifices, and efforts, of its citizens."

Many cities have progressed through an economic crisis, and have been left prostrate for all time.

Danville has experienced such a crisis, but fortunately for us survived.

Too few of our citizens realize that had our city been left to take its natural course, their homes, their fortunes, and all they treasure in Danville could have been wiped out of existence.

This is not a story of the Babylonian ages, nor of Colonial times, but one as modern as the last 20-odd years.

Mr. Walter Bluecher, executive director of the American Society of Planning Officials, in reviewing our transition, said, "This in Danville is not economic growth, this is industrial revolution."

This dramatic period in Danville's life is the story of our community's passage from one that grew and prospered by the exploitation of a nonreplaceable natural resource—coal.

It is the story of how coal came to dominate our economy, and then how, in just 20 years, it declined to such an extent as to become a minor factor in our community.

If our citizens would pause now, and look about them, and try to visualize our present coal mining operations, as our major employer of labor they would then have some idea of our possible economic paralysis and how our city, today, could be suffering economic chaos.

This history of what is known in coal parlance as the Danville district covers an area embracing our own Vermilion County alone.

It is the story of our major nonreplaceable natural resource, coal, dominating our community for a number of years, and then, its decline into a minor economic factor.

Those hardy backwoodsmen of America's pioneer era, who made the hazardous trek to and from the banks of the Vermilion River, for their small, but precious supply of salt, did not realize that the troublesome earth fires that resulted from the wood fires, kindled beneath the iron kettles of boiling salt water, would some day become the force that would foster the growth of a busy metropolis on the river's banks.

The rise of coal mining, as our major industrial employer, began in the 1850's. Then it was that coal was first mined locally, for local home use.

The entry of the railroads into the community gave added impetus to the then simple mining activity.

In 1866 several slope mines were opened in the Grape Creek area, followed in 1870 with the sinking of the first shaft mine in Illinois in what is now known as the Vermilion Heights area.

This new force in our community life grew rapidly.

It became not only the prime factor for our own growth and prosperity, but a factor also for the State of Illinois; in 1897 and again 1899, Vermilion County was the leading coal producing county in Illinois.

At the turn of the century, with a county population of just over 65,000 persons, there were approximately 3,000 persons engaged in the mining industry, or one in every 21 persons.

In succeeding years, even with the introduction of new mining techniques and mechanization, our dependence upon mining for employment increased, and the impact of the increase, and the decrease, of mining employment, is reflected in our population figures.

From 65,000 in 1900, our county population increased to 78,000 in 1910 and to 86,000 in 1920 but only increased about 900 persons from 1920 to 1950.

Danville, itself, grew from 16,354 in 1900 to 27,871 in 1910, and to 33,766 in 1920; and to 36,765 in 1930, but it increased by only 154 from 1930 to 1940, and only by 945 from 1940 to 1950, or only 55 persons per year increase for 20 years.

The causes of our small increases in population growth from 1930 to 1940 and again from 1940 to 1950 which so concerned and disappointed our citizens, is to be found in the period we are to review. People do not long remain in a community of rapidly decreasing employment.

In the 1920's the peak of mine employment was reached.

In 1926, out of a county population of 86,000 persons, 4,297 were employed in mining. Approximately 1 family in every 6 was dependent upon coal for existence.

Commencing in 1927, certain economic factors entered into the economy of producing coal in the Danville district that initiated the decline in mining.

The number of shipping mines decreased from a high of 9 mines in the 1920's to 1 mine in 1951, and a peak of employment of 4,297 eventually dwindled in 1951 to a mere 451 miners.

	Miners employed	Shipping mines in operation
1926	4,297	9
1929	3,286	8
1934	3,097	6
1939	2,558	6
1944	1,735	5
1951	451	1

In addition to the reduction in the number of mines and miners, the average days that the mines operated each year further decreased mine payrolls.

	Days
1920–1925	183
1925–1930	170
1930–1935	136
1935–1940	150
1945	115

With the final closing of the Bunsenville mine in 1947, our county ceased to be a major producer of coal.

In 1918, almost 4 million tons were mined in the county—largely hand mined.

In 1947, we mined less than 500,000 tons even with the most advanced mechanization.

Is it any wonder our community's population remained static?

Had matters been left to take their course, Danville would today be just another ghost of its former self, as are a number of other cities in southern Illinois.

Here was a community of some 40,000 people, its basic industry all but disappearing in 20 short years.

The black gold that was the foundation of Danville's growth and prosperity declined into a minor role.

Danville, known far and wide as "the heart of a large coal mining area" lost the major product that was the source of its national fame, and the fortunes of its people.

As if this, the loss of our major community support, were not enough, an additional blow was to simultaneously be struck at our economic foundation.

Due to the abuandance of coal, and the additional asset of local shale adaptable to brick manufacturing, it was only natural that brick making should become the second major factor in our community.

The coming of the automobile brought the new use of bricks for pavements, and along with the demand for bricks in the building of the rapid growth of Chicago, Danville became one of the largest brick producing centers of the country.

Five brickyards were in production in 1926 and 1,007 persons were employed; but even this substantial source of employment was to face its crisis.

Concrete became the standard material for highway construction, and steel, concrete blocks, and reinforced concrete, supplanted many uses of brick.

In addition, the introduction of mechanical processes in brick production further lessened the needed manpower.

From a high employment of 1,007 persons in this field, brick production in two remaining plants in 1951 employed 220 persons; thus another set of uncontrollable economic factors wiped out another 800 opportunities for employment.

What tragic consequences could have resulted:

	1926	1951
Mine employment	4,297	451
Brick employment	1,007	220
Total employment in these two major fields	5,304	671

For our purposes, manufacturing industries are establishments that produce a product for distribution beyond our wholesale or retail area; and Danville in 1926 had 18 such industries, employing 1,938 persons.

Yes, Danville today could have been only a ghost of its former self, but, fortunately for us, it is not.

Though its major source of employment disappeared, it had one asset that was to sustain it. Had this been lacking, as it had in so many other cities, we would not today live in a city more flourishing than its former self.

Danville had a primary asset; and that was community leaders and a citizenry that would not admit economic defeat, who would not, as had citizens in so many other cities, give up in despair.

It was in 1928 that the first of a series of meetings was held to discuss the growing problem. Visits were made to study other cities. Consultations were held with experts in the field of industrial development. No government was asked for aid or succor. This was our own task to solve.

At the height of our crisis, Danville's leaders were pioneering in a new method of community development.

After much discussion and days, yes, weeks and months, of effort devoted by loyal citizens to solving our critical situation, the solution was presented.

At a meeting of the Board of Directors of the Danville Chamber of Commerce, held in October of 1929, a plan directed toward saving our community from economic chaos was adopted.

At that chamber of commerce board meeting, the formation of the Danville Plan, a new and unique method of securing new industries, was drafted.

The action of that chamber board of directors meeting was to proceed with formation of the Danville Industrial Foundation, succeeded later by New Industries, Inc., and they set up the machinery to raise the necessary funds.

Taking a lesson from our past history, the decision was made to secure a diversification of manufacturing establishments in order that a more healthy base for our community's future would be provided.

In addition, it has as its premise that success, and particularly rapid success, could best be accomplished by a concentrated effort to induce small industrial establishments to locate in Danville, and our people would provide the funds to construct the buildings.

Danville's citizens responded most heartily. Over $70,000 was subscribed to launch the new enterprise.

The soundness of this action is given adequate testimony, not only with the revolutionary success we have had in rebuilding our tottering economy, but in the numerous visits by committees from other cities to our chamber of commerce office for advice, and in the hundreds of requests received from other communities for details of our plan, also the scores of articles written about our success that have appeared in magazines, newspapers, and national periodicals.

What a remarkable story of transition has taken place before our very eyes.

Our steady, consistent progress has been so constant that many of our citizens are unaware of what has transpired about them.

From a community, largely sustained by the employment of over 5,000 persons in two basic industries that had been reduced to the employment of only 671 persons in 1951, we have risen into a modern industrial city with 48 manufacturing establishments employing close to 8,000 persons.

And diversification we have. Jelly candy and drag line buckets, bobby pins and lift trucks, photographs and automobile castings, dresses, jackets and fertilizers, electrical supplies, and buttermilk products, hoists and dog foods, a host of products flow to the four corners of the world.

In 1929, at the start of our plan, Danville had 14 plants employing 1,444 persons.

In the next 2 years, five new plants were added.

By 1935, we had 23 plants employing 2,384 persons.

As the years rolled on, its leaders and its citizens were to keep doggedly at their task of reconstruction, and the results exceeded their fondest expectations.

Manufacturing industries and employment in Danville

By 1940, 26 plants, 2,890 employees; 1945, 26 plants, 3,284 employees; 1950, 46 plants, 6,745 employees; 1951, 46 plants, 7,825 employees; 1953 (employment should find us close to the 9,000 employment figure in 48 plants).

The source of the employment of the more than 12,000 employees of our stores, shops, and offices, and the livelihood and prosperity of the doctor, the lawyer, the wholesaler, and the retailer, in a larger measure than ever before stems from the payrolls of these plants.

The basis of all human existence stems from farm income and manufacturing payrolls, and our growth in manufacturing payrolls is most startling.

Payrolls, manufacturing industries

1940	$3,222,000
1945	5,837,000
1950	20,730,000
1951	25,788,000

But it is difficult to perceive the tremendous strides we have made in industrial payrolls, due to our present inflated dollars.

We have always taken pride in the richness of our surrounding agricultural area, and it is in comparing the increase in our total county farm income, with our industrial payrolls, that a more vivid picture is to be seen.

	Total farm income of Vermilion County	Manufacturing industry payrolls of Danville
1940	$7,849,000	$3,222,000
1945	17,983,000	5,837,000
1950	25,340,000	25,788,000

An amazing picture. Our industrial payrolls have grown from less than 40 percent of our total county farm income until they now exceed that income.

Success. Victory.

Yes; a city has been saved.

But what a debt of gratitude is due the men and women responsible for this unprecedented drama.

And they gave not only of their time, but of their personal resources as well; for to them these funds of their fellow citizens became as a public trust.

The moneys of the foundation stockholders were to be expended solely for the purpose to which they were dedicated, the construction of the buildings that would bring about our new economic era, and that alone.

And other costs must and did come from their personal resources.

Fools, some men might call them. But the results?

Not one penny invested in buildings has been lost.

Not one stockholder's investment has been squandered.

By watchful guardianship of the trust, a dividend of 22 percent profit was paid to the original stockholders.

A triumph most unusual in any joint community enterprise.

What a glowing monument is ours to see and from which we prosper today. As a testimonial of the time, the effort, and the personal sacrifices of those men and women, we do not have the dust and rubble of a ghost city, but a virile, prosperous city, and this prosperity is our inheritance.

Let us then pay tribute to them, in the present, and in the years to come.

Let us not be laggard in our present, and in our future years, with our inherited prosperity, our fortunes, and our livelihoods.

Let us, like them, by our continued community efforts and sacrifices, strive to make Danville a better city in which to work, a better city in which to play, and a better city in which to live.

For then, we can take continued pride in our community, and contribute our share in assisting Danville on its march forward.

Statement of Jack T. Jennings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the statement of the Cooperative League of the United States of America in opposition to H.R. 1253 "and any other legislation which would permit retail price maintenance on consumer goods." The statement was presented by Mr. Jack T. Jennings, assistant director, before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on Monday, March 23, 1959.

Mr. Jennings' statement is a very cogent presentation of a number of valid reasons why enactment of the fair trade legislation is not in the public interest and, on the contrary, indeed, is inimical both to the interests of consumers and to the interests of those who unwisely pushed this sort of legislation.

With the rarest exceptions all of the Nation's reputable and outstanding economists oppose this legislation. The Federal Trade Commission and the United States Attorney General have opposed this sort of measure time after time as being not in the public interest and as establishing an almost complete repeal of the several antitrust laws. I am in thorough accord with the remarks of The Cooperative League and other consumer groups who oppose this kind of pernicious legislation.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF JACK T. JENNINGS, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR, WASHINGTON OFFICE, COOPERATIVE LEAGUE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, BEFORE THE HOUSE INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE, MARCH 23, 1959

Mr. Chairman, the organization which I represent is by its nature interested in the legislation now before you. The Cooperative League of the United States of America is a national federation of consumer, service, and purchasing cooperatives. We include in our membership 13 million families who own and operate their own cooperative business enterprises: farm supplies, insurance, credit, medical care, electric power, consumer goods, housing and other services. The Cooperative League is the second largest economic organization in America measured in terms of family membership. We are pleased to have this opportunity to present our suggestions on this legislation to your committee.

We appear today in opposition to H.R. 1253 and any other legislation which would permit retail price maintenance on consumer goods. Our policy has always been for more strict enforcement of the antitrust laws and in opposition to any attempt to weaken them. We feel the so-called "Fair Trade" bill would permit unfair and unwarranted pricing practices and would seriously weaken the provisions of the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act.

Fair trade policy as embodied in this legislation is diametrically opposed by the antitrust laws developed over many years by Congress. These laws attempt to stimulate fair competitive conditions in our economy.

Fair trade laws stifle such competition—and worst of all, force the Government to police such detrimental pricing practices against the public good. We agree wholeheartedly with an eminent economist, Dr. Clare E. Griffin, professor of business economics of the University of Michigan, who testified last year against a similar measure.

He pointed out very well:

"The principle of free competition is expressed in our Sherman Act, Clayton Act, and in other antitrust laws. While it is true that individual businessmen may chafe at the limitations on their ability to avoid competition which these acts impose, I think it is greatly to their credt that they still recognize the fundamental wisdom of these laws. I have personally made it a point over many years to ask businessmen, who at times are quite critical of the administration of these laws, if they would favor their repeal. I have yet to find one responsible businessman in this country who has answered that question in the affirmative. Surely such a unanimous endorsement of the basic principle of competition would not be found in any other country in the world.

"The principle of resale price maintenance as expressed in this bill and in earlier ones is clearly in violation of this principle. If it did not restrain trade there would be no necessity of such laws. They are designed as very special execptions to section 1 of the Sherman Act which prohibits agreements in restraint of trade. It is well known that the history of judicial interpretation of the Sherman Act has been long and involved. There are many points of disagreement even yet, but there is one proposition which is firmly established, namely, that agreements on price constitute a clear violation of the act, both as to letter and to spirit. Such agreements are known as per se violations and as such are not subject to exceptions under the so-called rule of reason or on other grounds. The effect of the proposed bill is to eliminate competition on price between wholesalers and retailers. It does this even more effectively * * * than would outright agreement among competitors.

"This bill, therefore, constitutes a serious emasculation of the Sherman Act—an act which is peculiarly an American law in the sense that it expresses the accepted customs and mores of the American people, and in the sense that no other country in the world has been willing to go quite so far in asserting unequivocally the principle of competition."

Those who favor so-called fair trade, it must be assumed, believe there is something wrong with our competive economic system. Believers in price fixing would prefer to place all sellers on a perfect competitive basis. They would place all manufacturers in a position where they could block out and maintain a certain share of the market without worrying about competitors.

A recent report published by the European Productivity Agency of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation [1] points out that the history of resale price maintenance in other countries started with dealers or their associations who took the initiative in setting standard pricing in order to obtain higher or more secure margins. Then, according to the report:

"Gradually, as the branding of goods became more general, it became easier to have this wish fulfilled because branded goods create both the technical and the economic conditions which enable individual manufacturers to introduce maintained resale prices. At the same time, a greater desire for protection arose among dealers, because competition between them can be keener on branded goods than on most of the unbranded ones.

"The growth of new types of shops such as consumer cooperatives, department stores, chain stores, etc., accentuated the dealers' pressure to have resale price maintenance introduced. Such shops are generally not members of the ordinary dealers' associations, with the result that these associations have no means of curbing their competition drives other than persuading manufacturers to introduce resale price maintainance. In some cases, dealers have had to use boycott, or the threat of boycott, in order to convince the manufacturers, but in others their mere wish for protection has been enough.

"Independent action by the manufacturers is taken mainly with goods where it is impossible, or difficult, for consumers to make a reasonable comparison of the prices and qualities of different brands. This applies chiefly to durable goods, such as watches, radio and television sets, electrical house-

[1] "Resale Price Maintenance," project No. 238, Soren Gammelgaard, published by the European Productivity Agency of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation, Paris.

hold equipment and motor cars, and to cosmetics, toilet articles, pharmaceutical goods, and other similar goods of a chemical or biological nature. In this case, the manufacturer may be interested in purchasing the dealers' favor by guaranteeing them a particularly high and secure margin, so that they are particularly induced to recommend his brands to consumers.

"In other cases, the manufacturer's motive may be that he finds it advantageous to advertise the article at a fixed retail price; and again, resale price maintenance may be a means of reducing competition among the manufacturers themselves, or may serve as a link in more complicated systems by which manufacturers and dealers mutually protect each other against competition.

"In public discussion of resale price maintenance, its supporters have chiefly used two arguments which suggest that manufacturers not only find it consistent with their own interests to maintain the resale prices of their goods, but plainly consider it a condition of economic survival. These are: (1) the need to maintain a certain standard of necessary service; and (2) the need to hinder the development of market-spoiling "loss-leader" competition among dealers. * * * It seems, however, that very specific conditions must be fulfilled before ordinary price competition between dealers can develop into "loss-leader" competition with harmful effects on the total sales of the branded goods in question, and indisputable examples of this have not been found in practice. The service argument seems to be justified only in respect of presales service, and even then its purpose may be more safely achieved by other means than resale price maintenance. * * *

"In trade the practice generally tends to raise the level of costs because price competition is abolished or restricted and replaced by competition in sales efforts and services. The development of all types of low-service, cheap-selling shops is thereby hindered or retarded, and the consumer's choice between different combinations of price and service is narrowed. The rate of progress of productivity is generally retarded and in some respects may be totally arrested by resale price maintenance. In cases where the system leads to an overcrowding of wholesale or retail trades, productivity can be directly decreased."

Mr. Chairman, we were greatly interested in the results of the A. C. Nielsen study reported last week by the Bureau of Education on fair trade. If we take the results of this study at face value as reported by the Bureau, we find absolutely no need for fair-trade legislation. Among eight points the Nielsen study found: "The differences in weighted average price in the price comparisons (in fair-trade versus non-fair-trade areas) shown are so small as to be statistically insignificant. Most price differences are of the order of one-third of 1 percent to 1 percent."

The Bureau claims that consumers in fair-trade areas paid 1.4 cents less on the average for certain fair-traded brands than did consumers in non-fair-trade areas. Mr. Chairman, if this is true, and we doubt that all of the facts are presented fairly, then manufacturers would be better off without fair trade.

A 1954 study cited by the U.S. Department of Justice shows that consumers in areas covered by resale price maintenance laws paid 28 percent more for drugs and appliances than did consumers in areas where there was no such law. Congressman EMANUEL CELLER, who made the minority report on the McGuire bill a few years ago, said, in discussing the effect of these laws, that resale prices have been fixed so high * * * as to insure a remarkably profitable rate of return.

Promoters of fair trade have no interest in consumer welfare as evidenced by the fact that some arbitrarily peg prices as high as 350 percent above dealers' costs. This practice is nothing more than robbery and many dealers find it difficult to abide by such practices with clear consciences.

We wish also to submit that fair trade forces the public to pay for things it doesn't want. If manufacturers can legally collaborate in setting fair trade prices, they do not have to compete on the same basis as would be necessary without fair trade. Under fair trade, consumers would shop not necessarily for quality products (since quality differences between one product and another might be slight) but for fancy packages or other eye-catching inducements. The manufacturer who didn't spend a little of his exorbitant markup on packaging would find that he had no demand at the customer level. So the chances are that one manufacturer would try to outdo the other in fancy packaging, thus forcing the consumer to pay for frills which add nothing to the product. He might much prefer to get more goods and better quality in less expensive wrappings.

Manufacturers may say they are indeed in favor of fair trade. They may contribute many dollars to the cause of fair trade. But behind the backs of their organization heads they keep their assembly lines producing for the non-fair trade market as though they never head of fair trade. They may change products slightly for the fair trade labels but they continue to make their own branded items and even private-label goods for all markets. Consumers are beginning to learn of these practices and are buying accordingly. They learn from such publications as Consumer Reports that quality and price don't necessarily go hand in hand—that some products at reasonable prices are the same as their fair traded companions at much higher prices.

We have prided ourselves in this country on our free enterprise system which has been able to produce an abundance of goods of highest quality at the lowest price. The so-called fair trade concept violates this time-honored and proven heritage. Fair trade operates in the interest only of those able to take advantage of it. It protects the inefficient only temporarily. It hampers the efficient operator in adjusting to conditions which benefit the consumer. Except in the case of cooperatives which rebate to consumer members these high margins in the form of patronage refunds, the consumer is the loser.

Small business does not necessarily benefit from fair trade. Large firms, making the same margin on a product as a small firm, can advertise widely, attract greater numbers of customers, and make life difficult for the small businessman. There is a question whether fair trade offers small business any protection at all. In fact, the Justice Department survey indicates there was little difference in small business failures in fair-trade versus non-fair-trade areas.

In its extreme form, if every product were fair traded, merchants would be as free as those in Soviet Russia. The only difference would rest in who dictates the price. In the long run, fair trade performs a disservice to even those who think it is the answer to all problems.

In past years we thought the Miller-Tydings and McGuire Acts were bad enough. They merely permitted the States to pass fair trade acts of their own. But H.R. 1253 goes much further. It would impose a Federal price-fixing law on all the States, whether or not they want it.

Our position against resale price maintenance is adequately supported by the Federal Trade Commission and the Departments of Justice, Agriculture, and Commerce. Farm, labor, consumer, and other public interest groups have also voiced their opposition.

This country was built upon progress. Progress causes adjustments—sometimes in a form that damages at least momentarily the welfare or security of a few people. We are sure that we have not seen the end of progress—and we hope we shall never see it. One can't pass a law against it. One can't stop it as long as the ingenuity and spirit that we know as America is alive and sensitive to the wants and needs of all the people.

Resale price maintenance is a step backward. It is an admission that some manufacturers and dealers don't want to face up to the challenges ahead. It's an admission on their part that our free enterprise system is defective. It's an effort on the part of a few to exploit consumers in the name of protecting their products or their trademarks. But what it really boils down to is they want to protect only one thing—their profits.

Thank you very much.

Economic Possibilities and Limitations of Farm Price Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Walter W. Wilcox, senior specialist for agriculture on the staff of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, is one of the Nation's outstanding farm economists. On April 3, 1959, he delivered an address before the Midwest Milk Marketing Conference, at Madison, Wis., on the "Economic Possibilities and Limitations of Farm Price Policies." It summarizes the very difficult situation that faces American agriculture, and is of such a character as to provoke helpful discussion of one of the most important problems of our times. Under leave to extend my remarks I include a copy of this speech, as follows:

ECONOMIC POSSIBILITIES AND LIMITATIONS OF FARM PRICE POLICIES

(Summary of talks at Midwest Milk Marketing Conference at Madison, Wis., April 3, 1959, by Walter W. Wilcox)

Each year for the past 6 years $1.5 billion to $2.5 billion of farm products have been removed from commercial markets by the Government loan, storage and surplus removal operations. There is an upward trend in these overabundant supplies, for in the last 2 years the amounts removed would have been even greater except for the soil bank program which by its acreage reserve features idled approximately 20 million acres of land formerly devoted to the allotment crops, corn, cotton, wheat, rice and tobacco, and by its conservation reserve features in 1958, idled another 10 million acres of land formerly devoted to general crops.

Any attempt to explore the economic possibilities and limitations of farm-price support policies which might reduce Government costs, reverse recent upward trends in surplus stocks and yet stabilize or increase farm income must start with this recent economic history.

It is a matter of simple arithmetic that if market supplies were brought into balance with commercial market outlets at recent

price levels, farm income would be reduced by the amount of these recent annual surpluses—$1.5 billion to $2.5 billion a year (Government payments, largely for the soil bank program also totaled $1.1 billion in 1958).

It also is a matter of equally direct economic inference from the many statistical analyses of farm price and supply relationships, that if these $1.5 billion to $2.5 billion of surpluses, plus the potential supplies held in check by the soil bank and acreage allotments, were channeled through commercial markets, farm income would drop by two to three times as much or by $4 billion to $6 billion.

Farm leaders and farmers have been greatly confused on this latter point. Continued loan, storage and surplus disposal operations, together with the acreage allotments and the soil bank in recent years have prevented increased supplies equivalent to 6 to 10 percent of annual farm output from glutting commercial markets. Farm leaders and many of the farmers answering opinion polls may have been lulled into a false sense of security by these operations.

For those who doubt that farm prices and income would fall precipitously if production and marketing limitations were removed and surplus removal operations were discontinued, two items of recent history are informative: meat animal marketings on a weight basis were reduced 4 percent in 1958 as compared with 1957. Most of this reduction was in beef cattle marketings. Beef has a less inelastic demand than most livestock products. However, these 4 percent smaller meat animal marketings (mostly beef cattle) sold for some 16 percent higher prices and producers received almost 15 percent higher gross receipts in 1958 than from the larger supplies in 1957. Another item of interest in this connection: consumer disposable income was approximately the same in both 1957 and 1958, the usual annual growth in demand for meat resulting from the upward trend in consumer incomes was absent in 1958 because of increased unemployment.

The frost damage to the citrus crop in Florida in the winter of 1957–58 provides another bit of evidence with respect to the relation between supplies and prices for foods. Citrus fruit and frozen orange juice are usually considered to be products with an elastic demand, where moderate changes in supplies are accompanied by moderate changes in prices. Yet, Florida citrus producers who marketed 13 percent less fruit than a year earlier because of the frost damages in 1957–58, received prices 47 percent higher and gross receipts 27 percent higher than a year earlier.

These two items of recent economic history are not conclusive. But they strongly support the conclusions of economic analysts who estimate that if 6 to 10 percent more products had been channeled into consumption through commercial markets in recent years, prices would have been 15 to 25 percent or more lower than they were. Farmers and farm leaders have been inadequately informed regarding these relationships in recent years. Widespread lack of information of this character among farmers raises questions about the interpretations that should be placed on their answers on opinion polls.

TO MAINTAIN CURRENT FARM INCOME WITHOUT SUBSIDY

Farm leaders often make the point that food is cheap in the United States in terms of workers' earnings. Workers in the United States can buy more and better food in the United States with an average day's pay than in any other country in the world. They also can buy more food with a day's pay at the present time than in any previous period in history. In view of the relatively low cost of food, especially when it leaves the farm, they urge that farm programs be developed which eliminate Government subsidies and result in consumers paying the full price in the marketplace for their food.

If a goal of maintaining recent farm income levels without resorting to Government subsidies were set for some future program the economic requirements become evident. Farm production and marketings would have to be restricted by somewhat more than the 6 to 8 percent of surpluses that have been removed each year for the last 6 years by Government programs.

In order to maintain total farm income without resorting to Government payments some way would have to be found to restrict aggregate farm production and marketings some 10 to 12 percent as compared with potential market supplies in recent years. This appears to many farm leaders to be impossible of attainment, yet even if it could be achieved such a program would fail to grapple with the dynamics of the farm income stabilization problem in the years immediately ahead.

IMPLICATIONS OF FARM TECHNOLOGICAL ADVANCE

The crux of the farm price policy problem, as it has emerged in the last 6 years, is that output-increasing technological advances are being adopted at a rate which causes total farm output to increase faster than the demand for food and fiber is expanding. Utilizing both a smaller crop acreage base and a shrinking labor supply, farm output increased 23 percent between 1950 and 1958 (and would have been even higher except for the Soil Bank program and other acreage restrictions), while population increased only 15 percent.

The implications of this rapid rate of farm technological advance and its relations to farm price levels have been presented to the public in a most confusing manner. Farm technological advances are cost reducing and irreversible in the aggregate. Producers often make large capital investments to adopt new output-increasing, cost-reducing technologies. Once the capital investment is made the new production methods are continued even though prices fall. Other technological advances typically result from new additives in fertilizers or mixed feeds, new chemical compounds in pesticides and weed killers or the perfection of improved strains of seeds or breeding animals. Again since these technological advances are cost reducing, once adopted they will continue to be used even though prices decline.

A better understanding of this aspect of aggregate technological advance would correct many mistaken views with respect to expected shrinkage in total farm output under the influence of lower price levels. Most expansion in total farm output in recent years has been the result of technological advance, hence lower farm prices will not reduce farm output in the near future.

To affirm that lower farm prices will not result in a reversal of past technological advances in no way denies that the rate of technological advance is affected by price levels. Relatively favorable farm prices and incomes, the healthy financial position of most agricultural producers and their higher level of education in recent years, all have speeded the adoption of technological advances.

An agricultural industry lacking capital accumulations, without credit facilities, experiencing low prices and managed by entrepreneurs with a low level of competence would find it difficult to make the investment necessary for much of the technological advance in recent years.

WILL LOWER PRICES BALANCE OUTPUT WITH AVAILABLE MARKETS?

The failure to fully take into account the technical and economic relationships involved in technological advance has resulted in a tragic misconception of the nature of agriculture's price policy problems.

Given the present backlog of new technologies now available or in the testing stage which to a large extent are a result of Government planned and financed research and educational programs, and given the present educational level and financial position of agricultural producers, in spite of the 6 to 10 percent excessive productive capacity now existing, even though farm prices fall as much as 20 to 30 percent from recent levels, farm output probably will continue to expand faster than available markets.

Is it not probable that the adoption of output-increasing multiple farrowing equipment by hog producers at the present time is as much the result of expected lower hog prices in the future as it is the result of favorable hog prices in the recent past? Is it likely that the prospects of lower milk prices will reverse the upward trend in artificial insemination of dairy cows? Is it likely that the prospect of lower milk prices will reverse the trend toward output-increasing, year round feeding of dairy cows in dry lots?

Is it likely that lower corn prices will slow down the trend toward growing corn continuously on the most productive soils? Or will improvements in seed strains of hybrid grain sorghums be stopped by low grain sorghum prices?

New short strawed strains of wheat, yielding twice as many bushels per acre as those now in commercial production are reported in the quality improvement stage. Even though wheat prices drop to feed grain levels will not farmers adopt these new higher yielding strains as soon as they become available?

Those who expect moderately lower farm prices to bring supplies into balance with market outlets may be expecting fertilizer use to decline. Yet, technical studies in the Department of Agriculture indicate that at the levels of use of fertilizer in 1954 farmers were receiving marginal (additional) returns of $3 per dollar spent on fertilizer. With a slightly higher rate of fertilizer use in 1959 and somewhat lower farm product prices, marginal returns from fertilizer use may have dropped to $2.50.

With returns from fertilizer use at this level there is little reason to expect a decline in aggregate fertilizer use even though farm prices declined sharply. It is likely, e.g., that farmers will use less nitrogen on their corn unless or until corn prices drop to about 80 cents per bushel since the marginal cost of the corn produced by the nitrogen is probably 60 to 80 cents a bushel?

Few developments can be predicted with certainty in the economic world. Such evidence as can be assessed, however, suggests that because of this rapid rate of technological advance via atomistic competition in agriculture in the absence of Government programs, recent supply, price and income trends will continue to worsen until producers become financially unable to make further output-increasing investments.

COMPETITIVE POSITION OF LARGE FARMS

Reasoning from simple but unrealistic assumptions some farm leaders believe that the larger, more efficient farms would be able to continue profitable business operations under the price levels which would prevail, even though all current restrictions on production and marketing of farm products were eliminated.

Under such conditions they assume there would be fewer farm families and a lower total farm income but that average farm family incomes might be higher than in recent years. This might occur if the rate of technological advance could be slowed down by moderately lower price levels. However, production costs on the larger farms do

not appear to be substantially lower than those on the more efficient family farms. Furthermore, the backlog and oncoming stream of new technologies, including the possibilities for further substitution of capital for labor, are so great that their competitive adoption will continue to expand output faster than markets expand. This too rapid rate of output expansion, made possible by available new technologies and fueled by competitive efforts to survive under falling prices and rising costs, may well continue even though the number of farm operator families in agriculture drops by one-half or three-fourths.

With atomistic competition prevailing in agriculture it is profitable for individual farms to adopt new technologies even though farm prices are falling. Competitive forces lead to the more general adoption of these technological advances even though the increased aggregate output results in a sharp decrease in aggregate income. Fully as important, most of the resources previously committed to agriculture—tractors, improvements in land, harvesting machinery, and much of the previously committed labor—cannot shift to alternative employment—hence these resources continue to be used in agricultural production throughout their productive life in spite of low returns from their use.

Given the large backlog of output-increasing, cost-reducing technology not yet adopted on most farms, aggregate output under atomistic competition may be expected to expand at such a rate that prices will fall faster than costs can be reduced on the large, more efficient farms as well as on the smaller farms for an indefinite period. In view of these prospects in the absence of a farm program it is doubtful that even the larger farms would be able to maintain financial solvency."

POLITICAL LIMITATIONS

Turning now to the political problems involved in reaching an agreement on new price policies to be adopted, one can introduce realism into the discussion by quoting a recent statement of a Senator from one of the leading wheat producing States. In commenting on the program proposed by the National Association of Wheat Growers, he said:

"There is no organization in my State sponsoring any form of a two-price system. We only have two organizations, the Farmers Union and the Farm Bureau and they have different programs. But I find a sizable majority of the farmers still favor that approach to the wheat problem. I don't think they will be satisfied until it is tried out sometime."

For several years now there has been wide disagreement among farm organizations and between the leaders in the two major political parties regarding desirable changes in existing farm legislation. No important improvement in this situation is apparent as yet. Leadership in agriculture has been so divided by the developments of recent years that even within commodity groups paralyzing differences continue.

The historical record is quite clear on this topic. Major changes in farm price policy legislation only have occurred (1) when the executive branch of the Government exercised strong leadership, e.g., as in the establishment of the Federal Farm Board on recommendations of President Hoover in 1929 or (2) when the leading farm organizations and political groups agreed on general lines of action needed because of the severe adverse financial position of agriculture, e.g., the passage of the Agricultural Adjustment Act in 1933 and its major revisions in 1936 and 1938.

The provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1948 were largely drafted in the Department of Agriculture along lines suggested by the professional people in the Department. The executive branch of the Government actually took the leadership in formulating this early postwar legislation.

As long as farm people are confused and misinformed with respect to the economic implications of alternative lines of action, so long as the drop in farm prices and income is postponed by continued loan, storage, and surplus disposal operations, so long as the public does not rebel at the high cost of existing programs, and so long as the farm organizations continue to disagree as to desirable alternatives to existing price policies, no decisive new action is probable.

Farm leaders and agricultural economists have been caught offguard by the technological explosion now occurring in American agriculture.

Can we get our mistaken diagnosis of the price problems in agriculture corrected and make sufficient progress on an educational program based on the relevant issues, to permit the adoption of new policies in advance of the complete breakdown of existing programs? If this necessary educational work is to be done, it will be done by groups such as you folks gathered here today.

Why the Preservation of States Rights Is Important

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1959

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Woman's Club of Jacksonville has recently conducted an essay contest among the schools of Duval County. The title of the essay chosen for first place in the contest was "Why the Preservation of States Rights is Important." Mrs. Don Graze ably handled details of the contest. The judges were: Miss Annie Beaman, Miss Florence Hughes, Mrs. Iva Sprinkle, and Mrs. Selwyn Chalker. They have informed me that the first place winner was Miss Marian B. Wolking, a student at Englewood High School. Miss Wolking has achieved substantial leadership qualities in her high school career and I am very pleased to include here her thoughtful and inspiring essay, as follows:

WHY THE PRESERVATION OF STATES RIGHTS IS IMPORTANT

Our Nation is at the edge of a yawning precipice. At every side are those who want to shove her into the gulf of a world federation. Every day she loses a right that should be inherent to every sovereign nation. Now is the time for us to insure her sovereignty by preserving the sovereignty of the States, that is, by preserving States rights.

Perpetuation of States rights is important, not only to the statesman, but also to every citizen of this Nation. It is as old as the country itself.

We rarely remember that the United States began as separate Colonies, and even though they were under the same English flag, they were connected only through their proximity and their allegiance to the mother country. As this relationship to England became strained, there was discontent and unrest in the Colonies; men began to talk or using force. They knew that the only way that each could win independence was for several of them to band together and present a united front. Therefore, they formed a voluntary alliance for the common good.

When the dust of battle drifted away, it left the 13 tiny Colonies as victors over a world power. Instead of disbanding and assuming their independence as 13 small countries, they drew up a constitution by which their Union would be made stronger and able to act for the common good during peacetime. The Federal Government was given enough power to insure economic and military stability, to govern in areas not under the jurisdiction of any one State, and to represent the several States at the international level. The jurisdiction over all other things was given to the States so that they could best serve the interests of their respective citizens.

Thus it was that our Nation was formed, not as a country subdivided into States for political expediency, but as sovereign States united for the mutual well-being. This was the intention of our Founding Fathers and the basis for the doctrine of States rights.

Commonsense can tell us that as individuals we can benefit more from a State government. Because the people of any one State are more likely to have unified interests, the State government can deal more effectively with the problem of the people than can the Federal Government.

Economy is another advantage that appeals to the citizens of today. The shorter the trip of the tax dollar, the smaller the amount of it that must be spent for handling. Taxes collected by the State bring direct benefits to the same people who paid them. We invariably lose money when it is sent all the way to Washington only to have a fraction of it come back in the form of aid.

In addition to economy and practicality, the proximity of the State government makes it truly a government of, by, and for the people. They are able to scrutinize its workings and to examine its usefulness. Need for reform can be seen sooner and the reform itself can be accomplished quicker in the comparatively small area of a State. There is a greater change for each person to take part in and feel the results of this government.

The advantage that an emphasis on State government has for the individual can be and has been easily shown. They do not point out a need to abolish the Federal Government, but rather, they lead us to the positive conclusion that the strengthening of these United States is dependent upon the strengthening of these inherent States rights. Our Nation will not have achieved its full potential of greatness until this is recognized, for the ingredient now lacking is domestic harmony.

At present, our land is torn with jealousy and resentment. As the U.S. Government steps more and more into the jurisdiction of the States, one is turned against the other as they either compete for benevolences or cry out against infractions.

This indeed has become a problem in our present political situation, but it is of very little importance in comparison to a newer and greater one. This new enigma is the desire to sacrifice our national rights on the altar of world federation. If more people could be informed on States rights and its importance, they would become aware of these losses at the State and national level.

It is now time for us to see that these losses are restored by using our influence and abilities to see that States rights are preserved. By doing so we will insure internal harmony and national sovereignty through an economical and practical government, one that is true to its original meaning.

Public Opinion in the Greater Boston Area About Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, during the past winter the World Affairs Council of Boston has held its third annual discussion series on American foreign policy, during which more than 5,000 citizens in eastern Massachusetts met each week for 8 weeks to consider key issues.

The Council is to commended for its energetic efforts to increase public understanding of the problems of foreign policy which face our Nation.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the appendix of the RECORD a tabulation of opinion ballots on the eight topics of "Decisions 1959" which has been prepared by the World Affairs Council of Boston. This tabulation furnishes an interesting insight into the public opinion in the Greater Boston area about foreign policy.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECISIONS 1959—RESULTS OF TABULATION OF OPINION BALLOTS

TOPIC NO. 1. WILL ALLIANCES KEEP THE PEACE?

Tabulation of the opinion ballots on this topic revealed that many citizens of the greater Boston area (97 percent) think that the cold war, in one form or another, will probably continue for some time to come. Only 15 percent think that Communist influence in the world can be contained by a system of alliances, however, 81 percent believe that a strong and well-coordinated Western alliance is essential to U.S. security.

Of the decisions participants, 57 percent feel that the United States should have closer coordination of cold-war political and military policies with its Western allies while 75 percent think that there should also be closer coordination of economic policies. Few (6 percent) think that the United States should depend less on allies and concentrate on building U.S. economic and military power.

In relation to the non-Communist and underdeveloped world 81 percent feel that the United States should place less emphasis on building the military capacities of underdeveloped allies and more on their economic and social development, and also, that the United States should invest in greatly expanded trade and economic growth throughout the non-Communist world.

TOPIC NO. 2. ARE WE REALISTIC ABOUT COMMUNIST POWERS?

The Decisions ballots indicate that many Boston citizens (73 percent) believe that allout war with the Communist powers is always a possibility for which the West must be prepared. However, 64 percent do not think that the West can best prevent the further spread of communism through adequate military preparedness. The following policies were most often suggested as ones which deal most realistically with Communist powers:

1. That the West should put an embargo on trade in strategic materials with the Communist bloc (44 percent);

2. That the United States should maintain its commitments to reduce trade barriers and expand trade in the non-Communist world (83 percent);

3. That the United States should give military and economic assistance to Yugoslavia (59 percent); and

4. That the United States should give economic assistance to Poland (65 percent).

TOPIC NO. 3. PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST: WHOSE JOB?

A large number of ballots (88 percent) stated that the United States has a moral and ethical responsibility to help the people of the Middle East realize their aspirations for better health, working and living conditions. About the same number of people (86 percent) feel that United States help in social and economic development of this area should depend on the willingness of local leaders to cooperate and commit their own resources. Although this number think that, in principal, the United States should be involved in the social and economic development of the Middle East, a relatively high percentage (30 percent) think that the United States should not be as deeply involved as it is in Arab politics and rivalries.

In regard to communism in the Middle East, 68 percent of the participants think that the United States should supply military and/or economic assistance to any Middle Eastern government which is threatened by aggression from international communism and which requests such assistance (Eisenhower doctrine—13 percent do not agree with this policy). In dealing with communism in this area it is significant to note that 93 percent think that big power conflicts in the Middle East should be neutralized by bringing the U.N. more into Middle Eastern affairs.

The following policy proposals were the ones which received the most support from Decisions participants:

1. Participate financially in any Arab-sponsored development bank or institution that is set up on a sound basis (68 percent).

2. Continue U.S. aid and technical assistance programs country-by-country (66 percent).

3. Counteract anti-Western, anti-U.S. radio propaganda in the Middle East by expanding U.S. information activities (76 percent).

4. Press in the U.N. for an expanded permanent U.N. police force in the area to help keep peace on the borders and to monitor radio propaganda and other forms of indirect aggression against the independence of Arab states (80 percent).

TOPIC NO. 4. A BETTER NEIGHBOR POLICY FOR LATIN AMERICA

Seventy seven percent of the Decisions participants think that Latin America should receive higher priority than it has in the past in U.S. global foreign policy. Fifty four percent feel that the United States should approach Latin American development problems (economic, social, and political) on a regional basis and not on a country-by-country basis. Few (16 percent) think the United States should feel free to intervene on the side of democratic forces trying to overthrow totalitarian governments.

The following are some of the internal problems of Latin America which Boston citizens feel are important enough for U.S. assistance:

1. Improving educational systems (87 percent).

2. Controlling disease and providing better health and sanitation facilities (79 percent).

3. Diversifying internal economic development (76 percent).

4. Encouraging development of democratic governments (68 percent).

5. Promoting greater U.S. private investment in internal economies (66 percent).

6. Speeding up internal economic development (60 percent).

Specific policy proposals regarding Latin America which received the most support are:

1. Expand cultural and student exchange programs and encourage the study of Latin American languages and cultures in U.S. schools (76 percent).

2. Try to find long-range answers to the commodity price problem by joining with other surplus-producing nations in joint studies (70 percent). Few (6 percent) think that there should be a restriction of U.S. imports of Latin American commodities which might damage U.S. producers (such as lead, zinc, oil, etc.).

3. Reduce or discontinue U.S. military assistance to dictators (64 percent).

4. Expand present U.S. economic and technical assistance programs in Latin America (62 percent).

5. Explore the possibilities of a regional (hemispheric) tariff and trade agreement to reduce trade barriers, stimulate regional trade, and stabilize prices (62 percent).

Put Your House in Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, the other day the editor of the Columbus Citizen, Don E. Weaver, wrote a Sunday editorial entitled "Are You Eating High on the Hog?" A number of the comments contained in Mr. Weaver's article should be thoroughly reviewed by Members of this Congress.

Accordingly, I am submitting a copy of the text of this editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, for the information of Members of Congress.

ARE YOU EATING HIGH ON THE HOG?

(By Don E. Weaver)

Reading the papers you might think everyone is doing very well these days.

Congressmen, for instance, get $22,500 a year, another tax-free $2,500 for expenses, and a $37,000 allowance for office help. Just to keep it in the family, some Congressmen hire wives, sons, or daughters.

Two Iowa Democrats hit the headlines. One paid his wife $13,334 a year. Another paid his son, a 19-year-old university student, $11,873.

This revelation probably will defeat them at the next election, and it should. Congressmen who greedily gobble up tax money that way are morally dishonest. And Congressmen who don't do it themselves, but who condone it in their colleagues, are phonies.

Ironically, just as this crass nepotism was exposed, Congress was getting ready to declare itself another boost in expense money.

The Citizen series on high costs of hospitals, doctors, and medicine brought mixed reaction. Some were shocked that the charges are so high. Others say we didn't tell the half of it. They mention doctors who seem to generate fees and then keep raising them.

Meanwhile, over in the rackets committee, a procession of characters who have gotten rich from labor-union rackets cynically take the fifth amendment and defy the investigators to get the truth out of them.

Also, meanwhile, the Federal deficit runs higher, and Mike DiSalle has asked for $325 million more in his Ohio budget. Ohio is already over the $2 billion mark—more than the entire Federal budget was some years ago.

Congressmen, doctors, and union members who are highly paid are eating high on the hog. The unionists are demanding constantly more, which will just drive inflation up a few more notches.

But not everyone is doing so well. A little old lady calls us now and then to chat and air her troubles. She's a shut-in. She retired from schoolteaching so long ago she gets no pension. Her husband died too early for social security. She owns her home so she can't get old-age benefits.

She lives on a little insurance set up years ago before inflation cut the buying power of annuities in half. How will she live?

"Please do something to stop this inflation and spending," she pleads. Her wagon is not hitched to the star of inflation.

We have a letter from an Ohio State University professor. He's been reading about the incomes in the medical profession.

"The typical general practitioner gets $15,000 a year," he quotes. "The typical professor at Ohio State with lengthier training gets $7,500. Just half."

He gives his case history: "I came to Ohio State in the thirties as a full professor. During the depression, of course, I took cuts. Slowly we have climbed back up. But today in purchasing power my salary is slightly less than it was when I came here nearly 30 years ago. My case is fairly typical. Try to match our case with any other profession."

How do you suppose the reports of congressional greed, and of doctors' high incomes sound to old ladies living on insurance and professors whose pay hasn't kept up with the Joneses?

How do you suppose they like the stories of union featherbedding and strikes for more increases on pay that is already higher than a professor's?

Loose spending has become the American way of life. It reaches from the highest Federal level down through local governments and into our personal and family habits.

Let your wants, not your purse, be your guide. If you run short, squawk for more pay or a bigger expense account. If you can't afford it, charge it.

If you get in trouble holler for help. Look at all the welfare agencies, public, and private, that are supposed to look after you.

But if a nation as prosperous as the United States can't break even in times like these, when can it ever break even? And when can it ever start reducing the huge public debt?

The Congress that is building itself luxurious new office buildings, increasing its own pay, and tossing big chunks of expense money to its kinfolks, is the Congress that taxes us and spends our money.

There would be no Federal debt if Congress didn't vote it. It makes the laws. It represents the people. It levies taxes. It makes all appropriations. If it's doing wrong, you people just sent the wrong men.

We the people must take some of the blame. Partly for yelling for Federal handouts for our pet projects. Partly for not seeming to give a hoot what Congress does.

While we weren't paying attention, a vast bureaucracy has grown up at Washington. It's a system so vast, so entrenched, that no ordinary effort can shake it.

It's riding for a fall, and great may be the fall of this crazy, careless, blind spiral we call inflation.

Let Congress Know

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CARLTON LOSER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including two editorials which recently appeared in the Nashville Banner, Nashville, Tenn., in support of the Talmadge amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

It is my belief, as it is the belief of this fine newspaper, that the control of public schools should be in State and local hands.

I hope you will read these editorials. They follow:

TALMADGE BILL OPPORTUNITY FOR CONGRESS TO DISARM HANDS OF MISCHIEF

When irresponsible hands, whether individuals or agencies, persist in mischief, it's a good idea not only to put valued property out of their reach, but to disarm them of the instruments recklessly employed.

That is what Senator HERMAN TALMADGE, of Georgia, proposes to do in the bill he has introduced, which would provide that no Federal judge could hear, determine, or review any case growing out of the administration of public schools by States or their political subdivisions.

The measure in its specific purpose would rest on a point of law already written—a dozen times—into Federal statute; namely, that control of the public school system shall be exclusively vested in State hands forever.

In 12 acts admitting new States—every case of admission since the public school system came into existence—that stipulation has been included. It is spelled out beyond argument. Not once has it been formally challenged as such, much less repealed.

Judicial lawmaking has simply tried to bypass it.

Senator TALMADGE addresses himself to the realities of the case when he points out to colleagues that a usurpation has occurred divesting the States of authority reserved to them—transcending any question of State preference for either segregation or desegregation. For those mindful of the principle involved, the reminder should not be necessary that, no matter how much some citizens may applaud the school desegregation decision, "they will accept the manner in which it was handed down only at the peril of exposing themselves to some future application of the same theory of legislation by judicial decree."

Many today are realizing that who did not immediately in the wake of May 17, 1954. And most surely can understand the valid point of decision by State preference in an area of responsibility properly and historically left to State and local determination.

Pressure elements will rant against this measure all over again—quoting Myrdal, the NAACP, the ADA, but never the Constitution.

They are intolerant of the restraints placed on caprice by the basic concept of a government of law.

But a wider audience, a majority of the people who are aware of where this drift is leading will—with their eyes opened—demand of Congress the safeguards inherent in a governmental structure of checks and balances.

The public school system as such is crumbling under the assault of mischievous hands. It is time to disarm those hands, and Congress can do that if it will.

LET CONGRESS KNOW

The Constitution of the United States belongs to the people. They are the Government, as they are the governed.

It is theirs to amend, if that is deemed necessary. It is theirs to defend against emasculation or abridgment. It is theirs to spell out at points, if at points—under severity of test—that is needed.

Senator HERMAN TALMADGE's proposed amendment would clarify beyond all legalistic argument, pressure, or judicial distortion, the fact historically recognized—until the Supreme Court ruling of May 17, 1954—that public school controls belong exclusively in State and local hands.

That is not a segregation view or an integration view; it leaves the decision on that matter with the States and communities themselves; is uniformly fair, and an essential safeguard against the calamity of strife that has befallen America.

The enabling act now is before Congress, to submit that question to the people of the 49 States to decide. Yet because of the opposition pressure on an organized and inflammatory scale, many Members of Congress are on the fence.

If they hear from home—if they hear from constituents in the 49 States, unquestionably fair enough, and concerned enough, to demand submission of this amendment—they will approve it.

After all, it would be odd if Congressmen refused to let the people decide a question for themselves.

Senator TALMADGE has urged the people of the United States to write their lawmakers.

It is from that point that instruction must come.

Write your Congressman. Write your whole delegation.

Outstanding Musical Achievement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to invite the attention of the House to the remarkable achievements of Mr. John Bearzi, a young man who was born and raised in my district and has now gone to Colorado Springs, Colo., where his achievements as the conductor of the concerto ensemble have drawn praise from numerous quarters. Mr. Bearzi's parents, Mr. and Mrs. Louis Bearzi, of Lenox, Mass., and all of us in western Massachusetts, are tremendously proud of this young man's impressive achievements in the musical world.

We were pleased to note that he recently conducted the concerto ensemble in performances on television, drawing the praise of Gov. Steve McNichols, of Colorado, who said:

There is a distinct need for the type of musicianship and musical presentation

(this) group offered to the privileged viewers and listeners of Colorado.

Performances by the ensemble have been universally hailed in the press. At this point I wish to include in the RECORD excerpts from an article in the Colorado Springs Free Press:

On Monday night a group of nine instrumentalists under the direction of John Bearzi met to play two concertos for string instruments, by Vivaldi and Corelli. * * *

John Bearzi, himself a descendant of a famous Italian family with strong musical connections, directed this small group in a masterly way. We hear much about inherited qualities and characteristics. Could it be that he has inherited from his Italian forebears something of the rhythm of that country's culture? Certainly the ideas and ideals of feeling for interpretation of music of this caliber cannot be acquired from books, from study, or from toil. It is inherited in the individual, from its people.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, may I call the attention of my colleagues in the Congress to the following letter received by me from two junior high school teachers in Santa Barbara, Calif.:

SANTA BARBARA, CALIF.,
February 4, 1959.

Hon. CHARLES M. TEAGUE,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The undersigned are writing you to express our opinions regarding the principle of Federal aid to education and specifically concerning the Murray-Metcalf bill. We are categorically opposed to the latter for the following reasons:

1. Economy: It is much more economical to collect money on the local and State level and spend it on those same levels. Money passing through a dozen bureaucratic hands from the local level up to Washington and back is bound to return to the local school districts (taxpayers) in a very anemic, not to say dangerously weakened, condition. In fact, we would be lucky if California recovered 50 percent of the money contributed.

2. Logic: Since California is one of the wealthier States, obviously it would contribute much more than it would receive back. We sympathize with the plight of the poor tenant farmers of Mississippi, but in these days of high taxes we don't feel obligated to help relieve their condition, which stems in large part from the faulty socioeconomic systems of the past and not from a lack of resources. Many States with poor educational systems have as ample natural resources as does California.

3. Control: A federally supported educational system, even though only partially supported in the beginning, will inevitably, with time, come under partial or complete Federal control. This must not happen. This is probably the most dangerous aspect of all in the long run. A monolithic Federal system of education would be a ready apparatus for a demogog to brainwash whole generations into becoming a subservient, unthinking mass. With control retained on no higher than the State level this would be impossible.

4. Aid to education: Proponents of Federal aid claim that teachers' salaries would increase by an average of $1,500 (or some similar figure) if Murray-Metcalf were passed, that a golden era of plenty would ensue for the whole educational apparatus if only the "Washington money tree" could be forced to bear fruit. Our contention is that no matter how stringent an attempt would be made to insure that recipients of such aid keep spending their own money at the same level, in time State and local support would dwindle percentagewise compared to the amount provided by Washington. After all, local and State politicians have a duty to their constituents to keep down taxes if possible.

5. Support by educational organization: Judging by the professional journals we see—the California Teacher Association Journal and the National Education Association Journal—all teachers are 100 percent for Federal aid. Such is not the case. In our local organization here in Santa Barbara there has never, to our knowledge, been a floor discussion of the principle of Federal aid, or of any specific bill. The members have never voted pro or con on any aspect of same. No delegate from our local group has ever been instructed either way on how to vote when attending State or National meetings. The above-mentioned journals have never invited professional opinion or comment or conducted any sort of poll or vote. To us this situation seems only too grimly reminiscent of certain union practices so justly condemned by much of the American public.

In closing, we should like to say that this is not a political question at all, as far as we can see. Apparently party convictions have little bearing in the case, although we both voted for you in the recent election. One of us is a Democrat and the other a Republican. We heartily congratulate you on your stand concerning this matter in the past and hope you will continue to hold your same views on this and other matters.

Sincerely,

GEORGE E. HOPPING,
E. GRANT RUNYAN,
Teachers, LaCumbre Junior High School.

James Michael Curley

SPEECH
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 25, 1959

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, Gov. James Michael Curley was a great invincible fighter for the ordinary man whose lot he worked so hard for years to improve.

He was a man of superb and extraordinary gifts, one of the most famous orators of our day, a highly gifted administrator, and an unsurpassed tenacious public advocate.

He had the courage of a lion and a warmth of human kindness and loyalty that endeared him to his friends and all those who knew him.

A beloved and valued colleague in the Congress, I had occasion to know and observe the warm personal qualities of Governor Curley and his great zeal for human betterment. The future will bring greater luster to his colorful personality and outstanding public career.

May he find rest and peace in his eternal home.

United States-Canada Relations: After Awareness What?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 10, 1959

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, one of our colleagues, the Honorable FRANK COFFIN of Maine, was one of the first Members of Congress to become alert to the growing tensions between the people of Canada and the United States. Determined that this increasing unfriendliness must not be permitted to continue, he, along with our former colleague, the Honorable Brooks Hays, conducted a study of the problems and issues involved, and they submitted a most noteworthy report on the subject. I beg all the Members of Congress to read it.

The report highlights the traditional friendship between the people of the United States and of Canada as well as the geographical significance of two nations sharing an unguarded border of 4,800 miles, sharing common objectives, loving peace, and most important, believing in the dignity of man. The Hays-Coffin report thrashed out the issues and origins of the deterioration of relations between the two countries. As a result of the report and as a result of the study of the same problem conducted by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and by Senator AIKEN, of Vermont, a study group composed of Members of the House and the Senate, respectively, was appointed by the Speaker of the House and the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, pursuant to a Senate resolution, to meet with the Members of the Parliament of Canada. The first Hays-Coffin report, which contained a recommendation for the establishment of closer legislative liaison between the United States and Canada was the first suggestion for the establishment of bilateral relationships between the legislatures of the two countries. The suggestion was picked up by the Prime Minister of Canada and encouraged by the Parliament of Canada, and endorsed by the executive branch of the U.S. Government.

A meeting of representatives of the two legislatures was held in January of this year here in Washington and at that time it was agreed that the establishment of a continuing inter-parliamentary group to be composed of representatives of the United States and Canada would have a salutary effect on the relations between the two countries. Furthermore, the Canadian group has now issued an invitation to 12 Members of the House and to 12 Members of the Senate to attend a meeting in Canada

to be held in conjunction with the formal dedication of the St. Lawrence Seaway. We are endeavoring to make plans to participate in that meeting. There is a steering group on the U.S. side composed of Mr. COFFIN, of Maine; Mr. MERROW, of New Hampshire; Mr. JUDD, of Minnesota; and myself for the House, and of Senator AIKEN, Senator MANSFIELD, Senator MORSE, and Senator CAPEHART for the Senate.

In order to facilitate this meeting and in order to provide for the continuation of these meetings I have introduced House Joint Resolution 254, authorizing U.S. participation in parliamentary conferences with Canada. The resolution provides for the appointment of not to exceed 12 Members from the House and 12 Members from the Senate to participate in each meeting. It is not contemplated that 24 Members will participate in each meeting and it is quite probable that some of the meetings will be composed of a smaller group. The resolution also authorizes the appropriation of not to exceed $30,000 each year to meet the expenses of these meetings. Fifteen thousand dollars of this amount is to be available for expenses of the House group and $15,000 is to be available for the expenses of the Senate group.

It is my belief that the group that this resolution establishes will go far toward creating new understanding on both sides of the border and that it will result in the development of new ideas and new approaches to our economic and political problems.

The Honorable FRANK M. COFFIN recently delivered a speech at the Canadian-American Relations Seminar, at Michigan State University, in which he discussed the value of a Canadian-United States parliamentary group. I would like to insert this address in the RECORD:

AFTER AWARENESS WHAT?

(Address by Representative FRANK M. COFFIN, of Maine, at Canadian-American relations seminar, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Mich., March 9, 1959)

There are many new dimensions in the relations between the United States and Canada. They range from defense, trade, transportation, power, travel, education, culture, investment, management, labor, and resource arrangements to diplomacy in most areas and in most groupings of the world.

There is certainly a new awareness on both sides of the border. That on the Canadian side has come earlier, sunk in deeper, and spread wider. It is a popular theme, originating spontaneously from many sources, lending itself to political uses by all parties, and tending to be (so far as United States-Canadian relations are concerned) more divisive than cohesive in its impact. In short, the new awareness on the Canadian side is a natural instrument of nationalism.

On the U.S. side of the border, there is also a new and unmistakable awareness. But mark the differences. It is less than 2 years old. It began, quite self consciously, with a few of us in Congress, caught on in some executive departments, attracted the attention of some observant commentators, and has reached the stage of quite formal cabinet and congressional arrangements. It is spreading both in Congress and in the public mind, slowly, deliberately, almost painstakingly. There is no political lodestone in this movement. To some extend there may be political liability. The tenor of U.S. awareness is a constructive one, placing more emphasis on hearing the other side than on stating its own case. These factors justify one in saying that the new awareness on the U.S. side is a hard wrought instrument of international accommodation.

These two sides of the new awareness are natural, in view of the disparity of size, of population, wealth, and influence of the two nations. The comparison implies no moral judgments. I predict that as the new awareness loses its novelty, there will emerge international overtones in Canada and national themes in the United States. What we can hope for is a balance on both sides, an adjustment of problems with no injustices to the national aspirations of either country.

This, however, will not automatically happen. The new dimensions which make both sensible and necessary the new awareness could lead to the new psychosis.

Awareness is in itself neither good nor bad—or, perhaps more accurately, it can be both. It is good when it leads to effective action to deal with a situation. It is bad when it is static, leading nowhere, except to frustration.

It is still too early to say which of these roads the new awareness will travel. But the time will soon come when we can tell.

There are two dangers that threaten. One is that we who are actively enrolled in the awareness forces shall try too little. The other is that we shall try too much. In either case we shall be harshly judged by impossible standards of excessive expectations. What I mean by trying too little is that we may feel that all that is needed are occasional fellowship meetings, strong on the amenities and weak on the specifics. Should meetings at Cabinet, sub-Cabinet, or congressional levels be too infrequent, too short, too poorly prepared, too press-release conscious, there will set in a disillusionment that will undo much of the good work that has been done.

The opposite trap lies in trying to do too much. This would happen if the various executive groups or our Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group failed to recognize their limitations. There are some problems that are unsolvable; there are others that only time will solve; still others can be solved but by other groups or in other contexts. For example, it would not in my opinion be productive if our interparliamentary group were to set itself the task of trying to arrive at a consensus on tariff matters or of trying to persuade the other side of the soundness of our position. Here we may well find that a consensus is impossible and that national positions are fixed and at least temporarily immutable. It would be a waste of time, talent, and opportunity if this group should take upon itself the role of a perpetually hung jury.

It is right and proper for both executive and parliamentary joint bodies to begin their work by developing an agenda for discussion. Much good can come by way of understanding and tolerance simply from the presentation of different views of the many problems existing between the two nations. But eventually there will come a time when awareness for awareness' sake will not be enough.

When this time comes, what function will our interparliamentary group serve? I have been deeply concerned over the proper and fruitful function of this group in the long run. After all, we have taken an unprecedented step in the technique of international relationships. There are other interparliamentary organizations. These, however, involve many nations, large memberships, and obvious limitations in marking out fields of common interest. Their purposes are and must be of the broadest scope and general in nature.

What is different about the Canada-United States Inter-Parliamentary Group? What is its justification? There are some who fear that this may be a precedent for forming bilateral parliamentary liaisons with other nations. The answer to this fear lies not in political theory but in the opportunities for meaningful collaboration.

These opportunities arise from the length of the 4,000-mile common border; the infinite daily crossings of people, goods, services, and ideas; the interdependence of the two nations in defense, in economic development, in diplomacy; the multiplicity of friction points and problems. The essential point is that the very intimacy of relationships creates problems which overpower the ordinary channels of collecting, analyzing, discussing, and acting on information. Even with such a close and important ally as the United Kingdom, distance from the United States and proximity to other nations blunts the edge of the American problem. There may even be a kind of diplomatic law of thermodynamics: the farther apart countries are, the more adequate are the ordinary channels of relationships; the closer together they are, the more need exists for extraordinary arrangements.

It is my conviction that a flexible but continuous relationship between the lawmaking groups of complex and advanced neighboring nations is eminently sensible, if those concerned see and remain faithful to their proper function.

That function is, in my opinion, not so much the attempt to solve problems as it is the continuing and systematic effort to improve the procedures for recognizing, discussing, and solving problems. This distinction could be the means of avoiding stand-off stalemated sessions between people who lack the power to solve the problems they are discussing. It could be the key to a limited but highly useful service.

For example, I can easily imagine Canadian and U.S. parliamentarians making little progress in persuading their opposite numbers to change their positions relating to lead and zinc. But I can imagine them coming to agreement as to the manner in which metals policies should be changed, as to the usefulness of full discussions before changes are made, as to the need for exploring noncontroversial fields as research, marketing, and the gathering of worldwide data as to supply and demand.

This function would require an orientation toward procedure. The objective would be what former Congressman Brooks Hays and I have called "mechanisms which will guarantee—if not a solution—an orderly, regular, and routine method of discussion, exchange of views, and, if possible, agreement on action."

Here is how I would visualize the Canadian-United States Inter-Parliamentary Group working: It would begin with a full exchange of views on the major problems besetting the two nations. This process of mutual education could be expedited by the preparation of position papers on the various subjects by the members of each side. These papers would be exchanged by the two sides before the first series of meetings. Oral exchanges would then be encouraged.

A Canadian and a U.S. parliamentarian could be assigned the task of preparing a summary for each subject. This would include a description of the problem, the Canadian position(s), the U.S. position(s), a report of any consensus that could be arrived at, a statement of the remaining issues, and a description of possible approaches to solution.

At this point, possibly at a subsequent meeting, the subject matter is taken up again, but from a different point of view. The focus shifts to possible procedures. Such questions would be explored as these: Is there need for more research on the problem? Is there need for better communication of facts or positions to interested parties, government, or the people on the

other side of the border? Is there enough opportunity for discussion of the problem on both sides? Is the communication between governments frequent enough, easily achieved, and responsibly achieved? Is there need for advice to governments? Are additional structures needed? How can citizens or citizen groups help? Does experience in other countries offer a lead? Should the problem be considered in the broader context of the free world?

In trying to answer these questions, the group would be well advised to invite those intimately concerned to talk, not primarily on the merits, but on the procedures and mechanisms which might lead to sclutions.

A vital part of the group's function would be that of a friendly watchdog on the effectiveness of the relationships between the executive branches of the two Governments. To change the figure, the group would serve as an anticoagulant to the Canadian-United States bloodstream. There are certain natural tendencies of bureaucracies. Some of them are as follows: To resist change; to do things as they have been done before; to reduce the level of decision to that of the lowest common denominator; to avoid seeking new problem areas; to delay moving into an area that looks like added work; to put off meetings that might be difficult or inconvenient; to avoid bringing issues to a head where one's department might not appear to advantage; to limit meetings and discussions to platitudes; and, above all, to cultivate an abiding distrust of and contempt for the legislator.

The overnight function of Congress is well established. I am not sure to what extent the Canadian Parliament exercises a similar function, in view of the fact that the government leaders also serve as leaders in Parliament. Nevertheless, there is no reason why the Canadian-U.S. Inter-Parliamentary Group could not keep track of the relationships between the executive branches, and make observations as to their improvement. The U.S. members of the group, could, for example, study the extent to which joint cabinet committee meetings had been prepared, agenda set forth, background briefings given to participants; the extent to which each government consults with the other in advance of a policy shift; the adequacy of opposite number communication and discussion at career staff levels; the need for additional executive relationships; the need on each side for coordination and centralization of data in all the areas of concern. The Canadian members could, I am confident, find areas where their government's procedures could be improved.

The mere fact that an informed and interested group is serving as a procedural watchdog will do much to stimulate a higher level of performance by executive personnel both in their planning for meetings and in their day-to-day performance. What I have been suggesting is not an antagonistic role for the Inter-Parliamentary Group. Its observation should be made to the respective governments in a friendly, even private manner. No good purpose would ordinarily be served by blowing up criticism of either government by the lawmakers of either nation.

The results of the lawmakers' group operating in the procedural area might not be dramatic. We hope, of course, that over a period of time there will be enough members of Parliament and Members of Congress educated to see the point of view of the other nation to make possible the passing of salutary laws or the removal of some irritants. But in the meantime a worthy purpose will have been achieved if new channels of communication are opened, if interchange of views reaches a new level of attention, if roadblocks to consideration of problems are removed.

The function I have described is a legitimate role for the parliamentarians of both countries. Both countries have the representative form of government. The members of Parliament and the Member of Congress represents his constitutents. He is close to them, knows their problems, and is the instrument through which his people speak. The representative can bring to the overwhelming task of Canadian-United States relationships the insights and irritations of the farmer, businessmen, laborer, shopkeeper, and tourist. The parliamentary member can supply the leaven of the generalist to the loaf of the specialist.

We are entering a period of great and continued strains and stresses on both our nations. This new experiment in parliamentary relationships can well serve to minimize these pressures. It will do this if it helps direct "the new awareness" into areas of fruitful activity. We shall have succeeded in our task when it is no longer newsworthy to hold seminars about awareness. Our objective is to make awareness commonplace, routine, undramatic, and highly productive.

The Townsend Plan for National Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED MARSHALL
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to pay tribute to the dedicated people all over America who are joined with the Townsend plan for national insurance in working for a decent standard of living for our older citizens. Their headquarters is just a few blocks from this Capitol and most of us here are familiar with the fine services this office performs.

In the decade I have been privileged to serve my disrtict in the Congress, I have come to respect the faithful and tireless service this organization performs solely in behalf of the elderly citizens of our country. It has undertaken this worthy effort on a national level and deserves our commendation for the leadership it has provided. It has always been in the forefront of efforts to attain a realistic program of security for retired workers and continues to assert this leadership at a time when the problem is of growing consequence.

As a farmer and as a representative of a great agricultural area, it is natural that I should think of this legislation in terms of farm families. The serious decline in farm income and the natural hazards of agriculture make it difficult for farm families to provide for retirement. Yet, farmers were among the last to be covered under the Social Security Act and many today can qualify for only the minimum benefits. As self-employed persons, a distressing number of farmers operate at marginal levels and will therefore continue to qualify for the minimum or near-minimum benefits.

We certainly can agree that farmers contributing to any such program should be treated as equals of other workers and self-employed. They deserve the same opportunity to maintain a decent standard of living upon retirement from active farm operation.

Farmers have another stake in a realistic program of security for old age inasmuch as food is the basic requirement of every human being and retired workers remain the customers of agriculture. As the number of retired persons grows, it is important that their purchasing power be maintained at the level of decent comfort and adequate diet. Our interest in the retired worker, however, is not primarily economic, but humanitarian. In the midst of our abundance, we cannot permit a whole segment of our society to exist at subsistence levels after they have contributed their most productive years to our growth.

Because they are genuinely concerned with this problem and are dedicated to its solution, I welcome representatives of the Townsend organization to my office. In fact, in the 10 years I have been privileged to serve in this legislative body, the Townsend group have been the only organization to come to my office to express concern over the problems of the aged, those senior citizens of ours who have contributed so much to building our great country.

We respectfully suggest that all who share this concern devote some time to considering the purposes of H.R. 4000 and the goal it envisions. We are all too familiar with the inadequacies and the inequities of the present social security program and know that we must move forward with realistic programs if we are to meet the challenge now upon us.

Special Citation Awarded to Two Steamship Companies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, because of their significance and satisfactory performance in the interest of the general public, it is gratifying to have recognition given to the Marven Steamship Co.—formerly the Ore Navigation Corp.—and the Calmar Steamship Co. for attaining highest rating in vessel sanitation after the closest inspection by our Government authorities. These companies have just been awarded the special citations of the Public Health Service, after approval of the recommendations of inspectors by Joseph B. O'Connor, Regional Director of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware.

Harry W. Warley, who has over a lengthy period distinguished himself in maritime affairs of our Nation, is the president of both companies, and received the awards.

The special citations were given because each of the 9 ships of the Marven

Steamship Co., and each of the 12 ships of the Calmar Steamship Co. achieved a rating of 95 or better on official Public Health Service inspections in which 166 separate items of sanitary construction and maintenance were involved. Our citizens in large numbers, who have had contact with President Warley and with representatives of the two companies in question, will approve of these awards, which have been justified by lengthy satisfactory service

The Marven Co. has earned the award for the third consecutive year, while the Calmar Corp. is now being cited for the second successive year. Both concerns transport valuable products to Bethlehem Steel Co., and their ships transport lumber from west coast ports in connection with their return voyages.

Americans have reason to be proud of the performance of these companies, which have given encouragement to steamship operators in different parts of country.

A Positive Image

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I submit the following editorial from the Omaha World-Herald. The editorial appeared in the March 22 issue, and I believe it will be interesting to the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

A POSITIVE IMAGE

There's a story in the newspaper business about a country editor who was asked which side his paper would take in a local dispute.

"We haven't made up our mind yet," said the editor, "but I can promise you one thing—when we do we're going to be bitter."

Chairman Meade Alcorn of the Republican National Committee is in the position of the undecided editor.

Mr. Alcorn has been searching for a "soul" for the Republican Party. Or, in the words of the Madison Avenue ad men, an "image." The idea is to figure out what the Republican Party should stand for and then sell that image to the voters in 1960.

Meanwhile Mr. Alcorn has been out trying to stir up enthusiasm for his party.

"I am hopeful, of course, that all of you will choose the Republican Party," he has been telling college groups. "In any case, be political, be partisan."

Mr. Alcorn's plea for fervor when he isn't sure what the voters should be fervent about is one of the signs of these confused political times. The confusion affects both parties but seems to be more apparent among Republicans.

One thing the Madison Avenue people are telling Republicans is that they've got to "accentuate the positive." It isn't enough to be "agin'" something, they say. You've got to be "for." About this the witch doctors of modern politics are right. The Republicans (and Democrats, too) should present "a positive image." They should be "for" something. But what?

C. P. Ives said in the Baltimore Sun the other day that Republican idea men were overlooking an image that already exists, one much talked about by President Eisenhower. He wants his party to stand for sound money.

"As even his critics concede," Mr. Ives went on, "sound money shoots off implications in all policy directions."

It does indeed. If you're for sound money you cannot be for measures and practices that promote inflation.

Inflationists are for inflation because they expect to gain by it and to be protected from its bad effects. Inflationists know, for example, that pressure for higher wages inflates prices and so makes goods less available to other people. Unions try to get around this by out-pressuring employers and raising wages that much more.

But there is no defense against inflation for the great body of Americans who don't belong to pressure groups. This includes millions of wage earners and salaried workers, the self-employed, professional people and managers. It also includes millions who are nominally members of pressure groups but who realize that stable money is the only way that everybody can be protected against inflation.

If the Republicans are to be a consistent sound-money party, Mr. Ives points out, they will have to abandon inflationary high protective tariffs. But high tariffs are increasingly part of the Democratic grabbag of handouts for everybody. Jettisoning by the Republicans of the tariff issue along with high, fixed farm support prices and other catch-all subsidies would help make the difference between the major parties clear cut. A sound-money party would necessarily take a disapproving view of prodigal foreign aid, waste in government and all other policies and practices that erode the dollar.

If the Republicans really want an "image" around which millions of worried, dissatisfied Americans can rally, sound money is that image. And if Republican leaders will so declare, firmly and consistently, fervent support will be forthcoming.

The Al Sarena Case: A Log-Rolling Mine Gathers No Gold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the other day in reading through the interesting hearings on the Department of the Interior and related agencies appropriations for 1960 I came across an enlightening exchange between my able and distinguished friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] who is, of course, chairman of the appropriations subcommittee, and the director of the Bureau of Land Management of the Department of the Interior, Mr. Edward Woozley. You will no doubt remember that the famous Al Serena case developed in the Fourth Congressional District of Oregon and was one of the important issues in the campaign which resulted in my election to the 85th Congress. Under leave to extend my remarks I am inserting the following brief, but delightful, exchange between the chairman and the witness:

AL SARENA CASE

Mr. KIRWAN. Maybe one of you could enlighten me on this point. Did they ever discover those minerals that we gave Al Serena with all of that timber?

Mr. WOOZLEY. I think the minerals were discovered, but whether or not they are operating is a question. Gold prices are not too conducive to mining, and they have not been since 1934, as you know.

Mr. KIRWAN. They are not mining. This reminds me of a story Bob Burns, the comedian, once told about his uncle.

It took him 3 years to chisel a huge boulder out of the mountain overlooking Van Buren. He finally chiseled it away and the boulder rolled down the mountainside and destroyed every building in its path. They followed the boulder and when they got up to it to examine it carefully, his uncle said, "Just as I thought, no moss."

The same seems to be true of that mineral lease given to Al Sarena. After he removed thousands of dollars worth of timber, he found no minerals.

Mr. WOOZLEY. The timber is on a national forest.

Mr. KIRWAN. I am glad you mentioned that. It was, but, of course, it is now private land, thanks to the approval of the mineral claim given by the Interior Department.

The Sale of Steel to the Soviet Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. HESS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a letter received by me from Mr. James J. McCullough, of 6971 Sandal Court, Cincinnati 11, Ohio, in which he includes letters Mr. McCullough has received from L. S. Hamaker, general manager of sales for Republic Steel Corp., and from Avery C. Adams, chairman and president of Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp.

Those of us who served in the House during World War II can well remember the sale of scrap iron to the Japanese Government at a time when Japan was an unfriendly nation, and which was hurled at our men in the fighting lines during the war.

Mr. McCullough gives us food for thought when he calls attention to the sale of cold rolled steel sheet to the Soviet Government, at a time when the Soviet Communists are fighting a cold war with the free nations of the world:

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *March 9, 1959.*

Hon. WILLIAM HESS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HESS: Recently Republic Steel Corp. sold $3 million worth of cold rolled steel sheet to the Soviet Government. I wrote to Republic protesting the sale on the grounds that the steel would in some way aid the Russian war potential and/or economy. This certainly would not be in the best interests of our country.

Mr. L. S. Hamaker, general manager of sales, replied (see his letter of February 2, 1959 enclosed) and rationalized the sale with a series of defenses which are as follows:

1. Our Government approved the sale because we were bartering for chrome ore.

2. The steel had no military value or significance whatever.

3. It provided jobs for the unemployed.

4. It helped maintain regular dividends for the stockholders.

5. Any American steel company would have done the same thing.

These defenses are in the most part inadequate and can be answered as follows:

1. If we are dependent upon Russia for chrome ore, we had letter locate an alternate source soon. However, C. H. Samans in "Engineering Metals and Their Alloys," MacMillan 1949, lists the principal sources as Turkey, Rhodesia, and New Calendonia. Why then must we obtain it from the Soviets?

2. I quote from the February 28, 1959 issue of National Review on this matter. "One would indeed presume that someone in the State Department could figure out that the Soviet investment, equipment, and work releases from the need of making steel sheets by virtue of such imports can be—and is—redirected to the making of, for sufficient example, missiles and submarines."

3. This is indeed true. Making guns for Hitler during the 1930's would have increased employment also. Citizenship in a free country requires sacrifice, i.e. military service, jury duty, etc. Perhaps some unemployment is the price of freedom, although I hope not.

4. Not selling steel to Russia is good for the United States. If I may paraphrase J. P. Morgan and Charles Wilson, "What is good for the United States is good for the stockholders of Republic Steel Corp."

5. Unfortunately on the basis of the limited evidence I am able to obtain (see enclosed letter from Avery C. Adams of Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp. dated March 3, 1959) Mr. Hamaker's fifth defense is all too true. Evidently, there are those American businessmen who would sell anything to anyone in order to make a profit regardless of the ultimate consequences of their act.

Is there anything that can be done, Congressman HESS, by you or me to (1) prevent the completion of this sale, and (2) to forestall future transactions of this kind with Russia?

Your comments on the matter will be appreciated.

Very truly yours,

JAMES J. MCCULLOUGH.

REPUBLIC STEEL CORP.,
Cleveland, Ohio, February 2, 1959.

Mr. JAMES J. MCCULLOUGH,
Cincinnati, Ohio.

DEAR MR. MCCULLOUGH: Your letter of January 28 has been referred to this department since we handle the details of Republic's sale of a substantial tonnage of cold-rolled sheets to Russia. First let me say that this whole deal was worked out by our Government and appeared to involve the barter of a substantial tonnage of chrome ore, which we do not have in this hemisphere, for a tonnage of American sheets.

Republic was not a party to these negotiations, which had the complete approval and cooperation of our State Department. Our order came from an export-import house with which we regularly do business. Since cold-rolled sheets have no military value or significance whatever (your automobile body and your refrigerator are made from them) we did not feel that Republic should "second guess" our own Government, which could be presumed to know what it was doing.

This proposition arose last summer when Republic and the rest of the steel industry were operating at a very low rate. We welcomed the opportunity to improve our operations, provide jobs for a lot of men who had had little or no work for some time and to bolster our earnings so that regular dividends could be maintained.

Any American steel company capable of handling this order would have been glad to accept it. Republic was fortunate in landing it.

As you may know a certain amount of trade goes on constantly, not only between this country and Russia but between free European countries and Russia. The only reason the trade is not larger is because Russia has little to export beyond furs, minerals, and gold.

Our opinion of Russian policies and politicians is no higher than your own, yet we do not feel we would be serving our stockholders properly by turning our backs on profitable business for steel products which add nothing to Russia's warmaking potential.

Very truly yours,

L. S. HAMAKER,
General Manager of Sales.

JONES & LAUGHLIN STEEL CORP.,
Pittsburgh, Pa., March 3, 1959.

Mr. JAMES J. MCCULLOUGH,
Cincinnati, Ohio.

DEAR MR. MCCULLOUGH: Your letter of February 17 addressed to Adm. Ben Moreell has been referred to me.

Admiral Moreell retired as chairman of the board of this corporation on September 30, 1958, and he has been away until recently.

You asked, in effect, whether this corporation would solicit or accept an order for cold rolled sheets from the Soviet government.

The answer to this question is not as simple as it might be were this a proprietary business or a corporation owned by the directors or a small group of stockholders who could be readily consulted as to their wishes. It is, in fact, a corporation owned by more than 55,000 shareholders.

The foreign policy of the United States is established by the President of the United States under the Constitution, subject, particularly in the matter of trade and commerce with foreign governments and foreign nationals, to laws duly enacted by the Congress.

Assuming that a sale of cold rolled sheets to the Soviet Government is consistent with our foreign policy as established by the President, such an order constitutes legal and legitimate business for any American manufacturer.

I would have very grave doubts, to say the least, that we would be justified in refusing to accept such business if it were, in our judgment, in the best commercial interest of this corporation to do so.

In other words, I question whether the management of this corporation should undertake to deem undesirable, in the best interests of our country, that which our duly constituted authorities deem desirable, or at least not objectionable, when the commercial interests of our shareholders dictates otherwise.

The question is a difficult one, but I can reach no other conclusion than the one I have indicated, and I feel certain our directors would concur in this position.

Very truly yours,

AVERY C. ADAMS.

Tribute to Rabbi Samuel Price

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, this month Rabbi Samuel Price of Congregation Beth El in my home city of Springfield, Mass., will complete 35 years of service as chaplain to veterans of the Jewish faith at the Veterans' Administration Hospital in Northampton, Mass.

I JOIN IN TRIBUTE TO RABBI PRICE

I want to join in the tribute paid to Rabbi Price by the National Jewish Welfare Board of New York, which supervises and certifies all Jewish chaplains in the Armed Forces and Veterans' Administration hospitals.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that the National Jewish Welfare Board tribute, published in the Springfield Union on April 8, be printed in the RECORD:

JEWISH BOARD LAUDS SERVICE OF RABBI PRICE—TRIBUTE PAID CLERGYMAN FOR MANY YEARS AS CHAPLAIN

The National Jewish Welfare Board of New York paid tribute to Rabbi Samuel Price of Congregation Beth El in a March newsletter.

CERTIFIES CHAPLAINS

The board supervises and certifies all Jewish chaplains in the Armed Forces and veterans' hospitals.

Its article, entitled "A Milestone in the Chaplaincy," states:

"It is a distinct pleasure to pay tribute, on the occasion of his 35th anniversary as a chaplain, to Rabbi Samuel Price.

"In April, Rabbi Price of Springfield, Mass., will complete 35 years of official service as a representative of the Jewish Welfare Board and at the VA Hospital in Northampton, Mass.

"SERVES BETH EL

"During all of these years and, indeed, starting a decade earlier, he has served Temple Beth El in Springfield.

"The Rabbi received his training at the University of Berlin and at a number of European Yeshivot. His influence has been felt in almost every field of communal activity in Springfield—Council of Churches, Ministers' Association, National Conference of Christians and Jews, B'nai B'rith, etc.

"He is the author of 'Outlines of Judaism' and has lectured extensively throughout the State.

"His devotion to his chaplaincy responsibilities over the year has been exemplary.

"May God grant him many more years of life and health to continue his fruitful labors."

They'll Be Working

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I refer to an editorial in the Newark, N.J., Evening News, under date of March 24, 1959, in which it anticipated what the Members of this House would find when they returned home for the recess.

I believe, from personal experience, that the prophesy was even more accurate than the editorial writer could imagine it would be when he wrote it.

I found during the recent period of supposed rest and relaxation that a Congressman is, in many cases, a cross between a complaint bureau, an employment agency, and a sounding board.

With it all, however, there are many compensations. This makes it easier to take the many problems in stride, and eventually to return to the job with the sincere conviction that most people mean to be friendly and helpful:

THEY'LL BE WORKING

There will be little rest or relaxation for Congress during its approaching 10-day Easter recess.

Back home to places like Mesa, Ariz.; Ojai, Calif.; Nampa, Idaho; Exira, Iowa; Mankato, Kans.; Ontonagon, Mich.; Pascagoula, Miss.; Haw River, N.C.; Piqua, Ohio; Pampa, Tex.; and Lusk, Wyo., will troop Senators and Representatives for attentive consultation with the neighbors.

Much more than the public realizes does the Congressman heed sentiment back home. What the people who elected him think means more to him than what his party leaders in Washington want.

Even if the leader is the President of the United States, the Congressman will brave his displeasure on issues about which his constituents feel strongly. The mail and the hometown newspapers help him keep in touch with those feelings, but they are inadequate substitutes for the face-to-face contacts, on the streets, in the clubs and banks, the post offices, courthouses, and townhalls of the district.

When he calls himself a servant of his people, he is displaying no mock humility. He knows how he got where he is and who put him there.

So this week he returns to his bosses, eager to find out whether he is giving them what they voted for. What he has been giving them is a course of moderation that seems to fit the temper of the times. Before he gets back to Washington he will know for sure.

Sam the Loan Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I believe the editorial printed below about "Sam the Loan Man" carries an interesting message for the people of the country and for those here in Washington responsible for the future policies of this Nation. The editorial appeared recently in the Omaha World-Herald:

SAM THE LOAN MAN

Once upon a time there was a man named Sam. He wanted to be everybody's friend. He wanted to make everybody happy.

Among other things, he was in the loan business.

Unlike others who borrowed cheaply and lent at high interest rates, Sam borrowed high and lent low. He never asked for security.

He said he did this because he wanted to show the world he had no tricks up his sleeve and was really and truly the kindly, smiling old fellow he pretended to be.

When his relatives who financed him asked him why he simply didn't give the money away he had an answer.

Sam said he did give money away. Lots of it. But he said this was not the best way because it hurt people's pride. The important thing in the loan business, he said, was people's feelings.

When he gave the money away, Sam said, that made folks feel they were beholden to him. He tried to tell them this was a silly thought and that the money came only from the goodness of his heart and he wanted no return except their happy smiles, but the people grew angry and sullen and, perversely, demanded more money.

It was then that Sam thought of lending it to them on his low-interest, no-security, pay-me-if-you-feel-like-it terms. He borrowed the money from his nieces and nephews at 4 percent and he lent it at 2 percent, or sometimes 3 percent, but never 4. And he set the due date 30 years off so nobody would feel pressed or embarrassed.

By and by Sam had a flourishing business at which he was losing billions of dollars a year, and he had bright prospects of losing lots more. He gave employment to jillions of loan arrangers, inspectors, and file clerks, not to mention publicity men.

Sure enough, Sam got recognition. Everywhere he went people would shake their heads in wonder, and when he wasn't looking some would make a cabalistic sign in the form of a square and others would make a small circle in the air with their forefinger and point at their heads.

If Sam was not everybody's friend he was sure enough everybody's acquaintance and almost everybody's creditor.

Everything would have been fine, maybe, except that Sam's relatives finally realized they were going broke. Whereupon they had the old man committed and closed the loan window and everybody lived happily and more wisely ever after.

Moral: Keep a closer watch on your Uncle's allowance, especially if his name is Sam.

Oil Import Quotas Will Not Aid American Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the assertion has been made that imports of crude and residual fuel oil into the United States must be limited in the interests of our national security. Yet no proof of this assertion, which is the justification for the President's recent ruling placing quotas on oil imports, has been produced.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include three excellent articles showing that the President's order will actually work to the detriment of our national security. The articles are from the Journal of Commerce for March 24, the Boston Herald of March 12, and excerpts from Harvard Prof. Sumner G. Slitchter's newsletter:

[From the Journal of Commerce, Mar. 24, 1959]

OIL IMPORT CURBS SEEN NO HELP TO U.S. SECURITY

The U.S. Council of the International Chamber of Commerce has charged the administration's quotas on oil imports are "misguided" and "will contribute neither to the security nor to the economic strength of our Nation."

Philip Cortney, chairman of the council and president of Coty, Inc., rejected the contention oil imports are threatening national security by curtailing the search for oil here.

"A domestic source of crude oil in wartime," he said, "is obviously desirable, but import restriction is a clumsy and probably self-defeating means to obtain it."

Restrictions, he added, would cause the United States to use its own oil faster, which "only hastens the day when our dependence on foreign sources becomes critical."

Mr. Cortney said the United States uses nearly half of the world's oil products each year, although it has only one-sixth of the world's proved reserves.

The council claims the curbs injure the security of the United States by creating discord with friendly nations.

"The first step toward controls produces a chain reaction bringing more and more intervention in the private economy," the council holds. The action was said to be "directly in conflict with efforts the administration is making to check inflation."

The statement said import curbs will hurt (1) oil refiners "who have sought to augment national resources by developing foreign supplies," (2) industries relying on fuels refiners of U.S. crude cannot economically produce, and (3) the "whole large segment of the economy involved in our foreign trade."

The last group, the statement added, will suffer because of a weakening of the Government's ability to oppose reciprocal restrictions on U.S. imports.

[From the Boston Herald, Mar. 12, 1959]

WE ARE DUPED WITH SECURITY

In the deceptive name of national security, the administration in Washington has moved to put New England into a fuel hotspot. Again flagrant protection has been cunningly disguised as defense.

Here's how it goes:

New England uses large quantities of residual fuel oil in industry, in nonresidential heating and in the production of electricity. More than 55 percent is imported, mostly from Venezuela, which produces a crude suitable for topping out other products and leaving this heavy oil.

Domestic crudes are not so well suited, and the prices of other products are so much higher that refineries here operate more and more without any residual. In 1950 residual oil was 27 percent of domestic refinery production; today it is 12 to 14 percent and dropping.

Clearly New England is sharply dependent on imported residual fuel oil. Yet the Government has just announced that it will impose import quotas on residual as well as on crude oil, gasoline, and other products.

In deference to protests from this region, the administrator of the program said, disarmingly, that New England would be affected to only a small degree; that the quota on residual for the country east of the Rockies would be not a great deal less than present imports.

This is a trap. In any competitive field, it takes only a little less than enough to supply the demand to set the price soaring. In the winter of 1947–48 a shortage of only 1 percent sent fuel prices up in New England at the rate of at least $100 million annually.

In other words, the domestic oil producers, whose interest in exploration and development of new petroleum fields is supposed to be indispensable, are to get only a slight lift in demand for domestic residual, but to pay for that, New England is to be stuck with much higher prices.

Does that make sense? Or have the coal interests bilked the Government into contriving a better competitive position for coal in New England?

In this colder than normal winter, substantial additional amounts of heating oils came in to New England from Halifax, Puerto Rico, Venezuela, and California by boat, simply because our usual domestic sources could not meet the demand. But maybe New England is expendable and can be al-

lowed to freeze for the good of security. Or made to pay plenty.

The security angle is the thinnest subterfuge in all this business. Canada is part of our continental defense, yet we slap quotas on her oil. Venezuela would be an ideal source for oil in case of war, yet she is quotaed, too.

The fleets of tankers and the docks and handling equipment were invaluable in the Suez crisis. Do we give them up in the name of a dubious security? Or is security only for Texans?

There should be no restrictions on residual imports. New England, too, has a right to security.

[Excerpted from "The American Economy: Current Trends, Problems and Prospects," by Prof. Sumner H. Slichter, of Harvard University]

XIV. MANDATORY QUOTAS ON OIL

The President has fixed a national import quota on crude and semirefined petroleum at somewhat below the amounts specified in the recent voluntary controls. The President acted under the authority of the 1954 amendment to the Reciprocal Trades Agreement Act that permits mandatory curbs on imports of petroleum in the event that imports are found to threaten national security. The curbs are defended on the ground that imports of oil discourage the exploration for new petroleum sources that the country would need in event of war.

The real purpose of the curbs is to stall off legislation sponsored by oil-State Senators and Representatives that would have restricted petroleum imports by specific quotas. The mandatory quotas imposed by the President do not promote national security and are not needed for that purpose. In the first place, petroleum imports improve the reserve situation of the United States by making it less necessary to draw on our existing reserves. In the second place, the enormous civilian consumption of gasoline creates in effect an enormous reserve for war purposes, since the civilian use of gasoline can be easily curbed by rationing. It is not necessary that in time of war every American worker drives to his job in his own car. In the third place, the phony nature of the defense argument is revealed by application of the quotas to imports of oil from Canada. Since Canadian oil does not move overseas, imports of Canadian oil and the resulting stimulus to the Canadian oil industry would promote the security of the United States.

The oil quotas are an unwarranted act of economic aggression on behalf of a few oil States against the Nation as a whole and against the free world. By no stretch of the imagination can these curbs be regarded as promoting the national interest.

Honoring Siouxland's Meat Producers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, the Sioux City stockyards was established 72 years ago. The Sioux City livestock market is one of the largest in the country. Recently, the 200 millionth animal was delivered to the yards by my constituents, Mr. and Mrs. Wilfred Wurth of Remsen, Iowa. The following editorial, which appeared in the Sioux City Journal of April 8, 1959, is a fitting tribute to the livestock industry in northwest Iowa:

HONORING SIOUXLAND'S MEAT PRODUCERS

Siouxland's leading industry has honored its key man, the producer, this week with the presentation of a free, all expense paid trip to Washington, D.C. for Mr. and Mrs. Wilfred Wurth, whose black steer turned out to be the 200 millionth animal to be handled by the Sioux City Stock Yards since the establishment's founding 72 years ago.

The Remsen, Iowa, farmer, for many years a regular shipper to the Sioux City public market, is the symbol of this region's basic industry, the one which is the foundation of Siouxland's agricultural wealth on which livelihood of most citizens in this area ultimately depends.

Mr. Wurth will be living proof and a reminder to the nation, during the tour of the National Capital City, of Siouxland's preeminence as a meat producing region and of Sioux City's growth as a central market for meat animals.

Each year more producers and more buyers come farther and in larger numbers to this corner of the Nation.

Meat, however, has a way of losing its identity after slaughter, at least so far as the over-the-counter purchaser is concerned. It takes resourceful promotion to make sure that the producing area gets its fair share of credit in the distant consumer's mind. Such resourcefulness is demonstrated by the Sioux City Stock Yards company's recognition of the part played by the producers on the occasion of arrival of the 200 millionth animal since the beginning of the Sioux City market.

Mr. Wurth in a real sense represents the thousands of livestock producers in this four state area who consign their animals to the Sioux City market for distribution as processed meat to the nation's dinner tables.

The pride and confidence of a whole region in its chief industry, which is of such vital importance to national strength, rides with Mr. and Mrs. Wurth in their acceptance of the role of tourists and goodwill ambassadors from this great meat producing region.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Stanislaus Musiel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK KOWALSKI
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday last in the city of Hartford, Conn., the Polish Government in exile paid a deserved tribute to a great religious and civic leader, the Right Reverend Monsignor Stanislaus Musiel.

A commission representing the Polish government headquarters in London invested Monsignor Musiel as a commander of the Polonia Restituta, the highest honor of Poland. He was decorated with the Commander's Cross, an award with centuries of glorious tradition behind it.

The award is a recognition of the illustrious services performed by Monsignor Musiel in the cause of freedom. It pleases us in Connecticut, who have known so well his great work in many fields, that recognition of his achievements should be given also by the government devoted to the cause of Polish freedom.

In our State, Monsignor Musiel has won wide respect and admiration for his accomplishments. Born in Poland, he has brought to his adopted country the same love of freedom and justice which has marked the history of the Polish people.

In order that there may be an official record of this award to Monsignor Musiel, I am requesting, Mr. Speaker, that there be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following news account from the Hartford Courant:

MONSIGNER MUSIEL IS AWARDED HIGHEST POLISH HONOR

The highest honor of the Polish Government in exile was awarded to the Right Reverend Monsignor Stanislaus Musiel, pastor of SS. Cyril and Methodius Church in ceremonies at the Polish National Home Sunday.

Monsignor Musiel was invested as a commander of the Polonia Restituta. The decoration, a gold maltese cross bearing the arms of Poland and suspended from a red and white ribbon, was awarded in recognition of the monsignor's assitance to Polish-Americans in Hartford and for his aid to the exile Government.

The award was presented by a commission appointed by the exile Government, situated in London. Members of the commission were Adam B. Lyczak, of Brooklyn, N. Y., president of the Polish National Fund; Msgr. A. P. Francis P. Kowalczyk, of Passaic, N. J.; and the Very Reverend Anthony Mazurkiewcz, of New Haven.

Presentation of the award was preceded by an Easter supper at which traditional Polish food, blessed by Msgr. John P. Wodarski, was served. Walter Maznicki, president of the Polish National Club, was toastmaster at the dinner.

Monsignor Musiel was born in Jankowie Przygodskien, Poland, November 11, 1872, and was ordained a priest at the University of Louvain, Belgium, June 29, 1897. Shortly after his ordination he came to Hartford as assistant pastor of St. Peter's Church, where he remained a few months before being assigned to organize Polish parishes in New Haven and other Connecticut cities. He returned to Hartford as pastor of SS. Cyril and Methodius Church in 1917, and became a monsignor in 1939.

Richard Cardinal Cushing, of Boston, is among recent recipients of the Polonia Restituta.

Federal Interference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, each day it becomes more apparent that the Federal Government is interfering to a greater extent than ever in the lives of the people. An example of this interference in my own area, the Second Congressional District of Washington State, is the Federal Government's apparent decision to include the city of Everett and Snohomish County in the Seattle standard metropolitan area.

This, Mr. Speaker, is a case in which the Federal Government is interfering with the lives of individuals against their wishes. The residents of Everett and Snohomish County want to retain their

identity. They do not want to be identified with Seattle.

Snohomish County is a growing area. Its population is on the increase. Its industry and economy are expanding, and new oil refineries are scheduled to locate here. This growth justifies the faith of the people and their desire to identify themselves proudly with Everett and Snohomish County.

My father came to Everett in 1891 when there wasn't much of a city. He helped to build Everett and establish its identity. I was born there 54 years ago and I like to think that I, too, helped to make Everett a better place to live.

Seattle is Seattle and Everett is Everett. Most everyone knows this except some agencies of the Federal Government which think they know different. By what right do these people here in Washington, D.C., decide that Everett shall be a part of Seattle—are we to be regimented so that next they will be telling where we will live?

I hope that census and budget will come to their senses and let us run our affairs while they run theirs.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the editorial, "Not Everyone Works at Boeing," from the Tacoma, Wash., News Tribune of March 21, 1959. This editorial agrees with the principle that each area has a right to local identity.

The editorial follows:

NOT EVERYONE WORKS AT BOEING

The Seattle-Renton plants of the Boeing Airplane Co. represents the biggest industrial operation in the Pacific Northwest. They so far overshadow everything else in Seattle that one hears Seattleites say they have a one-industry town—"all their eggs in one basket." Boeing Seattle-Renton-Moses Lake also is a colossus in the Washington State heavy industry picture.

So, back in our National Capital it is understandable, even if not true, that bureau people hold the idea that everyone out here works at Boeing.

Lately the Bureau of the Budget and the Bureau of the Census are about to include Everett and Snohomish County in the Seattle metropolitan district for census purposes. This is based on the premise that more than 15 percent of the Snohomish County labor force commutes to Seattle to work. Where? At Boeing. The Bureaus maintain that 23 percent work in Seattle and therefore Snohomish County is socially and economically integrated with Seattle-King County.

The Everett Chamber of Commerce is upset and alarmed at the prospect of Everett losing its own identity as a metropolitan area in being gobbled up by Seattle. Very properly, it has informed the Federal bureaus that the picture is changing rapidly. Three major oil refineries are going into Snohomish County and there is considerable expansion there of existing industry. Everett hears from Senator JACKSON that Boeing will experience nearly a 50-percent payroll reduction in the next 2 years. These developments would shoot the commuter number to well below the 15 percent the bureaus use for their criterion.

Tacoma supports Everett's contention. Tacoma has its own metropolitan area. Bremerton has its own. Everett has its own, and should keep it. Much as we should like to see Boeing hold its payroll high, the prospect of industrial development around the Puget Sound area in the next few years favors expansion in Tacoma and in Snohomish County.

Federal Aid to Protestant Institutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, Judge Luther A. Smith of Hattiesburg, Miss., who has served with distinction as a judge in the 10th Chancery District of Mississippi, is now the Sovereign Grand Commander of Scottish Rite Masons, Southern Jurisdiction. There are a half million Scottish Rite Masons in this jurisdiction and an additional 3½ million Masons affiliated with the Blue Lodge. Recently there came to my attention, Mr. Speaker, a statement by this beloved southern leader regarding dangers which inhere in the matter of Federal grants to the support of religious programs. I appreciate and applaud this statement which points up a serious problem in our country today. That the institutions mentioned by Judge Smith are Methodist, Mr. Speaker, is quite incidental to the point he raises.

A Methodist himself, this distinguished jurist objects to Federal grants to Methodist institutions. But he would, by the same principle, object quite as strenuously to such grants for the benefit of any church. He believes that the strength and independence of our churches are most surely safeguarded when they subsist on the voluntary gifts of adherents.

There is a disposition I have detected too often, Mr. Speaker, to include church institutions in grants which come under the health and welfare banner. The intent is worthy, but the result may not be what is sought. For it is evident to me, Mr. Chairman, that institutions seeking and accepting aid from the government will inevitably come under some measure of Government surveillance and control. Such a development can scarcely be avoided since it is the solemn duty of the Congress to follow the flow of Federal funds in order to ensure their proper use.

I am one who believes, Mr. Speaker, that any such encroachment of the Government upon our churches—even though it may appear to be necessary and proper in the circumstances—would be a tragedy of vast proportions. I believe that the churches will fill a truly prophetic role in our Nation, and effectively serve the State itself, only as they remain truly independent bodies, free of the State's control.

The statement of Judge Smith which exhibits such a clear grasp of this basic principle, is as follows:

FEDERAL AID TO PROTESTANT INSTITUTIONS

(By Luther A. Smith)

One of the cardinal principles of the Supreme Council 33d Degree of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite of Freemasonry, Southern Jurisdiction, United States of America, which it traditionally and stanchly supports is stated as follows:

"The entire separation of church and state, and opposition to every attempt to appropriate public moneys—Federal, State, or local—directly or indirectly, for the support of sectarian or private institutions."

We feel compelled to call the attention of our members and all citizens to recent violations of this principle by the Methodist Church. One is the application for and acceptance of national fellowships for graduate studies in religion by Emory University, Atlanta, Ga., a Methodist institution. The money involved is small, but the principle at stake is mammoth. If the program is executed, the Federal Government will pay for religion. It collects $22,500 in taxes from American citizens, then pays three men who are engaged in religious studies. We believe that Emory University is wrong to apply for and accept these funds for such a purpose. We believe it is unthinkingly disregarding a basic American principle.

It is quite possible that voluntary gifts to Emory may decrease since the university has chosen to accept funds for its school of theology from the Federal Government.

We are further saddened to note that this same denomination has recently taken over from the Federal Government at Oak Ridge, Tenn., a hospital which, with its site, is said to be valued at $4 million. We are not interested in the fact that the Methodists won a referendum vote over another agency which had been interested in the property. A majority creed could do this in any community. What impresses us is that the Government has given a valuable facility to a church and in addition has guaranteed to assume operating losses for 10 years.

A notion seems to obtain in certain quarters that the principle separation of church and state is a constitutional weapon to strike at a particular church. This notion is grotesque. The principle applies to and is good for all churches, is basic to their health and virility. The principle of voluntarism which denies public support to sectarian enterprise has consistently redounded to the churches' advantage. It has rightly become one of the cornerstones of our free culture. We can name country after country that has suffered from "religious inflation"—a condition created by subsidies from the state to the church. Such subsidies build up the church as a power structure until it arouses the enmity of the people.

Such a condition, often called anticlericalism, has never developed in the United States. There has been no occasion for it since our churches have all been free institutions without ties of governemnt. The surest protection against anticlericalism is the voluntary principle in church finance. This means that not just one church but all churches shall go for their money not to the government but to their own adherents. We believe this principle is good. The Founding Fathers believed in it and put it into the Constitution. We favor it. We favor it for all churches without denominational distinction.

If the Roman Catholic Church were seeking these fellowships for the graduate training of its priests, we would object to such an expenditure of public funds. But it is Emory University, a Methodist-supported institution, and the Holston Annual Conference of the Methodist Church, which now seek and receive financial favors from the Federal Government. We object quite as strenuously. Yes, the sums involved are small, but the precedent is deadly. If such subsidies to the Methodist Church are permitted to stand, there will be more and more as the practice burgeons. The legal implications of these grants should be fully investigated. The grants may turn out to be highly expensive to the institutions which have accepted them.

Bishop Roy H. Short of Nashville, Tenn., the episcopal leader of the Holston Conference, Bishop Arthur Moore of Atlanta, Ga., and the trustees of Emory University are

Methodist leaders with whom many Methodists and others will want to register their concern in this matter.

I am a Methodist and an alumnus of Emory. If it needs financial aid, I will join the other alumni in donating to its relief.

Real Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, a retired banker from the Central Ohio area, Mr. J. Keller Kirn, of Lancaster, Ohio, recently submitted an article on real money which should be of interest to the Members of Congress.

The article is as follows:

REAL MONEY

(By J. Keller Kirn, Sr.)

Paper money is not really money. It is the promise of money. The language on the face of paper bills says so very plainly. One kind of money states: "This certifies that there is on deposit in the Treasury of the United States of America $1 in silver payable to the bearer on demand." Another kind of paper money declares: "The United States of America will pay to the bearer upon demand $5."

The 1932 Republican Party platform stated: "The Republican Party established and will continue to uphold the gold standard and will oppose any measure which will undermine the Government's credit or impair the integrity of its national currency. Relief by currency inflation is unsound in principle and dishonest in results. An ailing body cannot be cured with quack remedies."

Quack remedies are inseparable from currency not payable in gold coins. Using our gold only for other nations' citizens, and forcing us, including farmers, to pay taxes for quack remedies, such as subsidies, price supports, controls, and the Soil Bank law, then giving or selling surplus farm products at lower prices to other nations' citizens, forces us to be second-class citizens.

When our gold coins were in banks and our President or Congress alarmed us, we withdrew them from banks and hoarded them. It did not take Congress long to learn this and correct mistakes. When confidence was restored, we again deposited them in banks. Taking our gold coins from us made masters of our servants who no longer correct mistakes. The 100 cents we get for a dollar constantly buy less.

Reducing the gold content of our dollar from 25.3 to 15.238 grains per ounce reduced our buying power with a 59.06-cent dollar and increased the price of gold from $20.67 to $35 per ounce. This enabled other nations to pay their debts to us and buy our bonds, stocks, and products with less gold dollars. Contrariwise, it forced us to pay more gold dollars for foreign products and services, such as shipping and insurance. Raising the price of gold again would repeat this mistake.

Our gold coins were our private property, like our clothes. Forcing us to take currency not payable in gold coins violate the fifth amendment which prohibits taking private property for public use without just compensation. Panama refused to take currency not payable in gold coins for U.S. bonds and demanded that gold coins be 25.3 grains per ounce 0.900 fine.

We had more gold January 2, 1933 than on November 2, 1932, therefore there was no need to take us off the gold coin standard and there is no need to keep us off the gold coin standard. Neither our Nation nor any other nation ever was on a 100 percent gold convertible basis, just as banks can't keep all of depositors' money in banks. Gold Democrats helped to elect President McKinley.

When we were on the gold coin standard in 1920, our recession lasted only 1½ years and was followed by 7 years of real prosperity. We had a flexible wage scale that permitted immediate and adequate adjustments in accordance with changing conditions. Prices fell until buying resumed according to the law of supply and demand. We balanced the budget each year during that time. Franklin D. Roosevelt never balanced the budget.

Currency payable in gold coins stops abuse of credit. NAM's Robert de Fremery said: "But when our Federal Reserve banks are obliged to maintain domestic convertibility of currency into gold, we lay ourselves open to a drastic collapse of credit every time it becomes necessary to counteract an abuse of credit."

Importing $100 million gold from England in 1907 stopped the panic. Each nation went its own way and made its financial policies subject always to the limitation that if it overextend itself other nations would drain its gold and force it to reverse its policies, without war. This illustrates how currency payable in gold coins automatically stabilizes credit and halts inflation, therefore restore the gold coin standard now at $35 per ounce, 0.900 fine.

How Much Did American Prestige Suffer in Cyprus?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CARLTON LOSER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, recently the editor of the Nashvill Teennessean, Mr. Coleman A. Harwell, in company with Prof. Kenneth E. Olson of the Northwestern University School of Journalism, and under the auspices of the State Department exchange program, left on a world tour to exchange programs with editors and officials in a number of countries.

Mr. Harwell is writing a series of several articles for his paper during this tour. It is my plan to place each of the articles in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in order that you may have the opportunity to read them. Mr. Harwell is an astute newspaperman and I am sure you will find his articles interesting.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including his first article on Greece. It follows:

HOW MUCH DID AMERICAN PRESTIGE SUFFER IN CYPRUS?

(By Coleman A. Harwell)

ATHENS.—"Ah-o-kah! Ah-o-kah! Ah-o-kah!"

The shouts rang out from the streets and rooftops of Athens.

One of the greatest heroes in modern Greek history had returned at last.

Mustachioed, coal-eyed Col. George Grivas never smiled once, but shed tears several times as he was embraced, praised, and cheered when he came back from 4 years as literal underground leader of Greek forces in Cyprus.

Slender and erect at 62, he wore his khaki combat sweater, and uniform, his pistol, binoculars, and shining boots—all topped by his jaunty beret—as he stood at erect salute in a grey Cadillac convertible being escorted along streets jam-packed with exultant throngs held in tow by thousands of police.

Beside him was his lovely-looking wife. Younger than he and blondish she was still radiantly and somberly Grecian.

For the truly legendary colonel and his lady this was a day of emotion-packed triumph. And it was equally that for every person who calls himself Greek and who cherishes a history of heroes and of legendary events and characters who have often been proved to be truer than truth itself.

For an American, standing on the rooftop of a hotel overlooking Constitution Square, it was less personal. And yet it had something of the effect perhaps of sitting in the topmost row of an ancient Greek theater, seeing and hearing the last act of a classic play. It also had very direct significance for Americans aware that feelings toward us were involved here, too.

GREEK CHORUS

The chorus (there is always a chorus in Greek drama) was there in the streets below, it was on the parapet of the parliament building, it was on the rooftop of the building opposite us. The score of young men across from us (they looked like teen-agers who might have been wearing leather jackets on an American street) were shouting together, "Ah-o-kah! Ah-o-kah!"

Perhaps they were veterans of this heralded EOKA. Whether veterans or not, they were wrapped up in its meaning to Greece.

EOKA (National Organization for Cypriot Struggle) was the group that sought to force union of Cyprus with Greece. When Britain, having military control of the island, played for time, and America took a hands-off attitude, underground terrorism erupted in 1954.

The story, at least this major chapter, is now finished. The Greek majority will share a government with the Turkish minority. Britain will retain a naval base.

The result? Grivas would be in position to give the answer.

When he made his first open appearance in Cyprus the morning of March 18, after more than 4 years of existence under the mysterious pseudonym of "Dighenis," his first comment was something of a twister. The man who had resisted the British so fiercely, said:

"I am fanatically pro-British but the British made us bitter. It is for them to rebuild this friendship now."

Grivas pro-British? Recall that it was the British (with French and Russian help) who helped Greece win independence in 1829, after 400 years of being dominated by Turkey. Recall, too, that Greece was a British ally in World Wars I and II, had been in Britain's sphere of influence until 1947. And, as further evidence of Greek-British affinity, consider that they are two of the few nations maintaining royalty. (Incidentally, both descend from the now defunct German royal line.)

NOT SO STRANGE

It is not so strange, then, that Grivas should proclaim himself as pro-British. Nor should it seem strange that the Greeks were not so surprised when the British fumbled for time in the face of the irksome question as to whether Cyprus should be Greek or Turkish or neither. That's the way the British are supposed to act, isn't it?

Of course. But not the Americans.

They are for the self-determination of peoples. They are for independence.

And so, in 1955, 1956, 1957, 1958 and on into 1959, we Americans, who had spent $3 billion of our hard-earned tax dollars saving fair Greece from a fate worse than you-know-what, found ourselves getting the cool treatment, and sometimes not so cool at that—as, for instance, when the U.S. Information Service Library was sacked here in Athens and burned.

The Greeks reminded us and themselves over and over (their newspapers banged away for 4 solid years) that they had been our ally in both World Wars, that they had stood with us in Korea; that Turkey had turned against the Allies in World War I, that she had not truly pitched into World War II, but had had greater U.S. aid thereafter than Greece. And that, furthermore, Cypriots wanted to unite with Greece.

Puzzling? Disturbing? Aggravating? Does the situation make you want your tax dollars back?

Before you go too far along that line—and thus, perhaps, lose sight of what the Marshall plan and Truman doctrine did in Greece, keeping a valiant and freedom-loving people on our side of the Iron Curtain, and thousands of miles of Mediterranean shoreline open to our ships and planes and missiles—let's get back to the subject at hand—Cyprus.

You can make a powerful argument that an election should have been held to determine the island's future. And you won't find many people who'll say the vote wouldn't have been overwhelmingly in favor of union with Greece.

So, should it surprise you that Greece was unhappy about Cyprus? Or that you don't get cheers on Athens' Roosevelt Avenue when you mention John Foster Dulles? Should it ever surprise you that the U.S.I.S. library was set upon by an angry crowd?

It would be wiser, we believe, to consider that this is the kind of thing we will be facing from now in many parts of the world. And in such future cases, what do we do?

Hold to principle? Let freedom wave o'er the lands that want to be free and say they are brave?

Or compromise? And in what circumstances and to what extent?

These are big questions. They are facing Americans everywhere today—in Tennessee, in Washington, and in a hundred foreign lands. We heard the subject discussed by a group in Athens the other day. I'll run into it all around the world in the next few weeks. And perhaps some of the findings will be worth reporting.

PLEASANT CHANGE

Meantime, the Greeks are glad to stop arguing about Cyprus. It was exciting while it lasted, and one who hit the subject hard and often was Tom Little's counterpart on the Athens newspapers Vima and Nea. One of his latest was being laughed at when I arrived March 9 and I am forwarding it herewith. It pokes fun at Governor Sir Hugh Foot, who suffered much of Britain's discomfort as the elusive Grivas rocked the island. The dog represents Foot's unhappy predecessor, General Harding, who always had such a critter in his company.

Now, Greeks are glad the Cyprus argument is past and they can get down to some other pressing matters. Such as economic development, about which more later.

Asked why she thought Athens newspapers had lost circulation in recent years, attractive Mme. Helen Vlachou, successful publisher of Kathermirini, said: "Four years is too much of anything. People want a change."

Concerning America, it may be reassuring to know that the U.S.I.S. art gallery on Venizelos Avenue has an excellent exhibition of Greek sculpture that is drawing big crowds. That an American in Athens is made to feel welcome everywhere, except in the center of the street where drivers don't get a fair shot at you. That a lady guide to the Acropolis says: "Oh, yes, I have heard of the Parthenon in Nashville, Tenn. They came here to study it in great detail. The only sad thing is that it isn't located on a hilltop."

Teenagers and Outer Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I want to share with my colleagues and with the thousands of other persons who read this RECORD some thoughts and recommendations in the field of parental guidance. This is perhaps not the direct concern of Congress; yet, the results of a lack of parental guidance have occupied special and regular committees of Congress many weeks and months in studying juvenile delinquency and crime.

The thoughts below are from a talk given by the Reverend John E. Vernon, a close personal friend of mine. Father Vernon is guidance director of the Archbishop Ryan Memorial High School in Omaha. He has a master's degree in education from the Catholic University here in Washington, where he specialized in guidance and psychology.

This talk was given to a home and school group meeting last month and has since come to my attention. It will give everyone who reads it some food for thought, and I recommend taking the few minutes necessary to read it.

The remarks are as follows:

Everyone is concerned about outer space these days, what with missiles and satellites zooming around. Parents and teachers, too, have their outer-space problems—their children and pupils. I say outer-space problems because anyone observing teenagers for any length of time, seeing their strange dress, mannerisms, and language, feels like throwing up his hands and exclaiming, "Take me to your leader."

The teenage is the time for radical changes. Jane begins to powder and Junior starts to puff. Junior stands before the mirror and throws out his chest like a football player. Jane quits making faces at the boys and starts making eyes at them instead. She also discovers that Alexander Graham Bell invented a handy device called the telephone.

It is true that youngsters haven't really changed very much over the years. Witness what the oldest writing known to man says, "Things aren't what they used to be, children no longer obey their parents." Socrates, who lived about 469 B.C., said: "Children now love luxury; they have bad manners; have contempt for authority; they show disrespect for their elders and love chatter; they no longer rise when their elders enter the room; gobble up dainties at the table and tyrannize their teachers." Yet, we must admit that while the music of the younger generation is real cool, and their hotrods are the most, it does seem that their respect for their parents and teachers is real gone.

What is the answer to the burning question, "Why are our young people today so restless, so undisciplined and so contemptuous toward authority?—More so than ever before?" The first and obvious fact is a psychological truth that these youngsters are at this time insecure and unstable by nature. Now add to this fact the failings of three important agencies—education, society, and the home. The result is almost chaos.

Modern education is responsible for a part of modern youth's problems and criticism by elders. With the advent of so-called progressive education, these youngsters were conscripted into serving before the mast of that leaky tub which sailed under the name of "Cafeteria-Style Curriculum"; their minds and tastes were debauched by pursuing pedantic imbecilities in place of "tried and true" essential subjects; the progressivists abandoned the "three r's" for the three "t's" of "tutti-frutti, triviality, and twaddle." Thank goodness, we are witnessing now an abandoning of this type of education and a return to what is essential in education. But the damage already has been done to far too many.

Society itself is the second culprit, because many modern teenagers are more sinned against than sinning. Did you ever ask yourself the question, "Who are these kids?" I'll tell you who they are. They are those who (a) were conceived in the chaos of a world war; (b) were raised without fathers for their first 5 or 6 years (psychologists tell us this is perhaps the most important time in father-child relationship); they are those who (c) are products of working mothers and two-jobbed fathers; (d) are victims of broken homes, separated parents; (e) are sons of country-clubbers and daughters of social butterflies; (f) have the streets for their playground; (g) have gangs for their companions; (h) have comic books and 25-cent pocketbooks for their bible; and (i) have TV and movie houses for their very impersonal babysitter.

The home, even the so-called Christian home, is also a culprit. The popes and Catholic educationists have insisted that parents are the primary educators of their children, not the priests, nun, and lay teachers. Parents are given this God-given right and the graces to carry it out. Home should be the place where the child's physical needs are met, his character formed and personality shaped.

Parental guidance ought to concern itself with at least these four areas—example, love, understanding, and morality.

Example: Youngsters look to the adults for example. Here is an important area where we are failing them. Last year, at this time, I was in New York and I attended a delinquency trial, presided over by that outstanding American, Judge Samuel Leibowitz. As these flotsam and jetsam dregs of young American manhood and womanhood were brought before the court, their lives spilled out before all, one answer came back strong and clear as the reason why they acted as they did. Four out of five said they did these things—stole, molested, robbed, beat, etc.—because they were only following the example of adult Americans. What a terrible indictment of adult American life. Judge Leibowitz has said that the problem of juvenile delinquency can be solved very simply, in nine words—"Put father back as the head of the family."

In a survey I conducted last year among some 1,300 teenagers for my M.A. degree, one of the questions asked was, "To whom do you go for help with most of your personal problems?" Their answers came in the following order: First of all, their friends; secondly, their mothers; and far down the list was dad. Some even admitted that the only thing they discuss with dad is their allowance.

Love and understanding: Children and teenagers need to be loved and understood. But that alone is not enough. They must know that they are loved. Heart-to-heart talks between parents and their offspring are most essential to a child's well-balanced sense of security. And by all means, take their problems seriously. To laugh or scoff

at what seems to the parent as a trivial, foolish thing might well be the weapon severing the child's trust in his parents, perhaps, forever. Each child must be treated as an individual, since no two people are alike. It is not so much for parents to solve the problems of the child, as it is to help him solve his problems. Pope Pius XII said, "Make them understand themselves."

Morality: The young people of today are confused by a dual standard of morality. The home has one standard; the school and church another. It is fruitless to teach the children the laws of morality in school and then have them witness a complete disregard for them at home.

The TV program "Father Knows Best" is a wonderful example of proper parental guidance. Take the problems of the children seriously and work with them so that eventually they can face the world and its problems without fear, knowing that they have the ability to cope with them.

The Advancement of Medical Research and Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress, as well as the American people, the views of Dr. Edmund R. McCluskey, vice chancellor of the University of Pittsburgh, Schools of the Health Professions, on the continuing need for medical research and education. Dr. McCluskey is an outstanding educator in the fields of medical research and medical education. In 1958 he was the Man of the Year awardee in medicine. This award is given by the Pittsburgh Junior Chamber of Commerce for distinguished service in western Pennsylvania.

I submit the letter of Dr. McCluskey of April 7, 1959, and include his reference on manpower and facilities, which outlines the need for physicians, dentists, professional research workers, scientific facilities and medical schools. This is an excerpt from an excellent pamphlet, published by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, entitled "The Advancement of Medical Research and Education":

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH,
Pittsburgh, Pa., April 7, 1959.

The Honorable JAMES G. FULTON,
House of Representatives,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FULTON: You will recall our conversation at Dr. Barone's anniversary dinner at Pittsburgh. At that time we spoke of the continuing need for medical research and medical education, the continuation of Hill-Burton funds, and also the need for low-cost housing in relation to our health center hospitals.

RESEARCH AND EDUCATION

Enclosed please find a copy of "The Advancement of Medical Research and Education Report," published through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This is commonly known as the Bayne-Jones Report. This document is the best available source of our needs for medical research and education.

Sources of research funds and the ultimate use of such money are found in part A, beginning on page 17.

The chapter on "Manpower and Facilities," page 31, tells of our present and future needs.

The chapter on "Research and Training Grants—Extramural Programs," on page 67, summarizes some of the needs and tells of the types of grants that are now being given.

These matters are well set forth and I need not comment further.

HILL-BURTON FUNDS

There is information to the effect that congressional thinking on the allocation of Hill-Burton funds is undergoing revision. Most of the funds from this source have, in the past, gone to the building of hospitals for rural areas. This need has now lessened and Congress may allot more of this money to teaching centers and community hospitals in urban areas, hopefully for both new buildings and also for the renovation of present buildings. This would be a great help to teaching centers like our health center hospitals, for we are meeting the medical needs of our own community, the medical needs of the adjacent areas from which we get the most severe and complicated cases and, also, the needs of our teaching programs as well. We are in dire need of additional capital funds from both Government and other sources to provide necessary facilities to meet our growing responsibilities.

LOW-COST HOUSING FOR NURSES, INTERNS, AND RESIDENTS

Funds for this above purpose are now included as specifically earmarked money in a bill designed for the college housing program.

Medical centers desperately need low-cost housing immediately adjacent to the centers where married students, married interns, and residents in training, as well as nursing and key technical staff, can be housed. Many centers already have developed such programs to meet their own needs. Congress has become increasingly aware of the need and value of such housing and a bill to provide some funds for this purpose died in the closing sessions of the 85th Congress. This matter is now before Congress and receiving consideration in committee and we would appreciate your interest and support.

We are still looking forward to the pleasure of having Members of Congress visit with us, and will be most happy to make any arrangements for any of you which your time will permit.

With warmest personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

E. R. MCCLUSKEY, M.B.

MANPOWER AND FACILITIES

Research is an intellectual pursuit, led by intelligent, highly trained people who must work under conditions fostering creativity. The establishment and maintenance of a strong national research effort, including fields related to medicine, depend heavily on intangibles, such as the strength of universities, general respect for learning, and a sound system of secondary education. While the consultants are aware of the fundamental importance of these intangibles, they have been directly concerned with two concrete kinds of resources for research—manpower and facilities.

If the growth projected in this report is to occur, specialized research manpower of high quality and specialized research facilities must be produced on an expanded scale.

A. PROSPECTIVE MANPOWER DEMAND

The current $330 million medical research enterprise of the Nation is staffed by about 20,000 professional research workers.

The consultants assume that the trend toward more complex instrumentation is a necessary consequence of the development of science, that more non-professional help per thousand professionals will be used, and that more expensive supplies will be needed. These trends are not an unmixed blessing because the work of some scientists may be impaired by gadgeteering. But for better or worse, the expenditures per investigator will rise steadily, by an estimated 40 percent by 1970.

With increased expenditures per professional, the projected increase in medical research effort could therefore be staffed by less than a proportionate expansion of the manpower supply. A total corps of 45,000 (full-time equivalent) professional research workers could staff a $900 million total annual program under the assumed increase in annual cost per professional.

The consultants find that attainment of a national medical research investment of $900 million to $1 billion by 1970 depends upon the ability of the Nation to more than double the number of professional medical research workers over a 12-year period.

Is this increase attainable? What are the policy implications—immediate and long range?

B. PH. D.'S IN MEDICALLY RELATED SCIENCES

Using the most recent Office of Education total projections for doctoral degrees between 1958 and 1970 and assuming that the proportion of degrees in the fields related to medical research will remain constant, 16,000 (full-time equivalent) new Ph. D.'s would become available for medical research during the next 12 years.[1]

The actual proportion of Ph. D.'s in each field who will enter medical research over the next 12 years depends heavily upon the availability and suitability of job opportunities in industrial, governmental, private, university, and medical school laboratories. The effectiveness of efforts to recruit well-qualified people for these fields will also be important.

Provision of additional adequately paid and otherwise satisfying careers in universities and medical schools for Ph. D.'s heavily engaged in research is the most urgent prerequisite to attraction of increasing numbers of scientists to academic research careers.

By wise and vigorous action, private and governmental, it should be possible to produce 20,000 scientists with Ph. D. degrees who will enter medical research between 1957 and 1970.

C. PHYSICIANS FOR RESEARCH

The proportion of medical school graduates in teaching and/or research has been rising steadily.[2] On the basis of recent trends, it can be assumed that 8 percent of the medical school graduates of the 1957–65 classes conduct research and teach. This will contribute an additional 6,300 physicians to the medical research manpower pool by 1970. Assuming continuation of the pre-

[1] These are conservative assumptions because it appears likely that the proportion of Ph. D. degrees in the sciences will rise rather than remain constant.

[2] H. G. Weiskotten and Marion E. Altenderfer. Trends in Medical Practice. The Journal of Medical Education, July 1956, vol. 31, No. 7, p. 70. The proportion of all physicians graduating in 1935, 1940, and 1945 engaged in salaried positions involving teaching and/or research rose from 2.3 percent in 1935, to 4.9 percent in 1940, to 6.0 percent in 1945. (The consultants assume that there was an increase to 8 percent by 1957.)

vailing ratio of 3 part-time to 1 full-time physician in medical research, this would approximate 3,200 (full-time equivalent) researchers added to the medical research manpower pool by 1970.

It is quite possible that, as a result of trends already evident, the proportion of physicians who elect essentially full-time careers in research will rise. Medical schools will probably assume a more positive and more extensive role as institutions training M.D.'s specifically for full-time research careers.

The projected addition of 3,200 full-time equivalent M.D.'s to the medical research manpower pool by 1970 may therefore be low, if more M.D.'s are trained for research and if rewarding, stable careers are available for them after they are trained.

The projected rising demand for physicians engaged full time in research will—as contrasted with the situation in the past—begin to absorb an appreciable proportion of the total output of M.D.'s and therefore make the total production of M.D.'s a factor that must be weighed in projecting the Nation's medical research effort.

D. TOTAL SUPPLY OF AND DEMAND FOR PHYSICIANS

A major obstacle to the attainment of a well-rounded program of medical research and medical education for the Nation as a whole is the fact that the career opportunities in academic teaching and research—with respect both to salary and to the absolute number of positions—are inadequate. Any general development which makes a research or teaching career for the M.D. less attractive professionally and financially than a career in private practice will hamper the development of medical research.

1. Number of physicians

What is a reasonable national goal for the output of physicians? What are the prospects that the goal will be met?

The demand for medical care is influenced by many factors, some of which increase and others of which decrease the number of people who can be cared for by a physician. Among these are demographic changes, changes in therapy, urbanization, and a suburbanization, use of ancillary personnel, the nature of facilities for medical care, shifts in the causes of morbidity and death, extension of prepaid medical care programs, and the effectiveness of preventive medicine.

The Consultants believe that it would not be in the public interest for the number of physicians per 100,000 population to fall below the 1955 ratio of 132 per 100,000. This ratio has remained constant (plus or minus two) over the past 30 years.

To maintain this ratio, the output of physicians would have to expand by 1970 to 8,700 a year from domestic schools, plus another 750 from foreign schools. This compares with the production of 6,800 physicians in 1956. The domestic output would have to rise by 1,900 per year by 1970.

More physicians can be produced without increasing the number of 4-year medical schools. Additional 2-year schools attached to universities and devoted to teaching preclinical subjects would provide students to fill the existing clinical facilities. Clinical facilities of medical schools are expensive, and the existing facilities are not fully used.

In addition, experiments are in progress involving a shift of teaching responsibilities between the university and the medical school in a way that reduces the time required to produce physicians. To the extent that these experiments are successful, one of their effects will be to increase the number of physicians who can be trained by existing medical schools. But these expedients could not be realistically expected to yield more than the output of 7 new 4-year schools—about 700 graduates per year.

Therefore, about 1,200 (1,900 minus 700) additional physicians per year must be produced by new schools. The average medical school produces about 90 graduates per year. Therefore, a minimum of 14 and as many as 20 new medical schools will have to be built if the existing number of physicians per 100,000 population is not to fall. To meet this need construction would have to begin in the immediate future and be completed within a few years.

2. Quality of medical education

Concern over numbers should not obscure the critical importance of sustaining and increasing the quality of medical education. Attainment of optimum standards of education, research, and community service by medical schools at this time, and without increasing enrollments, would require additional operating funds of $10 to $20 million per year. As new schools are added, operating costs for the system as a whole will rise. There is a serious question as to the degree to which the physical plant of the medical schools can usefully expand without simultaneous availability of increased operating funds. Unless such funds are made available for present medical schools it will not only be difficult to increase the number of graduates but it will be almost impossible to provide faculties for any new medical schools.

Outside (nonuniversity) support for the operating expenses of medical schools during recent years from private sources has amounted to millions of dollars per year and not the tens of millions of dollars per year required for optimum performance today and future expansion during the next decade. In 1957, for example, the National Fund for Medical Education raised $2 million.

3. Physician supply and research

In the light of the prospective supply-demand situation for physician services, strenuous efforts should be made to make research careers more attractive for M. D.'s if research careers are to attract an adequate number of highly trained and highly intelligent physicians.

E. TOTAL MANPOWER SUPPLY SITUATION BY 1970

The estimated net addition of 3,200 M.D.'s in research and 16,000 doctorates in the sciences related to medicine would fall about 6,000 short of the 25,000 new medical researchers required by 1970 for the projected medical research effort. There will also be shortages of technicians, nurses, and other ancillary personnel. A portion of the deficit could be avoided, perhaps, by more effective utilization of existing personnel and facilities. Nevertheless, it would appear that an additional 6,000 M.D.'s and/or Ph. D.'s beyond the supply now projected will be needed if the Nation's medical research program approximates the 1970 estimates.

F. CONSTRUCTION OF MEDICAL SCHOOLS

The oncoming wave of college students will generate construction needs of unprecedented dimensions. The special facilities requirements for medical education and research must be viewed in the perspective of the much larger total demand for construction of all kinds of facilities for higher education.

Unless a large construction program designed to expand markedly the facilities of the Nation's system of medical and related schools is undertaken in the immediate future, the total medical research effort of the Nation will be impeded and the number of doctors per 100,000 population will begin to decline in the near future.

The problem is in two parts—improvement of the facilities of existing schools, and construction of new schools.

The present Health Research Facilities Construction Act will, unless extended and broadened, expire with extensive research construction needs unmet. There is on hand $61 million in currently approvable projects which cannot be financed. This represents at least $122 million in total medical research construction needs since each Federal dollar must be matched by a local dollar. Because these figures relate only to projects on hand, the total national needs are substantially greater.

Much larger capital investment will be required to renovate and enlarge existing schools, and to finance the construction of 14 to 20 new medical schools. A new medical school requires a capital investment of $35 to $50 million. The total cost of new medical school construction required to sustain today's population-physician ratio would range between $500 million and $1 billion. About 10 years typically elapse between the planning of a school and production of the first graduates.

Indeed, even if funds in the order of $500 million to $1 billion were made available immediately for construction of new medical schools, it seems certain that the number of physicians per 100,000 population will decline between now and 1970.

The consultants find that unless construction funds become available on a much larger scale than has heretofore been contemplated, the output of physicians will not keep pace with population growth and the needs of the Nation for research workers will not be met. Unless there is a marked change in social philosophy leading to private gifts or State appropriations on an unprecedented scale, large Federal appropriations will be required.

G. TOTAL SUPPLY OF AND DEMAND FOR DENTISTS

Dental research has grown in scope and depth of the past few years. Over 90 percent of the dental schools have active research projects, and in the year ending June 30, 1958, they spent $2.6 million on research Of this, about two-thirds was supplied by research grants from the National Institutes of Health. The investigations are concerned to an increasing degree with dental problems in the context of the whole body, and hence promise to become even more productive.

To sustain this momentum, additional research manpower, soundly trained in fundamentals, will be required. Steps to produce the required manpower are being taken. Among the most significant of these are the training programs of the National Institute of Dental Research, which supplied more than $700,000 to dental schools in the year ending June 30, 1958.

Shortages of dentists now and in the future will hamper the development of dental research. Since 1940, the number of practicing dentists has increased by only 10,000 while the population of the country has increased by 40 million. Dental services have not declined proportionately because of more extensive use of auxiliary personnel in recent years. The dental schools have been and are vigorous. Over the decade 1949–58, they have undertaken $41 million in new construction, and 94 percent of the funds were raised by the schools from private sources.

The Nation could use 13,500 more dentists now, and unless more dentists per year are produced, the dentist-population ratio will continue to decline. While four new dental schools have been established during the past 2 years, more new schools are needed. Indeed, two new schools, each with a graduating class of 50, would be required each year between 1957 and 1970 to reestablish the 1955 ratio of 1 dentist for each 1,900 persons.

Civil Rights Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, when the majority of the Members of the 85th Congress voted to enact the ill-conceived civil rights legislation, some of us very strongly opposed this action. We insisted that this bill which, among other things, would set up a special Civil Rights Commission under the Attorney General to investigate alleged civil rights complaints, would serve no good purpose. We maintained that such legislation would provide no new right, grant no new privilege to any citizen. It was, we contended, merely an attempt by self-righteous, self-styled liberal politicians to make the South their whipping boy in their frantic effort to gain the vote and support of certain groups.

Recent developments have, it seems to me, substantiated the arguments of those of us who opposed to the end the enactment of the 85th Congress' iniquitous civil rights legislation. Four members of the Civil Rights Commission created by that legislation say they will give up their positions on that body later this year. The chairman, who comes from Michigan, says in many of the questions referred to the Commission there is plainly no right answer. In short, the Commission is serving no good purpose, providing no new rights, granting no new privileges. This is as we said it would be, and it certainly is to be hoped that no new movements will get underway to perpetuate the life of this useless body.

An editorial on this subject appeared recently in the Sylacauga Advance, and under leave to extend my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to insert this editorial from this fine Alabama weekly newspaper.

THE CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION

The announcement that four members of the Civil Rights Commission, and possibly a fifth, would resign their posts when their terms expire this fall, is of great interest. It means that probably five of the six members will toss in the towel at the end of their 2-year terms.

The most enlightening thing about the recent development is the fact that the chairman of the Commission, the president of a prominent Michigan college, has declared that there are no right answers to many of the questions involved.

This is certainly an unbiased judgment, and it shows that a majority of the members on the Commission feel that the use of force in settling civil rights disputes is unwise. What many readers do not know is the fact that, some time ago, certain members of Congress were confidentially informed that the Civil Rights Commission would suggest that the life of that body not be continued by Congress.

All those politicians who were "crusading" on the issue, perhaps for the sake of votes, will not accept this verdict, even though it comes from members of the Civil Rights Commission itself.

We expect the leftwingers in Congress to continue to insist that the Civil Rights Commission be continued, even though five of the members think that it is not the answer. It is gratifying to know, however, that the action of the members of the Civil Rights Commission has had a profound effect on the White House.

Opinions From Columbus and Franklin County, Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, on March 9, 1959, I sent a newsletter and questionnaire to a cross-section of 1,000 persons in the 12th District of Ohio. The response was amazing. After 30 days 405 persons have answered. I feel this clearly demonstrates the keen interest the citizens of central Ohio have in the affairs of their Government.

Further, the overwhelming majority of responses contained studied comments, suggestions, and opinions relative to the matters we face here in Congress. I plan to retain these answers for some period of time, and any Member of Congress who wishes to examine them is most welcome.

In response to the question, "Do you favor a balanced Federal budget and reduced Federal assistance programs rather than additional public debt?" Ninety-one percent said yes, four percent said no, and five percent were undecided.

The results on the fair trade bill were not nearly as conclusive since 31 percent favored it, 46 percent were opposed and a large 23 percent undecided.

On the issue of Federal aid to education concerning Federal grants to schools for construction and teacher's salaries, 33 percent favored, 61 percent opposed, and 6 percent were undecided.

The omnibus housing bill relating to Federal grants and loans for urban redevelopment, public housing, college housing loans and other programs brought a favorable response from only 26 percent. Fifty-six percent opposed the legislation and 18 percent were undecided.

Thirty-five percent of the people answering were in favor of increasing the Federal gasoline tax from 3 to 4½ cents per gallon for the highway trust fund. Fifty-two percent opposed a gasoline tax increase and fifteen percent undecided.

On legislation aimed at elimination of corruption in labor unions, specifically such bills as Kennedy, Goldwater, and McClellan to require unions to submit reports on activities, hold secret ballot elections for officers, and other provisions, 94 percent favored such legislation, 3 percent were opposed, and 3 percent undecided.

The above figures express the views of a small segment of the population in Columbus and Franklin County, Ohio, and perhaps other areas in the great Midwest.

Due to the tremendous response and interest in central Ohio, I have mailed out another newsletter and questionnaire on March 30, with seven questions directed to the mutual security program that now faces Congress. The mailing list has been more than doubled due to the number of persons who have written asking that their names be added. I hope to give the Members of Congress the benefit of that poll on May 1. The results on incomplete returns to date are surprising.

The Anxiety of Castro Supporters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, is Fidel Castro playing the political piano by ear because of his administrative inexperience? Or are there darker and hitherto unsuspected motives which explain his recent actions which have so disconcerted many of his most ardent supporters?

The Fidel Castro I know doesn't need claques. The Fidel Castro I thought I knew would never have insulted his guest Jose Figueres, former President of Costa Rica, nor would he have had the temerity to question the intelligence of this proven democratic leader.

Under a previous consent I am including the text of an article by Bertram B. Johansson, staff writer on Latin American affairs for the Christian Science Monitor, which appeared in that paper on March 31, 1959.

PRO-CASTRO'S ELEMENTS' ANXIETY MOUNTS

(By Bertram B. Johansson)

Concern is deepening among even pro-Castro sources in the United States and Cuba over the thrust and direction of events of recent weeks in Cuba.

The anxiety, which appears most pointedly and poignantly among loyal pro-Castro sources, not pro-Batista elements, involves three categories of political activity in Cuba:

1. Recent anti-U.S. utterances of Premier Fidel Castro, which have bothered introspective Cubans more than U.S. citizens. The statements, incidentally, have not openly disconcerted the State Department, which is holding to a patient, wait-and-see, noninterventionist stance.

CASTRO PUZZLE

2. An obvious increase in strength of leftist and Communists in Cuban labor unions. Labor sources here estimate that Communists by now may have wrested effective control in nearly 20 out of 30 Cuban labor unions.

3. And the suspicion that persons of strong leftist or Communist inclination surrounding Premier Castro may become or are becoming more influential in his inner councils, thinking, and decisions.

Although the Castro-Urrutia government acted swiftly to clean out Communists from labor's top council in the early weeks after the successful revolution against Fulgencio

Batista, a change in the modus operandi apparently has taken place.

Some of the most astute labor sources here state that the evidence now is that top Cuban leadership wants the July 26 independence movement to grab the labor movement and hold it, with the effective help of the Communists.

Experienced Cuban labor leaders on lower levels are being shunted aside, these sources say, and inexperienced personnel substituted or Communists allowed to maneuver into positions.

In all three of these areas of political activity, the unanswered questions are whether Dr. Castro is naively or ignorantly being swept along with circumstances—playing the political piano by ear because of his administrative inexperience—or whether a conscious, studied position is being taken on significant issues. There are adherents of both points of view.

The first break with Dr. Castro among some of his supporters came at the time, several weeks ago, when he publicly objected to the decision of a Santiago military court which acquitted 43 Batista airmen of charges of genocide and bombing civilian populations and villages.

As a result of Dr. Castro's criticism of the acquittal by a lower military court, the case was hurriedly transferred to a higher military court, the decision reversed, and the airmen were sentenced to long prison terms. None of them was executed.

Havana lawyers and bar associations disputed the court reversal instantly. Persons who criticized the reversal were dubbed by Dr. Castro as counterrevolutionaries, though they were objecting to the points of law involved, not the issue of whether the men should or should not be punished.

There is also a growing uneasiness in Cuba and the United States over the continued military executions. They have mounted to more than 450 thus far. Dr. Castro, some weeks ago, said he expected and hoped the executions could be stopped when the figure reached 400.

Even those persons who were willing to grant that a certain number of military executions of the worst atrocity offenders were necessary to prevent mob violence and revengeful, indiscriminate retribution are beginning now to raise the questions, "Isn't this enough, for now at least? Can't the executions be deferred, and the trials shifted to civilian courts?"

ARDENT SUPPORT

On the other hand, the Cuban Government appears to have the general, in fact, ferocious support of the greater part of the Cuban public which has been tragically touched by the incredible persecutions, tortures, rapes, atrocities permitted under the Batista dictatorship.

Evidence has come to light recently tending to prove that in one instance some 90 rebels were executed by the Batista officers and bulldozed into a mass grave.

Furthermore, there is uneasiness among some Cubans and pro-Castro North Americans at the inclination of Dr. Castro to defer general elections. In the first flush of victory after the January 1 flight of Dictator Batista, Dr. Castro said elections might be held in 18 months.

Later the figure was put up to 24 months, to allow for the more gradual development of political parties, on the theory that if an election were held now the 26th of July revolutionary forces would inevitably make a clean sweep.

Now, whenever elections are mentioned by Dr. Castro to huge audiences, it appears that claques of people in the crowds shout, "No elections, no elections."

The incident which has caused greatest anxiety among Cubans and Latin Americans generally occurred at a trade union rally March 22. Col. José Figueres, former President of Costa Rica, who was visiting Cuba as a guest of the Government, had made the statement to thousands of workers in front of the presidential palace that in the cold war between the Soviet Union and the United States the interests of Latin America naturally lay with the West.

ANTI-U.S. GIBES

Dr. Castro later rose to say he was hurt and surprised that his old friend José Figueres should also have fallen into the trap of the propaganda of lies which distort Cuba's policy in the United States and in other countries.

Dr. Castro indicated he felt Cuba's position should be neutralist in the cold war.

At this point his speech was interrupted by David Salvador, secretary-general of the Confederation of Cuban Workers, who asserted that "Cuba cannot be with the United States," which he contended was oppressing Cuba.

Some Cubans expected an open break in United States-Cuban relations as a result of these statements, but the State Department has remained calm, tight-lipped, and noncommittal on the issue.

Quite to the contrary, the State Department is preparing, as a matter of course, to take all measures necessary for the protection of Dr. Castro on his scheduled nonofficial visit to the United States on April 17.

Dr. Castro has been invited by the American Society of Newspaper Editors to answer questions at its annual meeting in Washington.

Poison in Your Water—No. 54

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Niles, Ohio, Times on February 13, 1959, entitled "Tired of Floodings: Water-Weary Wickliffe Cries for Good Sewers."

[From the Niles (Ohio) Times, Feb. 13, 1959]

TIRED OF FLOODINGS—WATER-WEARY WICKLIFFE CRIES FOR GOOD SEWERS

AUSTINTOWN.—Water-weary Wickliffe area residents are whipping up support for creation of a citizens' committee to fight for a better sewer system in the area.

Kenneth Davis, of 262 North Roanoke Road, one of the backers of the group, said today the committee probably will hold an organization meeting sometime next week.

He said the action is an outgrowth of 3 years of fruitless efforts by residents for a better sewer system.

He said that during recent rains water entered about 25 homes in triangle-shaped area bounded by Mahoning Avenue on the south, Raccoon Road on the west, and Four Mile Run Road on the east.

Davis said water from both sanitary and storm sewers backed into homes during heavy rains. Most of the homes in the area are one-story structures, he said.

He said the group is working on a petition outlining the area's flood problems. A committee will be formed soon to complete the petition, he said.

Davis said the petition will cite Mahoning county commissioners, the county sanitary engineer, the Austintown township trustees, and the developers of International Homes, for failure to make adequate arrangements for sewers.

The move, Davis said, already has the backing of several area church, business, and civic groups.

Oceans Will Have To Be Stirred To Feed the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. OLIVER
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, as early as the 18th century, Thomas Malthus predicted that the increase of the world's population would ultimately result in a scarcity of food. The Malthusian theory assumes even greater interest today since the population of the earth is exploding at a tremendous pace while many countries are subsisting on a grossly inadequate food supply. Even though more and more of the land area capable of producing foodstuffs is being placed under cultivation, it is becoming more obvious that we must look for new areas for the development of additional food sources. Oceanographers visualize the oceans as a vast gold mine of untapped food potential, but a great deal of research must be undertaken before utilization of these resources can become a reality.

Mr. Everett S. Allen in the following article, originally published in the New Bedford, Mass., Standard-Times, outlines some of the possible oceanic food sources that might be developed. Unless our country's research programs are substantially expanded, we cannot hope to reap the harvest of what may eventually prove to be essential food products.

OCEANS WILL HAVE TO BE STIRRED TO FEED WORLD

(By Everett S. Allen)

The world's oceans will be artificially stirred eventually, for otherwise they will not provide enough food for the hungry millions who will turn to them for sustenance when there is no more land available for cultivation. They will have to be stirred to bring up nutrients from the bottom so sunlight can get at them and thus increase the sea water's productivity.

The ocean turns over by itself, but the rate—estimated by some scientists at once every 500 years—will not be fast enough to meet future food needs.

Prof. James Bonner, California Institute of Technology biologist, says the earth's present population of 2,700 million will triple in the next 100 years. By that time, nearly every inch of the earth's topsoil will be inhabited or cultivated, poultry and livestock will be virtually extinct, and man will be vegetarian, getting his necessary protein from plants.

NEW FOOD SOURCES

Marine scientists believe animal material nearer the bottom of the food chain—much simpler forms of sea life than the codfish, for example, may provide additional sources of food. They also suggest the ocean may

nourish plant life ashore on which man must depend for food.

Recently, ocean scientists from nine nations, convening at the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, concluded, "One of the most important long-range problems is concerned with the oceans as an important source of protein food for many of the world's peoples.

"With the quick growth of populations, man's need for food from the sea may be expected to increase rapidly. The living resources of the oceans are by no means infinite and, like the land, different parts differ widely in fertility. The fertile areas are those where nutrient substances, essential for plant life, are brought up from the deep waters. To obtain the maximum harvest, we must understand the processes by which this occurs."

SEA OUTPRODUCES LAND

Acre per acre, the sea already is producing about as much plant material as is the land; since there is more sea than land in the world, the oceans are, therefore, outproducing the total land output.

Plant food in the ocean is highly diluted, generally in the form of plankton—weakly swimming or passively floating plant and animal life of miscroscopic dimension—and getting it in quantity for man's food would involve filtering huge amounts of water.

At present, instead of eating this basic food form, men eat fish, which means that the original plant is concentrated through biological process—in other words, it has passed through the digestive systems of a half-dozen animals, each of which lives on the other.

Most significant is this: At each step of this process, there is a 90 percent loss in food value. As the world's need for food increases, oceanographers seek a way in which men can consume the basic food at first hand, without sustaining these interim losses. The plankton sandwich is a standard joke among earth scientists but it does indicate the direction of the thinking.

The sea actually can outproduce the land. The only reason it doesn't is because it is not sufficiently transparent to sunshine. At best, sea plants grow only in the area from the surface to a depth of 500 or 600 feet, in the midlatitudes, plant life is found only down to 50 or 60 feet.

Plants growing up in the surface areas, plus finely suspended clay materials from rivers flowing into the sea create an upperlevel umbrella which shades the lower ocean from the sunlight just as a forest does. Thus, there is a lot of ocean in which plant life does not grow.

But the sea has great advantages over the land as far as crop raising is concerned; there is no problem of drought, and the oceans contain vast sources of plant-nutrient material (phosphates and nitrates) washed off the continents since the beginning of time. Normal ocean turnover, dependent on temperature and density differences, brings these nutrients up to the surface layer but not always as fast as the plant life could use it.

For example, there are few phosphates in the surface waters of the Sargasso Sea; this is a marine desert. By contrast, tidal currents on New England's Georges Bank keep "plowing" the ocean, turning up plant food, exposing new water to the sunlight, and so Georges probably produces 200 times as much fish per cubic foot as does the Sargasso Sea.

Thus, if you could find some way to stir the sea better than nature now is stirring it, it could raise a lot more plant life, and a lot more fish, as well.

WHALE MAY HAVE ANSWER

Dr. Robert Menzies of Columbia University's Lamont observatory commented, "The world population is going to outgrow its food supply unless something changes a great deal; then it will have to turn to the nearest sea.

"We are harvesting the sea now at a great rate, but are not eating the primary producer, phytoplankton (the plant variety of plankton); instead, we eat a product five times removed. The whale is the only vertebrate close to eating the primary producer, and we must study the whale to see how he does it.

"The problem of food might some day require changing people's eating habits. Obviously, it would take a tremendous job of education to get them to eat plankton."

Dr. Menzies, director of Lamont's biology program, wrote to Columbia's Institute of Nutrition Sciences, "(We) might profitably investigate:

"1. The nutritional value of plankton. * * * Social and psychological problems involved in attempting to feed people plankton directly probably are too great to be overcome, but the possibility of using plankton as poultry food supplements may well be considered.

"2. Seaweeds. Oriental diets often contain considerable amounts of seaweeds, and experimentation is underway in Britain on the nutritive value of various seaweeds as cattle foods and dietary supplements.

ARE BARNACLES FOOD?

"3. Fouling organisms: These constitute a serious problem to shipowners, consisting of barnacles, hydroids, clams and mussels, and their removal costs several million dollars annually. These represent a wasted source of protein and probably also valuable minerals. No one has considered using these creatures as a secondary source of food, to my knowledge. One large vessel may accumulate in the course of a year as much as 1 million pounds of these animals."

In addition to providing food plants within its own depths, the sea also may supply a substantial part of the food of plants on land by means of bubbles coated with the organic matter of the ocean.

Dr. A. H. Woodcock at Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution commented, "Charles H. Keith, in our laboratory, discovered that droplets ejected from a water surface covered with organic matter come out coated with this material. Since the sea in many parts of the world have organic film coating on their surface, this finding suggests that the ocean may provide principal plant nutrients.

RED TIDE NOTED

"It has been known that airborne droplets sometimes contain small sea organisms and parts of plankton. The notorious red tide along our gulf coast, an occasional phenomenon produced by great swarms of reddish plankton, sends up airborne droplets containing a substance very irritating to mucous membranes, as shore dwellers and fishermen have discovered to their distress."

Again, it is reasonable to suppose that the seas would supply more plant nutrients if they were artificially stirred and agitated. The rain in Sweden is known to provide 30 percent of agricultural requirements for plant nutrition. Presumably, this plant nutrition got into the air through salt particles kicked up by whitecaps on the ocean.

Therefore, anything that man could do to add to the effervescent quality of the sea might very well put more nitrates and phosphates back into the atmosphere and produce more rainfall, as well, by providing salt nuclei for raindrops. Oceanographers believe this is the method by which forests get their nutrients, too.

JOINT ASSAULT SEEN

The International Special Committee on Oceanic Research, of which the United States is a member, considers as one of its principal objectives the coordination of a multination program of observation and measurements of the deep ocean waters. One point of this program would involve an intensive effort to understand the relationship between the plants and animals with that of the dynamics of the upper water layers.

Is is, therefore, possible, perhaps 3 or 4 years from now, for as many as 16 ships from several countries to make a combined assault on the largest unknown area on earth, the deep waters and seabed of the Indian Ocean. This is possible if there is sufficient money and ship time available. This area's unique qualities will provide valuable evidence for those investigating the general productivity of the oceans.

It is noteworthy that the Russian oceanographers already are working on an extensive program in the Indian Ocean.

Curtailment of Nuclear Tests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, recently at a meeting of the Society of Friends at the home of Mrs. Stephen Angell on Popham Road, Scarsdale, N.Y., I discussed the desirability of curtailing nuclear tests, especially because one of the byproducts of such tests is an increase in radioactive fallout.

I favor curtailing such tests on a bilateral basis. In other words, only if Russia agrees to do the same thing at the same time.

It was generally agreed at the abovementioned meeting that the resolution which Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY introduced in the other body a short time ago was a move in the right direction. With congressional endorsement and international support, this resolution could go a long way toward helping to establish real world peace.

I am introducing a facsimile of the Humphrey resolution in the House of Representatives because I believe it is a constructive effort to eliminate one of the great dangers which beset us today, and I urge all unfamiliar with its provisions to acquaint themselves with them.

The resolution is as follows:

Whereas the goal of the people of the United States is a just and lasting peace; and

Whereas the peace of the world is threatened by an arms race of major proportions among the leading powers of which a key aspect is the continuing development of devastating nuclear weapons; and

Whereas for 13 years negotiations to control and limit these weapons have not led to agreement; and

Whereas representatives of the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union are now meeting in Geneva for the purpose of drafting a treaty on the discontinuance of nuclear weapons tests; and

Whereas an effective international control system is a necessary component of any multilateral agreement on the cessation of nuclear weapons tests in which all states are to have confidence; and

Whereas an agreement regarding the discontinuance of nuclear weapons tests under an effective control system would prove an opportunity to ease world tensions and realize a small but significant first step to-

ward the control and reduction of armaments: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, That its Members support the efforts of the United States to continue to negotiate for an international agreement for the suspension of nuclear weapons tests, and that it emphatically endorses the principle that an adequate inspection and control system must be part of any such international agreement involving a suspension of nuclear weapons tests; and That the Senate requests the President of the United States to submit to the Soviet Government the contents of this resolution and that he ask the Soviet Government to transmit the resolution to the Soviet people so that leaders and people alike will know of the desire of the American people speaking through their representatives in the Senate for the successful outcome of the negotiations in Geneva for an effective and reliable agreement for the discontinuance of nuclear weapons test.

H.R. 2729

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the following news column by C. Wilson Harder in which he refers to legislation I have introduced, namely H.R. 2729. I believe his comments are very worthwhile and feel they should be called to the attention of this body.

WASHINGTON AND SMALL BUSINESS
(By C. Wilson Harder)

It would appear, barring apathy on the part of the Nation's small businessmen, that before this session of Congress is finished, some concrete measures will be passed strengthening the laws that permit opportunity to independent enterprise.

Of course, it is too early to tell as yet what the impact will be of opposing forces, or what coalitions might be formed by the socialistic dreamers monopoly-minded interests to head off the drive.

But a lot of effort is being put forth to protect free enterprise.

Attorney General William Rogers has asked both Senate and House to pass legislation giving Justice Department authority to compel production of documents during investigative stages of civil and antitrust proceedings.

As it stands now, the only way necessary documents can be forced out into the open is to file criminal charges with the respective grand juries making the demand. However, this is not always feasible, nor proper.

At present, civil enforcement of the antitrust laws is handicapped by the inability of Justice Department to force production of documents which have a bearing on the situation.

And from another quarter, Representative ALVIN BENTLEY, of Michigan, has introduced a bill amending the Federal Trade Commission Act which would prohibit certain practices now being carried out by manufacturers who attempt to carry water on both shoulders.

Representative BENTLEY states that there are instances where the manufacturer is selling his products to the consumer through his own stores at a price level that the independent retailer must pay for the same products. In other cases, he said, the manufacturer is selling direct to the consumer at one price, to the manufacturer owned stores at another price, and to the independent retailer at still another price.

At the same time, the Michigan Congressman is quite critical of the Federal Trade Commission. In his opinion, the major reason that the Robinson-Patman Act has not brought the expected relief to independent business at the local level is directly due to FTC failure to enforce the laws.

This has long been a complaint of the nationwide membership of the National Federation of Independent Business.

Representative BENTLEY seems to feel that the major fault of the FTC has been a failure of the FTC to vigorously enforce and police the cease-and-desist orders issued when a major violation has been perpetrated.

In other words, there have been occasions where the FTC has moved in on violators and against unfair practices. The guilty parties have replied that they would cease and desist, and the FTC has gone along its merry way, on the assumption that there would be no reversion to the forbidden practices.

Thus, in this respect, the FTC apparently has failed to recognize what men of the cloth have always known to be true.

There are always backsliders. Representative BENTLEY wants the FTC to recognize this fact and act.

Centennial of Guttenberg, N.J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, the century-old town of Guttenberg, N.J., sits high on the Palisades of the Hudson River, with a magnificent view of the river and the famed New York City skyline. It is likely that 350 years ago, New Jersey Indians took their first look at Henry Hudson's *Half Moon*, as it sailed up the Hudson in 1609, from this location.

Guttenberg is a substantial community in northern Hudson County that is justly proud of its traditions and history. It is known far and wide as an important center of the Schiffli embroidery industry. Its nearly 6,000 citizens have established a fine tradition of thrift and obedience to law that has come about as a natural result of the development of their religious and family life. The town's name honors Johannes Gutenberg, the pioneer printer of the Holy Bible, even though the town name contains one more "t" than does the printer's name.

During our Revolutionary War, a small battle was fought there when Colonial troops, led by "Mad" Anthony Wayne, attacked Tory workmen at a fortified blockhouse.

This town is now celebrating the 100th anniversary of its incorporation by the New Jersey Legislature and I would, therefore, like to include the official proclamation by the Honorable Herman G. Klein, mayor of the town of Guttenberg, N.J., in the Appendix of the RECORD.

PROCLAMATION BY MAYOR OF THE TOWN OF GUTTENBERG, N.J., REGARDING CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION OF GUTTENBERG, N.J.

Know all men by these presents that:

Whereas the town of Guttenberg in the county of Hudson and State of New Jersey was incorporated by official act of the New Jersey Legislature as an incorporated town in 1859; and

Whereas the said town of Guttenberg has been in continuous existence since 1859 so that appropriate centennial observances are fitting and proper in this year of 1959; and

Whereas it is the unanimous desire of the people of the town of Guttenberg to commemorate this 100th anniversary of the founding of the town by appropriate events and observances; and

Whereas the people of the town of Guttenberg have lived and prospered through this century under the blessings of our American liberties which inspired our centennial slogan "A Century of Progress and Freedom Through Democracy" and have earned the affection and respect of our neighbors and fellow citizens and desire to express their friendship and announce the centennial observance; and

Whereas appropriate plans are progressing under the leadership of the Guttenberg Centennial Committee to make the centennial celebration a memorable one and to invite thereto various friends and representatives from the Federal, State, and local governments:

Now, therefore, as mayor of the town of Guttenberg, N.J., I do hereby proclaim, by virtue of the authority vested in me, that the official Guttenberg centennial observance will be held on May 3–May 17, 1959, and all official departments and agencies of the town of Guttenberg are authorized to participate and cooperate in such observance, with the fervent hope that, under God, the people and the town of Guttenberg will continue to develop and prosper in the coming years and centuries.

HERMAN G. KLEIN, *Mayor*.

Spain and Russia: Closer to Each Other Than to Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, Eric Allen, managing editor of the Medford (Oreg.) Mail-Tribune questions whether Franco is, as he often alleges, a bulwark against communism. He writes of the threat to freedom of authoritarianism of both the right and the left and points out that they are in fact closer to each other than they are to the democratic forms to which we adhere in the West.

Under a previous consent, I am including the text of his editorial of March 27, 1959.

TWO-EDGED SWORD

We are not fond of dictators.

This goes for a Stalin or a Khrushchev or a Tito, and it also goes for a Trujillo, or a Hitler, or a Franco.

Despite the fact that free men's greatest war was fought against the forces of fascism,

as exemplified by Hitler and Mussolini, the current set of the times is against the Communist dictators.

Sometimes it seems that this very natural preoccupation with the threat of communism tends to blind us to the threat of the tyranny at the other end of the political spectrum.

Freedom lives in the middle.

It is threatened by the authoritarianism of both the right and the left—which are, in fact closer to each other than they are to the democratic forms to which we adhere in the West.

Both are insidious. But the danger of communism has been made so thoroughly understood that it is universally acknowledged. On the other hand, the danger from fascism was downgraded following the defeat of the Axis powers, and also as a result of the fact that its remaining protagonists, Franco, Trujillo, et al., present no immediate danger to the security of the United States.

They don't—no. But the authoritarian philosophy which they represent, does, always has, and probably always will.

One of the side effects of the Nation's preoccupation with communism has been a sort of de facto alliance with Fascist-type regimes.

Much of the American aid which has gone to Latin American dictatorships has been given under the pretext that it was to help them fight communism—which is a flimsy sophistry, at best.

The same is in part true of our uneasy alliance with Generalissimo Francisco Franco, the Spanish dictator, although because Spain furnishes bases for our planes, there is somewhat more justification for the practice.

But is Franco a bulwark against communism, as is always alleged?

Salvador de Madariaga, Spanish ambassador to the United States in 1931, now living in Oxford, England, an historian and diplomat, recently wrote to the New York Times to point out some of the facts about communism in Fascist Spain.

He declares it is thriving. And he cites these reasons:

"All parties being forbidden by Franco, the Communist is the only Spanish party which possessed a technique of clandestinity, and money.

"Spain receives a score of weekly radio talks and none from a free world point of view.

"Franco accuses all his enemies of being Communists, which automatically raises the prestige of communism, since opposition to Franco is popular and general in Spain.

"American friendship and aid to Franco generate a chain reaction of emotions on the basis of: Friends of my enemies are my enemies and enemies of my enemies are my friends; which, of course, works fatally in favor of communism.

"The people get used to apathetic obedience, which paves the way for communism.

"The regime has increased the scandalous gap between rich and poor; and the poor are denied any outlet in free working-class organizations of a syndicalist or social-democratic type; so they go Communist."

Senor Madariaga's arguments, while not conclusive, certainly tend to show how it is possible for a violent anticommunism, through ill-advised repression, to encourage the very thing it fears and detests.

Not only is this food for thought about our policy of cooperating with Franco and his ilk.

Perhaps even more important, it is one more reason why we should look with suspicion at those in our own midst who would curb the freedom of others under the pretense, or excuse, of fighting communism.

That is a sword which cuts both ways.

Threat of an Unwanted War Lies in Growing Tensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CARLTON LOSER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including a very fine editorial from the Nashville Tennessean of April 7, 1959.

World tensions are almost to a breaking point. We cannot say that an unwanted war will not erupt. We can only work and pray for a peaceful solution to the present situation.

The following editorial concerning the growing tension is well worth the reading of every Member of the House.

THREAT OF AN UNWANTED WAR LIES IN GROWING TENSIONS

No nation really wants a war over the German and Berlin questions, it is generally believed, and if that is so some kind of satisfactory agreement must be reached by negotiations.

But that does not mean a clash of arms could not result from the building up of tensions which are so plainly evident. Even now, the United States and Russia are exchanging heated notes over plane incidents—one over West Germany and the others in the Baltic and Japan Seas areas.

Tempers have flared and harsh accusations have been made. The Soviets have been made. The Soviets charge that an effort is being made to prevent any agreement at the summit, and our State Department blames Russia for provocative actions.

Both sides are making a show of their determination, so that it might be said that unofficial negotiations are already under way—but not in an atmosphere calculated to make peace easier to attain.

Already having pledged that he will not give an inch where our rights and obligations are concerned, President Eisenhower is acting accordingly lest the Kremlin suspect that the spirit of appeasement is being resurrected. And the Soviet, having brought on this crisis with its original free city demand for West Berlin, seems intent on emphasizing its belief that it will negotiate from strength as opposed to the group of free nations who do not see as one on every issue.

President Eisenhower and the NATO leaders are right in saying that they are not going to desert the free people of West Berlin and in resisting Russian pressures. There comes a time when a backward step is equivalent to defeat, and it is now at hand.

The free and undecided world is looking to the White House for reassurance, and it is not being disappointed. Mr. Eisenhower has evidently been advised that, if we are to resist further Communist victories, we are better equipped to do so now than we will be in the years just ahead.

In such a course, however, it should be recognized that the risks of starting a war by mischance or misunderstanding is increased. If Soviet airmen, instead of buzzing an American transport flying at high level over West Germany, had fired on it, there would have been an immediate crisis. And in a like manner, a grave emergency was threatened when, according to a United States protest, Russian planes attacked ours over international waters of the sea of Japan and the Baltic Sea. Since there was no loss of life in any of these cases, the matter is being handled diplomatically. Had it been otherwise, the consequences might have been far-reaching.

The existing situation is as explosive as that of 10 years ago when NATO was organized to meet the massive threat of the Red army to sweep all of Europe into the Communist camp. Significantly enough, there was another Berlin crisis at that time, and it was only met and overcome by Western solidarity.

For Mr. Khrushchev, the urge to play with matches in a powder magazine seems to be strong, but before committing himself fully to such a course he might dwell upon the fate of others with the same weakness whose names are written large in the pages of criminal history.

A Weak Economy Drive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the Waterloo, Iowa, Daily Courier in a recent editorial clearly points out one of the real weaknesses in the campaign of President Eisenhower for economy and a balanced budget.

It is not enough to simply balance the budget. There must be substantial payments each year on the Federal debt, the interest and other carrying charges on which now total well above $8 billion each year.

To accomplish this necessary objective there must be an end to spending for those programs which are clearly a responsibility of local subdivisions of government. As the Daily Courier well points out, "the Federal Government will soon be paying 50 percent of the cost of the traffic lights on Main Street" unless someone demonstrates the courage to demand sane fiscal policies.

The editorial follows:

IKE SAYS "SOME"; CONGRESS SAYS "MORE"

The greatest weakness of President Eisenhower in his campaign for a balanced budget is that he has, throughout his administration, refused to meet the issue head-on. His solution to a spending problem is always to "spend a little less for this" rather than take the more dramatic position that "the Federal Government shouldn't be spending a dime for this."

A typical example is the administration's position on money to aid local communities in building sewage disposal plants. The President in his fiscal 1960 budget recommended that the Federal contribution for this purpose should be reduced from $50 million to $20 million.

But the subcommittee handling the issue in the House, naturally, proposed an increase from $50 million to $100 million. And the administration, having refused to take a stand on a proper division of Federal and State responsibility, is in a poor position to oppose the increase. For it is committed to "some" aid for building sewage disposal

plants. And once that commitment is made, the record shows that there is likely to be an increase in the need every year.

Actually, there isn't the slightest justification for Federal aid for sewage disposal plants under any rational division of Federal-State authority. If the Federal Government is justified in this intervention, then there simply isn't any clear division of responsibility. Under this process, the Federal Government will soon be paying 50 percent of the cost of the traffic lights on Main Street.

If President Eisenhower would take a stronger stand on the question of a proper division of Federal and State authority, he would be able to win more public support for a sane fiscal policy.

A Tribute to a Great American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to announce that it is with pride and sorrow that I rise, in the name of my Wisconsin constituency, to pay tribute to a great American, Frank Lloyd Wright, who passed away in a hospital in Phoenix, Ariz., early yesterday morning, April 9—just 2 months short of his 90th birthday.

And this great American, who lived just 10 miles west of my congressional district in Wisconsin, in a once obscure place he named Taliesin, even in the last days of the broad expanse of his life remained provocatively controversial and magnificently creative. He will best be remembered for having lifted American architecture from the status of a craft to a fine art, but to Mr. Wright architecture was even more fundamental and meaningful; it was a way of life, a philosophy.

Frank Lloyd Wright was a man of unrivaled achievements in the field of architecture. Magnificent at once as an engineer and as an artist, he has left his monuments in stone and steel, in wood and concrete, and glass and plastic, in globe-girdling profusion.

Characteristic of the man was his daring conception of the plan for the Imperial Hotel in Tokyo, in 1915. Required to design an earthquake-proof building for a region noted for its frequent and severe earthquakes, he discarded the ancient reliance upon rock for solidity, knowing that it is in the rock itself that the earthquake takes place, and built the hotel like a huge Noah's Ark, not supported on anything solid, but floating upon soft mud, and held together internally by cantilevered floors and concrete supports.

The building was completed and opened for use in 1922, and in 1923 triumphantly survived, undamaged, the extreme test of the great earthquake of that year, one of the worst earthquakes in Japanese history. It was the only major building to withstand that upheaval, and many a correspondent wrote in awed tones of seeing its mass looming above a waste of rubble.

But that is one of his ideas, one of his buildings. He spouted ideas like a fountain, and strewed buildings behind him in his career as a child strews toys. But varied as these buildings are, each suited to its surroundings, meeting its special engineering problems, fulfilling the needs and desires of its owner, and expressing the resolute independence of the architect—yet there is a core of unity informing all this sparkling variety.

Everywhere, and all the time, Frank Lloyd Wright was the exponent of a philosophy of architecture that combined functionalism with what may be called naturalism. His effort was always to make his building seem to grow out of the earth like a tree or a bush, to loom like a rocky cliff or to curve like a lily; but at the same time to suit his building to its function as strictly as a machine. A similar suiting of building to its surroundings and function appears in the apparent inconsistency with which Wright, the most spectacular free-spender in the history of architecture, devoted himself and his Taliesin Fellowship to the problem of constructing medium-sized homes at a moderate cost and with the least expenditure of material and labor, at the same time retaining artistic excellence. A lavish expenditure of wealth he found suitable to the display of spectacular beauty that a rich man might desire for his estate—but for the man of moderate means he was intent on securing an equal beauty at a pared-to-the-bone cost.

A "rebellious old gentleman," they called him. He was indeed rebellious. He rebelled against hidebound conservatism, and equally against doctrinaire modernism. He was wise and witty, fierce and furious, warm with human sympathy, delight, ambition, energy, and a passion for truth and justice. His name will be honored for centuries in the history of architecture.

He had won international eminence long before some of us in the House of Representatives were born, but his contributions, his genius and the spirit of his personality will live forever. Indeed, he leaves this earth uniquely—already memorialized by his own monuments. We and the generations to come will long remain in his debt.

Postscript on the CCD

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, on March 3, 1959, I inserted in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Richmond News Leader, entitled "Pow-Wow on 40th Street," which dealt with a meeting of the consultative conference on desegregation. Along with the editorial was printed the minutes of the mass media committee of this organization.

The News Leader, on March 26, wrote again of this organization and related certain other facts concerning its membership which I think the American people would be interested in having made known to them. I believe that the second editorial, entitled "Postscript on the CCD" is worthy of the attention of all Americans. This points up, I think, the allout effort that is being made to spread false propaganda and hatred upon vast segments of the Nation.

I desire to include the editorial herein with my remarks and commend it to the reading of the Members of the House:

POSTSCRIPT ON THE CCD

A month ago this newspaper carried on its editorial page the minutes of a meeting held by an interesting, if unknown, body—the mass media committee of the Consultative Conference on Desegregation. These minutes, never intended for publication, described with revealing frankness the coordinated, professional efforts being made by integrationist groups to advance their point of view.

The Consultative Conference on Desegregation was a new outfit in our book. Inquiry to the Associated Press in New York at first drew a blank. The secretary was unwilling to disclose the names of the member agencies of this conference without their consent.

Now, however, a letter is at hand from the New York bureau of the Associated Press forwarding information obtained from Arnold Aronson, of the National Community Relations Advisory Council, who serves as secretary of the CCD.

The Consultative Conference on Desegregation was formed a little over 2 years ago, Mr. Aronson advises, "in order to further communication among organizations committed to facilitating orderly compliance with the constitutional requirements regarding desegregation." The CCD is a "mechanism for interconsultation and for an exchange of information, views, and experiences." It does not engage in legislative activity, "nor does it take public actions or issue public statements."

Member agencies include the following:

Department of racial and cultural relations, National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.
Catholic Committee of the South.
Synagogue Council of America.
American Friends Service Committee.
American Civil Liberties Union.
Americans for Democratic Action.
American Jewish Committee.
American Jewish Congress.
Anti-Defamation League.
Board of National Missions, United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.
Catholic Interracial Council.
Council for Social Action, Congregational Christian Churches.
Department of Social Welfare, United Christian Missionary Society, Disciples of Christ.
Evangelical and Reformed Church, Commission on Christian Social Action.
Jewish Labor Committee.
National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.
National board, YWCA.
National Council of Jewish Women.
National Council, Protestant Episcopal Church, Division of Christian Citizenship.
National Sharecroppers Fund, Inc.
National Social Welfare Assembly.
Southern Regional Council.
Union of American Hebrew Congregations.
Unitarian Service Committee.
United Automobile Workers of America.
United Church Women.

United Steelworkers of America.

Women's Division of Christian Service of the Methodist Church.

That is the lineup: Twenty-nine organizations, including several of great wealth and political influence, working smoothly together on one coordinated drive to promote racial integration.

And the American South, whose society, culture, and institutions are the targets of this formidable assault, remains almost defenseless in a war of ideas. When will we marshal our scattered forces for an effective campaign of our own?

America's Educational System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED WAMPLER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the April 1959, issue of the American Federationist magazine an article dealing with the problem of America's educational system and Federal proposals designed to relieve, hopefully to an appreciable extent, the stresses currently besetting our public schools.

The article was written by Carl J. Megel, the president of the American Federation of Teachers. Against the background of Congress' legislative attempts in the school construction and educational fields, I find Mr. Megel's analysis penetratingly provocative:

Among the union teachers who view educational deficiencies and inequities from inside our public schools, there is new hope that our national lawmakers will have the vision and the courage to provide Federal aid for education.

This hope is spurred by the introduction and strong sponsorship of the Murray-Metcalf bill. This bill would supply money at an equal ratio per child to help all States and communities to erect much-needed buildings and increase now-scanty teachers' salaries.

Hope for such aid to our overloaded public schools has sprung up at each session of Congress for many years, only to be dashed by the reactionaries.

The school burden on the States and local communities was reflected in a recent Census Bureau report that education now takes up to one-third of State and local tax revenue. The unfairness of this to State and local taxpayers is not so much the portion of their taxes spent for schools but the vast numbers of people who escape helping to pay public education costs under the outdated, provincial and local school taxing formulae.

The Federal taxing system is the only system with the ability to spread school costs over all the people and thus contribute enough money to update the Nation's public schools without financial harm to anyone.

Nevertheless, we must expect to face the same reactionary group that has blocked Federal aid for education in the past. That education is the first and major prerequisite for national defense and democracy is small deterrent to the reactionaries and to the numerous school administrations controlled by reactionaries.

Again raised is the old bromide that "Federal aid means Federal control." This is nonsense, but many people are fooled by the cry.

Then there is the demand for "sanctity of local responsibility"—without regard to the extent of local ability.

Also the crop of school cure-alls and nostrums:

"Let us teach 1,000 children in a class through one television camera."

"Let us keep good teachers with merit rating by paying those who agree with the principal more money than to those who may not."

"Let us solve the teacher shortage with housewives acting as teachers' aides."

"Let us organize 'Teacher for Tomorrow Clubs' among high school students." (They join the clubs, only to find out how much less a teacher earns than many semi-skilled manual workers.)

The other day J. Lloyd Trump, a professor at the University of Illinois, spread confusion among newspaper readers nationally with a speech before the National Association of Secondary School Principals.

"We should meet the teacher shortage with classes of 100 or more," he said.

Dr. Trump teaches education. Would he consent to 100 student teachers in one of his own classes? We don't think so. Knowledge is not an assembly-line product.

Families striving for better education for their children will do well to anticipate the campaign to spread confusion. They should find out at first hand the needs of their children's schools by talking to teachers. The teachers—more than administrators in ivory towers—know the score.

In the next quarter of a century our people will experience entirely new modes of living. The change is inevitable. It is not reasonable to expect that America's children will be able to prepare themselves for the new era in the neglected public schools of today—understaffed, undersized, and underequipped as they are.

Education is the key to the progress for which men strive. Many school systems have improved very little since 1909—and the reason is not entirely public apathy. The United States has 50,453 separate school districts. They are run by people who differ in their sense of responsibility. In the various school districts differing values are placed on education in general as well as on just what and how the schools teach.

Four major shortages are found in America's public schools today. The Murray-Metcalf bill or a similar measure would help to correct these shortages, directly or indirectly.

What are these four shortages? Let's look at them:

1. There is a shortage of at least 300,000 teachers having a bachelor's degree. Federal aid for teachers' salaries would help attract more young people into teaching and bring back many who quit for better paying jobs elsewhere.

2. At least 400,000 new classrooms are needed to eliminate double-shift classes, to reduce classes to 25 pupils each and to replace obsolete buildings, many of them built in the 19th century.

3. More than half the Nation's classrooms lack modern teaching equipment ranging from textbooks to visual aids.

4. Far too many school administrations are still unconscious of the new and vital role of education. They put ill-advised economies ahead of curriculum and proper education of children. Federal aid would awaken such school administrations.

To the perennial cry that Federal aid means Federal control, the thinking parent may well reply:

"The Murray-Metcalf bill sets up safeguards against this. But if it would mean Federal influence—so what?"

Certainly it would do no harm for the Federal Government to equalize educational opportunity.

Our Federal Government is by, for, and of the people. It is time we met the Federal control bogey head on.

The argument that Federal aid for education would be an innovation is also full of holes. For a hundred years the Federal Government has given aid to education in various forms—land grants and funds for special educational purposes.

The Nation will also hear the old cry from foes of Federal aid that wealthy Northern States do not need it. These wealthy States supply their own answer. They have as many outdated school buildings as the poorer States. In addition, none of the cities of over 400,000 population has been able to secure the number of degree teachers it has needed.

Federal aid for education may rightly be considered an investment that will more than pay for itself.

Tomorrow's need will be for greater numbers of skilled workers and fewer unskilled workers. Education will be the key to the individual's earnings. Higher incomes will mean more money channeled back to the Government in income taxes as well as in other kinds of taxes.

The need for an educational system capable of coping with our times should be clear. Adequate numbers of modern schools and thoroughly qualified teachers are our major prerequisite for national security and for democratic living in this atomic and space-pioneering age.

Frank Lloyd Wright: A Nonconformist, but a Man of Vision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD J. IRWIN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, the death of Frank Lloyd Wright has taken from the world one of those rare individuals who was not afraid to be a nonconformist, a man who did not fear being visionary.

His work was that of a man regarded by many as the greatest, if perhaps the most controversial, architect of this century.

On April 19, Mr. Wright had been scheduled to address a meeting of the Silvermine Guild in Norwalk, Conn., and I had hoped to hear this great individualist talk about his work.

I think that an editorial in the New York Times this morning sums up nicely the career and the life of Mr. Wright. I would like, therefore, Mr. Speaker, to introduce this editorial into the RECORD:

FRANK LLOYD WRIGHT

It is customary in many quarters these days to indict our society for its alleged stress on conformity and for its supposed trend toward the organization man as its representative citizen. Yet the passing of Frank Lloyd Wright was front page news yesterday, and no American of the present century has been less associated with conformity or anything smacking of the organization man than this pioneer in architecture who influenced so profoundly the surroundings in which many of us live, work and play.

Boldness and imaginative daring were the hallmarks of the long career of this artist,

who worked in three dimensions with the most varied of materials. Like every innovator who makes his mark upon his times, he was the object of both adulation and attack and it is still too early to give the final verdict on his place in the history of architecture and, more generally, of art. But even now it is clear that he brought a freshness of vision and a zest for life to his work which provided stimulus for new thinking and for new experimentation, a stimulus which worked its power on both his followers and his opponents. Original thinkers and artists of the stature of Frank Lloyd Wright are rare in any time and any society. We are richer for the fact that he found a hospitable atmosphere for his work and creativity.

Newsweek Reports on the Great Economic Debate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in Newsweek magazine of April 13, 1959, a most lucid and comprehensive analysis of the diversity in expert opinion today on the questions of economic growth and price stability. The authors of this timely and informative article are Editors Sandford Brown and Hobart Rowen, of the magazine. I believe it will be of great interest to Members on both sides of the aisle. Under leave to extend my remarks, I therefore offer the article for inclusion in the RECORD:

Unwatched by TV or tabloids, devoid of inflammatory words or fifth amendment thugs, a congressional committee this week began an investigation whose enormous scope transcends by far its lack of dramatics. The subject before the Joint Economic Committee was nothing less than the whole future of the U.S. economy and everything that leans on it. And that future could be boiled down to a single issue. As Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Illinois Democrat and committee chairman, defined it: "The central problem of our times is how to combine price stability and growth." The answers to that problem—which undoubtedly will be based on political as well as economic beliefs—will determine how much the Government spends in the future for what, and how much it collects in taxes from whom. In short, the answers will affect every person in the country.

The dry-talking, chart-toting economists called by the committee to give advice on the problem were stepping into a red-hot debate that has been raging for months wherever a businessman, labor leader, politician (or, for that matter, an economist) pushed back his chair and rose to make an afterdinner speech. One one side are those whose main worry is economic lassitude—the fear that the economy may be growing too slowly to meet the demands upon it. On the other side are those whose principal anxiety is economic explosion—the combustible inflationary forces that might be ignited by too rapid growth.

The problem of growth vs. inflation is hardly a new one. In fact, it is as old as the economy itself. What's more, the state of the economy at the moment seems caculated to soothe anxieties on both sides of the great debate. The Nation's total output of goods and services was still rising fast (up 2.4 percent in the first quarter over the fourth quarter of last year); personal income, retail sales, industrial production were all hitting new peaks. At the same time, the Consumer Price Index stands at 123.7 percent of the 1947–49 average, exactly where it stood when the recovery surge started.

Why, then, a great debate at this time?

CAUSE FOR TALK

The immediate reason probably lay in another statistic: The jobless rolls still were well above the 4 million mark in March, showing all too clearly how far employment was lagging behind the general business recovery. Harvard's Sumner Slichter, one of four economists called by the Joint Committee in its preliminary hearings last month, recommended that the Government schedule a $3 billion deficit in its budget for fiscal 1960 for the sole purpose of stimulating the economy. Another witness, President Truman's former chief economic adviser Leon Keyserling, told Newsweek last week that he favors a boost in Government spending as "the quickest way to create jobs." Committee Chairman DOUGLAS himself has made it plain that he thinks the first objective of the moment, with priority over any and all steps to check potential inflation, should be to restore full employment.

Against such views, the administraton, the Federal Reserve, and probably a majority of U.S. economists are solidly arrayed. Gabriel Hauge, former economic assistant to President Eisenhower and now an officer of New York's manufacturers Trust Co., states the case this way: A boost in Government spending would not create jobs quickly since it would be hard to allocate the money to areas and industries where unemployment is concentrated. More important, Hauge thinks that "the economy is ticking along just right at the moment, provided we ease the burden of the unemployed with adequate unemployment compensation." Extra Government spending, he thinks could set off another unhealthy, 1955-style boom and lay the groundwork for another recession.

STRETCHOUT

On top of this, Hauge agrees with administration spokesmen who predict that the natural forces of the economy will cut unemployment to close to 3 million by the end of the year in any case. "Up to now, management has preferred to stretch out the working week rather than hire back additional workers, because of high wage rates," says Hauge. "But the average workweek has been stretched about as far as it will go (to 39.8 hours). From now on, business improvement should be reflected in more jobs" (and it apparently is).

But the problem of 1959 unemployment is only a starting point for the great debate. Some far more fundamental issues have been brought to the fore by the whole cycle of recession and recovery just experienced. Among them:

The possibility that a growing labor force and continued automation of production are making it harder and harder for the Nation to achieve "full employment" as time passes.

The simple fact that, rich as the Nation is, 20 percent of its families exists on incomes of less than $1,890 a year.

The mounting economic challenge of the Soviet Union, whose industrial output has expanded at an average rate of 7 percent in the last 5 years versus a 2.3 percent rate (in constant dollars) for the United States.

To all of these basic problems, there is a single answer: Faster growth for the United States. Just to absorb the 1 million new people added to the work force, each year, the economy must grow $10 billion; in a sense, it would be standing still. To improve living standards, the output of goods and services must increase even faster. And while U.S. living standards have undeniably improved since 1953 in terms of the real benefits produced by each hour of labor, nearly everyone agrees that the Nation has been growing too slowly to achieve its real potential. Most authorities believe that the economy should work for an optimum cruising speed that would boost output without eroding the gains through price inflation and painful readjustments.

There are a few mavericks. Slichter, for one, thinks that "some of the causes that raise output also produce inflation." So what? he says in effect. He is convinced the Nation should accept a modicum of inflation as inevitable and harmless, try to keep it at a modest level by such means as lowering tariffs. Another Harvard economist, author John K. (The Affluent Society) Galbraith, thinks that the main objective should not be simply to boost the Nation's gross output but to channel more of its energies and capital into vital areas that don't get as much as they should (e.g., education, slum clearance).

But the essential questions of the great debate are on matters of degree (How much should national output be boosted?) and matters of method (What is the best way to achieve the optimum cruising speed?).

Not surprisingly, the same people advocating a boost in Government outlays this year to help create jobs are the people plumping for the fastest rate of growth over the long term—5 percent a year is a target mentioned, with Government spending to be used as a fiscal whip to drive the economy to the desired heights. This group has its roots of political power in the liberal wing of the Democratic Party. Its chief spokesman is Democratic Advisory Council member Keyserling, who feels that too little growth is just as apt to cause inflation as too much.

Underutilization of equipment and manpower has been forcing prices up in recent inflation periods, claims Keyserling, who feels that many of the administered price increases of recent years were put through specifically to compensate for uneconomically low levels of production and sales. By stimulating industrial expansion with boosts in Government spending (on the theory that the rest of the economy tends to catch up with what the Government is doing), Keyserling argues that the Nation would be able to put its facilities to more economical use, produce enough tax revenues so that the Government can balance future budgets, and thus lick the problem of inflation.

POINT OF ISSUE

To men like Economist Hauge and Chief Economic Adviser Raymond Saulnier, this is putting the cart before the horse at the top of a steep hill. While they don't argue with the need for faster growth, they would aim for an average rate of around 4 percent[1] and would make no attempt to set yearly goals for the economy but work for a long-term average. Most important: Instead of trying to stimulate growth to defeat inflation, they would concentrate on checking inflation to stimulate growth. The methods: Cut taxes to boost business incentives and increase private investment; reduce monopoly power to stimulate competition; make monetary adjustments to check or stimulate demand as necessary.

The fact is that neither camp can make a clear-cut, detailed case for its methods, or eliminate the inevitable loopholes that any economist can find in any other economist's brief. Saulnier has no really good answer to the question of why the Government should

[1] A small difference in rate eventually adds up to a lot. In a projection by the National Planning Association, the difference between a growth rate of 3.7 percent and one of 4.5 percent—only eight-tenths of 1 percentage point—would make a difference of $35 billion in the gross national product by 1970.

be concentrating on boosting private investment now, when there is already a large amount of idle plant capacity. And Keyserling never quite spells out how higher Federal budgets would generate higher spending by industry.

PRECEDENT

Economic history can be cited to support either side's case. Past statistics on growth rates versus price inflation over the same periods, for example, would seem to support the Keyserling view that rapid expansion alone has not been a prime cause of inflation. Prices dropped 0.3 percent while output was jumping 8 percent in 1954–55 and have held steady through the current recovery. In contrast, prices rose 2.7 percent while output dropped 3 percent in 1957–58. Yet New York's First National City Bank points out that the Keyserling technique of trying to balance the budget with Federal spending was tried and found wanting more than 20 years ago. It failed in 1933–36, even with the aid of successive tax increases, notes the bank. Trying to do too much and control too much spells inflationary disruption of orderly work and progress.

There is just as much room for argument on the question of how fast the economy can or should grow. For one thing, how much growth is physically within reach? Economist Hauge thinks that a 5 percent rate would require annual capital outlays "one and one-half to two times the peak level of nearly $38 billion we hit in the third quarter of 1957, plus a much larger proportion of the population in the work force. I just don't think this is in the cards for the near future." And how much growth could be sustained without yearly "borrowing" from the future (thus generating severe recessions) and without wasting too many gains through inflation? Again, there is no sure answer. But General Electric economic analysts have projected a probable 4.7 percent annual increase in the gross national product over the next 10 years—3.2 percent in constant, 1958 dollars, plus 1.5 percent in plain, inflationary air.

GROWTH CONSCIOUS

But one thing does seem certain, even though the debate is still millions of words, and probably millions of ballots, away from any sort of resolution: The Nation's rate of growth is going to be speeded up. There has been a noticeable shift within the administration toward a more liberal view of Government's role in promoting economic expansion, with conservative men like Saulnier looking toward higher spending for housing and education and talking easily of a $600 billion economy not too far ahead.

Dr. Gerhard Colm, chief economist of the National Planning Association, sums up the trend this way: "Under the impact of the great depression of the thirties, the Second World War, and of cold war and competitive coexistence, we have become increasingly growth conscious. It is likely that the Government will be forced to adopt programs favoring economic growth and counteracting prolonged periods of stagnation or recession.

We can count on a rate of growth during the next decade which is substantially larger than that [3 percent] of the last 50 years."

The NPA itself has picked 4.2 percent as the most likely rate. As part of an exhaustive study (whose details will be sent to its subscribers this month), it has constructed a model of the economy that this rate of growth would produce by 1970. Here is how hypothetical 1970 stacks up against prerecession 1957:

Gross national product: $790 billion in 1970 versus $451 billion in 1957.

Industrial production: 254 versus 142 (1947–49 equals 100).

Average working hours: 37.5 per week versus 41.

Labor force: 83.6 million versus 67.9 million; employment of 80.7 million versus 65 million.

Still another study, released last week by the Committee for Economic Development, gives the cheering promise that this may be real growth, and not just a paper mirage conjured up in Washington. Surveying probable Government budgets over the next decade, Economist Otto Eckstein estimates that Federal outlays in 1968 will amount to about $97.1 billion, with a fat, anti-inflationary surplus of $7.5 billion.

But Eckstein's forecast has one strong hedge: All bets are off if there's an upset of the recent overall balance of forces in the great debate of 1959.

Twelve-Point Plan To Improve Social Security System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, it is by now generally agreed that help and care of our aged population constitutes today a major national problem which requires a serious approach on a national scale. We have today over 12 million elderly and retired citizens who are dependent on their monthly social security payments for their subsistence, and before very long their number will reach 15 million people. There are others in this age group who would prefer to retire, but they cannot afford to do so because the benefits they would derive would be insufficient to cover their needs in these days of high cost of living.

Our social security system was initiated in 1935. We shall soon be approaching the quarter-century mark. It was originally established as one of the major steps in combating the greatest economic depression in our history, and it really proved to be an important factor in helping to pull the Nation out the economic mire of the 1930's. What is achieved then it can do now, too, in view of the 5 million unemployed in the country now and the very slow recovery that our economy is making from last's year's recession.

Over the past few years we have made some amendments to the Social Security Act, particularly in extending coverage to more people and increasing benefits to some extent. Last year I supported the 7-percent increase, though I tried to obtain a higher increase. However, these improvements have been relatively small compared to the needs of the average retired person. Many of them have no savings to supplement their social security income They have been victimized by the sharp rise in the cost of living since the end of the war. Many of them find themselves in dire straits and are actually undergoing physical and mental anguish in an effort to keep their heads above the water at a period in life when their health is deteriorating.

Our Nation cannot afford to let those who are forced to retire because of advanced age to pay a heavy toll by being relegated to a lower standard of living in their declining years. The higher costs of food, medical care and other essentials of life have shrunk the value of their meager dollars which they receive each month. In the past, some of our elderly citizens were able to supplement their limited income with outside earnings, but these opportunities have greatly diminished in recent years with the increase in unemployment.

I have become firmly convinced in the last few years that we have reached a point where an overhaul of the social security system is badly needed. We must bring it into step with the times and the needs of the people. We must make urgent improvements and introduce long-needed changes which will enable our elderly people to enjoy the fruits of their life's labor in their declining years, without undue worries and the feeling of being "the forgotten people."

Consequently, I have given considerable thought to this whole problem of our senior citizens, with the result that I am now renewing my efforts to obtain larger benefits. During the past few months I have been working on an omnibus social security measure and I am now introducing this bill. It contains 12 major changes which, if adopted, would be a great step forward in overhauling and improving the whole social security system.

The following are the 12 major provisions advocated in my omnibus social security bill:

Section 1 increases all social security benefits by 30 percent. Minimum monthly payments are to be increased to $50, instead of $33 at present. Maximum payments are to be established at $200 in the case of primary beneficiaries.

Section 2 reduces the retirement age to 62 for both men and women, and eliminates the present actuarial reduction in benefit amounts for women.

Section 3 increases from $4,800 to $6,000 the amount of annual wages which may be taken into account in computing benefits and taxes, thus increasing the earnings base.

Section 4 does the same thing for those in the self-employment category by increasing from $4,800 to $6,000 the amount of their income from self-employment which is to be taken into account in computing their benefits and taxes.

Section 5 extends from 18 to 21 the maximum age for eligibility of children to receive benefits, which would enable such children to continue their education and finish college or other schooling.

Section 6 increases the amount of a widow's social security benefit from the present level of 75 percent of her husband's allowance to 85 percent of that amount.

Section 7 increases from $1,200 to $1,500 a year the amount of outside earnings which a social-security pensioner may receive without suffering deductions from his benefits under the work clause.

Section 8 permits a blind person to receive disability insurance benefits with only four quarters of coverage, and to

continue to receive such benefits after attaining retirement age.

Section 9 establishes a new program of hospitalization and surgical insurance for individuals entitled to old-age and survivors insurance benefits. It would cover the costs of up to 60 days of hospitalization in each 12-month period; the cost of up to 120 days of nursing home services in each 12-month period, also payments covering reasonable costs of surgical services, as well as out-patient care and emergency surgery.

Section 10 provides that an individual's first $50 a month of earned income shall be disregarded in determining his eligibility, on the basis of need, for old-age assistance. In other words, recipients of such assistance would be permitted to earn up to $50 a month without having that amount deducted from their subsistence grants.

Section 11 seeks to aid dependent children over the age of 18, if they are regularly attending school. The purpose here is to encourage the care of dependent children and to enable such needy children to acquire an education.

Section 12 increases the rates of social security taxes for employees, employers, and the self-employed in order to obtain the necessary funds required to cover the additional costs of these increased benefits and to keep the social security fund solvent.

This is my 12-point program for overhauling the social security system. Each of these points fills a need. All of them together would bring the entire system up-to-date and make it one of the best in the whole world—a model for many other nations to seek to emulate.

It is my view that the increased benefits advocated in my bill will repay the extra cost in a number of ways:

First. It would provide greater purchasing power to our retired citizens and enable them to maintain an adequate standard of living in their retirement.

Second. It would encourage many of our older workers to retire and make available more jobs for younger people, thus decreasing the unemployment rolls and unemployment insurance payments.

Third. It would provide a much-needed health program of hospital and surgical services and nursing home care for the elderly, thus helping them to save on their costly medical care needed in old age and to utilize their meager income for other essentials.

Fourth. It would assist and encourage many youngsters to stay in school and continue their education up to the age of 21, from which both they and the Nation would gain, thus keeping them out of the labor force or preventing them from becoming public charges.

Fifth. It would provide a considerable boon to the economy of the country because of the increase purchasing power on the part of the retired, the reduction in unemployment, the medical care for the old, the educational to the young, and the other phases of this program.

Just as the launching of social security in the 1930's helped to overcome the effects of the depression of that era, so an overhaul along the lines as suggested in my bill could prove to be of more lasting value to the economy of the Nation and the continued economic growth of the country.

I recall that when social security was first introduced nearly a quarter of a century ago, it was considered by many people as a drastic step because of the payments involved. There were even some pessimists who foresaw economic ruin for the country. As we look back over the perspective of time, what do we find? Today a grateful Nation realizes the tremendous significance of the social security system and would not hear of discarding it or even reducing it. A political officeholder or a political party advocating such a step would be thrown out of office at the very next election.

The American people have long ago ceased to regard social security in the nature of a dole. Rather, they prefer to regard it as a democratic system established by a free people to provide economic security to its older citizens after they have completed a lifetime of useful service. It is our way of saying to these people: Now that you are retired from your life's labors, a grateful Nation will maintain you in dignity and security, free from want or worries. But are we really maintaining them in dignity and security? Unfortunately, our elderly citizens are not enjoying the measure of economic independence originally foreseen for them under the social security system.

The time has, therefore, come when we must take full cognizance of the problems of our aging population, not merely for their own benefit but for the Nation as a whole. We cannot ignore these problems any longer or they will get out of hand. We must approach them from a practical, yet humane, point of view.

I believe that the approach advocated in my bill is reasonable and realistic. It will help eliminate major deficiencies in our social security system, and at the same time provide our older citizens with greater economic security. It will make possible for them to live in dignity and to walk with their heads high—proud that an appreciative Nation has not forgotten them in their old age.

John Drupa, Boys' Clubs of America Boy of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, in my short speech to the House at the opening of today's session I told of John Drupa, the Binghamton, N.Y., boy who has been chosen Boy of the Year by the Boys' Clubs of America, and who is in Washington today. The news release concerning his selection gives more details about his background, and I am sure my colleagues will agree that he is a remarkable young man.

BOYS' CLUBS OF AMERICA BOY OF YEAR FORMER LATVIAN REFUGEE

John Drupa, 15, a member of the Binghamton, N.Y., Boys' Club, has been named 1959's "Boy of the year" by the Boys' Clubs of America, the youth organization dedicated to the furtherance of juvenile decency. Drupa, who fled from the Russians with his mother after World War II, was chosen by a national committee of judges from candidates nominated by BCA's 522 local clubs. The young winner, an accomplished public speaker, will come to New York to receive the "Junior Citizenship Award" from former President Herbert Hoover, chairman of the Boys' Clubs of America, during National Boys' Club Week, April 6 to 12.

The Boys' Clubs' "Junior Citizen" represents more than half a million Boys' Club members from all over the country and Hawaii. He was selected in the 13th annual search for the boy who best fulfills the requisite "outstanding service to home, church, school, community and Boys' Club."

Young Drupa was a very small child when his mother escaped from Latvia with another brother and a sister. His older brother and father remained behind to defend their homeland against the reconquering Soviets. Both father and brother were taken prisoner by the Russians and sent to Siberia. Mrs. Drupa and her three small children moved from one European country to another until they were admitted to the United States in 1951. Recently John's father and brother were released from Siberian prison camp but are unable to join their family in the United States.

John couldn't speak English when he arrived here at the age of seven, and so could not be placed with his age group in school. The young refugee had difficulty making friends because of the language barrier until soon after his arrival, he became a member of the Binghamton Boy's Club. There he made friends easily, and today is one of the club's most popular members.

John has been able to catch up in school and for the past five years has been an honor student, is now treasurer of his homeroom and a member of the school traffic staff. His principal says proudly, "John helps his fellow students by devoting his own time to teaching them efficient methods of preparing for exams and to giving advice and assistance in homework."

Junior Citizen Drupa has been active in all forms of community service in which his Boys' Club engages, including making speeches for United Fund campaigns, and has won a variety of wards. In 1956, he was co-winner of a trip to Washington in connection with the American Heritage—Boys' Clubs of America national "Get Out the Vote" contest. He was one of two Boys' Club members who obtained the greatest number of pledges to vote. In speeches during the "Vote" campaign, he stressed that "the right to vote is the most important right in democracy. It is the right which will keep a free people always free. . . . By voting we who came as refugees are repaying to America a small amount of what this country has given us. Voting is the voice of the people. Take it away and men won't dare to speak about things such as liberty, justice and freedom."

John received the Binghamton Good Citizenship Award for directing the Mayor's Youth Council community projects, including the safety program "Hitch Horse Sense to Horse Power." The Mayor has publicly expressed his appreciation of this work: "John's handling of this project has resulted in a material decrease in speeding and reck-

less driving in our area." Drupa was mayor-for-a-day in 1958.

The Boy of the Year is a Junior Leader in his Boys' Club, a Boy Scout patrol leader, and chairman of the board of the Junior Sertoma Club. Under John's leadership, the group has raised $1,000 for Boys' Club Day Camp through the sale of Christmas trees which the boys plant every year.

John has also received honors in sports, including a special Boys' Club Athletic Achievement Award and first place in the Activities Day contest in which he succeeded in doing 604 sit-ups. His hobbies are skiing, skin diving, swimming, electronics, chess, and coin collecting.

Many Older Farmers Use Soil Bank Plan as Retirement Route

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, this Congress should take a very long and searching look at the conservation reserve program to see that it does not become a gravy train which eclipses the original congressional intent of withdrawing land from production in order to discourage production. The following article from the Wall Street Journal depicts some extreme applications of the program which are bringing it into disrepute. Income received from the program has become a supplement to nonfarm income. It is being used as a source of retirement funds and is defeating the primary purpose by assisting farm operators to increase the productivity of their remaining farmland. These practices should be inspected with a congressional microscope.

MANY OLDER FARMERS USE SOIL BANK PLAN AS RETIREMENT ROUTE—OTHERS, AFTER IDLING FARMS, TAKE CITY JOBS; WILL PLAN CUT TOTAL FARM OUTPUT?

(By Arthur C. Nauman)

BEETOWN, WIS.—An auctioneer's chant recently floated through the brisk spring air out on Orlo Taylor's 160-acre farm near here, as tractors, a corn planter, bolts, hay and even the old dinner bell went on the block.

Four hours later, this lean, 66-year-old farmer was out of business. He's among the 183 farmers here in Grant County to take advantage of one of the latest Government programs for cutting the farm surplus. Mr. Taylor put his entire farm in the soil bank's conservation reserve and agreed to keep it out of production until 1969.

Both here and in other areas the new program is providing older farmers, such as Mr. Taylor, with enough guaranteed income—which they receive without working their farms—to permit them to retire.

TWO MAJOR REASONS

Of 27 farmers interviewed here, 22 said they planned to retire with the money received from idling their farms. This group averaged 58 years of age. Soil bank officials in Washington are checking nationally now to find out just what farmers' motives were for idling their land. They say, however, that early returns from the survey indicate the two major reasons were to retire and to work at jobs in town.

This grain- and livestock-producing county here in southwestern Wisconsin provides a good capsule picture of how the program is working. In this county, 4.8 percent of the farms and 4.4 percent of the tillable land has been deposited in the conservation reserve. Nationally, 3.1 percent of the farms and 7.2 percent of the cropland has been idled. The program, of course, affects not only farmers and rural businessmen but is of major importance to U.S. taxpayers. Uncle Sam will pay nearly $250,000 a year to farmers in Grant County to keep their farms out of production.

Farmers throughout the United States have deposited 23 million acres in the conservation reserve. The annual bill for keeping this land idle will total $365 million. But Agriculture Secretary Benson can spend up to $375 million a year, which he hopes will enable him to idle an additional 5 million acres. He's considering asking Congress to lift the annual outlay to $575 million so the land in the conservation reserve can be boosted to 40 million acres.

The retiring Mr. Taylor will receive $30,760 over the next 10 years for keeping his farm out of production.

CLIPPING THE WEEDS

"I won't know for sure until the end of the year whether or not we can make out," Mr. Taylor says. "But I think the income will keep us going. After all, my two daughters are grown and married. I won't have to buy any fertilizer. All I'll have to do to the farm is have the weeds clipped twice a year."

Drive down the road a few miles and talk with 65-year-old Joseph Matt. He agreed last fall to deposit his 103 acres in the conservation reserve and will get $2,183 a year from the Government.

"This soil bank is like an insurance policy to elderly folks like us," he says, puffing his long cigar. "The money will come in steady every year. It won't ever freeze, a drought won't hurt it, and you don't have to work to get it."

Here in Grant County, too, a number of farmers banked their farms so they could work in town. Loren J. Wood, 30, will receive $2,000 a year for keeping his 80-acre farm in the soil bank. He's working full time now at the Stella Cheese Factory in Lancaster, the county seat. Last year he held down the job in the cheese plant and farmed evenings and weekends. Some nights he'd be in the fields until 2:30 a.m., he recalls. "I'll get just about as much from the farm as before, maybe a few bucks less, but I won't have to do any work there now," he says.

Other farmers also are using the conservation reserve as a way to whack the number of hours they work. Harry Horsfall, a breeder and raiser of purebred Aberdeen Angus beef cattle on a farm 10 miles north of here, banked his 123 acres of cropland. "Cattle take a lot of time," he says. "This way, I can work a shorter day because I don't have to bother with raising any crops."

INCOME TO BUY FARMS

Some farmers are using the plan to get an assured income that will help them buy farms. William Pink bought a 390-acre farm near here last year for $45,000. Then he deposited the 250 acres of crop land in the conservation reserve. Mainly a dairy man, Mr. Pink owns 50 head of Holstein cows. He'll keep them on his 140 acres of pasture. He has rented 25 acres on which he plans to raise corn for the silage he'll need to feed the cows. But the $5,000 a year he'll get over the next 10 years for the land he has in the conservation reserve should pay off the mortgage, he says.

While it's still early to measure the effect on production of idling 13,000 of this county's 298,000 acres of tillable land, evidence here indicates other farmers will try harder than ever to get each acre to yield just a little more corn, oats, and soybeans, three of the major crops produced here.

"Our orders for fertilizer are running a good 15 percent ahead of last year at this time," says Herm Wolfgram, manager of the fertilizer plant operated at Prairie du Chien by Wisconsin Farmco Service Cooperative. It supplies the fertilizer the co-op sells in Grant County. "We've had to hire three more people to handle the spring rush," Mr. Wolfgram adds.

Despite the land taken out of production, the acreage planted to corn probably will climb, says Frederick Dahms, Grant County farm agent. There are no planting controls on corn this year and the price support level is somewhat higher than was paid to farmers who ignored acreage controls last year. The big sales of seed corn don't take place until April but E. S. Floyd, Farmco office manager in Lancaster, says sales so far this season are running about 10 percent ahead of a year ago.

Corn, of course, is one of the biggest farm surpluses. At last count on January 31, Uncle Sam had $2.4 billion tied up in surplus corn.

Farmers who are sticking to farming also are pushing mechanization in an effort to keep output rising. Talk with William Schneider, Lancaster's Deere & Co. farm machinery dealer.

"My sales were nearly $100,000 last year," he says, considerably above the year before. Since November, he was sold five tractors; he sold only four during the entire year ended last October 31.

North Pacific and Bristol Bay Salmon Fisheries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I refer again to my bill H.R. 3063 and related bills designed to ban the importation of Japanese-caught salmon until the Government of Japan cooperates in measures necessary to restore the depleted Bristol Bay salmon runs on the coast of Alaska. Recent notice of closure of the Bristol Bay salmon fishery for the coming season highlights the intolerable situation which has developed in our dealings with Japan through miscarriage of the North Pacific Treaty entered into in 1953 between the United States, Canada, and Japan for the purpose of preserving and improving our once great salmon resource.

To supplement previous presentations on this subject which were submitted to acquaint the Congress with the facts and background pertaining to this serious national problem, I hereby insert into the Appendix of the RECORD the following major portions of the illuminating testimony of Mr. Clarence L. Anderson before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at hearings presided over by Senator BARTLETT on April 1 and 2, 1959, at Juneau, Alaska.

Mr. Anderson, who is the director of the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, spoke in support of the pending bills I have mentioned. His testimony follows:

In the general peace treaty that was signed by Japan and the United States after World War II, no mention was made of the valuable fisheries of the North Pacific Ocean. However, Japan did agree to negotiate a separate convention on these matters at a later date. Accordingly, representatives of Canada, Japan, and the United States met in Tokyo during 1951 to work out the details. Although this International Convention for the High Seas Fisheries of the North Pacific Ocean was signed by all three countries at Tokyo on May 9, 1952, it did not enter into force until June 12, 1953, when final ratification papers were exchanged at Tokyo.

A formal organizational meeting was held at Washington, D.C., on February 1–12, 1954. Since that time annual meetings have been held each fall, alternating between Canada, Japan, and the United States. Under terms of the treaty, a policy making commission was created with four representatives from each of the three countries. Each national section has only one vote, and all resolutions, recommendations and decisions must be by unanimous vote. Each nation may establish an advisory committee and employ such scientific and other experts as it may require.

The primary objective, as spelled out in the convention, is "to ensure the maximum sustained productivity of the fishery resources of the North Pacific Ocean, and that each of the parties should assume an obligation, on a free and equal footing, to encourage the conservation of such resources."

As a part of the treaty, the principle of abstention was established, which, briefly, is as follows:

"A nation should abstain from entering a fishery (1) which is already utilized as fully as is consistent with its sustainable yield; (2) which is under scientific study to determine the steps necessary for its conservation, and its maximum yield; and (3) which is being managed administratively in keeping with the findings of research and the objectives of sustained yield conservation."

In line with this principle, the annex to the convention provides that Japan agrees to abstain from fishing:

1. Halibut off the coasts of Canada and the United States in which commercial fishing for halibut is being, or can be, prosecuted.

2. Herring off the coasts of Canada and the United States east of the extremity of the Alaskan Peninsula, but not including Bering Sea.

3. Salmon off the coasts of Canada and the United States east of the provisional line of 175° west longitude, which line passes through the western extremity of Atka Island in the Aleutian chain.

The annex further provides that Canada agrees to abstain from fishing salmon in the Bering Sea east of the provisional line.

When the provisional line at 175 degrees west longitude was settled upon in 1951, there was every reason to believe it would be an equitable line. Little did the participants in the memorable meeting at Tokyo dream that in just a few short years the International North Pacific Fisheries Commission would be embroiled in heated arguments over relocation of the line. Neither did they dream that congressional hearings on this very subject would be held in Juneau today.

At the organizational meeting in 1954, the Commission agreed upon a broad program of research on the salmon of the North Pacific. Each national section supplied its own funds and personnel, but the various research projects were closely dovetailed and coordinated. Because of lack of funds it was impossible to get started in 1954. However, the program was initiated in 1955 and has been expanded and continued ever since.

At the outset, little was known about the distribution and migration of the salmon of the North Pacific. Much to the surprise of most of us, but perhaps not to the Japanese, it was soon learned that the various species of salmon were widely distributed across the entire Pacific from the North American coast to the Asian shore. The southern limit was roughly at the line of 45 degrees north latitude, which, at some places, is approximately 1,000 miles from the nearest land. Although limited feeding of immature salmon does occur in the Bering Sea, there are, nevertheless, extensive runs of migrating mature salmon north of the Aleutian chain destined for both Asia and North America.

The next problem was to try to segregate, on the high seas salmon of North American origin from those of Asian origin. It is not the purpose of this review to go into the intricate scientific details of how this is being done. It is sufficient to state here that it is being accomplished by:

1. The study of the anatomical structure and the body proportions of the salmon.
2. Analyses of the scales.
3. Presence or absence of certain parasites.
4. Serology, or the study of blood types.
5. High seas tagging.

In addition, one might add the presence of net-marked salmon in American streams. This in itself is a form of tagging done unwittingly by the Japanese fisherman on the high seas.

By means of this broad and highly specialized research, it is now known that there is a wide zone of intermingling of Asian and American salmon along the line of 175° west longitude. Red salmon of North American origin occur west of Attu Island or 170° east longitude. This is approximately 550 miles west of the provisional line. On the other hand, pink salmon of Asian origin have been located at 163° west longitude, south of False Pass at the tip of the Aleutian Peninsula. This is about 450 miles east of the provisional line. This zone of intermingling is, therefore, roughly 1,000 miles wide.

Turning more specifically to red salmon, it has been found that the feeding ground of the Bristol Bay fish is delineated generally by this zone of intermingling, except that they do occur somewhat further to the east.

* * * * *

During the 1957 season it has been estimated that the Japanese fishermen caught between 6 million and 10 million red salmon in about two weeks time in this area, most of which were headed for Bristol Bay. Is it any wonder, then, that the salmon fishermen of Bristol Bay are worried? Their fishing effort is being cut more and more each year. Very soon now, every red salmon that escapes the Japanese fishery will be required for seed stock in the streams and lakes of Bristol Bay in order to perpetuate this high seas fishery for Japan.

At Vancouver, British Columbia, in 1957, and again at Tokyo in 1958 the American members of the North Pacific Commission, backed up by their advisory committee, made a concerted effort to get an agreement from the Japanese delegation for movement of the provisional line from 175° west longitude to 170° east longitude. In this they were not successful. To this date there has been no indication from the Japanese that they will even decrease their fishing efforts in the red salmon zone of vulnerability.

As you know, the Japanese persist in their claim that they are fully complying with the terms of the treaty. While it may be true they have abstained from fishing salmon east of 175° West longitude, are they really following out the spirit of the convention? It would appear not. Earlier in this review the primary objective of the convention was stated as follows: "to insure the maximum sustained productivity of the fishery resources of the North Pacific Ocean." The salmon in the intermingling zone south of the Aleutians are largely immature fish, which at the time of capture by the Japanese have from 2 months to 4 years before they are ready to start on their spawning migration. They are constantly feeding, growing, and increasing in weight. Even the mature migrating salmon continue feeding and putting on weight until almost the time they reach the shores of Bristol Bay.

In order then, to get maximum productivity, the fishery should be confined to the coastal areas, so the salmon will be caught at their prime and when they have attained their greatest weight. The Canadian and American Governments have recognized this and passed laws to prevent the net fishing of salmon on the high seas. The Japanese steadfastly refuse to accept this principle.

The picture does look bleak for the fishermen of Bristol Bay. Certainly Congress should do everything within its power to assist the people of this area.

As the situation looks today, there appears to be one faint spark of hope. A recent dispatch from Tokyo, dated March 10, 1959, outlined the progress of the Japanese-Soviet fishery conference which has been carrying on since January 10. After spending a month and a half on preliminaries, discussing the biological and other related aspects of the salmon problem, Russia presented its proposal for the 1959 season to Japan. Except for a prohibited area off northern Kamchatka, the Japanese have, in the past, been free to fish throughout the Pacific, west of 175° West longitude between May 1 and August 10 and within certain tonnage limits. The new Soviet proposal would drastically curtail both areas and time. The areas open to Japanese salmon fishing would be reduced approximately 80 percent and the time by over one-half. The 1958 Japanese catch quota as set by Russia was 110,000 tons of salmon of all species. The actual catch exceeded this by 145 tons. The Soviets now propose a Japanese catch quota for 1959 of only 30,000 tons, with not more than 10,000 tons of this being red salmon.

The section of the Pacific Ocean covered by the Japanese-Soviet Treaty lies north of 45° north latitude and west of 175° west longitude. The proposed areas that would be open to Japanese fishing in 1959 are indicated on the map, with the seasons shown below. As can be seen this will give, for all practical purposes, protection against high seas fishing of Bristol Bay red salmon. From all available reports, it would appear the Russians are deeply worried about the decline of their salmon runs and are now making an effort to correct the situation. It could be they have in mind the eventual abolition of all high seas salmon fishing in their treaty areas, just as Canada and the United States have already accomplished.

However, one cannot rest on this assumption. Alaskans, through their elected Representatives in Congress, must carry on the fight. This can be done in two ways: (1) By exerting every possible influence on the U.S. State Department to secure withdrawal of Japanese fishermen in the critical area west of the provisional line; and (2) by endeavoring to enact suitable legislation that will make the Japanese voluntarily move out of the vulnerable zone, ocean home of the Bristol Bay red salmon.

Discrimination Against Reserves Charged in Retiring Officers With World War I Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that an inequality in regard to retirement pay exists between Regular and Reserve officers with World War I service. In order to correct this I have cosponsored legislation along with a number of my distinguished colleagues. To acquaint Members of the Congress and the American people with this situation I am inserting an article from the Army, Navy, Air Force Journal of March 7, 1959 in the RECORD.

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST RESERVES CHARGED IN RETIRING OFFICERS WITH WORLD WAR I SERVICE

(By Col. George H. Foster)

Many Members of Congress, as well as many other well-informed persons, have expressed the feeling that there should be no discrimination between officers of the Regular establishments and officers of the Reserve components. In the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 this was specifically established as basic policy: "There shall be no discrimination between and among members of the Regular and Reserve components in the administration of laws applicable to both Regulars and Reserves."

In spite of the general feeling that culminated in this statement of policy, there appear to be a few who feel that a retired Reserve should not have the same right to an increase in retired pay, because of World War I service, that is now given to retired Regular officers.

Regular Army officers who served in the military or naval forces prior to November 12, 1918, whether or not in combat areas, retired under such circumstances that their retired pay would be less than 75 percent of their active-duty pay, are entitled to an increase in the retired pay up to the maximum of 75 percent because of such wartime service. Reserve officers, retired at considerably less than the maximum retired pay, do not get a similar increase for wartime service.

The provision for special recognition of service in the World War I period had its origin in the act of July 31, 1935 (49 Stat. 507). At that time, due to the large increase in Regular officer personnel following World War I, there was a stagnation in promotion. In order to alleviate this bad morale factor, provision was made for voluntary retirement of Regular officers after 15 years of service. The retirement pay was at a reduced percentage rather than the conventional 75 percent, being based on years of service. The retired pay was such percentage of active-duty pay as was derived from multiplying the number of years of service by 2½ percent. A special award, however, was given to those who had served as commissioned officers during the war period by raising to the grade of major for retired pay purposes any officer below that grade who voluntarily retired under the act.

In June 1940, in furtherance of the same plan, the 1935 act was amended to provide that any officer on the active list of the Regular Army who had served in any capacity in the military or naval service prior to November 12, 1918, could, upon his own application, be retired with 75 percent of his active-duty pay, with an added provision for increasing the pay and rank of majors and lieutenant colonels, to lieutenant colonel and colonel.

The 1940 amendment made the retired pay provision so broad and liberal, to use the words of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, in Senate Report No. 1543, June 8, 1948, "as to make it theoretically possible to retire certain officers after only 1 day's service under a Regular Army appointment," if they had served in the military or naval service prior to November 12, 1918.

Shortly thereafter during the preparedness program, on July 29, 1941, Congress passed a joint resolution to provide a speedy method of elimination of unsuitable officers from the active list of the Regular Army. This law provided that any officer so eliminated who had served in any capacity in the military or naval service prior to November 12, 1918, should be retired with 75 percent of his active-duty pay, with service of only 7 years. This law suspended for the emergency an earlier law passed in 1920 under which unsuitable officers were classed as class B officers and eliminated from the active list. Under that law, which was cumbersome to operate, officers eliminated from the active list who had had 10 years of service were retired with the reduced retired pay based on 2½ percent for each year of service, without a special award for World War I service.

When the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 was under consideration by Congress, the fact was brought out that Army officers who served in World War I were granted retired pay of 75 percent, whereas officers in the Navy and Marine Corps who had served in World War I were not so entitled. In the House an amendment was adopted to provide a similar right for the Navy and Marine Corps officers. The bill was rewritten in committee and apparently to make this provision uniformly applicable it said that the retired pay of any officers in any of the services mentioned in the title of the act, i.e., Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, or Public Health Service, who served in any capacity as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States prior to November 12, 1918, thereafter retired under any provision of law, shall be paid 75 percent of his active-duty pay.

However, before the bill was passed by Congress another paragraph was added, giving to the class B officers eliminated under the 1920 act, 75 percent retirement pay if they served in the World War I period. The War Department had opposed this latter paragraph, but after a fight in Congress the paragraph was adopted.

Having given this special right to officers eliminated from the active list as unsuitable, under the 1920 act and under the joint resolution of 1941, Congress, on October 18, 1943, amended the Pay Adjustment Act of 1942 by adding another paragraph granting the same right to those officers who had been eliminated in 1922 as the result of an economy wave then existing. These officers had been retired if they had had at least 10 years of service. The retired pay for the 10 years retired officers, under the act under which they were eliminated, amounted to only 25 percent of active-duty pay.

Thus, most, if not all, Regular Army officers retired on a reduced pay basis have had their retired pay raised to the maximum of 75 percent if they had World War I service. Even the officers eliminated as unsuitable whose retirement pay would otherwise be 17½ percent (the 7-year officers retired under the 1941 joint resolution), or 25 percent (the 10-year officers under the 1920 act), have now been raised to 75 percent merely because a part of their unsuitable service was during the period of World War I.

It is against this background that the equity of retired Reserves to a similar treatment is to be appraised.

Reserve officers in order to be retired must be 60-years old and must have had over 20 years of satisfactory service. When this age factor is considered, it will be seen that most of these officers not only were in service in the period of World War I but served as well in the period of World War II.

It certainly is equitable to consider that over 20 years of satisfactory service by a Reserve officer is equal to the 7 or 10 years of service by Regular Army officers, which service was so unsatisfactory that they were eliminated from the active list. The average retired pay for Reserve officers is not over 30 percent, with no increase at all for World War I service, yet the eliminated Regular officers have been granted 75 percent retired pay because a part of their service was during World War I.

There are bills pending in the 86th Congress to correct this manifest inequity, notably bills sponsored by Senators SPARKMAN and JACKSON, and by Representative HUDDLESTON. It is to be hoped that early remedial legislation will result, if only to assure justice to a dwindling but distinguished group of veteran officers whose service dates back to World War I.

Union Sends Officers to World Affairs Class

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am taking the liberty of inserting in the RECORD an article which appeared in the New York Times of April 3, written by A. H. Raskin.

The article is entitled "Union Sends Officers to World Affairs Class," and points out an unusual picture of union education, wherein officers of Local 3 of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers are now attending morning classes on major world problems.

The Times has performed an outstanding and much-needed service to labor during these trying days for the trade union movement in bringing to the attention of the public the efforts and aspirations of a forward-looking union headed by an intelliegnt and progressive leader.

Mr. Raskin's article follows:

UNION SENDS OFFICERS TO WORLD AFFAIRS CLASS—VASSAR PROFESSOR TO OFFER ELECTRICIANS BASIC STUDIES

(By A. H. Raskin)

A union once so parochial that its members would not even install electrical equipment made outside the metropolitan area started a mandatory course in world affairs yesterday for all its paid officials and business agents.

The unusual venture in union education was designed to give the staff of Local 3 of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers a "feel of the world" through the tutelage of Clyde G. Griffen, a young teacher on leave from the faculty of Vassar College.

Harry Van Arsdale, Jr., who heads both the local and the New York City Central Labor Council, said international problems

had become so much a part of daily living that no union official could do his job adequately without knowing more about them.

Mr. Van Arsdale and 43 of his aids gathered yesterday morning in a classroom in the union headquarters at 130 East 25th Street. The room, normally used to instruct union mechanics in television repair techniques, was rimmed with video and hi-fi sets in varying states of disorder.

The opening lecture was scheduled for 8 a.m., but everyone was in his seat so early that the local's educational adviser—Dr. Harry J. Carman, dean emeritus of Columbia College—began an introductory talk 5 minutes ahead of time.

He told the officers that he considered the new course one of the most important and exciting developments in a cultural program that already was probably the most unusual conducted by any local union.

One mainstay of the program is a course in thinking intended to spark the intellectual curiosity of the union's rank-and-file members. It is conducted on a 314-acre estate that was once a millionaire's summer playground at Southampton, Long Island. Unionists spend a week there reading books, discussing philosophy and otherwise developing their critical faculties.

Another main facet is employer financial support for a scholarship program under which 140 sons and daughters of local 3 members have had their tuition paid for 4 years of college. Those whose academic records are good enough can get additional grants to finance 2 years of postgraduate study.

The new course in major world problems is an outgrowth of a foreign travel project Mr. Van Arsdale initiated several years ago. Under the program, business agents are sent to Europe, Asia, or Africa for 2 or 3 months to get a first-hand understanding of how people live and unions operate in other lands.

Mr. Griffen is a tall, eager man of 29 years, who looks more like a freshman than the holder of a Phi Beta Kappa key and an imposing list of fellowships and college teaching posts here and abroad.

Born in Sioux City, Iowa, Mr. Griffen took his master's degree at Columbia after his graduation from Iowa State University. He went to Pakistan in 1954 under the auspices of the State Department and was coleader of a Foreign Policy Association seminar on India 2 years later. He has taught history at Columbia and Barnard, as well as at Vassar, and is currently completing his doctoral thesis on a social science research council fellowship.

He emphasized that the course was not going to be concerned with current events but with a basic understanding of such issues as imperialism, colonialism, population trends, tariffs and ideological conflicts. He assigned outside readings calculated to give pause even to the longhairs on the union staff.

The texts were Raymond Aron's "The Century of Total War," and Joseph Schumpeter's "Imperialism and Social Classes." Mr. Griffen made it clear that no one could sleep through the course. Periodic examinations will be given, and term papers required. The class will meet once a week on what is expected to become a permanent basis.

With no school bell to signal the end of the hour, the first period ran 15 minutes overtime.

In addition to the union staff, the student body will include a former official of local 3, Armand D'Angelo, now city commissioner of water supply, gas and electricity.

Two other students also plan to come every week. They are Morris Iushewitz, secretary of the merged labor council, and Martin Rarback, secretary-treasurer of District Council 9 of the Brotherhood of Painters and Decorators.

In the years before World War II, local 3 was not noted for its global outlook.

At the New York World's Fair in 1939, foreign nations complained that the union had forced them to dismantle elaborate electrical devices that had been wired abroad for display in national pavilions. The exhibits had to be rewired by union mechanics here. In the same period, the local also refused to handle equipment made by members of other electrical unions in other parts of the United States. All of these boycott practices have since been abandoned.

Stanley Posner: Citizen of the Americas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, a nation is no stronger than her citizens and sometimes those citizens working outside of government, but in support of fundamental principles, can accomplish tasks which have proved too great for the resources of the government.

I refer now, Mr. Speaker, to Stanley Posner, a worthy citizen indeed, and to the problem of unification of the Central American States, an awesome task indeed.

Stanley Posner has been a good friend of mine since I first contemplated a visit to Latin America 2 years ago. A Washington correspondent of Time, himself an expert on Latin America, Jerry Hannifin, recommended I talk to Stanley before I went to Costa Rica. Stanley came to my office. We had a fine talk. He knew that area and its peoples. He gave me Carleton Beal's magnificent book on Latin America.

Since then we have together followed the fortunes of our mutal friends, such as José Figueres, former President of Costa Rica, and Romulo Betancourt, now President of Venezuela. We have often talked about Latin American affairs, hopefully and idealistically but realistically in terms of existing conditions. His friendly help has been invaluable in my own attempts to improve our relationships with Latin America.

Recently I came across a magazine article about him. It is worth sharing with my colleagues. Here is the story of how Stanley Posner, citizen, went about Central America creating good will for the United States and confronting the knotty problem of unification. Under a previous consent I am including the article entitled "The Don Quixote From Massachusetts," which appeared in This Day, March 1955:

THE DON QUIXOTE FROM MASSACHUSETTS

(By Harold Helfer)

You would never turn around for another look at Stanley Posner if you passed him on the street. He is an unprepossessing figure, a rather smallishly built middle-aged man with hornrimmed glasses and a very bald head. And his name—Stanley Posner—means nothing to the bulk of his fellow citizens in the United States. He could speak out on almost any topic in the world without creating a ripple in the press of this Nation.

Yet this same Stanley Posner would only have to pass casually through Guatemala, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, or any other Central American country, for his trip to be treated as an event of major importance. Headlines would tell about it. Gala receptions would be planned for him. Representatives of the newspapers would be on his trail. Very likely banners would be unfurled along the way, and schoolchildren would dress up and sing songs.

For this mild mannered native of Massachusetts (who doesn't have a drop of Latin American blood in him and who was never south of the border until 5 years ago), has come to be regarded by many in Central America as a modern Simon Bolivar. More than any man of recent times he is responsible for shaping the destiny of that narrow but strategically-placed stretch of land that links the two great continents of this hemisphere. Almost singlehandedly he brought about the newly created organization of Central American States, which is a matter of great moment for the Central American region and is apt to have important ramifications for all the Americas.

HE CHANGED THE FLOW OF HISTORY

How this Stanley Posner, who is all but unknown in this country and never had anything much to do with any local politics, let alone international relations, came to change the flow of Latin American history is really quite a fascinating story. The fact that it was his unprepossessing looks and manners that played a vital part in winning the Central American countries back to an age-old dream in no way detracts from the aura of incredibility about the whole thing.

But to begin at the beginning, the Inter-American Bar Association was holding its annual convention in Lima, Peru, in 1947. Stanley Posner was something which the Washington, D.C., woods are full of—a lawyer. He did well enough financially, providing adequately for his brood of three youngsters and his wife, Lillian, but it could not be said that he had a particularly spectacular legal practice. Diaper concerns were his principal clientele.

But Posner set his mind to thinking about this convention in Lima and how nice it would be if he and the "missus" could "have us a little vacation" in such an exotic place at Lima. Stanley and Lillian would get out maps and just mull over South America. To a couple who never got into south side Washington very much, it all seemed wonderously fabulous.

Well, Stanley and his wife, Lillian, went to Lima, and they had quite a high time taking in the sights, making new friends, and the like. And, of course, Stanley attended convention sessions, of the bar association, too, at which, naturally, there are a large sprinkling of Latin American lawyers.

And it was from them, at some of the committee get-togethers, that Stanley began to hear rumblings of how nice it would be if there were a Latin American federation of states similar to the United States of North America, instead of the many struggling, impoverished little countries with artificial trade and tariff barriers and border disputes and bloodshed.

When Posner got back to Washington, the thought of a United Latin America kept darting into his consciousness. He had seen some of the squalid, miserable conditions firsthand, and it seemed a shame that they should be allowed to continue when, in the main, they were unnecessary.

Still Stanley told himself that it was not his affair. He had no ties with Latin America.

A CONFEDERACY OF STATES

But, just the same, one day Stanley Posner called on the State Department. They lis-

tened to him tell about his trip to Lima and how he had become imbuted with the notion of a confederacy of states for that part of the world, "I'd like to see what I can do about bringing it about," the lawyer told them.

Since there was no denying the man's sincerity, State Department officials answered: A stabilized, unified Latin America would be a wonderful thing for both continents. In the past couple of years there had been no less than nine revolutions south of the border. With the menace of communism growing and feeding, as it does, on unrest, solidarity in Latin America was more important than ever. But a "United States of Latin America," because of age-old fueds between countries, chauvinistic influences, etc., was an altogether unattainable goal. The State Department, profoundly concerned as it was with Central America and its vital Canal Zone, told Posner that this Government could give him no help whatsoever in his efforts. The odds were overwhelmingly against his proposal—there were a hundred reasons why it could never be put into effect.

Posner felt compelled to go ahead with the project anyhow. So one day, after brushing up on his grammar-school-acquired knowledge of the Spanish language, he set out for Central America. Although undismayed by the note of faint amusement with which the State Department had received his proposed mission, he nevertheless faced some practical difficulties. No one in Central America knew him or had even heard of him.

THIS SILENCE WAS GOLDEN

So what did Stanley Posner do upon arriving in Panama? He simply got off a telegram to the President of the country, stating he would like to see him. He did not mention his mission or explain who he was. He reasoned that if he did not mention why he wanted to see the President, his silence might intrigue Panama's ruling head to find out who he was and what his purpose might be. And that's the way it worked out. He got his audience.

President Enrique Jimenez listened to the rather slightly built caller from North America politely but with considerable astonishment. It was really fantastic—a private citizen from another country, without a corpuscle of Latin blood in him, without any Latin family ties, and without any business interest in those countries, speaking with such passionate conviction about the affairs of Central America and what could be done to better the situation there.

But the sincerity and good will of the man was obvious, and President Jimenez told him that if it were possible to bring about a federation of Central American states, he would be for it. Then Stanley Posner contacted the press in Panama. He allowed himself to be questioned on anything and everything.

While expressing admiration for the "small fellow with the big ideals," as one paper put it, it was with reservation that they greeted his mission. More than one journal likened him to Don Quixote, the legendary figure of great chivalry but of equally great futility. They praised the North American's great chivalry in tilting at the Central American windmill, but they did not see much hope for any success.

MODERN DON QUIXOTE—PLUS

As the Yankee lawyer wended his way down that narrow tropical strip, he could have given the State Department in Washington more than even 100 reasons why his mission ought to fail. There was powerful opposition of entrenched officeholders and vested interests who did not want the monopolies created by tariff walls and their control of cheap native labor pools dissipated. Guatemala had served as the tax-collecting headquarters for that region under Spanish rule, and it was feared that with her dominant population she would again turn into the landlord of Central America. On the other hand, Nicaragua had the most powerful military establishment, and it was also feared that for that reason she would, in effect, under the guise of unification, actually run Central America. Guatemala was ultraliberal, Nicaragua a rather iron-fisted dictatorship. How could you have two opposing forces of this sort in one camp? Then there was El Salvador, the richest and technologically most progressive of the Central American countries, which did not want to see the taxes of her heavy but industrious population spread out into more indolent areas. Costa Rica, with a predominately white population, held herself somewhat aloof from the other countries. Honduras and Nicaragua had been having a bitter border dispute for decades. And so it went.

But Stanley Posner persisted, using the same tactics, sending his rather innocuous telegram to the president of a country and contacting the press. And there began to grow, despite all the opposition and all the reasons why there could never be any unification, a ground swell for it. It made sense. He told them how he was born in one State, Massachusetts, went to school in another, Illinois, first began to practice law in still another State, New York, and finally wound up in Washington, D.C. "Mi padre estaba un sastre," he would say, meaning, "My father was a tailor." Yet he had gone on to become a successful trade-association attorney, one of the pioneers in his field. Had he been born in Central America, relegated to one small area by passport restrictions and enmities and rivalries between countries, he probably would have had to become a tailor like his father.

In telling his story Stanley Posner did not disparage tailors or handicrafts of any kind but humbly pointed out the advantages of a passportless unified federation of States that encouraged the free flow of trade and exchange of ideas and that extended the horizons of a man so that he could better his status and follow some other trade than his father's if he so desired. After all, did not all the people of Central America speak a common language and have a common history? Why, for example, shouldn't El Salvador sell its dairy products, Panama it shoes, Guatemala its vegetables, to all the Central American region, instead of being stultified by restrictions and heavy tariffs and confined to its own small strip of territory?

VOICE FOR ALL

The diaper attorney talked, but he also did something to remedy matters. There were not only suspicions between countries but also deep rifts between factions in one country. One party would tell him: "Yes, we will support the unification of Central America for our country, but we do not want this other political group represented in this action." Posner would quickly reply that this was not the way to do it, that all factions must be represented in this common objective, that it must be an expression of the will of all the Latin American people. He explained that in the United States, no matter how bitter a campaign might be, the loser always congratulates the winner of an election and promises to cooperate in working for the good of the country. The Central Americans were flabbergasted and aghast. But they agreed to go along with this strange, energetic, selfless man of deep convictions.

So members of different parties, vicious rivals for years, sat down together. At one of these gatherings one man leaned over and whispered to Posner: "If I didn't see this with my own eyes, I wouldn't believe it. There are men here who have been hunting one another like rabbits."

A STEP CLOSER

Before Stanley Posner's trip to Central America was over, he was likened, not to Don Quixote, but to Simon Bolivar, the liberator of South America.

The smallish, bespectacled man who was born in faraway Leominster, Mass., was not content with merely feeding the idealistic fires of the Central American people. He had a concrete plan—a loosely federated organization of states that would work toward a gradually tightened union.

No longer is the name of Stanley Posner regarded with faint amusement at the State Department. Instead, it is apt to invoke awe mingled with gratification. For despite the 100 reasons why it couldn't have happened, it did. The Organization of Central American States has come into being. Moreover, it is much more than a paper proposition. A full-time paid secretary-general has been appointed—Ricardo Toledo of Costa Rica. And various committees have already been created to work out the elimination of passports, the cutting down of tariffs, the establishing of a great university for all Central America, instead of the several poor colleges now in existence.

Of course, this still isn't quite the United States of America. But something like it appears to be on the way at least. One thing is sure: Central America, which the Carnegie Endowment for Peace once studied as a hotbed of war, will never be quite the same again since this Stanley Posner fellow took that trip of his some 4 years ago. "Peace and Unity" is now the burning slogan down that way. Although some differences still exist, even infrequent feuding, the Central American States have made genuine progress toward union.

ALONG THE PATH WITH SIMON BOLIVAR

The program to bring about a unified, peaceful, and progressive Central America—and perhaps eventually a United States of Latin America—is sometimes referred to as the Posner plan by the press south of the border. But Stanley Posner, still as active as ever in behalf of the Latin American cause, takes little credit for anything original. He says all he did was to awaken a dream that more than a century ago Simon Bolivar had.

Poison in Your Water—No. 55

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Chicago Daily News on February 16, 1959, entitled "Blasts Pollution of Streams—Charges Illinois Is Lax":

BLASTS POLLUTION OF STREAMS—CHARGES ILLINOIS IS LAX

(By Bob Cary)

"I want to know who behind State Sanitary Engineer Clarence Klassen is falling down on the job," Walter Sherry of Joliet, Ill., Izaak Walton pollution chairman, stated Saturday.

Sherry, fiery pollution fighter, keynoted the first northeast Illinois Clean Streams Convention at the Cook County forest preserve headquarters, River Forest.

"The rivers in Illinois are so dirty I don't think I'll even buy a State fishing license this year," said Sherry.

"The fish aren't fit to eat from the filthy water."

In a stream-by-stream report, Izaak Walton delegates and members of the Cook County clean streams committee documented health law violations on the Chicago River, Calumet-Sag, Des Plaines River, Du Page River, Fox River, Hickory Creek, Illinois River, and the Fox Chain of Lakes.

"It's time to quit handling these law violations with kid gloves," said Sherry. "We want to know why the State and Federal pollution laws are not being enforced."

Instances were cited where pollution violations of 4 years' standing had been investigated by State sanitary engineers only to have their reports die in the Springfield health office.

Sherry praised the work of the sanitary engineers, at the same time laying the blame for the filthy streams at the door of the Springfield health office and the Illinois attorney general.

Among the panel of State and Federal officials who participated in the day-long meeting were: Senator Paul Douglas, H. W. Poston, U.S. Public Health Service; Col. John B. W. Corey, and L. A. Beaudin, U.S. Corps of Engineers; Lee Bradish, Metropolitan Sanitary District of Chicago, and Benn Leland, State Sanitary Water Board.

Credit Union Legislation, H.R. 3674 and H.R. 3675

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on January 29, 1959, the distinguished gentleman from Montana [Mr. ANDERSON], joined me in introducing a bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act. The bill numbers are H.R. 3674 and H.R. 3675.

On March 18, 1959, at pages 4061 and 4062 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I made a statement to the House explaining the reasons for the introduction of the bills and urging our colleagues to support the enactment of this legislation.

The response of our colleagues indicating their support of H.R. 3674 and H.R. 3675 is most gratifying.

In order that our colleagues may have a better understanding of exactly what those bills do, I am setting forth a section-by-section analysis of the bills, showing the changes from the present statute sought to be accomplished, together with an explanation and reasons for each change.

Changes in existing law made by these are shown as follows: Existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets; new matter is in italics; existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in regular type:

"SHORT TITLE (12 U.S.C., SEC. 1751; F.C.U. ACT, SEC. 1)

"SECTION 1. [Citation of chapter.] This [chapter] *Act* may be cited as the 'Federal Credit Union Act.'"

Statement of purpose: To eliminate citation and change reference from "chapter" to "Act."

Reason for proposal: To clarify and modernize the section.

"DEFINITIONS (12 U.S.C., SEC. 1752; F.C.U. ACT, SEC. 2)

"SEC. 2. [A Federal credit union is defined as a cooperative association organized in accordance with the provisions of this chapter for the purpose of promoting thrift among its members and creating a source of credit for provident or productive purposes. When used in this chapter the term 'Bureau' means Bureau of Federal Credit Unions, and the term 'Director' means the Director thereof.]

"As used in this Act—

"(a) The term 'Federal credit union' means a cooperative association organized in accordance with the provisions of this Act for the purpose of promoting thrift among its members and creating a source of credit for provident or productive purposes, and includes a cooperative association (hereinafter called a 'Federal central credit union') whose members are Federal credit unions and credit unions organized in accordance with the provisions of law of any State, the District of Columbia, the several Territories and the several possessions of the United States, the Panama Canal Zone, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and located within a well-defined geographical area, and whose members may also be directors and members of the supervisory and credit committees of such credit unions.

"(b) The term 'Bureau' means the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions.

"(c) The term 'Director' means the Director of the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions."

Statement of purpose: (a) To rearrange definitions of Federal credit union, Bureau of Federal Credit Unions, and the Director thereof;

(b) To further define a credit union to include Federal central credit unions with membership composed of Federal credit unions, State credit unions, and directors and committee members of credit unions.

Reasons for proposals: (a) To modernize and clarify the section;

(b) To allow for the purchase of shares and the obtaining of loans by Federal credit unions and State credit unions in and from Federal and State central credit unions, and to provide a source of credit for directors and committee members. Under the existing Federal law, directors and committee members may not borrow in excess of the amount of their holdings in a Federal credit union as represented by shares thereof. Through membership in a central credit union, the directors and committee members would be subject only to the normal borrowing restrictions applicable to the general membership of a credit union.

But there is another and more important reason for establishing central credit unions under the Federal law. Over the years, it has become apparent that there is a real need for a source and reservoir of additional funds to satisfy local and seasonal requirements of credit unions. The function of the central credit union in this case would be to provide a source of ready credit, and a reservoir to meet varying local credit needs. Central credit unions, thus, would provide an efficient mechanism for self-help which would enable credit unions to undertake to meet their own problems in a particular geographic area.

"CREATION OF BUREAU (12 U.S.C., SEC. 1751A; SEC. 2 OF ACT OF JUNE 29, 1948)

"SEC. 3. [Establishment of Bureau of Federal Credit Unions in Federal Security Agency; appointment of Director.] There [is hereby established in the Federal Security Agency] *shall be in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare* a Bureau of Federal Credit Unions, which shall be under the supervision of a Director appointed by the [Federal Security Administrator] *Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.* The Bureau of Federal Credit Unions and the Director [thereof] shall be under the general direction and supervision of the [Federal Security Administrator] *Secretary.* [The functions, powers, and duties of the Farm Credit Administration under the Federal Credit Union Act, as amended, shall be exercised by the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions. The functions, powers, and duties of the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration under the Federal Credit Union Act, as amended, shall be exercised by the Director of the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions.]

Statement of purpose: (a) To change section number;

(b) To set forth the status of the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Reasons for proposals: (a) To make section number consistent with other sections of the act;

(b) To clarify and modernize section dealing with creation and operation of Bureau of Federal Credit Unions.

"FEDERAL CREDIT UNION ORGANIZATION (12 U.S.C., SEC. 1753 F.C.U. ACT, SEC. 3)

"SEC. 4. Any seven or more [natural] persons who desire to form a Federal credit union shall subscribe before some officer competent to administer oaths an organization certificate in duplicate which shall specifically state—

"(1) [The] *the* name of the association [;]

"(2) [The] *the* location of the proposed Federal credit union and the territory in which it will operate [;]

"(3) [The] *the* names and addresses of the subscribers to the certificate and the number of shares subscribed by each [;]

"(4) [The] *the* par value of the shares, which shall be $5 each [;]

"(5) [The] *the* proposed field of membership, specified in detail [;]

"(6) [The] *the* term of the existence of the corporation, which may be perpetual [; *and*]

"(7) [The] *the* fact that the certificate is made to enable such persons to avail themselves of the advantages of this [chapter] *Act.*"

Statement of purpose: (a) To change section number;

(b) To change reference from "chapter" to "act;"

(c) To eliminate the restriction upon subscribers to "natural" persons.

Reasons for proposals: (a) To make section number consistent with other sections of the act;

(b) To modernize and clarify the section;

(c) To allow credit unions to act as subscribers in the formation of Federal central credit unions.

"APPROVAL OF ORGANIZATION CERTIFICATE (12 U.S.C., SEC. 1754; F.C.U. ACT, SEC 4)

"SEC. 5. [Any such] *The* organization certificate shall be presented to the Director for approval. [Upon such approval the Federal credit union shall be a body corporate and as such, subject to the limitations herein contained, shall be vested with all of the powers and charged with all the liabilities conferred and imposed by this chapter upon corporations organized hereunder.] Before any organization certificate is approved, an appropriate investigation shall be made for the purpose of determining (1) whether the organization certificate conforms to the provisions of this [chapter] *Act*; (2) the general character and fitness of the subscribers thereto; and (3) the economic advisability of establishing the proposed Federal credit union. Upon approval of such organization certificate by the Director, it shall be the charter of the corporation, and one of the originals thereof shall be delivered to the corporation after the payment of the fee required therefor. *Upon such approval the Federal credit union shall be a body corporate, and as such, subject to the limitations herein contained, shall be vested with all of the powers and charged with all the liabili-*

ties conferred and imposed by this Act upon corporations organized hereunder."

Statement of purpose: (a) To change section number;

(b) To change outdated wording and add sentence setting forth corporate limitations, powers and liabilities of a Federal credit union.

Reasons for proposals: (a) To make section number consistent with other sections of the act;

(b) To modernize and clarify the section.

"FEES (12 U.S.C., SEC. 1755; F.C.U. ACT, SEC. 5)

"SEC. 6. For the purpose of paying the costs incident to the ascertainment of whether an organization certificate should be approved, the subscribers to any such certificate shall pay, at the time of filing their organization certificate, the amount prescribed by the Director, which shall not exceed $20 in any case; and on the approval of any organization certificate they shall also pay a fee of $5. Not later than January 31 of each calendar year, each Federal credit union shall pay to the Bureau [of Federal Credit Unions], for the preceding calendar year, a supervision fee in accordance with a graduated scale prescribed by regulation on the basis of assets as of December 31 of such preceding year, but such fee shall in no event be less than $10 nor [(subject to such minimum)] more than the amounts specified in the following table: *Provided, however,* That no such annual fee shall be payable by [such an organization] *a Federal credit union* with respect to the year in which its charter is issued or [the year] in which final distribution is made in *its* liquidation [of the credit union] or the charter is otherwise canceled. All such fees shall be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States for the account of the Bureau and may be expended by the Director for such administrative, *supervisory* and other expenses incurred in carrying out the provisions [thereof] *of this Act* as he may determine to be proper, the purpose of such fees being to defray [as far as practicable, the administrative and supervisory costs incident to the carrying out of this chapter] *such expenses as far as practicable."*

Statement of purpose: (a) To change section number;

(b) To shorten reference to Bureau of Federal Credit Unions and to change wording of other portions of section.

Reasons for proposals: (a) To make section number consistent with other sections of the act;

(b) To clarify and modernize the section.

"REPORTS, [AND] EXAMINATIONS *and audits* (12 U.S.C., SEC. 1756; F.C.U. ACT, SEC. 6)

"SEC. 7. Federal credit unions shall be under the supervision of the Director, and shall make such financial reports to him [(at least annually) as he may require] *as and when he may require, but at least annually.* Each Federal credit union shall be subject to examination by, and for this purpose shall make its books and records accessible to, any person designated by the Director. The Director shall fix a scale of examination fees to be paid by the Federal credit unions, giving due consideration to the time and expense incident to such examinations, and to the ability of Federal credit unions to pay such fees, which fees shall be assessed against and paid by each Federal credit union promptly after the completion of such examination. Examination fees collected under the provisions of this section shall be deposited to the credit of the special fund created by section [1755 of this title] *6 hereof,* and shall be available for the [purposes] *purpose* specified in said section *6."*

Statement of purpose: (a) To change section number;

(b) To change wording and correct references to another section of the act.

Reasons for proposals: (a) To make section number consistent with other sections of the act;

(b) To clarify and modernize the section.

"POWERS (12 U.S.C., SEC. 1757; F.C.U. ACT, SEC. 7)

"SEC. 8. A Federal credit union shall have succession in its corporate name during its existence and shall have power—

"(1) [To] *to* make contracts [;]

"(2) [To] *to* sue and be sued [;]

"(3) [To] *to* adopt and use a common seal and alter the same at pleasure [;]

"(4) [To] *to* purchase, hold, and dispose of property necessary or incidental to its operations [;]

"(5) [To] *to* make loans with maturities not exceeding [3] *five* years to its members for provident or productive purposes upon such terms and conditions as this [chapter] *Act* and [the] *its* bylaws provide and as the credit committee *or a loan officer* may approve, at rates of interest not exceeding 1 per centum per month in unpaid balances, inclusive of all charges incident to making the loan: *Provided,* That no loans to a director [officer] or member of [a] *the supervisory or credit committee* shall exceed the amount of his holdings in the Federal credit union as represented by shares thereof *plus the total unencumbered and unpledged shareholdings in the Federal credit union of any member pledged as security for the obligation of such director or member of committee.* No director [officer, or committee member] *or member of the supervisory or credit committee* shall endorse for borrowers. A borrower may repay his loan, prior to maturity, in whole or in part, on any business day. The taking, receiving, reserving, or charging of a rate of interest greater than is allowed by this [subsection] *paragraph,* when knowingly done, shall be deemed a forfeiture of the entire interest which the note, bill, or other evidence of debt carries with it, or which has been agreed to be paid thereon. [In case the greater rate of interest] *If such greater rate of interest* has been paid, the person by whom it has been paid, or his legal representatives, may recover back *from the credit union taking or receiving the same,* in an action in the nature of an action of debt, the entire amount of interest [thus] paid [from the credit union taking or receiving the same]: *Provided,* That such action is commenced within [2] *two* years from the time the usurious [transaction occurred] *collection was made;* [.]

"(6) [To] *to* receive from its members payments on shares [;]

"(7) [To] *to* invest its funds (a) in loans exclusively to members; (b) in obligations of the United States of America, or securities fully guaranteed as to principal and interest thereby; (c) in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Director, in loans to other credit unions in the total amount not exceeding 25 per centum of its paid-in and unimpaired capital and surplus; (d) [or] in shares or accounts of [Federal] savings and loan associations, [and in shares or accounts of any other institution] the accounts of which are insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corp.; *or (e) in shares of Federal central credit unions and in shares or accounts of other central credit unions, as defined in section 2, paragraph (a) of this act. Payments to, and withdrawals from, such central credit unions by a Federal credit union must be specifically authorized by the board of directors of such Federal credit union;* [.]

"(8) [To] *to* make deposits in national banks and in State banks, trust companies, and mutual savings banks operating in accordance with the laws of the State in which the Federal credit union does business [;]

"(9) [To] *to* borrow [(from any source)] *in accordance with such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Director, from any source,* in an aggregate amount not exceeding 50 per centum of its paid-in and unimpaired capital and surplus: *Provided,* That any Federal credit union may discount with or sell to any Federal intermediate credit bank any eligible obligations up to the amount of its paid-in and unimpaired capital; [subject to such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Director.]

"(10) [To] *to* [fine members] *levy late charges,* in accordance with the bylaws, for failure to meet promptly their obligations to the Federal credit union [;]

"(11) [To] *to* impress and enforce a lien upon the shares and dividends of any member, to the extent of any loan made to him and any dues or fines payable by him [;]

"(12) to charge members and individuals eligible to become members a reasonable fee for cashing or selling checks, not to exceed the direct and indirect costs incident to providing such service;

"[(12)] *(13)* [To] *to* exercise such incidental powers as shall be necessary or requisite to enable it to carry on effectively the business for which it is incorporated."

Statement of purpose: Section 8: To change section number.

Reason for propsal: To make section number consistent with other sections of the act.

Statement of purpose: Section 8(5): (a) to make certain changes in wording;

(b) To amend paragraph to provide for a loan maturity limit up to 5 years;

(c) To amend paragraph to provide that in addition to borrowing up to the extent of his shareholdings, a director, officer or committee member may borrow an additional sum equal to the total of the free and unpledged shareholdings in the Federal credit union of any member pledged as security for the obligation;

(d) To provide for the approval of loans by a loan officer.

Reasons for proposals: (a) To clarify and modernize the section;

(b) To extend the maturity limit to allow Federal credit unions to more adequately meet the demands of their members for various types of loans. For instance, a 5-year loan maturity on home repair and modernization loans would be more feasible for many credit union members. Also, there are many occasions when a credit union member has suffered a series of financial catastrophies and wishes to borrow additional funds or consolidate his debts but is realistically unable to pay off these debts over a 3-year period. Under these conditions, if the member is of sound character, the credit union often wishes to extend a longer term loan. Such loans can be a sound use of credit and are consistent with the fundamental purposes and goals of credit unions. The experience of many State chartered credit unions, which in some cases may grant loans for up to 20 years, has been extremely favorable on longer term loans;

(c) To liberalize borrowing restrictions on officials. It is often difficult and in some instances almost impossible to secure members to serve as directors, officers or committee members because of the present limitation in the law on the borrowing privileges of persons serving in such capacities. As a result, credit unions are not always getting the most capable leadership available from the qualified membership. This weakness would be remedied to a large degree by the proposed liberalization, and at the same time due regard for the safety of the funds of the credit union would be retained.

(d) Please see section 15.

Statement of purpose: Section 8(7): To allow Federal credit unions to purchase shares or invest in accounts of central credit

unions, subject to authorization by boards of directors of such Federal credit unions.

Reason for proposal: To create an additional source of investment for funds of Federal credit unions, which funds could be used for the purposes set forth under section 2.

Statement of purpose: Section 8(9): To relocate wording.

Reason for proposal: To clarify section.

Statement of purpose: Section 8(10): To change wording.

Reason for proposal: To clarify section.

Statement of purpose: Section 8(12): To authorize Federal credit unions to charge a reasonable fee for cashing or selling checks.

Reason for proposal: The Director of the Bureau has ruled that Federal credit unions may not charge a fee for cashing or selling checks. Credit unions throughout the country had been engaged in this activity and the ruling has created considerable hardship. The activity, which is desired and requested by the members, results in certain direct and indirect costs. It is only fair and equitable that these costs should be borne by those directly availing themselves of the service rather than by the general membership. This principle has been accepted by the credit unions directly involved and as the owners of the credit unions, they should have the right to provide this service for themselves.

Statement of purpose: Section 8(13): To change the number of the subsection.

Reason for proposal: To make the number of this subsection consistent with other portions of the section.

"BYLAWS (12 U.S.C., SEC. 1958; F.C.U. ACT, SEC. 8)

"SEC. 9. In order to simplify the organization of Federal credit unions the Director shall [on June 26, 1934] *from time to time* cause to be prepared a form of organization certificate and a form of bylaws, consistent with this [chapter] *Act*, which shall be used by Federal credit union incorporators, and shall be supplied to them on request. At the time of presenting the organization certificate the incorporators shall also submit proposed bylaws to the Director for his approval."

Statement of purpose: (a) To change section number;

(b) To remove obsolete date and make an addition authorizing the Director of the Bureau to "from time to time" modify the form of organization certificate and form of bylaws consistent with the act.

Reasons for proposals: (a) To make section number consistent with other sections of the act;

(b) To clarify and modernize the section.

"MEMBERSHIP (12 U.S.C., SEC. 1759; F.C.U. ACT, SEC. 9)

"SEC. 10. Federal credit union membership shall consist of the incorporators and such other persons and incorporated and unincorporated organizations, to the extent permitted by rules and regulations prescribed by the Director, as may be elected to membership and as *such* shall, each, subscribe to at least one share of its stock and pay the initial installment thereon and the entrance fee; except that *other than as provided in section 2, paragraph (a) of this Act as to Federal central credit unions*, Federal credit union membership shall be limited to groups having a common bond of occupation, or association, or to groups within a well-defined neighborhood, community, or rural district. *A Federal credit union may, by authorization of its board of directors, become a subscriber to, or organizer or member of, a Federal central credit union or a central credit union as defined in section 2, paragraph (a) of this Act.* Shares may be issued in joint tenancy with right of survivorship with any [persons] *person* designated by the credit union member, but no joint tenant shall be permitted to vote, obtain loans, or hold office, unless he is within the field of membership and is a qualified member."

Statement of purpose: (a) To change section number;

(b) To except Federal credit unions from the general limitations upon fields of membership;

(c) To make Federal credit unions eligible to subscribe to the charter for a central credit union.

Reasons for proposals: (a) To make section number consistent with other sections of the act;

(b) To allow for the field of membership of central credit unions to be as set forth in section 2.

(c) Under certain circumstances, it may be desirable that credit unions act as subscribers.

"MEMBERS' MEETING (12 U.S.C., SEC. 1760; F.C.U. ACT, SEC. 10)

"SEC. 11. The fiscal year of all Federal credit unions shall end December 31. The annual meeting of each Federal credit union shall be held at such time during the month of the following January, and at such place as its bylaws shall prescribe. Special meetings may be held in the manner indicated in the bylaws. No member shall be entitled to vote by proxy, but a member other than a natural person may vote through an agent designated for the purpose. Irrespective of the number of shares held by him, no member shall have more than one vote. *Federal credit unions having membership in a central credit union may be represented at annual or special meetings of the central credit union by one member duly authorized by the board of directors of the member Federal credit union. To the extent permitted by the articles or certificate of incorporation or bylaws of the central credit union, such representative shall have one vote and shall be eligible for office in the central credit union the same as though he were a member as an individual of such central credit union."*

Statement of purpose: (a) To change section number;

(b) To provide for representation by Federal credit unions in membership meetings of central credit unions in which they are members and to allow representatives of such Federal credit unions to be eligible for office in such central credit unions.

Reasons for proposals: (a) To make section number consistent with other sections of the act;

(b) To give Federal credit unions the rights of membership consistent with basic credit union principles.

"MANAGEMENT (12 U.S.C., SEC. 1761; F.U.C. ACT, SEC. 11)

"SEC. 12. [(a) Generally] The business affairs of a Federal credit union shall be managed by a board of not less than five directors, a credit committee of not less than three members, [and a supervisory committee of three members (a majority of whom shall not be directors) all to be elected by the members (and from their number) at their annual meeting, and to hold office for such terms, respectively, as the bylaws may provide.] *all to be elected at the annual members' meeting by and from the members which, in the case of Federal central credit unions, shall be deemed to include the duly authorized representatives of the member credit unions, and by a supervisory committee of three members, one of whom may be a director other than the treasurer, to be appointed by the president from the membership promptly following the annual meeting, subject to ratification by the board at its next meeting. If the board fails to ratify the appointment of any member of the supervisory committee, the term of such member shall thereupon cease, and the president shall immediately appoint a replacement, subject to ratification by the board at its next succeeding meeting. Any vacancy occurring in the supervisory committee shall be filled in the same manner as original appointments to said committee. All members of the board and of such committees shall hold office for such terms, respectively, as the bylaws may provide.* A record of the names and addresses of the members of the board and *such* committees and officers shall be filed with the Bureau within 10 days after their election *or appointment*. No member of the board or of either *such* committee shall, as such, be compensated."

Statement of purpose: (a) To change section number;

(b) To amend section to provide that the supervisory committee shall be appointed by the President from the membership promptly following the annual meeting, subject to ratification by the board at its next meeting and that at least one director other than the treasurer may be a member of the committee.

Reasons for proposals: (a) To make section number consistent with other sections of the act;

(b) The board of directors have the responsibility for the general direction and control of the affairs of the credit union. The present law limits the ability of the board of directors to properly discharge this responsibility in instances where an elected supervisory committee is not functioning in an effective manner and in accordance with prescribed procedure. The recommended changes would allow for the appointment of qualified persons to the committee by the board and would charge the board with more direct responsibility for supervisory committee performance.

"OFFICERS (12 U.S.C., SEC. 1761; F.C.U. ACT, SEC. 11(B))

"SEC. 13. [(b)] At their first meeting after the annual meeting of the members, the directors shall elect from their number a president, [a vice president, a clerk,] *one or more vice presidents, a secretary,* and a treasurer, who shall be the executive officers of the corporation [and may be compensated for their services to such extent as the bylaws may provide]. *No executive officer, except the treasurer, shall be compensated as such.* The offices of [clerk] *secretary* and treasurer may be held by the same person. The duties of the officers shall be as determined by the bylaws, except that the treasurer shall be the general manager of the corporation. Before the treasurer shall enter upon his duties he shall give bond with good and sufficient surety, in an amount and character to be determined [from time to time] by the board of directors in [conformance] *compliance* with regulations prescribed from time to time by the Director, conditioned upon the faithful performance of his trust."

Statement of purpose: (a) To allow for more than one vice president;

(b) To change section number;

(c) To change name of "clerk" of board of directors to "secretary;"

(d) To prohibit compensation to any executive officer, except the treasurer, for services rendered as such.

Reasons for proposals: (a) To eliminate the necessity for an amendment to the bylaws in order to provide for more than one vice president;

(b) To make section number consistent with other sections of the act;

(c) To give the position a title which is more descriptive of its function and to add dignity and stature to the office;

(d) To provide that only the treasurer, as general manager of the credit union, may be compensated for his services. Service without pay by the directors, committee members and all other officers is consistent with credit union philosophy. Under the present law all of the officers of a credit

union may be compensated to such extent as the bylaws may provide.

"DIRECTORS (12 U.S.C., SEC. 1761; F.C.U. ACT, SEC. 11(C))

"SEC. 14. [c] The board of directors shall meet at least once a month and shall have the general direction and control of the affairs of the corporation. Minutes of all such meetings shall be kept. Among other things they shall act upon applications for membership *directly or shall appoint a membership chairman from the members, other than the treasurer or assistant treasurer, who shall be authorized to act upon such applications for membership as the board may prescribe and who shall submit to the board at each monthly meeting a list of applications for membership received since the previous monthly meeting, together with such other information as may be required by the bylaws of the board;* require any officer or employee having custody of or handling funds to give bond with good and sufficient surety in an amount and character to be determined [from time to time] by the board of directors in compliance with regulations prescribed from time to time by the Directors, and authorize the payment of the premium or premiums therefor from the funds of the Federal credit union; [recommend the declaration of dividends;] fill vacancies in the board and in the credit committee until successors elected at the next annual meeting have qualified; have charge of investments other than loans to members; determine from time to time the maximum number of shares that may be held by an individual; subject to the limitations of this [chapter] *Act*, determine the interest rates on loans and the maximum amount [that] *which* may be loaned with or without security to any member; and, subject to such regulations as may be issued by the Director, authorize an interest refund to members of record at the close of business on December 31 in proportion to the interest paid by them during [the] *that* year; *and provide for compensation of necessary clerical and auditing assistance requested by the supervisory committee, and of loan officers appointed by the credit committee.*"

Statement of purpose: (a) To change section number;

(b) To provide that in addition to the board of directors acting directly upon applications for membership, they may appoint from the members (other than the treasurer or assistant treasurer) a membership chairman who shall also be authorized to act upon such applications;

(c) To authorize the board of directors to provide compensation for necessary auditing assistance requested by the supervisory committee and for loan officers appointed by the credit committee;

(d) To make other changes in wording.

Reasons for proposals: (a) To make section number consistent with other sections of the act;

(b) To enable credit unions to make their services and benefits available more quickly to applicants for membership. The board of directors usually meets but once per month, and under this arrangement action upon such applications may be delayed for from several days up to a month;

(c) To assist the supervisory committee in functioning more effectively by providing for assistance which may be compensated by authorization of the board of directors. This committee, which is charged with the responsibility for making regular internal audits of the credit union, often requires outside clerical and auditing assistance, due to the increasing volume of work. Compensation for loan officers who would take some of the burden off the credit committee is based upon the same principle.

(d) To clarify and modernize the section.

"CREDIT COMMITTEE (12 U.S.C., SEC. 1761; F.C.U. ACT, SEC. 11(D))

"SEC. 15. [d] The credit committee shall hold such meetings as the business of the Federal credit union may require and not less frequently than once a month [(of which meetings due notice shall be given to members of the committee)] to consider applications for loans. *Reasonable notice of such meetings shall be given to all members of the committee.* No loan shall be made unless approved by a majority of the entire committee and by all [the] members of the committee who are present at the meeting at which the application is considered: *Provided, however, That the credit committee may appoint one or more loan officers, who may be the treasurer or an assistant treasurer, and delegate to him or them powers to approve loans up to the unsecured limit or in excess of such limit if such excess is fully secured by unpledged shares. Each loan officer shall furnish to the credit committee a record of each loan approved or not approved by him within 7 days of the date of the filing of the application therefor. All loans not approved by a loan officer shall be acted upon by the credit committee. No loan officer, including the treasurer or assistant treasurer, shall have authority to disburse funds of the Federal credit union for any loan which has been approved by him. Not more than one member of the credit committee may be appointed as a loan officer.* Applications for loans shall be made on forms prepared by such committee, which shall set forth the purpose for which the loan is desired, the security, if any, and such other data as may be required. No loan shall be made to any member, *except in the case of a loan by a Federal central credit union to a member credit union,* which [shall cause] *causes* such member to become indebted to the Federal credit union in [the aggregate, upon loans made to such member, in excess of $200 or 10 per centum of the Federal credit union's paid-in unimpaired capital and surplus, whichever is greater, or in excess of $400 unless such excess over $400 is adequately secured.] *an aggregate amount, upon loans made to such member, which is in excess of $1,000 unless such excess over $1,000 is adequately secured, except that in no event may any such loan be made if such aggregate amount would be in excess of whichever of the following is greater:*

"(1) $200, or

"(2) 10 per centum of the credit union's paid-in and unimpaired capital and surplus.

"For the purposes of this subdivision an assignment of shares or the endorsement of a note shall be deemed security."

Statement of purpose: (a) To change section number;

(b) To increase the signature loan limit from $400 to $1,000;

(c) To provide authority for the credit committee to delegate to a loan officer, for whom compensation would be provided, power to approve loans up to the secured limit, or in excess of such limit, if fully secured by unpledged shares;

(d) To rephrase, add, and delete certain words and phrases.

Reasons for proposals: (a) To make section number consistent with other sections of the act;

(b) To raise the unsecured loan limit to a realistic figure which will more adequately satisfy the consumer credit needs of the expanding credit union membership. Congress has progressively increased this limit from $50 initially in the original act to $100 in 1940, $300 in 1946, and $400 in 1949. The experience of Federal credit unions on loans of this type has been very good over the years, and the rising cost of commodities and services, coupled with the progressive growth in knowledge on the part of credit unions of the character and financial responsibility of their members, warrants an increase in the signature loan limit to $1,000;

(c) To provide for a realistic, practicable means of acting upon the large and ever-increasing volume of loan applications and activity in some Federal credit unions. Also, the credit committee (which is not compensated) is often scattered and finds it difficult to properly consider loan applications and render prompt loan service in emergencies. A loan officer will resolve this special problem. Adequate control over the loan officer's activity is provided for in that he is required to furnish to the credit committee a record of loans approved and loans not approved within 7 days of such action;

(d) To clarify and modernize the section.

"SUPERVISORY COMMITTEE [; DEFINITION] (12 U.S.C., SEC. 1761; F.C.U ACT, SEC. 11(E))

"SEC. 16. [e] The supervisory committee shall make, *or cause to be made,* at least quarterly, an examination of the affairs of the Federal credit union, including an audit of its books; *shall make, or cause to be made, a report of its quarterly examination to the board of directors;* shall make, *or cause to be made,* an annual audit, [and a report to be submitted] *a report of which shall be submitted to the members* at the *next* annual meeting of the corporation; and [by a unanimous vote, may suspend] *may suspend by a unanimous vote* any officer of the corporation or any member of the credit committee or of the board of directors, until the next members' meeting, which [said] *members'* meeting [however] shall be held within [7] *seven* days of said suspension and at which meeting said suspension shall be acted upon by the members; and, by a majority vote, may call a special meeting of the shareholders to consider any violation of this [chapter] *Act*, the charter, or of the bylaws, or any practice of the corporation deemed by the committee to be unsafe or unauthorized. [The said committee shall fill vacancies in its own membership until successors to be elected at the next annual meeting have qualified.] *Any and all members of the supervisory committee may be suspended by the president, subject to the approval of the board of directors, or by the board of directors, subject to the approval of the members. In the latter case, a members' meeting to act upon such suspension shall be held within seven days thereof. The board of directors or the members, as the case may be, shall decide whether the suspended committee member shall be removed from or restored to the supervisory committee.* The supervisory committee shall cause the passbooks and accounts of the members to be verified with the records of the treasurer from time to time, and not less frequently than once every [2] *two* years. As used in this [subsection] *section*, the term 'passbook' shall include any book, statement of account, or other record approved by the Director for use by Federal credit unions."

Statement of purpose: (a) To change section number;

(b) To change wording to provide for all or a portion of the work of the supervisory committee to be carried forward under its direction and control by outside auditing assistance;

(c) To provide for suspension of any and all members of the supervisory committee if warranted;

(d) To make other changes in wording.

Reasons for proposals: (a) To make section number consistent with other sections of the act;

(b) Please see section 14;

(c) To carry forward the basic principle that the board of directors has primary responsibility for the direction and control of the credit union;

(d) To clarify and modernize the section.

"RESERVES (12 U.S.C., SEC. 1762; F.C.U. ACT, SEC. 12)

"SEC. 17. All entrance fees and [fines] *charges* provided by the bylaws and 20 per centum of the net earnings of each year, before the declaration of any dividends, shall be set aside as a regular reserve against losses on bad loans and such other losses as may be specified in the bylaws in accordance with regulations prescribed under this Act: *Provided, however,* That when the regular reserve thus established shall equal 10 per centum of the total amount of members' shareholdings, no further transfer of net earnings to such regular reserve shall be required except that such amounts not in excess of 20 per centum of the net earnings as may be needed to maintain this 10 per centum ratio shall *continue to* be transferred. In addition to such regular reserve, special reserves to protect the interests of members shall be established when required (a) by regulation, or (b) in any special case, when found by the Director to be necessary for that purpose."

Statement of purpose: (a) To change section number;

(b) To change wording and add a phrase.

Reasons for proposals: (a) To make section number consistent with other sections of the act;

(b) To clarify and modernize the section.

"DIVIDENDS (12 U.S.C., SEC. 1763; F.C.U. ACT, SEC 13)

"SEC. 18. [At the annual meeting a dividend may be declared from the remaining net earnings on recommendation of the board of directors, which dividend shall be paid on all paid-up shares outstanding at the end of the preceding fiscal year.] *Annually, or semiannually, as the bylaws may provide and after provision for the required reserves, the board of directors may declare a dividend to be paid from the remaining net earnings. Such dividend to be paid on all paid-up shares outstanding at the end of the period for which the dividend is declared.* Shares which become fully paid up during such [year] *dividend period and are outstanding at the close of the period* shall be entitled to a proportional part of [said] *such* dividend [calculated from the first day of the month following such payment in full]. *Dividend credit for a month may be accrued on shares which are or become fully paid up during the first five days of that month."*

Statement of purpose: (a) To change section number;

(b) To authorize board of directors to declare dividends rather than the membership;

(c) To provide for an annual or semiannual dividend, depending upon which is provided for in the bylaws;

(d) To provide that dividend credit for a month may be accrued on shares which are or become fully paid during the first 5 days of that month.

Reasons for proposals: (a) To make section number consistent with other sections of the act;

(b) To transfer this function to the board of directors, which is primarily responsible for the management and sound operation of the credit union, and is the body which is in the best position to determine the size of the dividend which should be distributed, based upon its intimate knowledge of the organization's affairs and its current and future needs. This would also eliminate the condition presently existing whereby the members are in a position to declare a dividend in excess of that which the credit union can safely and prudently afford to pay.

(c) To allow an alternative to the current requirement that dividends be paid annually, which often penalizes members who are forced to withdraw shareholdings prior to the yearend, thereby losing the dividend. The semiannual dividend proposal would alleviate this inequity. Adoption of the alternate dividend plan would be optional with each currently operating credit union and would require an appropriate amendment to the bylaws. Newly chartered credit unions would have an initial choice;

(d) To provide dividend credit for the month on the accounts of members who do not receive their compensation until the last day of the previous month or the first day of the current month and find it impractical to make share payments immediately. Dividend credit under the current law would not commence until the following month. The proposed amendment eliminates this inequity and provides an additional incentive for saving.

"EXPULSION AND WITHDRAWAL (12 U.S.C., SEC. 1764; F.C.U. ACT, SEC. 14)

"SEC. 19. A member may be expelled by a two-thirds vote of the members of a Federal credit union present at a special meeting called for the purpose, but only after an opportunity has been given to him to be heard *and subject to review by the Director, if such review is requested by the member within thirty days.* Withdrawal or expulsion of a member shall not operate to relieve him from liability to the Federal credit union. The amount to be paid a withdrawing or expelled member by a Federal credit union shall be determined and paid in the manner specified in the bylaws."

Statement of purpose: (a) To change section number;

(b) To allow a member expelled from a credit union to obtain a review of such action by the Director of the Bureau.

Reasons for proposals: (a) To make section number consistent with other sections of the act;

(b) To provide for a method of review, since such action may seriously affect the person's standing and reputation in the community and may be based upon factors which do not represent a valid reason for such expulsion.

"MINORS (12 U.S.C., SEC. 1765; F.C.U. ACT, SEC. 15)

"SEC. 20. Shares may be issued in the name of a minor or in trust, subject to such conditions as may be prescribed by the bylaws. *When shares are issued in trust,* [the] *the* name of the beneficiary shall be disclosed to the Federal credit union.

Statement of purpose: (a) To change section number;

(b) to add a phrase.

Reasons for proposals: (a) To make section number consistent with other sections of the act;

(b) To clarify the section.

"CERTAIN POWERS OF DIRECTOR (12 U.S.C., SEC. 1766; F.C.U. ACT, SEC. 16)

"SEC. 21. (a) The Director may prescribe rules and regulations for the administration of this [chapter] *Act* [(] including, but not by way of limitation, the merger, consolidation, and/or dissolution of corporations organized under this [chapter] *Act.* [)]

"(b) (1) The Director may suspend or revoke the charter of any Federal credit union, or place the same in involuntary liquidation and appoint a liquidating agent therefor, upon his finding that the organization is bankrupt or insolvent or has violated any provisions of its charter, its bylaws, [or of this chapter] *this Act,* or [of] any regulations issued thereunder.

"(4) Subject to the control and supervision of the Director and under such rules and regulations as the Director may prescribe, the liquidating agent of a Federal credit union in involuntary liquidation shall (i) cause notice to be given to creditors and members to present their claims and make legal proof thereof, which notice shall be published once a week in each of three successive weeks in a newspaper of general circulation in each county in which the Federal credit union in liquidation maintained an office or branch for the transaction of business on the date it ceased unrestricted operations: *Provided,* That whenever the aggregate book value of the assets and property of a Federal credit union in involuntary liquidation is less than $1,000, unless the Director shall find that its books and records do not contain a true and accurate record of its liabilities, he shall declare such Federal credit union in liquidation to be a 'no publication' liquidation, and publication of notice to creditors and members shall not be required in such case; (ii) from time to time make a ratable divided on all such claims as may have been proved to his satisfaction or adjudicated in a court of competent jurisdiction and, after the assets of such organization have been liquidated, shall make further dividends on all claims previously proved or adjudicated; and the liquidating agent may accept in lieu of a formal proof of claim on behalf of any creditor or member the statement of any amount due to such creditor or member as shown on the books and records of the credit union: *Provided further,* That all claims not filed before payment of the final dividend shall be barred and claims rejected or disallowed by the liquidating agent shall be likewise barred unless suit be instituted thereon within three months after notice of rejection or disallowance; (iii) in a 'no publication' liquidation, determined from all sources available to him, and within the limits of available funds of the Federal credit union, the amounts due to creditors and members, and after sixty days shall have elapsed from the date of his appointment, shall distribute the funds of the Federal credit union to creditors and members ratably and as their interests may appear."

"[b] (*c*) After the expiration of [5] *five* years from the date of cancellation of the charter of a Federal credit union the Director may, in his discretion, destroy any or all books and records of such Federal credit union in his possession or under his control.

"[c] (*d*) The Director is authorized and empowered to execute any and all functions and perform any and all duties vested in him hereby, through such persons as he shall designate or employ; and he may delegate to any person or persons, including any institution operating under the general supervision of the Bureau, the performance and discharge of any authority, power, or function vested in him by this [chapter] *Act.*

"[d] (*e*) All books and records of Federal credit unions shall be kept and reports shall be made in accordance with forms approved by the Director.

"[e] (*f*) The Director is authorized to make investigations and to conduct researches and studies of the problems of persons of small means in obtaining credit at reasonable rates of interest, and of the methods and benefits of cooperative saving and lending among such persons. He is further authorized to make reports of such investigations and to publish and disseminate the same.

"[f] (*g*) Any officer or employee of the Bureau [of Federal Credit Unions] is authorized, when designated for the purpose by the Director [of the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions], to administer oaths and affirmations and to take affidavits and depositions touching upon any matter within the jurisdiction of the Bureau [of Federal Credit Unions].

"[g] (*h*) The Director [of the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions] is authorized, empowered, and directed to require that every person appointed or elected by any Federal credit union to any position requiring the receipt, payment, or custody of money or other personal property owned by a Federal credit union or in its custody or control as collateral or otherwise, to give bond in a corporate surety company holding a cer-

tificate of authority from the Secretary of the Treasury under the Act of Congress approved July 30, 1947 (6 U.S.C. [, secs.] 6–13), as an acceptable surety on Federal bonds. Any such bond or bonds shall be in a form approved by the Director with a view to providing surety coverage to the Federal credit union with reference to loss by reason of acts of fraud or dishonesty including forgery, theft, embezzlement, wrongful abstraction, or misapplication on the part of the person directly or through connivance with others, and such other surety coverages as the Director may determine to be reasonably appropriate or as elsewhere required by this [chapter] *Act*. Any such bond or bonds shall be in *such* an amount in relation to the money or other personal property involved or in relation to the assets of the Federal credit union as the Director may from time to time prescribe by regulation for the purpose of requiring reasonable coverage. In lieu of individual bonds the Director may approve the use of a form of schedule or blanket bond which covers all of the officers and employees of a Federal credit union whose duties include the receipt, payment, or custody of money or other personal property for or on behalf of the Federal credit union. The Director may also approve the use of a form of excess coverage bond whereby a Federal credit union may obtain an amount of coverage in excess of the basic surety coverage.

"(i) *In every case of an adjudication by the Director under this Act, determination shall be made on the record after giving the opportunity for a hearing to all persons and credit unions who may be directly affected by any order that may be issued as a result of such adjudication. The words 'adjudication' and 'order' as used herein shall have the meanings specified in the Administrative Procedure Act.*"

Statement of purpose: (a) To change section number and letters;

(b) To change certain words and phrases;

(c) To place the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions under all provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act. At present it is subject only to the rulemaking provisions of the act.

Reasons for proposals: (a) To make section number consistent with other sections of the act and to make letters consistent with other letters of the section;

(b) To modernize and clarify the section;

(c) To provide Federal credit unions and proposed new credit unions with the right to a hearing on adjudications made by the Bureau, and to create a formal record of such hearings.

"FISCAL AGENTS AND DEPOSITORIES (12 U.S.C., SEC. 1767; F.C.U. ACT, SEC. 17)

"SEC. 22. Each Federal credit union organized under this [chapter] *Act*, when requested by the Secretary of the Treasury, shall act as fiscal agent of the United States and shall perform such services as the Secretary of the Treasury may require in connection with the collection of taxes and other obligations due the United States and the lending, borrowing, and repayment of money by the United States, including the issue, sale, redemption, or repurchase of bonds, notes, Treasury certificates of indebtedness, or other obligations of the United States; and to facilitate such purposes the Director shall furnish to the Secretary of the Treasury from time to time the names and addresses of all Federal credit unions with such other available information concerning them as may be requested by the Secretary of the Treasury. Any Federal credit union organized under this [chapter] *Act*, when designated for that purpose by the Secretary of the Treasury shall be a depository of public money, except receipts from customs, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury."

Statement of purpose: (a) To change section number; (b) To change references from "chapter" to "act."

Reasons for proposals: (a) To make section number consistent with other sections of the act; (b) To clarify and modernize the section.

"TAXATION (12 U.S.C., SEC. 1768; F.C.U. ACT, SEC. 18)

"SEC. 23. The Federal credit unions organized hereunder, their property, their franchises, capital, reserves, surpluses, and other funds, and their income shall be exempt from all taxation now or hereafter imposed by the United States or by any State, Territorial, or local taxing authority; except that any real property and any tangible personal property of such Federal credit unions shall be subject to Federal, State, Territorial, and local taxation to the same extent as other similar property is taxed. Nothing herein contained shall prevent holdings in any Federal credit union organized hereunder from being included in the valuation of the personal property of the owners or holders thereof in assessing taxes imposed by authority of the State or political subdivision thereof in which the Federal credit union is located: *Provided, however,* That the duty or burden of collecting or enforcing the payment of such tax shall not be imposed upon any such Federal credit union and the tax shall not exceed the rate of taxes imposed upon holdings in domestic credit unions."

Statement of purpose: To change section number.

Reason for proposal: (b) To make section number consistent with other sections of the act.

"PARTIAL INVALIDITY; RIGHT TO AMEND (12 U.SC., SEC. 1770; F.C.U. ACT, SEC. 20)

"SEC. 24. [Separability of provisions; right to alter, amend, or repeal chapter] (a) If any provisions of this chapter *Act*, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of the [chapter] *Act*, and the application of such provisions to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

"(b) The right to alter, amend, or repeal this [chapter] *Act* or any part thereof, or any [chapter] *charter* issued pursuant to the provisions of this [chapter] *Act*, is expressly reserved."

Statement of purpose: (a) To change section number;

(b) To eliminate certain phrases and change references from "chapter" to "act."

Reasons for proposals: (a) To make section number consistent with other sections of the act;

(b) To clarify and modernize the section.

[ALLOTMENT OF] "SPACE IN FEDERAL BUILDINGS (12 U.S.C., SEC. 1771; F.C.U. ACT, SEC. 21)

"SEC. 25. [Allotment of space in Federal buildings.] Upon application by any credit union organized under State law or by any Federal credit union organized in accordance with the terms of this [chapter] *act, at least 95 per centum of* the membership of which is composed [exclusively] of *persons who either are presently* Federal employees *or are retired Federal employees* and members of their families, which application shall be addressed to the officer or agency of the United States charged with the allotment of space in the Federal buildings in the community or district in which said credit union or Federal credit union does business, such officer or agency may in his or its discretion allot space to such credit union if space is available without charge for rent or services."

Statement of purpose: (a) To change section number;

(b) To modify the conditions under which space in Federal buildings may be allotted to credit unions serving Federal employees.

Reasons for proposals: (a) To make section number consistent with other sections of the act;

(b) To allow credit unions to continue membership of retired Federal employees without jeopardizing the credit union's eligibility for space in Federal buildings. This would be accomplished by adding the phrases "Persons who either are presently" and "or are retired Federal employees." Also, to allow such credit unions to continue their eligibility although membership is extended to a limited number of employees of private contractors working on Federal installations along with Federal employees, and to American Legion and Red Cross personnel working at Veterans' hospitals, etc. This would be accomplished by substituting the phrase "at least 95 percent" for the word "exclusively."

"CONVERSION FROM FEDERAL TO STATE CREDIT UNION AND FROM STATE TO FEDERAL CREDIT UNION (NEW SECTION)

"SEC. 26. (a) *Conversion from Federal to State credit union. A Federal credit union may be converted into a 'State credit union' under the laws of any State, the District of Columbia, the several Territories, and the several possessions of the United States, the Panama Canal Zone, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, by complying with the following requirements:*

"(1) The proposition for such conversion shall first be approved by a majority of the directors of the Federal credit union. The proposition then shall be submitted to a meeting of its members, the notice of which shall be in writing and shall be delivered in person to each member, or shall be mailed to each member at the address for such member appearing on the records of the credit union, not more than thirty nor less than seven days prior to the time of the meeting. Approval of the proposition for conversion shall be by the affirmative vote of not less than two-thirds of the members present and voting at the meeting.

"(2) A copy of the minutes of such meeting, verified by the affidavits of the president or vice president and the secretary of the meeting, shall be filed with the Bureau within ten days after the meeting.

"(3) Promptly after the adjournment of such meeting of the members, and in no event later than ninety days after such meeting, the credit union shall take such action as may be necessary under the applicable State law to make it a State credit union, and within ten days after receipt of the State credit union charter there shall be filed with the Bureau a copy of the charter thus issued. Upon such filing the credit union shall cease to be a Federal credit union.

"(4) Upon ceasing to be a Federal credit union, such credit union shall no longer be subject to any of the provisions of this Act. The successor State credit union shall be vested with all of the assets and shall continue responsible for all of the obligations of the Federal credit union to the same extent as though the conversion had not taken place.

"(b) Conversion from State to Federal credit union. A 'State credit union', organized under the laws of any State, the District of Columbia, the several Territories and the several posessions of the United States, the Panama Canal Zone, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, may be converted into a Federal credit union by: (1) Complying with all State requirements requisite to enabling it to convert to a Federal credit union or to cease being a State credit union; (2) filing with the Bureau proof of such compliance, satisfactory to the Director; and (3) filing with the Bureau an organization certificate as required by this Act.

"When the Director has been satisfied that all of such requirements have been

complied with, the Director shall approve the organization certificate. Upon such approval, the State credit union shall become a Federal credit union as of the date it ceases to be a State credit union. The Federal credit union shall be vested with all of the assets and shall continue responsible for all the obligations of the State credit union to the same extent as though the converison had not taken place."

Statement of purpose: To add a new section to the act, providing for conversion of a Federal credit union to a State credit union and from a State credit union to a Federal credit union.

Reason for proposal: To make specific provision for such conversion. Under certain circumstances conversion of its charter may be deemed advisable by a credit union and acceptable to the supervisory agencies involved. Special authority appears warranted which would facilitate the procedure of converting a credit union from a Federal to a State charter and vice versa without dissipation of reserves or undue disruption of normal service to the credit union members.

"ROBBERY AND INCIDENTAL CRIMES AGAINST FEDERAL CREDIT UNIONS (NEW SECTION)

"SEC. 27. *Section 2113 of title 18 of the United States Code is hereby made applicable to robbery and other crimes against Federal credit unions by amending subsection (g) of said section by inserting before the period at the end thereof ', and any "Federal credit union" as defined in section 2 of the Federal Credit Union Act.'*

Statement of purpose: To add a provision making robbery of a Federal credit union a Federal crime.

Reason from proposal: To add robbery of a Federal credit union to the current Federal statutory offenses of false entry, forgery and embezzlement. This proposed amendment would permit the Federal Bureau of Investigation to assume jurisdiction in instances of robbery, as well as the others.

"TERRITORIAL APPLICABILITY OF ACT (12 U.S.C., SEC. 1772; F.C.U. ACT, SEC. 22)

"SEC. 28. [Extension of chapter to Panama Canal Zone and Virgin Islands. The provisions of this chapter shall be extended to and include the Panama Canal Zone, and the Virgin Islands.] *The provisions of this Act shall apply to the several States, the District of Columbia, the several Territories and the several possessions of the United States, the Panama Canal Zone, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico."*

Statement of purpose: (a) To change section number;

(b) To provide for the establishment of Federal credit unions in the U.S. Territories and possessions hereafter created.

Reasons for proposals: (a) To make section number consistent with other sections of the act;

(b) To eliminate the need for future amendments of this type.

The Second Battle of Gettysburg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I believe the Members, particularly those on the Senate side, will be interested in "The Second Battle of Gettysburg," which appeared in the Harrisburg (Pa.) Patriot-News of April 5, 1959. I regret that pictures cannot be reproduced in the RECORD for then the Members could see for themselves what is happening to one of our most meaningful national historic shrines.

I have spoken before on the creeping commercialism at Gettysburg, and no doubt I will speak again and again until such time as the National Park Service obtains the necessary funds to eliminate the blight from what should be our most hallowed ground.

I might point out that this excellent article does not note that although the Union lines are reasonably well preserved in Park Service hands at Gettysburg, a large portion of the land on which the Confederate Army made its most heroic achievements is the very land the Park Service wishes to acquire. For example, the field of the second day's battle where the men of Texas, Arkansas, Alabama, Mississippi, Georgia, Florida, South Carolina, and Virginia fought and died in a magnificent effort is presently marked by a line of souvenir shops, garages, beer parlors and trailer courts. I can hardly believe that this was the intent of Congress when Gettysburg was first authorized as a national park. The article follows:

COMMERCIALISM LAUNCHES SECOND BATTLE OF GETTYSBURG

(By Hans Knight)

GETTYSBURG.—Unless the United States cares enough to do something about it, the ghost of General Meade gazing out of the window of his headquarters will behold a fantasy land, fabulous, magical, wonderful make-believe, with miniature golf course.

And in a dozen other spots of the battlefield, where guns boomed and horses screamed and men bled, there will be the symbols of a more advanced civilization—neon-framed diners, gas stations, bigger and better souvenir stands, suburban development.

That is the fear of many in Gettsyburg and across the rest of the country concerned with saving the Nation's greatest battlefield from creeping commercialism.

Looking down from Roundtop upon the rolling rock-strewn hills, the battlefield still appears much as it was pictured after the carnage of July 1863.

A closer scrutiny shatters the illusion.

Driving along the Harrisburg Road, the visitor suddenly is confronted with a battery of signs informing him that he is entering a country of service stations, snackbars, bakeries, hobby shops, and restaurants.

SMALLEST SIGN

One sign, however, proclaims that he is entering the Gettysburg Battlefield. It is the smallest sign.

There are other symbols of the modern age dotting the interior of the battlefield.

Yellow, red, and green signs advertising commercial establishments crest the ridge above the famed peach orchard where the Confederate troops attacked the Union lines from the west. A granite monument erected to Pennsylvania soldiers nestles against the perimeter of a restaurant parking lot.

Where gun emplacements guarded the approaches to Power's Hill, smoke from a wrecked car dump wafts lazily across the fields. A free museum and souvenir shop marks the area where General Buford's cavalry suffered 60 percent casualties in pitched battle.

SECOND BATTLE

"Attractive building lots" signs stand where Ewell's Corps assaulted the Union 11th Corps in the drive toward Wrightsville.

The land around the old Adams County Home near Route 15, north entrance, scene of much of the first day's fighting, will be up for sale to the highest bidder before the year is out.

The "second battle of Gettysburg" to preserve the shrine now is coming to a head.

The decision may come in the U.S. Senate this month.

The battle was joined when the House Appropriations Committee deleted $1,250,000 for the National Parks Service from the 1960 Interior Department budget.

Some $750,000 had been earmarked to acquire crucial sites on Gettysburg Battlefield for the Nation.

The appropriation cut was approved by House voice vote.

The backers of the appropriation then swung into action.

Pennsylvania's senate had unanimously adopted a resolution calling on the State's congressional Representatives to support any legislation and appropriations which will protect the environs of the battlefield of Gettysburg from encroachment by commercial enterprises and housing which may prevent the full and complete development of Gettysburg National Park by the National Park Service."

The park, the resolution asserted, "is seriously threatened by commercial enterprises which are stimulated by the volume of visitors."

HOUSE OK'S SLASH

When the House, despite the protests of Representative JAMES M. QUIGLEY, of Camp Hill, confirmed the appropriations slash, Quigley persuaded Senator CLARK to call for extended hearings when the issue comes before the Senate Appropriations Committee.

These hearings are to be held some time after April 15.

Said QUIGLEY, who represents the 19th District which includes Gettysburg:

"Unless the Senate can be persuaded to restore the item to the budget, we will have lost not only the second battle of Gettysburg but the whole campaign to restore Civil War battlefields before commercialism sweeps the field."

Only a truly grassroots campaign can set the necessary fire under the Senate and its appropriations committee to restore the land acquisition program, he said.

The request for money to buy up Civil War land has drawn considerable criticism.

During the House hearings, Representative MICHAEL J. KIRWAN (Democrat, Ohio) bluntly declared the proposed purchases are unnecessary.

"The Government has enough land in Gettysburg," he said. "There's no use in taking more."

Meanwhile, however, support for the appropriation has been gaining momentum.

FAVOR PRESERVATION

"We have received scores of letters from people all over the country," said James Myers, superintendent of Gettysburg National Park. "All have been in favor of preserving the battlefield the way it is. A large portion of letters have come from school children."

In all, the Government wants to buy some 600 acres of land to add to the 2,700 acres it already owns.

About 150 acres surround the old county home. The county, faced with losing money on the operation of the home, plans to sell the land this year to help finance a new home for the aged.

Other battlefield land in which the Government is interested now is owned by private interests.

As one Federal spokesman put it, "We're not anxious to tear down or buy built-up areas like housing developments. We are vitally concerned with acquiring open land on the battlefield before it is developed by commercial interests. You can't blame the county or private land owners for trying to get a good price for their tracts. We'll do our best to put in our bid. Of course—no appropriation, no bidding."

SUPPORT GROWING

Organized and individual support for preventing over-commercialization has been growing in Gettysburg itself.

A leading businessman said of the commercial encroachments:

"Those who cry for full-scale development in the name of progress and prosperity are shortsighted. What would Gettysburg be without the battlefield? A farming town like a thousand others. Look at us now. We've got two banks doing good business. We have a fine college. We've got good accommodation. We're prospering. Why? Because this battlefield draws about three-quarters of a million people a year. This means some $6 million pouring into the area annually. And that's new money. It multiplies. Take away the attraction of the battlefield by jazzing up the thing with bars and amusement parks and housing right in the field—and you're killing the goose that lays the golden eggs."

Says Walter Lane, president of the Travel Council, affiliated with the chamber of commerce:

"We're definitely for preserving the battlefield, and we hope the Government will get the money to buy more land for the public here."

Another businessman, LeRoy Smith, a past president of the council, said: "It makes good sense, esthetically and businesswise, to stop encroachment on the battleground. Naturally, you have to have some commercialism to take care of the thousands of visitors. What we're against is indiscriminate development and building that would spoil this monument to our history."

PRESS FOR RESTORATION

Dr. Harry W. Pfanz, historian at the national park and new president of the Civil War Round Table, said his group has urged 70 Round Tables throughout the country to press for restoration of the slashed appropriation in the Senate. The group also is writing to more than 700 persons who have shown interest in Civil War affairs.

Representative QUIGLEY, meanwhile, announced that Bruce Catton, noted author, and other historians have joined the fray and "we have enlisted the aid of the State Civil War Centennial Commissions."

Most of those interviewed in Gettysburg appeared to be agreed that land purchase by the Government is the best way to save the battlefield.

A number of citizens questioned whether the county commissioners were justified in offering the battle land around the county home for sale.

One professional man said, "I don't see why the commissioners should use the value of the battlefield land as a barter to get money for the county treasury. You'd think they could have raised the money for the home for the aged some other way. Suppose the Government can't offer enough to buy the land. That means, I presume, that any Tom, Dick, or Harry can get the site and put up anything he wants."

Questioned on the land issue, the three commissioners maintained a military secret attitude.

Federal spokesmen, however, pointed out that the county had agreed to hold off on any land auction until the Government has had chance to make its bid.

NEED REVENUE

One county official criticized what he called "this hullaballoo over the battlefield."

"You gotta have revenue," he said.

A prominent resident said, philosophically:

"County officials are hard-headed people. Thear job is to keep county business in the black. So, they're losing money on the county home. So, they try to sell it. They can't stop to figure who might get the land. They're more interested in taxes than history."

Is Gettysburg outliving its place in the heart of the Nation? Has it become a gimmick?

An elderly man from Wisconsin, chatting by the roadside, gave one of many possible answers.

"I was here many years ago and I promised myself I'd be back. So, here I am. It's beautiful. Let's leave it the way it is. Let's not spoil it. Let the dead sleep in peace here."

Gettysburg Revisited

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, may I call attention of the Members, particularly those in the other Chamber, to the following excellent editorial from the Camden (N.J.) Courier-Post. Except for the small typographical error which placed Gettysburg's population increase at 2,100 when it should have been 6,100, I commend it to your reading. The editorial follows:

Many south Jerseyites are familiar with Gettysburg National Park, which covers a small fraction of the area where the great Civil War Battle of Gettysburg was fought 96 years ago.

The park was created in 1895 when a group of Gettysburg citizens donated 600 acres of ground to the Government. Since then it has quadrupled in size. Yet it still covers only a small portion of the 20,000 acres over which the armies of Lee and Meade fought and maneuvered July 1–3, 1863. For patriotic reasons, as well as to accommodate the annually growing throngs of visitors, it should include much more of the hallowed ground where Union forces thrust the Confederates back from their high-water mark, and where Lincoln made one of history's immortal addresses a few months later.

The National Park Service has been wanting to buy up 680 additional acres of ground to add to the park's present 2,773. But it has encountered obstacles from many directions, nearly all of them commercially motivated.

The acquisition would block at least two proposed real estate developments. It would doom the present tawdry string of taverns, gas stations, and motels crowded along historic Emmitsburg Road, the main highway south out of the town of Gettysburg through the battlefield and into Maryland.

Many businessmen of Gettysburg are opposed to further growth of the park. The town is a focal point for tourists, attracting 700,000 to 800,000 a year, and they bring it much business. Their numbers will certainly boom during the next few years in observances of the centennial of the Civil War.

Yet Gettysburg citizens, or many of them, feel that their town needs industry, new residents, and room to grow. They say that the town remains in the 19th century while nearby cities grow.

There is little migration to Gettysburg and little there to keep ambitious youngsters from moving away, they say. Hence, they view enlargement of the battlefield as a barricade to progress.

On the other hand, history lovers think Gettysburg belongs to the entire Nation rather than the 8,100 Pennsylvanians who happen to live there (an increase of only 2,100 in a century). They think the battlefield's important sectors should be preserved as a park and the areas added which the National Park Service wants to add.

The controversy is part of a larger struggle going on in many other areas of the Nation today. It is closely allied to commercial encroachment on another famous Civil War battlefield only 40 miles away, at Antietam, Md., which threatens to destroy all trace of Lee's first invasion of the North. It is akin to the clashes over plans to build steel mills on the unique island sand dunes of Indiana, on the south shore of Lake Michigan, and the struggle over commercialization or preservation of the natural beauties of Cape Cod, Mass.

The House has just passed a bill carrying appropriations for the national parks and forests for the coming year, but barring the $1 million to $1½ million which the National Park Service wants to enlarge the park at Gettysburg. Representative JAMES M. QUIGLEY, Congressman for the district, told his colleagues the money was necessary to prevent desecration of the battlefield by commercialism, but his plea went unheeded.

Desecration has already taken place. As a recent article about Gettysburg pointed out: "A gas station and candy shop mark the line of Confederate General Longstreet's assault on Union troops [Pickett's charge]. The scene of a fierce artillery duel is decorated by an auto graveyard and city garbage dump."

Is America so indifferent to its past and to its future as to allow such things to happen? So much the worse for us if we are.

The Courier-Post deeply regrets the failure of the House to grant the funds that would allow proper preservation of the field on which the greatest battle ever waged in North America was fought.

We sincerely hope that the Senate corrects the mistake the House has made and votes to insert in the appropriation bill the money that is needed to expand Gettysburg National Park as it should be expanded.

We think that most of our readers who have visited Gettysburg will agree.

Dynamic Union Scholar: Harry Van Arsdale, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the New York Times of April 3 there appeared a profile of Harry Van Arsdale, Jr., who heads Local 3 of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers in New York City, and in addition, is president of New York City's recently merged labor council.

Mr. Van Arsdale has a tremendous capacity for work, and has obtained for the members of his own union wage and welfare benefits that are almost without equal. He has accomplished all this, however, without losing the respect and admiration of the men in the industry with whom he deals.

After reading and hearing about so many adverse reports on labor leaders, it is most refreshing to be able to say that New York has a strong union leader of whom we can be justly proud, and who sets an example that could well be followed by other unions and union leaders.

The article follows:

DYNAMIC UNION SCHOLAR: HARRY VAN ARSDALE, JR.

The chief spokesman for 1 million New York unionists is an electrician with a self-powered generator for ideas, energy and enthusiasm.

When he became president of the city's merged labor council 2 months ago, it took him 6 hours of rapid-fire talking to outline his "priority projects" for union and community betterment. "If I seem impatient, it's because I am impatient," Harry Van Arsdale, Jr. told his somewhat dazed associates in the council's executive board. That was after he had listed an activity catalogue that ranged from Brooklyn to Bangkok.

His impatience has paid impressive dividends for the 30,000 members of his own union, Local 3 of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers. Not only are their wages and welfare benefits among the highest of any unionized group, but their cultural opportunities include access to facilities that the country's most richly endowed university would find hard to surpass.

The newest enterprise in Mr. Van Arsdale's ceaseless campaign to expand the local's educational horizons was unveiled yesterday. It took the form of a compulsory course in major world problems for every member of the union's paid organizing staff, including himself.

This emphasis on culture for unionists whose taste in reading matter was once largely confined to comic books and racing form sheets represents as much of a departure from tradition for Mr. Van Arsdale as it does for his rank and file.

UP FROM HELL'S KITCHEN

Born in the Hell's Kitchen district of Manhattan's rowdy West Side 53 years ago, he was as tough as his neighborhood. His formal education ended in his second year of high school. When he became head of local 3 in 1933, his organizing and strike tactics drew greater inspiration from the Marquis of Queensberry than from the Ivy League.

However, responsibility exerted a swift civilizing effect on the hard-fisted young union chief. In a craft long accustomed to featherbedding practices, he laid down the principle that the workers would have to produce more if they wanted fatter pay envelopes.

This philosophy has proved so salutary for both sides that the union's 6,000 members in the skilled divisions now earn $5.40 an hour in total employer payments, and the contractors, far from feeling exploited, register their esteem for Mr. Van Arsdale by hanging his picture on their office walls.

The architect of this transformation is a stocky, gray-haired man with hazel-brown eyes and a bulldog chin. His belt buckle bears the initials "N. B." It used to belong to Naftel Bedsole, a Texas-born business agent of local 3, who died 10 years ago. From him Mr. Van Arsdale got his guiding slogan:

"Give me hills to climb and strength to climb them."

He says he needs 6 hours' sleep each night, but acknowledges he owes himself a lot of unslept hours. His aids are used to find him knocking at their doors at 6 a.m. or telephoning them long after midnight.

When he is in a real hurry, which is most of the time, he gets around town on the back seat of a motor scooter driven by the editor of the union paper, Arnold Beichman.

LIVES PLAINLY

The fancy living standards that have become fashionable among some top unionists have little appeal for him. His salary is $200 a week and he and all the union's business representatives have to buy their own cars.

He lives in the frame house in Ozone Park, Queens, that he and his father built with their own hands just after his marriage 35 years ago.

He has never lost his certainty that it is "the little fellow down below" who makes a union.

"This is not the Army, not the Navy," he has a way of saying. "You can't tell the people what to do. You have to build a union like a building, a brick at a time, one on top of another. There is no easy way."

He has two sons, both college graduates, and both members of local 3, and two daughters, plus seven grandchildren.

Good Hearing Is as Essential as Good Sight for Automobile Driving

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 13, 1959

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, no one can drive an automobile in any State or Territory of the United States who suffers from any serious type of vision impairment. Thanks to the American Safety Council all motor vehicle bureaus in every State and Territory have made it mandatory that all applicants for operators' licenses submit to rigorous sight tests. Where it is found that the applicant suffers from any type of visual difficulties of a nature which might impair his own or the safety of others, he is obliged to wear corrective lenses and his need of such lenses while operating a motor vehicle is clearly imprinted upon the face of each such license.

However, up to now nothing has been done about taking into account the important fact that there are some 15 million or more Americans who suffer from hearing defects of a minor or major nature. There is no hearing test required of anyone seeking an operator's license nor is any cognizance given to applicants suffering from such deficiencies. This, in spite of the fact that deficient hearing, equally as much as poor eyesight, can endanger lives and property.

Of some 15 million Americans suffering from impaired hearing, only about 1 million use hearing aids as a corrective measure. This is due mainly to two things: first, many hard-of-hearing persons of all ages are totally unaware of such defects, and second, many who do know of it refuse to wear hearing aids because the majority of such instruments are cumbersome and conspicuous.

The reluctance of the hard-of-hearing to wear a hearing aid which draws attention to their affliction is understandable. But it does not alter the fact that a hard-of-hearing person driving an automobile can endanger lives and property.

Three men in the United States are currently doing something about this situation. They have petitioned the National Safety Council to help. They are also appealing to the legislators of every State in the Union to enact laws requiring motor vehicle bureaus to take legal steps to prevent persons with poor hearing from operating a motor vehicle unless they use an adequate hearing aid.

These men are Paul B. H. Smith, who has devoted his life to audiology and is president of one of the Nation's foremost hearing aid manufacturing companies; Dr. James A. DePew, Jr., chief audiologist of the world famous New York Eye and Ear Infirmary; and William R. Hutchins, electronics engineer, presently a key figure in the U.S. guided missiles program.

These three men are requesting that all motor vehicle bureaus require a hearing test of every applicant for a driver's license just as they now require a vision test.

Dr. DePew and Mr. Hutchins are inventors of a drastically sensitive audiometer which can accurately measure the extent of human hearing in fractions of a second.

To date, thousands of students in schools of every level throughout the Nation who had previously been labeled by their teachers as backward, indifferent, or below normal intellectually, have been subjected to audiometer tests. In a great number of cases, it was discovered that theses boys and girls were neither poor scholars nor indifferent ones, but victims of some hearing impairment. Steps were at once undertaken to provide them with corrective materiel and when this was accomplished their classroom interests became enlivened and their marks shot up, equally as good as their fellow students.

Because so many sufferers from deafness are unaware of their affliction, Dr. DePew, Paul B. H. Smith, and Mr. Hutchins are waging this campaign to make it mandatory that a hearing test be required for all applicants for drivers' licenses.

Inspired by this campaign, hundreds of leading industrial firms are arranging for their own workers in plants, offices, and factories to take audiometer tests as a measure of safety as well as to increase worker efficiency where it is discovered that employees suffer from hearing deficiencies.

In some cities across the Nation, steps are being taken to offer free audiometer tests under civic sponsorship via mobile audiology laboratories.

In the case of those who need a hearing aid, but do not want to use one because of vanity or sensitivity, hearing aids are being made available which are no longer visual to others. These can be adriotly concealed as they no longer require wires or a volume control box because they are manufactured on transistor principles.

The people of the United States are indebted to Dr. James A. DePew, Jr., Engineer William R. Hutchins, and Paul

B. H. Smith for their long and now successful fight to bring a normal way of life to persons suffering from hearing deficiencies; to safeguard life and property by campaigning for legislation which will require a hearing test for appliancts for drivers' licenses; and for directing the paths of thousands of children who are hard-of-hearing into progressive, useful, and productive channels.

Keeping the Peace in Berlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, with nine of my colleagues in the House of Representatives, Congressmen Carter, Clark, Meyer, Clement Miller, Porter, Reuss, George Rhodes, Byron Johnson, Rivers, and six colleagues in the British Parliament, Attlee, Davies, Foster, Henderson, Pitman, and Reeves, I have joined in a proposal which I believe is quite suggestive. Its purpose is not to foreclose thought on the Berlin issue but to open possible ways that the United Nations and the United Nations police force could be used in keeping the peace.

It should not be forgotten that the United Nations was formed to keep the peace and to help in the settlement of international disputes. This is the aim of the United Nations and we must afford it an opportunity to function in accordance with the aim that it was assigned by the sovereign states of this world.

The proposal, as released jointly on Thursday, April 9, is as follows:

1. We believe that the problem of Berlin offers another opportunity for utilizing the U.N. through the establishment of a U.N. police force.

2. A first step would be the appointment of a U.N. commander for the present Allied Kommandatura. This would require the consent of the U.S.S.R., which should be invited to resume its membership of the Kommandatura.

3. We propose that the whole of Berlin should come under U.N. responsibility and this would involve removal of the seat of government of the East German Government away from Pankow—to somewhere outside the confines of Berlin.

4. A further stage would be the gradual replacement of the units of the four occupying powers, as the new U.N. force built up around the figure of the U.N. commander. The transfer of power to U.N. could thus be a gradual process, in which all parties could see how the transfer was progressing before proceeding to the next step.

5. We consider that the U.N. force could be more effective if it is commanded and paid, and directly and individually recruited, by the U.N. from a wide range of nations. If this is not practicable, then it could, as in UNEF, be composed of national contingents, drawn from countries other than the occupying powers. In the view of the group, the system of national contingents of seconded personnel adopted in UNEF, NATO, and Warsaw Pact, have shown that there is no real integration by that method, and that national sovereignty—the right to be judge and jury in your own cause—is still unimpaired.

6. The financial requirements for the establishment and maintenance of the proposed police force should be guaranteed for at least 5 years in advance.

7. We believe the opportunity offered by Berlin for a practical experiment in building up a force acceptable to both NATO and Warsaw Pact countries in a location strategically placed between the two camps, could be not only immensely valuable as a solution for the Berlin problem but also as a contribution to the eventual coming together of East and West Germany.

The idea of use of the United Nations Police Force is not a new one. The United States and this Congress has always supported the use of a U.N. Police Force either in the form of an observer group or as an actual police force. In the past, we have taken the initiative in formulating various plans that would have the effect of fostering such developments. For example, in the fall of 1958, the United States proposed to the General Assembly, the creation of a United Nations Peace Force. President Eisenhower stated to the General Assembly on August 13, 1958, the following:

The countries of this area (the Middle East) should also be freed from armed pressure and infiltration coming across their borders. When such interference threatens, they should be able to get from the United Nations prompt and effective action to help safeguard their independence. This requires that adequate machinery be available to make the United Nations presence manifest in the area of trouble.

Therefore I believe that this Assembly should take action looking toward the creation of a standby United Nations Peace Force. The need for such a force is being clearly demonstrated by recent events involving imminent danger to the integrity of two of our members.

I understand that this subject is to be discussed at the 13th General Assembly and that our distinguished Secretary-General has taken an initiative in this matter. Recent events clearly demonstrate that this is a matter for urgent and positive action.

Elaborating on the President's proposal, Secretary of State Dulles outlined the possible structure of such force to the Assembly on September 18, 1958:

The United States suggests the following points for consideration:

1. We conceive of the peace force not as a combat force, but rather as a group that would observe and patrol, and by its very presence make visible the interest of the world community in the maintenance of tranquility. Also, we believe that members other than the permanent members of the Security Council can most usefully contribute personnel.

2. A small planning staff might be created within the Secretariat to develop standby plans for calling into being, deploying and supporting such a peace force.

3. The planning staff could develop concrete arrangements so that a United Nations decisions to employ such a peace force could be promptly implemented.

4. The costs of the standby arrangements should be kept small and that should be possible if there is no force-in-being to be maintained.

These arrangements should make it possible to bring together on short notice a United Nations group to meet a need which has become evident over recent years. That would be an important bulwark of the pacific settlement objectives of the charter.

Just before the U.N. Assembly met, the Congress had made known its support of such an initiative by the adoption on August 22 of a concurrent resolution to the effect that:

It is the sense of Congress that consideration should immediately be given by the General Assembly of the United Nations to the development within its permanent structure of such organization and procedures as will enable the United Nations promptly to employ suitable United Nations forces for such purposes as observation and patrol in situations that threaten international peace and security.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee Report No. 1884, 85th Congress on its resolution emphasized that:

The main objective of the committee in recommending the adoption of the resolution is to underline the urgency of continuing to work on the problem of devising a military type of force which will be helpful in achieving the objectives to which members of the United Nations have subscribed.

House Committee on Foreign Affairs Report, No. 2581, 85th Congress, stated that:

The resolution reflects the desire of the Congress that the United States delegation to the United Nations support action necessary to attain the desired objective * * *.

Spokesmen for the Department of State have repeatedly emphasized United States interests in the creation of a standby force for use in troubled areas. The Assistant Secretary of State for International Organizations Affairs Francis O. Wilcox outlined the longstanding policy of the United States of strengthening "the capacity of the United Nations to carry out its important responsibilities under the charter" in testimony before the House Foreign Affairs Committee on July 25, 1958.

The United States also has given, and continues to give, full support to the United Nations Emergency Force in the Middle East. At the time this force was created, Secretary Dulles told the General Assembly that both he and President Eisenhower shared the view that the Secretary-General should be authorized to make arrangements for a U.N. force large enough to keep the borders at peace while a political settlement was being worked out. As House Resolution 367 indicates, this force did make an important contribution to international peace and stability in the Middle East. The UNEF experience has shown clearly how, under certain circumstances, such a force can serve an extremely useful purpose. For many months the frontiers between Egypt and Israel have been free from the kind of hostile incursions which formerly troubled the area.

The Department of State shares the view of this committee that a similar force, established on a permanent basis, could be an important instrument for observing and reporting, and for assisting in the maintenance of international peace and security. You will have noted, in connection with the current Middle East crisis, that our Government supported the establishment of the United Nations observer group in Lebanon. We also presented a resolution to the Security Council on July 17 requesting that the

Secretary-General consult member states with a view to making arrangements for additional measures, including contingents, to protect Lebanese integrity and independence and insure against illegal infiltration of personnel or arms into Lebanon. Unfortunately this resolution was vetoed by the Soviet Union.

I recall these examples, which I know are familiar to all of you, in order to emphasize the positive attitude of the U.S. Government toward the creation of United Nations forces in order to meet a variety of difficult situations. The State Department is also favorably inclined toward making more permanent arrangements for some type of U.N. force.

Not only have the Congress and the executive department gone on record repeatedly in favor of a U.N. force, but there are many indications of general public approval of such a force. I have certainly found this to be true in my district.

The American Institute of Public Opinion, directed by George Gallup, has frequently polled the public on its views regarding a U.N. force—with overwhelming support for such a force:

ONE HUNDRED THOUSAND STANDING ARMY FOR U.N. BACKED IN POLL—TWO OUT OF THREE IN SURVEY FAVOR FORCE SUFFICIENT TO PUT OUT BRUSH FIRE

(By George Gallup, director, American Institute of Public Opinion)

PRINCETON, N.J., March 11.—American public opinion is solidly in favor of a standing United Nations army large enough to deal with any brush-fire wars around the globe.

Such a proposal, which some observers see as revolutionizing present military planning, is supported by two out of three adults questioned in the latest institute survey.

As regards the actual size of such a permanent U.N. emergency force, the vote is 2 to 1 that it should be increased to at least 100,000 men. The present U.N. emergency force serving along the Isreali-Egyptian border is considerably smaller in number.

SUPPORTED SINCE AIRLIFT

Actually, Americans have supported the general idea of such a force for 10 years now. It was in the spring of 1948—at the height of the Berlin airlift—that the institute first recorded a substantial international police force.

Observers claim that the establishment of such an international army might well mean a substantial reduction in the number of troops maintained by each nation at present—including the United States—to take care of such brush-fire conflicts as the Korean war.

In the most recent survey, the question was posed as follows:

"A proposal has been made to build up the United Nations emergency force to a size great enough to deal with brush-fire or small wars throughout the world. Does this sound like a good idea or a poor one to you?"

The vote was as follows: Good idea, 66 percent; poor idea, 15 percent, and no opinion, 19 percent.

The second question dealt with the size of such an international force:

"The present number of men in the U.N. emergency force is 10,000. Would you like to see it built into an army of at least 100,000 or more?"

The result was: Yes, 51 percent; no, 26 percent; and no opinion, 23 percent.

Although both proposals have the support of the rank-and-file members of both political parties, analysis reveals that they have somewhat more appeal to Democratic voters than to Republicans.

FOR PERMANENT FORCES

After 4 months of duty along the Israeli-Egyptian border by the emergency force, a survey in April of last year found the vote more than 2-to-1 that the U.N. should have its own permanent forces, including troops from the United States, which it could use to enforce U.N. decisions.

The present U.N. emergency force was proposed to the U.N. General Assembly by Canada's Lester B. Pearson who was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1957.

Mr. Speaker, the people, the Congress, and the Executive have shown their support for a U.N. peace force. Its effectiveness has already been shown. I am sure that its effectiveness could be shown again in Berlin. With an interim stabilization of the area by the U.N. peace force negotiators will be better able to arrive at a general settlement in Western Europe that would alleviate tensions without destroying our interests in Western and Eastern Europe.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer, plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va.*
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.* 6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind.* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J.*
Albert, Carl, *Okla.* 5115 Allen Terrace
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C.*
Alford, Dale, *Ark.*
Alger, Bruce, *Tex.*
Allen, Leo E., *Ill.* University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn.* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Anderson, LeRoy H., *Mont.* 911 Beverly Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Andrews, George W., *Ala.* 3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y.*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill.* 4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C.*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo.* Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J.* 113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans.*
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*
Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va.*
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn.*
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif.*
Barden, Graham A., *N. C.* 2601 Woodley Pl.
Baring, Walter S., *Nev.*
Barr, Joseph W., *Ind.* Tulip Lane and Glen Mill Rd., Rockville Md.
Barrett, William A., *Pa.*
Barry, Robert R., *N. Y.*
Bass, Perkins, *N. H.*
Bass, Ross, *Tenn.*
Bates, William H., *Mass.*
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y.*
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex.*
Belcher, Page, *Okla.*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla.* 1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich.* 3718 Cardiff Rd., Chevy Chase, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich.*
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak.* 118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn.*
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, (Mrs.), *Ga.*
Boggs, Hale, *La.*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass.*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo.* 3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.* 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C.* Calvert-Woodley
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y.*
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio.* 4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowles, Chester, *Conn.*
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala.* The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill.*
Brademas, John, *Ind.*
Bray, William G., *Ind.*
Breeding, J. Floyd, *Kans.*
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md.*
Brock, Lawrence, *Nebr.*
Brooks, Jack, *Tex.*
Brooks, Overton, *La.* 4413 46th St.
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*
Brown, Charles H., *Mo.* 3723 N. Oakland St., Arlington, Va.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio.* Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga.* Boston House
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va.*
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y.*
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*
Burdick, Quentin, *N. Dak.*
Burke, Frank W., *Ky.*
Burke, James A., *Mass.*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex.* 2737 Devonshire Pl.
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa.*
Byrne, James A., *Pa.*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis.* 1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Cahill, William T., *N. J.*
Canfield, Gordon, *N. J.*
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo.*
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo.*
Carter, Steven V., *Iowa*
Casey, Bob, *Tex.*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich.*
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y.* The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky.*
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo.*
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill.* 1713 House Office Building
Church, Marguerite Stitt (Mrs.), *Ill.* 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa.* 3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Coad, Merwin, *Iowa*
Coffin, Frank M., *Maine*
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif.* 2820 Ordway St.
Collier, Harold R., *Ill.*
Colmer, William M., *Miss.*
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass.*
Cook, Robert E., *Ohio*
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C.* 2480 16th St.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa.*
Cramer, William C., *Fla.* 6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr.* 4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa.*
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass.* 3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo.*
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn.*
Dague, Paul B., *Pa.*
Daniels, Dominick V., *N. J.*
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn.* 4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, James C., *Ga.*
Dawson, William L., *Ill.*
Delaney, James J., *N. Y.*
Dent, John H., *Pa.*
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind.*
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y.*
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill.*
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich.*
Dingell, John D., *Mich.*
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah.* 1817 N. Quinn St., Arlington, Va.
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y.*
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass.*
Dooley, Edwin B., *N. Y.*
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y.*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C.*
Dowdy, John, *Tex.*
Downing, Thomas N., *Va.*
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif.* 3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N. Y.*
Durham, Carl T., *N. C.* The Lee House
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N. J.*
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla.*
Elliott, Carl, *Ala.*
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn.*
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn.* 5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md.*
Farbstein, Leonard, *N. Y.*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla.*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa.* 3725 Macomb St.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y.*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex.* Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa.* The Congressional
Flynn, Gerald T., *Wis.*
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga.*
Fogarty, John E., *R. I.* 1133 House Office Building
Foley, John R., *Md.*
Forand, Aime J., *R. I.* 4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich.* 514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga.*
Fountain, L. H., *N. C.* The Westchester
Frazier, James B., Jr., *Tenn.* Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J.* 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md.*
Fulton, James G., *Pa.*
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N. J.*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md.*
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va.*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark.* 6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa.*
George, Newell A., *Kans.*
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn.*
Glenn, Milton W., *N. J.* Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Granahan, Kathryn E. (Mrs.), *Pa.*
Grant, George M., *Ala.* 4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill.*
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg.*
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa.*
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich.*
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa.*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif.*
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif.*
Haley, James A., *Fla.*
Hall, David M., *N. C.*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind.* 4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N. Y.*
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va.*
Hargis, Denver D., *Kans.*
Harmon, Randall S., *Ind.*
Harris, Oren, *Ark.* 1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va.*
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio.* 1323 Barger Drive, Falls Church, Va.
Healey, James C., *N. Y.*
Hébert, F. Edward, *La.* 26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va.*
Hemphill, Robert W., *S. C.*
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla.*
Hess, William E., *Ohio*
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif.*
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa.* 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich.* 3018 M St. SE.
Hoffman, Elmer J., *Ill.*
Hogan, Earl, *Ind.* 5211 Flanders Ave., Garrett Pk., Kensington, Md.
Holifield, Chet, *Calif.*
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa.*
Holt, Joe, *Calif.*
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y.*
Horan, Walt, *Wash.*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif.*
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala.*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo.*
Ikard, Frank, *Tex.*
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn.* The Coronet
Jackson, Donald L., *Calif.*
Jarman, John, *Okla.*
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va.*
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa.* 2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich.*
Johnson, Byron L., *Colo.*
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif.*
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis.*
Johnson, Thomas F., *Md.*
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C.*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo.* 1111 Army Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala.*
Judd, Walter H., *Minn.* 3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo.*
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn.*
Kasem, George A., *Calif.*
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa.* Sheraton-Park
Kee, Elizabeth (Mrs.), *W. Va.*
Keith, Hastings, *Mass.*
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N. Y.*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y.* The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y.*
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex.* 3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex.* 4848 Upton St.
King, Cecil R., *Calif.*
King, David S., *Utah*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*
Kitchin, A. Paul, *N. C.*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill.*
Knox, Victor A., *Mich.*
Kowalski, Frank, *Conn.*
Lafore, John A., Jr., *Pa.*
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis.*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga.*

Appendix

Moscow's Cold War Air Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, in recent weeks the Russian-provoked crisis over Berlin has again focused the attention of the West on that island of democracy behind the Iron Curtain. Though 10 years have already passed since the blockade of Berlin, we are reminded of the hastily organized but highly successful Berlin airlift. From the end of June 1948, to the 12th of May 1949, when the blockade was lifted, more than 2 million tons of foodstuff, coal, and other goods were airlifted into West Berlin in approximately 200,000 flights.

It was a magnificent achievement by the men and the planes of the immediate postwar era—before the advent of the jet age, when there was no question of America's air supremacy over Soviet Russia.

Today, however, we are faced with a new cold-war threat from Russia. Quite apart from their military aspirations, we see the Soviets using the jet plane as an economic and propaganda weapon in the growing commercial battle for jet age supremacy.

My distinguished colleague, Senator BARTLETT, of Alaska, and a member of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, recently spoke of this threat in a speech before the Queens County Committee of the American Legion, in Jamaica, N.Y. I ask unanimous consent that his well-documented talk on "Moscow's Cold War Air Force" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOSCOW'S COLD WAR AIR FORCE

For the past several years, our newspapers and our radio and television broadcasts have carried in great detail the latest developments in the international arms race between our Nation and the U.S.S.R.

In recent months, this struggle for world supremacy has even been carried beyond the limits of our atmosphere into the void of space.

Aside from the military significance of these fantastic developments, the news of about them is in itself important. The word of progress on the part of either great competitor reaches every enlightened corner of the world. Each success or failure affects the prestige of the nation concerned, and prestige is an extremely important factor in influencing the peoples of the world who waver between espousal of the democratic or the communistic way of life.

To you opinion leaders, who I am sure have followed closely each of these new developments in defense, I can offer nothing new on the subject of our defense posture vis-a-vis the Soviet Union. Instead I would like to talk tonight about another area of competition between the United States and the Soviets. It is one which has not been so widely publicized, but one which rivals de-defense progress in the international prestige battle. It is also highly important to the relative economic status of the two nations.

This is the field of civil air transportation, an area in which I have a dual interest both as member of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, which studies closely our national air commerce, and as a representative of the people of the State of Alaska.

We are figuratively fighting a cold war with our Russian competitors in this field of commercial air transportation, and I regret to report that it is one more area where, at the moment, we are behind them.

Our American jets started actual airline flying just 5 months ago, but the Soviets have been carrying passengers in jet airliners for almost 3 years. Only one American airline is flying our jets beyond our own borders. Its Boeing planes have made limited appearances in four European capitals, and only since last October.

The Russian jets, on the other hand have been flying to a great many European cities for more than 2 years and they are also flying regularly to the Middle East and to Asia. The Soviets are planning further extension of their jet routes to Africa and the Far East, in particular to Japan.

In addition, they are building new and even more modern airliners and will in a very short time have in service a giant prop-jet passenger plane which can carry 170 passengers 5,000 miles nonstop at a speed about equal to that of our jets, although we can match neither that range nor passenger capacity. This massive airplane has an elevator, a sky-restaurant which can seat 48 and even a motion picture theater.

The Soviets have stated publicly that they are planning a large-scale expansion of their civil air operations, in terms of added aircraft and a great extension of their already tremendous air route system. They are, of course, less interested in developing air commerce beyond their boundaries, but they are equally interested in parading their aircraft showpieces before the peoples of other nations for prestige purposes.

They are, for instance, currently negotiating for landing rights in Ghana, the newly independent republic in Africa. Whether the traffic potential justifies such a route is a moot point, but unquestionably the Soviet Union can chalk up some prestige points by showing off their jets to this Nation which has not yet seen an American jet transport. The Soviets are shrewdly aware of the propaganda value of such a handsome piece of modern machinery as a jet airplane, and they are masters at exploiting it.

Let me tell you something about the Soviet civil air organization which is conducting this facet of the cold war. It is called Aeroflot, or Air Fleet. It is considerably more than an airline as we know airlines. It is in effect a cold war civil aviation force and its operating heads are two marshals of the Red air force.

Aeroflot embraces all aviation in the Soviet Union that is not military. It operates a large scale air ambulance service, which flies doctors to isolated areas and evacuates emergency cases to hospitals.

It operates an agricultural service for aerial crop dusting and seeding, pest control in swamplands, geologic surveys, and fire control.

It has its own very modern weather service.

It provides other miscellaneous services, which show that the Soviets are fully aware of the potential of aviation in their national economy. For instance, Aeroflot operates helicopters and aircraft in conjunction with the Russian fishing fleets. These planes fly out ahead of the fishing boats in search of schools of fish and radio back the best locations.

Aeroflot also has airborne cowboys, who herd cattle in the central plains by light aircraft or helicopter. From their aerial lookout posts, the "coyboys" spot the best grazing grounds for the herds, then push the cattle in those directions by "buzzing" them with the airplanes.

These are, of course, internal services which are not of particular relevance in the cold war. I mention them because I feel they illustrate how energetically the Soviets exploit all their resources to better their economy, and their overall economic status is very important to us, since their leaders have frequently challenged us to do battle in this area, rather than with weapons.

The transport operations of Aeroflot are of more importance, both from the economic and diplomatic standpoints.

A few months ago, the Soviets issued a massive document with the title "Targets for the Soviet Economy." It was a résumé of economic and production goals of the 7-year plan for 1959 through 1965.

Newsweek magazine called this report "the most comprehensive blueprint ever compiled for the destruction of capitalism and the overthrow of the United States in a global economic war."

Premier Khrushchev stated that the 7-year plan called for a sixfold increase in air transportation. Air Chief Marshal Pavel Zhigarev, who heads Aeroflot, added some of the details of the proposed economic penetration in the field of aviation. They included:

An increase of almost one-third annually in the number of passengers carried and the number of ton miles flown;

A tremendous construction and expansion program for air facilities on the ground, with 90 major airports scheduled for construction or rebuilding and annual expenditures for improvement of service of three times what they are today;

Addition of thousands of miles of new routes, a great portion of this expansion to come outside the Soviet Union.

The marshal predicted that by 1964 the annual traffic increase would be as great as the total traffic in 1958. This means an expansion of truly staggering proportions in Soviet civil air operations—and we have learned in the last year or so that they are not given to idle boasting.

To handle this traffic growth, the Soviet aircraft industry is turning out numbers of modern turbine aircraft. This reequipment program started long before the formation of the new 7-year economic campaign. Although the Soviets do not provide too many details, it appears that their first jet transport was flying in 1955.

Named the Tupolev 104 after its designer, this plane was first shown to the Western

World when it made a surprise visit to London in March 1956. It is a 70-passenger plane with speed only slightly less than that of our new jets.

The Russians used a short-cut approach to developing this jet, by using the basic design of a tested bomber. In so doing, they skipped the intermediate step of development—the four-engine propeller-driven transport.

The Tupolev 104 was placed in scheduled service in September of 1956, when our first jet was still in an early test stage. For the following 2 years, the Soviets had the only airline jet service.

During that period, the Soviets developed and started flying three other turbine planes of the propjet variety.

Today, they are readying for service two much more impressive aircraft.

One is the Tupolev 110, a big brother to the Tupolev 104. It has four jet engines instead of the earlier version's two and can carry 100 passengers.

The giant showpiece I mentioned earlier is the Tupolev 114, also called the Roossia. It is a propjet, with four of the largest turboprop engines ever built anywhere. In addition to the extras such as the elevators and the restaurant, it has its own telephone system and private cabins for deluxe service.

This fleet of modern planes will make ideal propaganda equipment for the Reds, for each plane is a symbol of the technological capacity of the building nation.

Now, although we can do nothing about the time we have lost in this area of the prestigial battlefront, our own situation is looking up. We already have in airline service three turbine types of aircraft, the Boeings I spoke of and two propjets built by Lockheed and Fairchild.

Two more jet transports, built by Douglas and Convair, are now being test flown. They will be in airline service this year and in 1960.

Our American turbine planes are being built by the hundreds and they are scheduled for service all over the world. Under the banners of our own American-flag carriers, they will be flying into a great many foreign cities in a year or two. In addition, these American-built planes have been ordered by almost 40 foreign airlines.

Although we know that the Soviets have made some effort to interest airlines outside their boundaries in their aircraft, they have as yet made no penetration.

There is another plus on our side of the ledger. In general, our turbine planes are much bigger and faster than their Russian counterparts, with the single exception of the king-size Roossia. As symbols of American industrial capacity, they will stand up well in comparison with Soviet airline equipment.

From the economic standpoint, our airplanes are attractive to foreign buyers because they are designed and built with an eye toward making a profit for the operator. The Soviets, in their haste to develop new transports, were not able to achieve economy of operation. Their Tupolev 104, for instance, is a fuel gobbler and carries only slightly more than half as many passengers as our Boeing 707.

In their later planes, however, it appears that they have concentrated on this factor, and we cannot overlook the fact that they may become competitors for aircraft sales.

Our manufacturers of airliners employ hundreds of thousands of people and have more than 5,000 small companies supplying parts and equipment. This represents a substantial portion of our national economy and we must watch closely any Soviet attempt to influence it.

So, after a late start, we are catching up and may surpass the Soviets in this area of economic and aero-diplomatic competition. What is of concern is the next step.

Remember, the economic health of our airlines dictates the speed at which we can put new aircraft in service. These planes are not developed and bought by the Government, as is the case in the Soviet Union.

It took our airlines a long period of gradual transition from two-engine to four-engine propeller planes before they were ready for jets. They had to build up passenger volume over many years before they could afford these planes, which cost more than $5 million each.

The Soviets were able to leapfrog the intermediate steps because development and operating costs of the planes were not a factor under communistic economy.

The next step is the passenger-carrying transport which flies faster than sound, probably two or three times as fast, or between 1,300 and 2,000 miles per hour.

Fantastic as that might seem, our engineers say that we have the technological capacity to start work on such planes right now. We do not, however, have the economic capacity.

Our airlines are investing close to $3 billion in these new jets. Obviously, it will take a long period of time to pay for these aircraft, and another period before the airlines can accrue the necessary backlog to think of even faster equipment. There are so many problems connected with the introduction of our current jets, airline officials don't even want to think of tomorrow.

The Soviets are hampered by no such economic restrictions. When the designers say that such planes can be built, more than likely they will get the government go-ahead.

I need not dwell on the economic and propaganda effect of such a development. The effect on the impressionable layman, to whom our current jets are fantastic machines, would be almost as devastating to our national prestige as was the first sputnik.

In the interim, our American airlines with their jets will be carrying abroad demonstrations of the type of product a free economy can produce. They cannot fail to impress. As American civil cold war ambassadors, these free enterprise airlines with their free-enterprise planes deserve all the support we can give them.

The High Courage and Valor of the Seven Young Americans Who Will Probe the Realm of Outer Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, it has become almost trite to despair of America's youth, to deplore widespread juvenile delinquency, to yearn for the good old days.

I have never despaired of our young people. I think they measure up splendidly—perhaps better than we did in our own days of youth.

In the New York Times of April 12, 1959, the able journalist, Mr. James Reston, has written an inspiring column in tribute to the seven youthful Americans who will be our first spacemen.

Imagine the scope of this adventure—off into the wild blue yonder, far beyond the limit of earth's atmosphere. Surely such an exploit compares in daring and magnitude with that of Captains Lewis and Clark probing the wilderness of the Rockies and the Oregon country, with that of Peary challenging the North Pole, and Scott and Shackleton and Amundsen facing the South Pole, with that of Lindbergh crossing the Atlantic, and Admiral Byrd off on his epic flights.

Mr. Reston's imaginative article assures us that American youth is all right, and with him I agree wholeheartedly. After all, these seven spacemen are all married, they are between the ages of 32 and 37, and they are ready to risk their lives on the ultimate frontier—the frontier of distant outer space. Does this add up to decadent youth? In my estimation, it adds up to high courage and admirable valor.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the article from the New York Times of April 12, by James Reston, entitled "The Sky's No Longer the Limit."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SKY'S NO LONGER THE LIMIT

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, April 11.—Those gloomy students of the American character who think we've lost the hop on our fast ball should have been around here this week when seven young American men dropped into Washington on their way to outer space.

Somehow they had all managed to survive the imagined terrors of our affluent society, our waist-high culture, our hidden persuaders, power elite, and organization men; and here they were, aged 32 to 37 and all married, in the last stages of training for the first manned rocket flights into space.

We have had a lot of fancy visitors around here this year making the best speeches money can buy, but nobody as exciting as these intelligent, plain-speaking, smalltown fliers.

What made them so exciting was not that they said anything new but that they said all the old things with such fierce conviction. They talked of the heavens the way the old explorers talked of the unknown seas. They wanted to see what was "on the other side." They spoke of duty and faith and country like Walt Whitman's pioneers.

PERSONAL TESTIMONY

Capt. Donald Kent Slayton, Air Force: "My hometown is Sparta, Wis. My age is 35. I feel that this is the future of not only my country but the world. We have gone about as far as we can on this globe and we have to start looking around a bit."

Capt. Virgil Ivan Grissom, Air Force: "I am Virgil I. Grissom, from Mitchell, Ind. I'm 33. My career has been serving my country, and here is another opportunity where they need my talents. I'm just grateful for the opportunity."

Col. John Herschel Glenn, Jr.: "I am John Glenn from New Concord, Ohio. I'm the lonesome marine in this outfit. I'm 37. In answer to this same question [Why did you volunteer for space experiments?] I said, jokingly of course, that I got in on this project because it probably would be the nearest to Heaven I'll ever get and I wanted to make the most of it."

"My feelings are that * * * it's like the Wright brothers, who stood at Kitty Hawk about 50 years ago with Orville and Wilbur pitching a coin to see who was going to shove the other one off the hill."

Lt. Malcolm Scott Carpenter, 32, Boulder, Colo., a Navy pilot, said "it is a chance to

serve the country in a noble cause." Another Navy flier, Lt. Comdr. Walter Marty Schirra, Jr., of Hackensack, N.J., said he was just carrying on the tradition of his father, who was one of the very early airplane pilots.

Navy Comdr. Alan Bartlett Shepard, Jr., 35, of East Derry, N.H., said he was convinced we were on the threshold of space travel and wanted to be in on it, and Capt. Leroy Gordon Cooper, Jr., 32, of Carbondale, Colo., added: "I am a career officer, career pilot, and this is something new and very interesting."

All have children, all expressed the hope that they'd be shot into space, all said their wives had agreed to let them volunteer, all confessed to a religious conviction that they would come back.

Colonel Glenn, the marine from New Concord, Ohio, put it this way: "I was brought up believing that you are placed on earth here more or less on a sort of 50-50 proposition, and this is what I still believe. I think there is a power greater than I am that will certainly see that I'm taken care of if I do my part of the bargain."

DREAMERS AND CHANCE TAKERS

This is a pretty cynical town, highly allergic to corn, but nobody went away from these young men scoffing at their courage and idealism.

Under the responsibilities of world affairs, officials here have become highly conscious of the limitations of power and policy, and were almost startled to hear, not only the ancient American cry that "the sky's the limit," but that it is just the beginning.

Maybe the sociologists are right about the pawky conformity of our big-town, big-business, big-union society, but there are a lot of dreamers and chance takers left.

Last year there were 150,268 new business incorporations in the United States—the largest number in our history. In the heyday of the 1929 boom, before the advent of the welfare state, there were 3,029,000 individual businesses in the country; now there are 4,323,000; so there must be some steam in the old boiler yet.

Address by the Honorable Fred A. Seaton, Secretary of the Interior, at Gettysburg College Convocation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, the following is a very outstanding address given by the Honorable Fred A. Seaton, Secretary of the Interior, Gettysburg College convocation, Gettysburg, Pa., Friday, April 3, 1959.

I highly recommend that each Member of Congress read Mr. Seaton's remarks:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE FRED A. SEATON, SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR, GETTYSBURG COLLEGE CONVOCATION, GETTYSBURG, PA., APRIL 3, 1959

It is a rare honor for me to speak tonight of the liberal arts, of education, and of history here at Gettysburg—the scene of a historic battle between the North and the South, the site of an immortal address, and the home of a great President of the United States.

What more fitting place can there be to do this, than here in the chapel of a college, founded 127 years ago—Gettysburg College—whose very name encompasses that battle, the presidential speech of dedication and the home address of President Eisenhower?

More than a century ago Daniel Webster said of his beloved Dartmouth College, up in the New Hampshire wilderness, "It is little, yet there are those who love it."

How fortunate we are that, by and large, liberal arts colleges all over the United States still enjoy such loyalty from their trustees, alumni, other supporters, and from their undergraduates.

That is not to say the future of independent colleges and universities is assured. There are many people, and they include some prominent names in education, who fear that the days of many small, independent colleges are numbered.

They see ahead an ascending curve of costs and of enrollments which give them doubt that tuition fees and private gifts can be increased enough to insure financial solvency. In short, they believe altogether too many of the Nation's independent educational institutions either will be eventually forced to close their doors, thus losing their very existence, or necessarily turn to State or Federal Governments for money, thus losing their independence.

I do not concur in such a prophecy. On the contrary, I believe there are valid reasons why these sincere and well-meant doubters will prove to be wrong.

For an example, in February the Council for Financial Aid to Education reported that nongovernmental contributions to educational and general income of American colleges and universities had risen from a World War II level of 41 percent to a current level of 51 percent of the total. In other words, despite massive increases in Federal grants for research, nongovernmental sources of financial aid had produced so much more as to take the lead.

It is important to note there is no apparent reason to question in the foreseeable future a continuance of this rising curve of support.

This is welcome encouragement to all believers, as I am emphatically am, in the national necessity of keeping one sector of American higher education, and a large and most influential sector, vigorously independent of any form of governmental direction.

Admittedly, an encouragement in itself is not an automatic guarantee, and we must confess much remains to be done to make it so.

For one thing, the council estimates that in just a decade, American colleges of whatever description will need for all purposes, for current operations, plant, and equipment, and endowment, about $9 billion a year, or twice the amount they now have.

Right there, some will say: "How can you expect gifts, tuition, and fees to go up enough to do the job while governmental support of all kinds goes up as well?"

That is a good question, but in answer, I think you can properly remind them that, in the past decade, tuition and fees have already gone up almost 130 percent and private gifts and grants 247 percent, while Government help has increased by 63 percent.

On the evidence, I believe this: We can accomplish the task before us if we do three things—positively inform the American people of the importance of the educational job to be done, plainly tell them the cost of that job, and emphasize the necessity of refusing to permit any source, including the Federal Government, to acquire a monopoly over American education.

I sincerely believe one of the greatest services each of us can render to our colleges, our country, and our fellow citizens is to rouse up more active support for privately financed education.

There's a second job which is inextricably entwined with this first one, and that is to help make certain that the American dollar retains its power to buy.

All our educational institutions, of whatever description, have a life and death interest in that.

To illustrate, here are some sad but true fiscal facts.

In 1929–30, the total current income of American colleges and universities was $555 million; by 1953–54 it was nearly $3 billion, almost 5½ times as much. Now, on the face of it, that seems wonderful, but a particularly vicious and stealthy thief, inflation, was at work. That thief stole away so much of the value of the dollar that by 1954 it was worth only 62 cents. Simply put, that meant for every dollar the universities and colleges gained in income, they lost 38 cents to price increases.

You cannot get away from the fact that inflation hurt these institutions. And specifically it hurt their faculty members.

While it is true that in the past 20 years the dollar tag on teachers' salaries has indeed been going up, it is just as true that all the while the purchasing power of those salaries has been going down.

Universities and colleges can hardly be expected to put escalator clauses into their administrative and teaching contracts. That's because nobody can guarantee them escalator clauses in their incomes. Professors can't dodge inflation simply because universities and colleges can't either.

What they can do, and I hope they will, is to join with those of us who are working with all our might for fiscal integrity in government, whether it is local, State or Federal.

In that connection, we have only to recall to mind one widely publicized situation as proof that such an endeavor should be our common cause.

In Michigan, a political force under a professedly liberal banner has for a decade avoided the hard realities of the management of the State's finances and relied heavily on deficit financing. As a result, the Governor of Michigan is presently known far and wide as a dealer in deficits.

Today, after 10 years, the people of Michigan have finally found out that there is no such thing as a free lunch: Sooner or later somebody has to pick up the check, with interest charges added.

As of today, Michigan has a $7 million lag in old age and children's aid funds. It is $27 million short on payments to its public schools. It is $15 million behind in payments to its three leading State universities.

As a result, Michigan State University and the University of Michigan have had to go to banks to get money to meet their payrolls.

No wonder some of the best faculty members are looking elsewhere for jobs.

What has really happened in Michigan is that for too long the present was allowed to cannibalize the future.

Now, I ask you, is a governmental policy which leads to such a deplorable state of affairs a truly liberal one? Or is it only openhanded to the extent that everybody's pockets finally get emptied?

Certainly, as citizens, without regard to politics, we have every reason to abhor the preemption, the narrowing, and the twisting of the word liberal by men who, on their own record, have traded away any legitimate title to it.

Once trained to define and divide, a process which Aristole considered central to the pursuit of knowledge, you should be able, I believe to distinguish liberalism from prodigality.

You should be equipped to see through the self-styled liberal whose liberalism largely consists of advocating more and more public spending and who thus simultaneously undermines, in the end, even governments' power to borrow money to carry on the very programs he espouses.

And you should be able to penetrate the disguise of those who oppose all progress by resisting every demand the Government enter into new fields or accentuate its share of responsibility in old fields by crying "Socialism." Those people, left to their own devices, would have us mentally replant our feet in the 19th century and resist every attempt to move us forward to the present.

What I am saying is that there is a sensible and sane middle ground between the two schools of political and economic thought and it is our solemn obligation to search it out.

Finally, you should be capable of detecting the inconsistency of the self-styled intellectual who cries out that politicians are never the leaders of thought in a society and simultaneously calls for an administration in Washington to produce new ideas.

Here in Gettysburg, as a result of living, working, and studying in the midst of historical surroundings, all of you—young and old—should surely be able and ready to help make our country's future in every way worthy of its glorious past.

Here, despite Lincoln's modest disclaimer, the Gettysburg Address and the deeds of brave men, living and dead, northern and southern all together, have consecrated Cemetery Ridge and Little Round Top and the Wheatfield. This is indeed hallowed ground, and here, to rich and poor, and young and old; patriotism, virtue, honor, and freedom all have, in Shakespeare's phrase, a "local habitation and a name."

Ever since Biblical times, when the author of "Ecclesiasticus" said, "Let us now praise famous men," peoples have found in their honored heritage from the past a guide and an inspiration for the performance of their duty in the present and in the future.

Gettysburg is indeed a place of such praise. You and I will agree that it must always be so, and further you and I agree that together we can keep it so.

When the question is asked, "What is the importance of all such shrines and monuments and parks?" to answer "Manifold" is not to be in error. Surely, many of us have had the same experience as the young soldier in the U.S. Army who wrote to John D. Rockefeller, Jr., that he had never seen "the greatness of this country with more force and clearness" than when he had walked the red brick sidewalks of the Duke of Gloucester Street in Williamsburg.

The monuments which visitors come to see are in themselves clues to a pattern of events which Sir Winston Churchill has woven into the "History of All English-Speaking Peoples." Moreover, our history is also becoming a part of that of many other peoples and races—some speaking such strange tongues as Hindi and Bahasa-Indonesia and Urdu, living in faraway lands, worshiping in vastly different ways.

On the other side of the world, the President of Indonesia, Sukarno, professes almost a veneration for Abraham Lincoln and Thomas Jefferson. The American town of Concord, Mass., and nearby Walden Pond are, through Mahatma Ghandi's admiration for Henry David Thoreau, part—and an almost central part—of the history of modern India. Our monuments—and the human feelings they have awakened in distant, different peoples beyond the seas—indeed, remind us again and again that no man is an island, any more than a nation is an isolated citadel.

Do you recall the words of Carl Sandburg on February 12 of this year, when he addressed a joint session of Congress in honor of the 150th anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln? "The people of many other countries take Lincoln now for their own," Mr Sandburg said. "He belongs to them. He stands for decency, honest dealing, plain talk, and funny stories. Look where he came from—don't he know all us strugglers and wasn't he a kind of tough struggler all his life up to the finish?"

Surely, in a time when the United States is trying to advance the cause of understanding and mutual aid with people all over the free world—all kinds of people, a good many of them strugglers—isn't it only practical for us to praise the famous men of our history, to share their example of deeds and devotion to the cause of liberty?

Abraham Lincoln, George Washington, Thomas Jefferson—few countries have anybody like them. Surely, we should be lacking in humility and be unwise in the extreme to forget them or our other great men and places, and the examples and lessons they have taught us.

Theodore Roosevelt once said, "There is nothing more practical in the end than the preservation of beauty." Agreeing, we can add: "There is also nothing more practical than the preservation of those places which cause us to remember the great days and great men in our history and which help show people all over the world what we as a nation really are."

It is to those ends that historians and scholars study the past. And it is to those ends that, in Lincoln's own words, we preserve the honored battlefield and the marble monument along with the well assured and more enduring one in the heart.

To study the past, to act in the present, to consider carefully the future—and to do all three with wisdom and magnanimity—those are the continuing obligations of every educated man and woman.

In our time, not only the searching for but the finding of the correct answers to these problems is more important than it has ever been before. That is so, you see, because the atomic and hyrdogen age neither brooks delay nor allows mistake, lest man perish by his own hand and his own works.

As we are gathered here, we can be sure all mankind cries out in its heart for peace, no matter what some mad men may say or do.

How else, I ask you, can we sustain such a state of world affairs, if we do not, in the Apostle Paul's own words, "follow after the things which make for peace"?

You students here at Gettysburg College, a Christian educational institution, are being trained to meet this great challenge as are your fellows everywhere. Your collegt is doing its best for you. It now remains for you to do your best for it, for yourselves, and for your country in the years ahead.

Seventy-fifth Anniversary of the Orford Soap Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on April 7, 1959, the Manchester Chamber of Commerce celebrated the 75th anniversary of the establishment of the Orford Soap Co., makers of Bon Ami products.

I wish to join in extending congratulations to this Connecticut concern; and I ask unanimous consent to have a statement printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE OF AMERICA'S MOST FAMOUS PRODUCTS CELEBRATES DIAMOND JUBILEE

A pioneering cleanser and a tiny chick, hatched 75 years ago in Glastonbury, Conn., celebrate Bon Ami's diamond jubilee throughout this year.

The world famous trademark, with its familiar slogan "hasn't scratched yet," made Bon Ami a household word before the turn of the century.

The original Bon Ami cake that has "kept America clean" for 75 years and is still on the market, with a longer record than any other brand cleanser, has sold close to one-half billion cakes, while its companion product in powder form, Bon Ami cleanser, introduced in 1913, is close to its two billionth sale.

The first product had a humble beginning during a decade which heralded many new inventions that are now a vital part of the national life. The birth of Bon Ami, in a New England farm kitchen, occurred in a 10-year span during which Edison invented the electric light, phonograph, and kinetoscope; Eastman brought out his first Kodak; Burroughs, the adding machine; Waterman, the fountain pen, and Bell, the telephone. This decade saw the introduction of the early automobile, the gasoline engine, the linotype machine, and the bicycle.

In a Glastonbury, Conn., farmhouse, just three-quarters of a century ago, J. T. Robertson took over the family kitchen and there made, molded, and wrapped by hand the first lot of his own-devised cake cleanser. Then he peddled it in a market basket from door to door. At first he called it Robertson's mineral soap. This was the original of what was soon to be named Bon Ami.

Robertson's do-it-yourself, one-man business flourished mostly on the enthusiastic recommendations of housewives who bought it plus his own Yankee perseverance. Soon, he had to expand and moved to the neighboring village of Manchester, where Bon Ami products are manufactured to this day. His product and his sales won over a group of local Connecticut businessmen who in 1891 formed the J. T. Robertson Co. There were 7 stockholders with Robertson receiving 80 shares, the largest holding in the group.

The company acquired Robertson's formulas, trademarks, and good will for $500. One stockholder at the organization meeting expressed doubt that the investment would ever earn profits. How wrong he could be was proved in 1920 when the Childs family which then owned control of Bon Ami turned down an offer of $3 million for the trademark.

In January 1898, the company was incorporated as the Bon Ami Co. in New Jersey. Later this corporation was dissolved and the assets acquired by William H., Mary S., and Eversley Childs. A new corporation, also known as the Bon Ami Co. was chartered in Delaware in 1909. In November 1915, a new Delaware-chartered corporation, still the Bon Ami Co. was formed, acquiring all the assets of the 1909 corporation and this is the company which is in existence today. During this period Bon Ami also established manufacturing and distribution in Canada and Australia. These operations, also highly successful, continue to this day.

Members of the Childs family retained an interest in Bon Ami Co. until 1954. Last year, a group of businessmen, headed by R. Paul Weesner, acquired control of Bon Ami and adopted a dynamic new policy which is bearing fruit in this anniversary year with the launching of new products and a full-scale international promotion of Bon Ami, around the current calendar year.

Reactor Decision Was Farsighted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, as my colleague, Senator JACKSON, can testify, our effort to obtain both authorization and funds for location of a dual reactor at the Hanford atomic energy works has been long, hard—but successful.

Our satisfaction in this victory is shared by the community in which this dual-purpose reactor will function.

As an indication of the community reaction I would ask the unanimous consent that the editorial of the Tri-City Herald of Sunday, April 5, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REACTOR DECISION WAS FARSIGHTED

We don't know what prompted the Atomic Energy Commission decision to make the new Hanford reactor a dual-purpose one. But it is wise in at least two important ways:

1. The reactor will help conserve other fast-diminishing fuels, and 2. It will provide knowledge and experience needed for that day when nuclear energy must be used.

America's future depends largely on how well we solve the problem of adequate energy supplies. Ultimately the nation that controls the most energy will dominate the world.

Looking ahead 50 or 100 years, a relatively short time in the life of a great nation, the available supplies of the fossil fuels—oil, coal, and natural gas—will be exhausted, or nearly so. They are finite, and the best estimates today are they will be gone by the year 2000, at the earliest, or 2050, at the latest.

Fossil fuels now supply about 93 percent of the world's energy, water power 1 percent and the remainder comes from human and animal labor. Fossil fuels were made by the sun millions of years ago. They are not renewable.

More fossil fuels have been consumed in the past 50 years than in all the time before that. Consumption is increasing even faster than the population which in the United States, if the present pace is maintained, will equal India's (392 million) in 50 years and that of present-day China (628 million) in 80 years.

The rapidity of our growth has given us little time to adjust our thinking and the problem is upon us before we're ready to meet it.

The one practical answer to the coming power crisis is nuclear energy. Our present known reserves of fissionable materials are many times as great as those of coal and it seems certain that in this century, perhaps even within the next 25 years, fossil fuel costs will have risen enough to make nuclear fuels economically competitive. Before that time comes we must have the scientific knowledge and the engineering skills necessary to build and operate the nuclear powerplants which may have to furnish a major part of our energy needs.

By going ahead now we may be able to achieve the requisite engineering and scientific knowledge before our fossil fuel reserves give out. However, there is no time to spare—the margin of safety is not a comfortable one.

Resolution of Connecticut Chiefs of Police Association Expressing Their Support of the FBI and J. Edgar Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on March 19, 1959, the Connecticut Chiefs of Police Association unanimously adopted a resolution expressing the support of their organization for the Federal Bureau of Investigation and for its chief, J. Edgar Hoover.

It has been fashionable in certain quarters and in some publications to criticize the FBI and Mr. Hoover. In fact, there seems to be an organized attempt to undermine public confidence in this great institution and its leader.

I believe that under the direction of J. Edgar Hoover the FBI has become the world's greatest security and law-enforcement agency; and, more important, it has done so while observing the highest standards of due process of law and without threatening fundamental American freedoms.

I therefore take pleasure in asking unanimous consent to have the resolution printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the leadership in coordinating the effort of all law enforcement in the country and the high ideals and standards for law enforcement as expressed and practiced by the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation; and

Whereas J. Edgar Hoover and the agents of the FBI under his direction have constantly strived to raise the standards of law enforcement to a professional level; and

Whereas recently there has been an insidious smear campaign attacking the good name and character of J. Edgar Hoover by those who would tear asunder the high principles of law enforcement exercised by J. Edgar Hoover in our great democracy: Be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the Connecticut Chiefs of Police, assembled at this meeting at Berlin, Conn., March 19, 1959, express to Mr. Hoover our continued appreciation and support of his high ideals established for law enforcement; for his efforts in developing police standards and to express the high esteem in which he is held as a man of great utmost personal integrity; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to J. Edgar Hoover.

National Cultural Center: One Step Closer to a Reality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. WILEY. From his weekend headquarters in Augusta, Ga., President Eisenhower last Saturday took another significant action which brings us one step closer to the realization of the National Cultural Center here in our Nation's Capital. His naming of the 34-member Advisory Committee on the Arts now gives the green light to actual construction of this international cultural beacon which, as I have previously remarked, will be commensurate with our leadership in world affairs.

SPONSORSHIP OF LEGISLATION

As I have previously mentioned to my colleagues, there was a long and sometimes discouraging battle fought by many dedicated Members in both Houses of the Congress that resulted in enactment of S. 3335 of the 85th Congress, which bill I was happy to cosponsor, and finally in Public Law 874. Many courageous and determined public-spirited citizens maintained the courage of their convictions that here was a project which would enrich countless numbers of lives through expansion of cultural horizons. They realized that this was an absolute necessity in order for our Capital City to fulfill its role of importance as a tourist center from which local and foreign visitors derive their knowledge and lasting impressions of the United States. A splendid example of how Members from both sides of the aisle can work together in harmony for the cultural advancement and mutual benefit of our great country was shown in the commendable bipartisan spirit which marked enactment of this legislation. Enactment of S. 3335 was specifically requested by President Eisenhower and endorsed by the Department of the Interior, the Bureau of the Budget, the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and the Commission on Fine Arts.

NAMING OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The Advisory Committee on the Arts will serve as a program committee to establish objectives and policies of the National Cultural Center and will make recommendations to the Board regarding cultural activities to be carried on in the center. I believe that the naming by the President of Mr. Robert W. Dowling, president of the American National Theater and Academy, as the head of the Committee, is an extremely wise choice, since Mr. Dowling is well known for his outstanding contributions to the arts and has capably demonstrated his qualifications for such a post through his active cooperation with the State Department in our International Cultural Exchange program.

I am particularly pleased that Dr. Howard Mitchell, the distinguished conductor of our own National Symphony Orchestra here in Washington, has been named as one of the leading members of the Advisory Committee. Dr. Mitchell has been deservedly accorded international acclaim as one of the most competent of American conductors and has been lauded by the press on many occasions; including words of praise by the New York Times and the New York Herald Tribune. Other outstanding local citizens who are well known for their activity in many worthwhile civic and national projects are Rabbi Norman Gerstenfeld, of the Washington Hebrew

Congregation; Paul Callaway, of the Washington Cathedral; Dr. Edward Elson, of the National Presbyterian Church; Father Gilbert Hartke, of Catholic University; Mrs. Marjorie Merriweather Post May, philanthropist; Warner Lawson, of Howard University; the Very Reverend Francis B. Sayre, of Washington Cathedral; and Mrs. James H. Douglas, Jr. Many additional names of national fame are also on the list, including Helen Hayes, Marian Anderson, Fred Waring, George Murphy, Reginald Allen, and Richard Rodgers.

COOPERATION WITH BOARD OF TRUSTEES

These members will work in close cooperation with the 15 Federal officials named in Public Law 874 and the 15 general trustees appointed by the President last January who are responsible for supervising and overseeing the construction of the center with funds contributed through popular donation. In this connection, I wish to state that I have been very pleased to receive many letters from these distinguished citizens, including the Honorable L. Corrin Strong, Thomas Emery, F. H. Ricketson, John Nicholas Brown, Robert L. Wood, Ralph J. Bunche, Henry Clay Hofheimer II, Daniel W. Bell, Ralph E. Becker, and Mrs. George Garrett; all of whom have unanimously pledged their continued support toward construction of this center.

As I have previously emphasized, however, the National Cultural Center will belong to every citizen of the United States; not just the District of Columbia, and we shall need the help and support of all the people. Sufficient funds will be needed within 5 years from the time of enactment of the act in order for Public Law 874 to be effective and it will therefore be vitally necessary that every effort be exerted to accomplish the necessary collection of funds. By providing a suitable building for the presentation of music, opera, drama, dance, and poetry deserving of recognition as a part of the great heritage of our civilization, this national cultural establishment will develop a greater knowledge, understanding, and appreciation of the fine arts; and their presentation and standards of execution will be raised to an ever-higher level of achievement.

Mr. President, yesterday, April 12, there was presented over radio station WGMS an extremely significant and timely statement by Mr. Patrick Hayes, a local impressario of considerable repute. In this statement, Mr. Hayes wisely pointed out that the time has now come for full and fast action to bring the dream of a cultural center into reality. I feel that his comments regarding the qualifications and appropriateness of selection of the various individuals were well stated; as were his suggestions as to how the average citizen can help along the movement for the center. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Hayes' statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BROADCAST BY PATRICK HAYES, WGMS, APRIL 12, 1959

Good afternoon. If we were to learn that one of the great dramas of our times had just been written and would be produced sometime during the next 4 years, our curiosity would be intense to learn the name of the playwright, who would produce and direct the cast of characters, the set and lighting designers, and especially we would want to know how soon the curtain would go up on this great work.

The emergence on the Washington cultural horizon during the next 4 years of a grand cultural center is a dramatic development in our times, and our interest and curiosity are indeed intense. The cast of characters is now complete, with the President's announcement yesterday at Augusta, Ga., of the 34 members who will compose the advisory committee called for in the Cultural Center bill which he signed last September 2 at Newport. The architect and the general administrator are yet to be selected, and the money raised. But the time has now come for full and fast action to bring the dream of a cultural center into reality.

Full authority for the project rests with the board of trustees, appointed earlier by the President, with Arthur Flemming as chairman, and L. Corrin Strong as vice chairman. Mr. Flemming has to administer the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and it has fallen to Mr. Strong to be, in effect, an executive vice chairman, and this is a most fortunate development; few men in the country are better qualified by experience, organizing ability, diplomatic skill, and a sense of dedication to such a cause. Fortunately Mr. Strong has the time as well as a keen personal interest in the project. He and Mr. Flemming are 2 of the 15 public members, who serve with the 15 members from the Government side, a total of 30 trustees.

The 34 appointed yesterday are members of the advisory committee, whose strength will lie in the merit of the ideas and suggestions it offers to the board of trustees. How to plan the center and its future use; how to present the story to the Nation; how to raise and administer the funds; recommendations on the selection of the top administrative personnel. For the moment the only matters that are settled are the geographical location of the building or buildings along the Potomac, just up from the Lincoln Memorial; and the membership of the two bodies, the Board itself, and the advisory committee.

In an earlier commentary, I expressed the opinion that the board of trustees represented a solid group of citizens of wealth and reputation, as qualified as any group that could be brought together for such a purpose. I noted then, as now, the presence of Mr. Strong and David Finley on the board. Mr. Finley is the man who saw the National Gallery of Art through from start to finish, and then became its Director for many years. His experience and wisdom are invaluable to the Cultural Center project.

With this in mind, the appointment yesterday of Reginald Allen, of New York City, is a most important one. Mr. Allen is former manager of the Philadelphia Orchestra, former senior assistant manager of the Metropolitan Opera Association, and currently director of operations for the Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts in New York City. He is the David Finley of the Lincoln Center project, living daily with the problems of land, buildings, future use, financing. With the Lincoln Center project well beyond the planning stage, Mr. Allen is already in a position to report the right, and perhaps some wrong, avenues of approach. All of the other 33, and hundreds of others besides, know in a general way what is needed, and why, and will have ideas on how to use a Cultural Center when it arrives, but the current experience of Mr. Allen is an invaluable file of reference for the board of trustees during the next months and few years.

Nine Washingtonians are among the 34: Paul Callaway, conductor of the Opera Society of Washington; Mrs. James Henderson Douglas, president of the Opera Society here; Rev. Edward L. R. Elson, pastor of the National Presbyterian Church; Rabbi Norman Gerstenfeld, spiritual head of the Washington Hebrew congregation; Rev. Gilbert V. Hartke, the well known head of the speech and drama department at Catholic University; Dean Warner Lawson, dean of the school of music at Howard University; Mrs. Marjorie Merriweather Post May, patron of music extraordinary; Dr. Howard Mitchell, conductor of the NSO; the Very Reverend Francis B. Sayre, Jr., dean of the Washington Cathedral.

Mr. Callaway and Dr. Mitchell are more than well informed on the problems of producing and presenting music to the public, especially Mr. Callaway in the field of grand opera. Mrs. Douglas is close to the opera production problems also. Father Hartke is an expert on staging, and has a staff of experts, including Leo Brady and James Waring, to advise him. Mrs. May graces any board or committee on which she sits, and she will lend prestige and strength to the Advisory Committee. The clergy represent the broad sweep of the community, and each is a recognized leader in his own name. Dean Lawson represents an educational institution, and he has also demonstrated a capacity for administration in his work at Howard University. Each of these nine have the acquaintance of others in the city, and consultations will undoubtedly go beyond the committee meetings themselves. I note especially that a majority of the nine Washingtonians are daily aware of the pressing need of a Cultural Center here, at the earliest possible moment.

Robert Dowling, of New York City, is chairman of the advisory committee, 1 of the 25 others named from throughout the Nation. They represent a good cross section geographically, and in their fields of endeavor. Some are famous—like Marian Anderson, Helen Hayes, and Katherine Cornell. Others are well-known leaders, like John Brownlee, president of AGMA, Herman Kenin, president of the AFM, and Fred Waring. Actors Robert Montgomery and George Murphy are on the list, as is Richard Rodgers, the composer.

At this point in time, there is an answer to a question that has been asked for years: What can I do about the problem? How can I, as one citizen, help along the movement for a Cultural Center? Now that there are duly constituted trustees and members of an advisory committee, appointed by the President of the United States for the purpose, communicate with one or more of them. Express your ideas if you have any; express your willingness to work under their direction; express your willingness to give money, and ask where to send it, and how the check is made payable.

I have one simple suggestion now: I would like to see the first meeting of the new group, perhaps jointly with the board of trustees, held on the stage of Lisner Auditorium or of Loew's Capitol Theater, followed by a complete tour of the backstage area from floor to floor. Nothing would fix in their minds the fundamental problem of an adequate stage and backstage area so well—no end of talk or written reports. The stage is the key point in what is proposed, once they come to the plans for the building. Most people regard a new building concept in total, and look at it, even in their mind's eye, from the outside. The view from the beginning, should be from the stage out in planning the Cultural Center. And without consulting Mr. Callaway here and Mr. Allen in New York, I know with certainty that this is their view.

Thus, the cast of characters is complete, and now, on with plans for the show.

Establishment of National Park on Padre Island, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Conrad L. Wirth, Director of the National Park Service, has said:

One of our greatest recreation resources—the seashore—is rapidly vanishing from public use. Nearly everyone seems to know this fact, but few do anything to halt the trend.

In 1935, the National Park Service made a survey of the Atlantic and gulf coasts and found plenty of unspoiled seashore areas available for public recreation. It recommended 12 major strips, with 437 miles of beach, be preserved as national parks. Only 1 of the 12 was actually acquired as a national seashore.

Today, just two decades later, all the other areas which the National Park Service recommended have gone into private development except one.

If we delay longer, Padre Island will be taken up.

Our Nation's public shoreline is rapidly vanishing. Some of it must be preserved for the enjoyment of all Americans.

I have introduced a bill to preserve one area of historic and scenic value—the measure would establish a national park on Padre Island off the coast of Texas in the Gulf of Mexico. It is rich in scenic beauty and historical significance. In addition, it is valuable today as a game preserve and as a fine winter playground for the Nation.

The Texas Legislature is now considering a proposal to assist in the acquisition of land for this park.

Mr. President, in support of Padre Island National Park, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution and memorandum from the Texas Ornithological Society, dated February 10, 1959.

A letter and resolution from the Outdoor Nature Club of Houston, Tex., dated March 17, 1959, which was sent to members of the Texas Legislature concerning the State proposal, and also to Members of Congress.

A resolution from the Houston Federation of Garden Clubs, representing more than 6,000 members.

A resolution from the Garden Club of Houston, a member of the Garden Clubs of America, dated March 19, 1959.

A resolution from the St. Marks Methodist Chapter in Houston, of the Methodist man's organization, dated March 22, 1959.

A resolution from the Bunker Hill Garden Club of Houston, dated March 24, 1959.

An editorial from the Wichita Falls (Tex.) Times of Sunday, April 5, 1959, under the heading "Legislature Should Act To Preserve Padre Island."

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION TO MAKE PADRE ISLAND A NATIONAL PARK

Whereas Padre Island contains a wealth of vegetation and wildlife in substantially the same condition as when this sunny region was first discovered by de Pineda in 1519 and boasts a superb sand beach 30 miles in length along a gulf coast shoreline admirably suited for safe swimming and wading; and

Whereas commercial development has gained two footholds on Padre Island and threatens rapidly to ruin its natural beauty; and

Whereas Padre Island is unique in scenery, climate, ecology, and geology and fulfills in every way the standards for a national park; and

Whereas the establishment of Padre Island as a national park would permanently preserve natural treasures of Padre Island for the benefit of the public: Therefore it is

Resolved, That the undersigned organization hereby urges the adoption of the bill (S. 4) to provide the establishment of Padre Island as a national park.

Passed this 10th day of February 1959.

A. EARL JOURDE,
President, Texas Ornithological Society.

PADRE ISLAND, THE STATE'S MOST MAGNIFICENT BEACH

(Memorandum, Texas Ornithological Society)

The 95 miles of Padre Island that is still undeveloped should be permanently preserved in public ownership as a recreational area. Preferably as a national park or national seashore recreation area, this island would offer to present and future generations a small portion of Texas still with its natural grandeur virtually untouched by man. Because of current real estate developments in this area, to wait beyond the present legislative session may be disastrous. The National Park Service in its seashore recreational area survey of 1955 stated that Padre Island is among the areas judged to be of highest priority for acquisition and conservation by a public agency. Excerpts from this survey in specific reference to Padre Island follow:

Padre Island: "The 98-mile stretch of undeveloped beach on Padre Island presents an opportunity for beach recreation of a type unmatched by any other area along the Atlantic or gulf coasts. * * * Its great size and remote character, endless sweep of broad beach, grass-topped dunes and windswept sand formations have great appeal. Its natural resources, historical and biological values should be preserved in public ownership. * * * Padre Island contains the longest stretch of undeveloped seashore remaining in the United States. * * * It is the longest island, or barrier beach, of the Atlantic or gulf coasts. * * * It is one of the best places along the entire coast line where the complex processes which create and reform barrier beaches can be studied. * * * It has a long history highlighted by many colorful events. * * * The sheltered bays, marsh lands, and island along Padre Island are especially attractive to all forms of bird life, providing both breeding and nesting grounds."

Padre Island is under the surveyor's ax at this moment and the end of 1959 may see another 10, 20, or 30 miles further subdivided unless portions are preserved in national ownership. Our entire Texas coast may soon resemble the Atlantic coast where American families drive mile after mile in search of access to the seashore without success. There, children living a short distance from the coast have never observed the immensity of marine waters, nor been inspired by the roar of breakers as the foamy crest of one wave crashes into the trough of another, even the refreshing smell of the sea is foreign to them. Were you to find access to the seashore, you are due to be disappointed for you will find homes and private property everywhere; none of the animal life which thrill our children and are our heritage.

This is the future Texans may expect, unless we take action now.

OUTDOOR NATURE CLUB OF HOUSTON,
Houston, Tex., March 17, 1959.

Subject: Club endorsement of House bill 469, The Padre Island Park bill.

MEMBERS OF THE TEXAS LEGISLATURE,
The Capitol Building,
Austin, Tex.

GENTLEMEN: As fellow Texans we feel certain you and your families, children and friends have often gone to the seashore for recreation, relaxation, and inspiration. Texans love the outdoors and for many generations Texans have made their beaches their greatest outlet for recreation.

Until recently, access to the many miles of our beaches had always been easy, however, because of recent Texas Supreme Court decisions in the Luttes case many property owners have built fences to the waters edge denying all access to the public. Selfish as these property owners and developers are it is inevitable that unless large seashore areas are permanently preserved as park sites thousands of Texas children whose constant dream and desire is to go to the seashore will have to be crowded in tiny county parks in the not too distant future. The mass of humanity on the crowded New England beaches where umbrella almost touches umbrella is the handwriting on the wall for all Texans to see.

Although the Luttes case decisions by the Texas Supreme Court are ridiculous, nevertheless they become the law of the land and their effect is disastrous to future enjoyment of this great Texas natural resource. Unless specific legislation such as House bill 469 becomes law more and more of our beaches shall become inaccessible and we shall suddenly find ourselves in a position of too little and too late.

House bill 469 which will make Padre Island a public recreational area, will in the years to come probably be considered the most significant piece of legislation the legislature had to consider at this session. From its economic value to the State as a National Park passage of this bill is highly important and in fact for this reason alone merits passage.

Texas has many outstanding features that make it attractive as a tourist mecca but there is no greater attraction in our great State than our Texas seashore of which Padre Island is its most magnificent example.

At a regular meeting of our organization the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

"The Outdoor Nature Club of Houston with an active membership of approximately 500, endorses House bill 469 of the Texas Legislature which would establish Padre Island as a national park or public recreational area. In conformance with the club objective of striving for the permanent establishment of natural areas so that posterity can better perceive the pattern of virgin America and citing the following:

"(1) That there is an urgent need for the permanent establishment of a seashore recreational area on the gulf coast not particularly for ourselves but for the millions yet unborn that will have great need of such areas;

"(2) that the many unique features of Padre Island such as its being the longest barrier island in the world, its being the longest unspoiled natural beach still in existence in the United States, its having such a great variety of fish, bird, and seashore life that it will provide wholesome recreation for millions of Americans, its having such a varied and unusual history;

"(3) and that because of this urgent need for a public recreational area along the gulf coast and because of its many unique features the National Park Service considers Padre Island of highest priority for acquisition as a public recreational area,

"the Outdoor Nature Club here resolves that it will fully support all efforts to establish Padre Island as a national park or public recreational area, specifically endorsing House bill 469 in the Texas Legislature."

This resolution is a reaffirmation of the club resolution of September 1956, in which it was proposed to encourage the acquisition of Padre Island as a public recreational area which resolution was also endorsed by many other conservation organizations in the State.

Yours in conservation,

M. A. YRAMATEGUI,
Chairman, Conservation Committee.

The Houston Federation of Garden Clubs unanimously endorses proposed legislation that would make Padre Island a national park and urges that State and Federal legislators do all in their power to preserve the island for posterity.

The federation takes this action because it recognizes that wilderness areas, where man can get close to nature, are essential to the health and well-being of a nation's people. It recognizes, also, that Padre Island is ideal for preservation as a national park.

Because it is the longest and one of the few remaining natural, largely undeveloped seashore areas along the combined Atlantic and gulf coasts;

Because the islands' broad sand beaches, magnificent dunes, and saltgrass marshes afford excellent opportunities for the observation, enjoyment, and study of birds, marine life, plant life, and plant ecology;

And especially because it offers relaxation and healthful recreation for man's leisure hours now and in a more crowded tomorrow, if it can be preserved in its natural state.

Mrs. G. G. ORR,
President, Houston Federation of Garden Clubs.

THE GARDEN CLUB OF HOUSTON,
Houston, Tex., March 19, 1959.

The Honorable Senator YARBOROUGH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Our organization passed this resolution regarding Padre Island and we would like to bring it to your attention.

"Resolved, That the Garden Club of Houston take whatever action seems advisable to support proposed legislation to make Padre Island a national park."

The club takes this action because:

1. Far too small a percentage of our national seashore areas has been preserved for public recreation and relaxation and Padre Island is the only large, as yet undeveloped seashore area on the combined Atlantic and gulf coasts.

2. The National Parks survey has shown Padre Island to be highly desirable for preservation as a national park because of its scenic beauty, its historic and scientific interest, and its great potential as a recreational area.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. WILLIAM S. COCHRAN, Jr.,
Conservation Chairman.

ST. MARKS METHODIST CHURCH,
Houston, Tex., March 22, 1959.

Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: The St. Marks Methodist Houston Chapter of Methodist Men realizes that far too little of our natural seashore has been preserved for posterity, and that Padre Island on the lower Texas coast is the only large undeveloped seashore area along the combined Atlantic and gulf coasts.

It recognizes that the island has excellent potentialities for public recreation and relaxation, and it offers much to anyone interested in scenic beauty, birds, plantlife, and marine life.

Resolved, therefore, That this organization requests the Congress and State legislature to support the proposed legislation to make Padre Island into a national park.

Sincerely,

LEE THOMPSON,
President, Methodist Men.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY BUNKER HILL GARDEN CLUB OF HOUSTON, TEX., MARCH 24, 1959

Whereas Padre Island is ideal for relaxation and the enjoyment of nature, for surf fishing, swimming, picnicking, camping, and many forms of recreation that only the seashore can provide; and

Whereas Padre Island is by far the longest and most desirable of the few remaining beach areas along the Atlantic and gulf coasts, and is still largely in the same state as it was when the Karankawa Indians lived there in the 16th century; and

Whereas our organization realizes that practically all beach areas that are readily accessible by car on both coasts have already been lost to the public and that Padre Island will also be forever lost to the public if immediate action is not taken to preserve it: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Bunker Hill Garden Club endorses proposed legislation that would preserve Padre Island as a national park; and be it further

Resolved, That our State and Federal legislators be advised of our wishes and be urged to support any legislation that will insure preservation of the island.

Passed March 24, 1959.

Mrs. M. K. NOLAN,
Corresponding Secretary.

[From the Wichita Falls (Tex.) Times, Apr. 5, 1959]

LEGISLATURE SHOULD ACT TO PRESERVE PADRE ISLAND

Ocean shorelines in the United States to which the public has free and unlimited access have been vanishing rapidly in the last few years. A survey by the National Park Service midway in the current decade revealed the extent to which private development and commercialization have made inroads upon stretches of beaches and scenic areas bordering the Atlantic Ocean particularly, although the Pacific Ocean and the Gulf of Mexico are not unaffected.

The fact is that few areas remain available for preservation and dedication to public use in their natural state, and Texans may be surprised to learn that one of these unspoiled strips where gulf waters meet the shoreline is currently endangered. It is the approximately 95 miles of Padre Island which could be preserved as the longest public beach in America and typical of the wide open spaces for which Texas is known throughout the world.

The National Park Service in its survey in 1955 included Padre Island and found its stretch of undeveloped beach "unmatched by any other area along the Atlantic or gulf coasts. * * * Its great size and remote character, endless sweep of broad beach, grass-topped dunes, and wind-swept sand formations have great appeal. Its natural resources, historical and biological values should be preserved in public ownership."

A movement that began in the gulf coast area of the State immediately following the survey to secure and dedicate this longest stretch of undeveloped seashore remaining in the United States will reach a climax Monday night at Austin when the appropriate house committee will hold its first hearing on a bill which has as its purpose the conversion of Padre Island into a national park or national seashore recreational area.

The proposal copies the procedure which led to the inclusion of Big Bend National Park into the National Park System in 1944, a move which has been a source of pride to Texans and of great benefit to the recreational facilities of the State.

Favorable committee action, followed by enactment of the proposal, is particularly urgent in the current session of the legislature because Padre Island is now under survey and within a few months as much as 30 miles of the beach may be lost to public use and its natural grandeur despoiled.

Here is an opportunity for the present generation of Texans to act with the same foresightedness that led to the preservation of the first national park, Yellowstone, in 1872. Another national park in the State on Padre Island is a move which the Times heartily endorses.

International Refugee Year Calls for Humanitarian Action by the United States

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, once more we are called upon not to substitute the word for the deed. International Refugee Year begins July 1. What are we in the United States going to do for wretched, homeless men and women who have fought against Communist tyranny and now are consigned to dreary refugee camps?

The Zellerbach Commission, headed by Harold L. Zellerbach, of the Crown Zellerbach Paper Corp., has urged that our country admit some 50,000 of the 200,000 refugees still in European camps. This is only 25,000 refugees a year. Surely our vast and wealthy Nation can make such a contribution to humanitarianism, to liberty, and to human dignity.

The Washington Post and Times Herald for April 12, 1959, voiced such a plea with eloquence and firmness, and I ask unanimous consent that this editorial, entitled "Action on Refugees," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACTION ON REFUGEES

If American participation in the International Refugee Year, which begins July 1, is to be more than a gesture, Congress will have to allow additional refugees to enter the country. At present refugees can come to the United States only if they qualify under regular immigration quotas. It has been reported, however, that President Eisenhower will request Congress to set up modest but permanent annual refugee quotas. Enactment of such legislation would be a welcome indication of the awareness of the United States that refugees have become a permanent problem in a world beset by tyranny.

The plan under consideration would help to empty the European refugee camps where 200,000 persons still are forced to live. An annual refugee quota would also make it easier for the United States to act in situations such as the Hungarian revolt of 1956, when tens of thousands of refugees streamed into Austria. The Zellerbach Commission, a private American group headed by San Francisco businessman Harold Zellerbach, recommended recently that the United States admit over a 2-year period 50,000 of the 200,000 persons still in European camps. The United States surely can absorb 25,000 refugees annually.

Building International Good Will Through Sports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, one of the great common denominators among all peoples of the world is the love of athletics. For example, the opening of the major league baseball season here in Washington, last Thursday, was followed eagerly by baseball fans in every corner of the globe.

It has long been my feeling that this country can, and should, do more to build international good will through exchanges of athletic teams, the provision of equipment to needy youngsters in other lands, and supplying instruction in our games to other peoples of the world. The people-to-people sports program, with President Eisenhower's strong support, is doing a tremendous job along these lines. And the U.S. Information Agency, through its channels, and the Voice of America are also exploiting this means for cementing friendship with our world neighbors.

A recent article in the New York Times points up the manner in which a State Department official is helping strengthen the bonds between America and the Congo Republic, through teaching young men the game of baseball. The article emphasizes the great potential for increasing international good will through sports. I ask unanimous consent that the article by Milton Bracker be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. CONSUL BRINGS BASEBALL TO CONGO REPUBLIC—PLAYERS IN SIX-TEAM LEAGUE PICK BANKS, OF CUBS, AS HERO

(By Milton Bracker)

BRAZZAVILLE, CONGO REPUBLIC, February 9.—There is a young "moyen champ" here named Albert Ondongo, and he would like nothing better than to be like another moyen champ whom he has never seen.

The other fellow is named Ernie Banks, of the Chicago Cubs. It will probably be news to Banks, the most valuable player in the National League last year, that he is a moyen champ et al.

The term means shortstop (literally "middle field") in the modified French used here in the first baseball league in West Africa.

The league has six teams. They play on Saturdays on a somewhat informal diamond hemmed in by tropical grass that grows a lot faster and taller than it does at the Stadium or Wrigley Field. The remarkable thing is that they play at all and that the teenage Africans are making such progress.

The man behind the league is Frank Magliozzi, from Massachusetts, whose full-time job is running the U.S. consulate here.

CONSULATE OPEN A MONTH

The political changes in French Equatorial Africa have been keeping Magliozzi busy since the consulate was opened in January. Previously the State Department lookout was conducted from Leopoldville, across the river in the Belgian Congo.

Like Americans in remote posts before him, Magliozzi brought his hobby with him. It happened to be baseball. He found the barefoot youngsters curious, then interested, but their entire athletic orientation—as in most Europe and Latin America—was toward soccer. Players were quick on their feet, but awkward with their hands. The whole idea of catching a ball was new to them.

Coach Magliozzi was both stubborn and persuasive. He decided to use, not a real baseball, but a hollow rubber ball with mock seams. This was economical in itself and was compatible with the lack of gloves.

Bases were sewn together fairly easily and a segment of an old tire with pegs through it made a pitching rubber. When it came to bats, the project was better equipped. In Gabon, a territory north and west of here, there is a reddish wood called Ogouwe. A friendly Swede did the lathing—and voilà, les bats.

BATS WELL BALANCED

A visitor, taking a practice swing with one, found it well balanced and altogether good to grip. The league's bat-bag is the trunk compartment of Magliozzi's car.

Albert Ondongo, who works in the consulate, was one of the earliest candidates. Albert, who might be taken for a kid brother of Jackie Robinson, caught on quickly. Like young ballplayers from Maine to California, he seemed to enjoy batting most.

The grand frappeur—mighty blow, or home run—was the big thrill, Albert found out. He did not know how many other players, from the first day they swung a bat, had reached the same conclusion. And naturally, the most enviable man in baseball was the grand frappeur.

That was how Ernie Banks came into it. Magliozzi wanted to cite an example of a star who could hit homers. But he also wanted one who played the infield, because he felt that the secret of the Africans' progress lay in their development around second base.

Banks was an obvious choice. So gradually the Cub shortstop's name became a byword in the dusty streets off the Avenue Foch, and in the native section of Poto-Poto. And more than that, the example proved practical. The infielding improved.

Magliozzi has tried to get photographs of Banks to prove to the boys that he is a real person. So far, requests have gone unanswered.

The baseball project is personal with the young diplomat. He snorted a little unhappily when it was suggested that the games were serving to keep him in touch with future nationalists.

PROUD OF VICTORY

The truth is in the young New Englander's voice and eyes when he tells of how his team beat a team of Europeans, 10 to 1, a few Saturdays ago. Robert Rogers, the vice consul, a Californian, was on hand, too. During the league's early stages, in fact, the Americans coached, played, umpired, and generally held things together.

Now the structure is firm. Boys like Albert Ondongo, and others from the Ba Kongo, the Téké and the M'Bochi tribes—citizens of a young republic of 750,000 inhabitants of whom more than 100,000 live in Brazba—are getting to be ballplayers.

"They have no shoes, no gloves, no anything," Magliozzi said. "And you saw the ball we use—not even a softball. But you know what makes it all more than worthwhile? The way they go for the force play. You ought to see them—the instinct is there, and the timing. The first time I saw them pull a force play——"

The consul's face lit up. It was as if the scout who discovered Ernie Banks were reliving Ernie's first day in Chicago.

Expansion of Federal Responsibility in Field of Unemployment Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, often we are told that it is dangerous or unwise to expand Federal responsibility in the realm of unemployment insurance. Evidently 21 experts in the field of economics and social science do not think so. Meeting at Ann Arbor, Mich., they have recommended that the national responsibility for unemployment compensation be strengthened on a permanent and lasting basis. This eminent commission was headed by Dean F. F. Fauri of the School of Social Work of the University of Michigan.

Such recommendations are unusually significant, in view of the fact that many of us believe Federal standards in the field of unemployment insurance must be established. I have a particular interest in this subject because my own State of Oregon has suffered heavily during the past 6 years from joblessness in our key lumber industry, and our State unemployment reserves are at a low level.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the body of the RECORD an article describing the action taken by the 21 academic and campus experts in unemployment insurance, as reported in the New York Times of April 12, 1959, under the title of "Jobless Pay Role Proposed for United States."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOBLESS PAY ROLE PROPOSED FOR UNITED STATES—GREATER RESPONSIBILITY FOR ENSURING ADEQUATE FUNDS URGED BY ECONOMISTS

ANN ARBOR, MICH., April 11.—A group of 21 experts in economics and social insurance recommended today that the Federal Government be given a greater responsibility in the field of unemployment insurance.

In a statement issued here they proposed that Congress establish a national reinsurance fund to equalize excessive costs of unemployment insurance in States experiencing high and prolonged unemployment.

They also recommended legislation to insure Federal standards for the amount and duration of benefit payments and broadened coverage to include all those with a substantial attachment to the labor force.

"The changes recommended," the statement said, "would retain the basic responsibility for unemployment insurance in the individual States. At the same time, however, recognition is given to the fact that the Federal Government should have a responsibility to assist the States to meet unemployment which cannot effectively be handled exclusively on an individual State basis."

INITIATED BY DEAN

The statement was initiated by F. F. Fauri, dean of the school of social work at the University of Michigan.

The statement declared that the Federal-State unemployment insurance system in its present form was inadequate to protect the unemployed during a recession.

"Early in 1958, after the recession had begun," the statement continued, "the executive and legislative branches of the Federal Government concluded that the Federal-State system of unemployment insurance was not adequate to meet the unemployment emergency without Federal action. As a result, Congress passed, and the President signed, an emergency stopgap bill to provide temporary unemployment compensation benefits by advancing funds to the States to increase the duration of State benefits by 50 percent.

"At the time Congress took emergency action there was in excess of $8 billion in the State unemployment insurance reserve funds. But a very large proportion of this money was not available in States experiencing heavy unemployment.

"As a result, on January 1, 1959, there was a total of nearly $7 billion in these unemployment reserves which was available but had not been used. Yet, during the last 6 months of 1958, the Federal Government had to advance to the States over $300 million out of general revenues, under the temporary unemployment compensation program, to meet the need for increased duration of unemployment benefits.

"The weaknesses in our Federal-State unemployment insurance system thus were clearly demonstrated by this need for emergency Federal legislation for loans while there were substantial overall reserves.

"This recent experience demonstrates the need for strengthening the national responsibility for unemployment insurance on a permanent basis."

Our Country's Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Manion Forum, one of the last remaining unhampered mediums of communication in America, being free as it is of the restraints of commercial sponsorship or advertising of any kind, recently presented over the air the voice of the former President of the United States, Herbert Hoover.

Mr. Hoover spoke provocatively of our country's crisis. The message is comprehensive and thought provoking, and I feel it should be included in the Appendix of the RECORD:

OUR COUNTRY'S CRISIS

DEAN MANION. Comes now the highest honor ever to be conferred upon the Manion Forum and the greatest opportunity ever offered to our millions of listeners. Ladies and gentlemen, the former President of the United States, the Honorable Herbert Hoover.

Mr. HOOVER. Thank you, Dean Manion. The Sabbath is a day of reaffirmation of religious faith and the moral foundations of life. It is also a day more free from the routines of life. Therefore, it can well be a day for the consideration of some principles of conduct and morals in this world crisis.

The greatest problem before us is to find some road to lessen the repeated tensions created by the Communists over the world.

The Communist ultimatum as to the free people in Berlin is only their latest. But in fact it involves all free peoples. For behind these tensions lurk the dangers of war more dreadful than mankind has ever known.

A great conference is now proposed with Russia in the hope that it will bring some relaxation of this world crisis.

For over 40 years, most of the Western World has been engaged in an effort to find some workable relationship or some basis of peace with the Communists.

In these efforts, the Western World has had some bitter experiences and by now should have learned some lessons as to the whole Communist purpose.

During these years, either through my official duties or my interest in peace, there has been imposed upon me some awareness of these problems.

From our long national experience, it would seem appropriate to shortly review some of the lessons learned and the principles upon which we must stand fast.

The first of these lessons is a realization of the utterly different concepts of international relations between the Communists and ourselves.

We are a Nation whose actions are based upon religious faith and the moral codes which have sprung from it.

The atheistic Communists, who deny all religious faith, have no code of morals such as that to which we must adhere.

This reflects itself in our sense of moral obligation to agreements into which we have entered; whereas, the Communist concept is that agreements and treaties are an obligation only so long as they are of use to Communists.

I do not need to quote the abundant statements of their leaders themselves admitting this bare fact, nor the long list of treaties they have violated.

For a recent example, I need only point to the agreements at Yalta and Potsdam, which provided for free elections in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Yugoslavia, and Rumania to establish their own forms of free governments. Those elections were prevented, or they were never free.

OUR WEAKNESS WELL KNOWN TO SOVIETS

The bitter lesson from this experience was that the Western World failed to stand firm and united in holding to those agreements. And so we stood by and witnessed the death of freedom in five nations.

At this moment, we are again confronted with precisely the same Conmmunist concept of agreements. The number of human beings in Berlin is not large. But the principles of decent relations betwen nations and the moral standards vital to a peaceful world are at stake.

Fortunately, as never before in my recollection have our leaders and the American people been so united in their feelings that the time has come for a determined stand.

President Eisenhower alone can speak for the American people. He has spoken. And our support to him must be unwavering.

The unity of the free world is also today at stake. The agreements as to Berlin must be upheld. They can only be modified by mutual consent in a fashion which truly protects the free people of Berlin and gives hope of a step toward peace.

Firmness today alone can bring a halt in the creeping Communist conquest of Western Europe, and prevent the breakdown of principles and morals in international life into a third world war.

Our people are not frightened by the unceasing blustering threats and warnings showered upon us from the Kremlin. We are used to them. We can defend ourselves.

I scarcely need mention that, in the face of these perils we must maintain such military strength as will deter an attack. And we must continue the development of scientific research and invention which will keep the Western World in the lead in weapons of defense.

Another principle in our relations with the Communists deserves mention. They have at various times proposed peaceful coexistence, the abolition of nuclear weapons tests, the reduction or limitation of armies, and other seeming ideas of promoting peace.

Our people are not adverse to such steps. But, from our bitter experiences, we have learned that, if we reach such agreements, there must be set up independent machinery to enforce such agreements on both sides.

President Eisenhower has stood firm in this principle. The Communists have refused.

THE MYSTERIOUS MR. MIKOYAN

I may well spend a few moments on the mystery of the recent visit of Mr. Anastas Mikoyan, the Deputy Prime Minister of the Soviet Union. It has some lessons on our relations with the Communists.

Mr. Mikoyan announced the purpose of his visit was to discuss the expansion of trade between Russia and the United States. He repeatedly stated that such expansion would be an important step in lessening the tensions of the cold war.

During his visit, he was extended the courtesies and hospitalities due a representative of another nation. Our State Department stimulated a series of dinners or luncheons where he was given the opportunity to freely discuss his project with our businessmen and to expound his ideas over our radio and in our press.

Mr. Mikoyan is an intelligent, highly informed man and his proposal should be analyzed as to its possibilities as a way toward peace.

It is, however, a down-to-earth fact that there never has been, nor is there ever likely to be, such consequential trade with Russia as would thaw out the cold war.

Russia, like the United States, is a great reservoir of raw materials. We have no need for consequential amounts of Russian raw materials. Their natural market is Western Europe, which does need them.

And Western Europe can make manufactured goods to exchange for these raw materials cheaper than we can at our wage levels. Therefore, any volume of such exchanges is most improbable.

And, in support of this, I may call up a little statistic. In the 6 years from 1934 through 1939, until the interruption of the Second World War, there were no important restrictions on trade between the United States and Communist Russia.

But our exports to their 180 million people averaged only about $40 million yearly. Our imports from them averaged about $20 million each year. This microscopic amount of trade is a little less or a little more than our trade today with Denmark or Finland or the Dominican Republic or Ecuador or Liberia.

Also, as to Mr. Mikoyan's proposals to our businessmen, we must remember that there is no such thing as free action between our free enterprisers and the Russian people.

Our people must deal with a Communist agent in New York.

Further, there arises here again a fundamental difference in moral concepts between the Communists and ourselves.

When the present Department of Commerce building was under construction during my administration, I chose a sentence from Benjamin Franklin to be emblazoned over one of the portals of the building. It says: "Commerce among nations should be fair and equitable."

As to fair and equitable, I may mention that there is an International Patents and Copyrights Agreement among free nations by which discoveries, inventions, and the writings of citizens of the free world are protected for a just and fair return for their contributions of new ideas. These agreements have been one of the great stimulants to progress.

The Communist governments have not only refused to sign this agreement but they have ruthlessly appropriated these ideas from the whole free world.

In summing up Mr. Mikoyan's visit, it may be that he had in mind something beyond his idea of the expansion of almost nonexistent trade to thaw out the cold war.

Perhaps he wanted to discover if our people were united behind the President. Also, if we were determined to insist upon certain principles in our foreign relations.

He no doubt discovered an adamant people. And I trust he discovered that we are prepared and that we are not afraid.

As I said at the outset, we continue to strive for world peace. We have great hopes that the impending negotiations may at last bring it to the world.

But the successful negotiator is one who approaches his problems with a clear head, a sharp eye, a long memory. President Eisenhower has that awareness and he must have the unwavering support of a united people behind him and a people who are not afraid.

DEAN MANION. Thank you very, very much, Mr. President Hoover.

Financial Assistance From the Practice of Educational Thrift

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. GRANT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, there was recently held at the Alabama Polytechnic Institute, at Auburn, Ala., an industrial seminar on credit unions. Mr. Fred M. Lyon, president of the Opp-Micolas Cotton Mills Co. and chairman of the board of the Alabama Textile Manufacturers Association, made a most interesting talk which I am privileged to insert in the RECORD:

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FROM THE PRACTICE OF EDUCATIONAL THRIFT

A majority of speakers start their talk acknowledging the pleasure and privilege of appearing on a program. I am not doubting the sincerity and honesty of those speakers, because I think in most cases it is a pleasure. It is quite an honor to be singled out and use the occasion to exercise your talent, if you have any, on the subject of which you are speaking.

I will start the same way, but to me I get a little more pleasure appearing here today, because even though I fail to qualify in any way as an expert on the operation of employee credit unions, I am happy to be a part of an organization that has learned the operation from the bottom up. It may be that I have little to tell those in the audience who daily work directly or indirectly with company credit unions. I realize there are some people in the audience who have not had the pleasure of working with a credit union of their own. It is to them I bring this talk in hopes that they may share some of my enthusiasm.

I would like to ask a few questions. Have you ever taken time from the problems of the day to reflect upon good fortunes belonging to others? Have you ever been left with a warm glow of satisfaction by the accomplishment of others? Have you ever been so proud of the acknowledged results, when perhaps only the germ of the idea was yours, and even though you gave passive approval, you had little part but merely watched the progress which gradually matured and progressed? This group of ours deserves praise for their stamina, fortitude, and ability of handling.

We are all interested in credit. Even though my knowledge on company credit unions is limited, I have been quite exposed to credit matters since credit is an everyday problem in the running of cotton mills. You know our customers do not knock us down to buy goods or send money ahead of billings. I think back to years of long ago when I had hoped to see a credit union in our organization. As much as I wanted it, I could think of many reasons not to broach the subject for fear the imagination of our well-qualified and loyal workers would pester me into the formation of such a union. For years I had observed monthly reports of various company credit organizations and was astounded by their results. The more I thought how profitable it would be for our employees, the more my resistence to such hesitancy crumbled in favor of the starting of one in our own organization. With our passive approval, it fell to those interested workers within our organization to take the initiative and learn about the workings of company credit unions in general.

Today I am proud of the results and hope to take a few minutes of your time to give you figures you will find hard to believe. In the presentation of this talk may I express to you my own deep feeling of satisfaction toward those from within our ranks who have made this possible. They are not supermen and the same results can be obtained by your workers. I think it only fair, however, to tell you that unless you have employees, experienced from years in the organization, men who are not afraid to work, you had better forget the idea right now. You need workers who will give unselfishly of their time to at least get the formation of a credit union off to a sound start.

When Mr. Jerry Anchors asked me to appear on this program, it was because of his satisfaction that the credit union of the Opp and Micolas Mills was truly a representative one and a unit with which they held in pride. He wanted me to tell you something of the story. He knew that we, in top management, had not hindered their progress, that we had given them the early encouragement without dictating in any way. Neither Mr. Anchors nor I wish to cast any reflection on any of the credit unions which may be directed from the top. It is merely the fact that we have attempted to run ours in this fashion, and the results have been encouraging enough to show you, who may have interest, that the same can be accomplished by your plant personnel.

I think it only fair to express that besides my pride in their accomplishment and the interest for our employees' needs of financial independence, we at the Opp Mills had a selfish motive in wanting this credit organization founded. To give you a brief example: From the beginning of the mills operation we maintained a petty cash account of a moderate amount. From this checks were drawn only for loans made to the employees. The money was paid back in stipulated amounts as agreed upon by the employee and the mill official. In many cases when an employee's needs arose, the one in authority was not always available for such approval or else with his many other duties, prompt handling could not be consummated. I have known employees worthy of a loan suffer from this cumbersome method because there was little other way to handle in the absence of the mill manager.

Credit is a vital function, involving everyone no matter what his economic station in life happens to be. The proper control and sensible handling is the link that must be considered for the borrower to be fully benefited. I do not care how much income anyone has, credit for the long term or for the short term is necessary in cases of unusual circumstances. To create a source of credit for provident and productive purposes is a normal, healthy, and beneficial action. The mills' petty cash fund had to go a long way so as many as possible could secure the amounts they needed. Looking back on this method, I feel a slight sense of nostalgia, because there was no question about the many times we were able to be of help. I have become more sensible than merely a dreamer of the past because our former method was as outdated as the horse and buggy period and especially when compared to the advent of the smooth, easy-working and businesslike way the modern credit union operates.

Toward the end of 1953 we had several conferences with representatives of the Alabama Credit Union League with reference to the mechanics of starting a credit union at our Opp and Micolas Cotton Mills. These talks were most beneficial, as the help given proved fruitful enough that now looking back over the 5-year period, it seems impossible that such progress could have been achieved.

Perhaps at this point, it may be interesting to review some results that have transpired during this period from baby existence to the full-grown vigor of maturity. You may not like statistics, but since they are a necessary function of any well-run business, we realize without this yardstick, past results could not be studied or plans made for the morrow.

The bylaws and charter were completed instruments by February 2, 1954. As the year ended, loans outstanding stood at a modest but impressive first-year record of $13,646.34. December 1955, they had risen to $34,600.26 and showed still further rise at the end of 1956 by increasing to $55,492.15. Nineteen hundred and fifty-seven figures showed an increase, but here a period of digestion and consolidation occurred that gave the year-end figure an increase, but somewhat less impressive. The figure at the year end amounted to $64,619.22. We finished the year ending December 1958 with loans outstanding of $101,919.48.

Now if you will travel with me for a moment through some additional figures which illustrate the needs and services of our fellow workers, I am sure they will interest those of you who could gain for your employees the same benefits. During 1954 loans were made for every conceivable purpose, some say from babies to bathtubs. We are not as interested in the statistical study of what the loans were for as to the amounts. In 1954 the amount loaned was a very impressive $41,942.80. This activity increased during 1955 and amounted to more than $146,000. For 1956 loans were $253,691.70 and for 1957 a hefty $290,000. Last year the one-third of a million-dollar level was surpassed and loans made totaled nearly $378,000.

Gentlemen, a Herculean task was achieved many times over when you consider that since the second month of 1954, 6,757 loans totaling $1,104,632.37 were made to our members for many useful purposes that have made better living and insured better health, while relieving the temporary strain in which we often find ourselves.

Yes, a company credit union run by company workers for the benefit of the members can be one of the grandest financial pillars to security. This is evidenced by the credit union's assets which have grown from the first-year figure of $17,860.71 to a credible figure of $132,139.25 at the end of the fifth full year. I understand from the hard-working secretary-treasurer, Fred Kirkland, that at the end of January of this year the total assets reached $150,207.36 or an increase for January of some $18,000. It is estimated that today the total assets have now surpassed $165,000.

The loans to individual members for necessary purposes is one thing. What about thrift? Time would not permit me to give you the interesting facts that I have available. I could recite many stories which would be hard for you to believe; husband and wife teams both working for their welfare and for the future needs of their families. The encouragement of thrift is after all the finest thing that could happen to any individual. It is so easy to have your money deposited because a written and signed slip channeled through the credit union's office speedily reaches the payroll department, and the deductions from the pay records are made and thrift is started. The shares of members have increased from $15,348 in 1954 to $120,000 in 1958. You do not have to be a mathematician to see that a small amount of money can be safely turned over several times for the benefit of many. This is certainly better than dropping an occasional coin in the sugar bowl or tucking a couple of dollars under the mattress.

Besides the advantage of thrift and the utilization of employees' money for loans, let me tell you of the monetary gains of those who build for the future by systematically investing their deposits into the shares of the credit union. Dividends have been paid each year since 1955 and at a rate varying from 3 to 6 percent per year. This policy, with good management, should be continued throughout the years and still leave a comfortable amount for safety and in accordance with sound rules and regulations of any banking department. These dividends have amounted to $9,901.14 while leaving undivided profits at the end of 1958 of $7,809.27. I think some of the large commercial banks should take notice of the efficient way employees run their credit business, because for the entire year of 1958 the bad debts amounted to the staggering sum of $15.75.

In summing up my statistical review, I would like to repeat that the total dividends, increased shares saved and accumulated do not tell the entire story. The main thing is that those hundreds in our organiaztion who have showed the way by their participation are setting an example for those who have not availed themselves of this opportunity. Many of your workers may find they will be unable to meet emergencies or plan for the future. They need to enjoy some of the interesting gadgets of this modern era while at the same time benefiting by thrift, as well as the furtherance of a fuller life in cooperative venture run by people who live and work with them daily. It is human nature to spend a little more when money is in your pockets. Joining a credit union is the means for dollars that seem impossible to keep to start working for the future while relieving the temporary urge to spend.

I feel sure you gentlemen will pardon my personal references to our credit union, but I know of little else that would serve to illustrate the history and functions of general credit union procedures. I am so sold on the need and use for this general organization that I can afford to be partial in my using our own figures and story. Our people are part of the approximately 7 million members of some 20,000 credit unions scattered in various industries and plants over the entire United States. This impressive total illustrates the mushroom acceptance of a sound institution. Each day men and women are finding easy, friendly, and convenient credit unions solving their personal money problems.

As I said earlier, the Alabama League of Credit Union Officials think our setup to be a model one, because it is run completely and exclusively by those people within our organization, who are not directly associated with top management policies. The Opp & Micolas Credit Union was organized in 1954 by the employees and has been continually run by them. It does have the full cooperation of the company officials and while the general rank and file executives are helpful, they do not have any shares and are not on the board of directors or meddle or dictate in any way. The board of directors and credit committee members are elected by the membership. The only paid worker is the treasurer, and in our case, we would have to give praise to those others who worked long and hard hours without any pay at all. As the business grows I feel sure additions to the staff will have to be added, but the extra business will more than compensate for the additional expense. As a safeguard, irrespective of the number of employees, the ones handling the affairs are bonded for total assets up to $1 million. The daily work goes along, serving members by promoting thrift. Some of the outstanding cases of savings are those who admit they have never saved before and now have several hundreds of dollars to their account.

The interest charge is very low and is computed at 1 percent per month on the unpaid balance. This is generally figured not to cost over 6 percent for the duration of the loan. These loans take care of emergencies, for the purchase of appliances, as well as automobiles. A typical case of savings is $50 to $100 on appliances and $100 to $300 on the purchasing of an automobile. They are also able to consolidate debts with payments low enough to eliminate financial strain. A further help in the case of our workers has been the avoidance of the facilities that are handy, but expensive.

I mentioned earlier it has been a relief to the company in that it has completely eliminated borrowing by the employees; it has also helped the company, as well as employees in the reduction of garnishments. This reduction amounts to 75 or 80 percent. Our people feel more secure in that they have financial relief as well as savings—all this with possibility of a return from their investments. This chain of events can be accomplished by payroll deductions as low as 25 cents.

One of the most attractive and valuable services of the credit union is the life insurance its members have at no extra cost. All the premiums are paid by the organization. A member's certificate is given each showing the table of benefits paid in event of death or total disability, for each $1 savings up to $2,000. This ranges from 25 percent to 100 percent, varying according to age. No insurance is available on deposits made after age 70, but the insurance is good on any money you deposit before age 70 unless withdrawn, or for as long as you live. While no loan insurance is available after age 70, all personal loans are covered up to $10,000 before age 70.

From a very humble start in 1954 with the beginning by seven charter members, the Opp and Micolas Credit Union has shown steady growth. There are now approximately 625 members, with an average savings of $241.45. Inasmuch as 126 new members joined in 1958, the average has been reduced from a more creditable figure of a year ago. The highest family unit savings account is $4,400.26.

About half the loans carry additional signatures and the average loan balance is about $306. The State League is ever ready to be helpful, but by no means are they the boss of the local credit union. The losses have been small, amounting to $206.80 in 1956; 1957, $325.53; and 1958, $15.75. From this total of losses, recovery has been $51.58.

An example of how our employees are using the facilities for thrift is indicated by the large deposits. One employee is depositing biweekly $100; 1, $80; 3, $50; and 15 depositing $25.

The important thing is to get credit union members in at first who are sold on the organization and who have been employed long enough to know the people. The all important credit committee must have as members those individuals who know people and conditions at the respective plants.

Each year when dividends are declared, they are posted to the credit of the individual member and remain for further investment or are available for his withdrawal. As a matter of fact, any deposit can be made one week and withdrawn the next. An interesting example is one that actually happened at our mills. One member deposited $1,000 in January. In February he withdrew to buy a house. The seller of the house came in the following day and deposited the $1,000 in the credit union and thus kept the money in the credit union for further use for others, while at the same time, investing for the future by possible realization of income. The largest loan made so far has been $6,000 with the smallest loan $5. At this time the real estate loans run about 9 percent of the total loans.

There are many details connected with any credit union's operation and the Alabama Credit Union League will be more than willing to assist in the formation of such an organization at your plant. With the many thousands of these scattered over the country, and with literature, periodicals, and pamphlets available from the Credit Union National Association, Inc., no one should have any trouble starting. It is advisable to secure information from those who have made a success and our directors, credit committee, or secretary-treasurer would be more than willing to give anyone information and the benefit of their experience. The members have to own at least one share to become a full-fledged member; this share is valued at $5. This enables you to become eligible for a loan up to $300 on your own signature, or at the discretion of the credit committee, borrow $300 in excess of amount of saving or $300 for each cosignature. With suitable collateral, there is no limit to your borrowing.

If I have used too many personal allustrations, I beseech your apologies. If I have seemed over enthused in my references, it is because I have seen the incalculable benefits that the credit union of the Opp and Micolas Cotton Mills has brought to our personnel. We in top management have offered our cooperation and support but have not pried into their affairs.

If I have even seen an organization within an organization work independently of each, it is the directors and officers of the company's credit union. I do hope I have been able to impart to you some enthusiasm as to the results which can be obtained. My appearing on this program today was solely because of my interest, and my pride in their accomplishments should show you my wholehearted endorsement to the unlimited possibilities of such an organization for use in savings, the foundation for thrift, and the bridge to span the yawning chasm of mis-

used credit that afflicts the everyday lives of us all. Credit is economics, so let us be economical in the use of money, and soon we will find that the paths of loyal workers, handling more efficiently their money problem, can be one answer to a more satisfied person when he faces the realities that often confront families and friends.

Albert J. Hayes, President, International Association of Machinists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in the past several months there has been a great deal of attention focused on the misconduct of certain union officials. It is important, however, that a proper perspective be kept. The betrayal of a sacred trust by a relatively small number of union officials should not serve to obscure the fact that the vast majority of labor leaders are sincerely dedicated to honestly serving the rank-and-file union members.

One of our country's outstanding labor leaders is Albert J. Hayes, president of the International Association of Machinists. Mr. Hayes exemplifies the spirit of the leadership of the American labor movement—service to the union membership and to the community at large.

The Christian Science Monitor on February 25, 1959, presented an excellent article entitled "Albert J. Hayes Came Up From the Ranks."

I ask unanimous consent that this article describing a great labor leader and great American be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALBERT J. HAYES CAME UP FROM THE RANKS

Last year when the International Association of Machinists marked its 70th anniversary Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat of Minnesota, paid an unusual tribute to a labor leader on the Senate floor: "It is one of the great attributes of democracy that the democratic process produces leaders who are imbued with the spirit of justice and freedom and who typify and reflect, to a great extent, the qualities of the men and women who raise them to office.

"Such a leader is the international president of the Machinists Union, Al Hayes. I have known him for quite a few years now. I admire him for his personal qualities and for his personification of what is good about the American labor movement," Senator HUMPHREY told the Senate.

Criticism of a James R. Hoffa makes news, praise for an Al Hayes seldom does. And, unfortunately, the questionable circumstances which permit the emergence of a Hoffa to power become widely known—and condemned as a labor fault—while the democratic processes by which a Hayes rises through union ranks to leadership too often go unnoted. In the Machinists, and most other unions, carefully planned checks and balances assure that democratic practices are not only written into union laws but are also enforced.

The president of the International Machinists, Albert J. Hayes, is a 59-year-old machinist who worked his way up through union ranks to be elected president in 1949. The organization's most dramatic growth in numbers (nearly doubled since 1950) and in prestige has taken place under his administration, recognized and respected in labor as highly competent and businesslike. The IAM was an independent union when Mr. Hayes was elected president. Within a year, Mr. Hayes successfully eased strained jurisdictional relations with a number of AFL unions and led the machinists back into the federation. At the same time, he negotiated a no-raiding agreement that smoothed relations with the rival United Auto Workers (CIO). This pact served as a model for a no-raiding agreement between AFL and CIO—and helped clear the way for the merger of the two major labor bodies in 1955.

KEYMAN IN AFL–CIO

Since the merger, Mr. Hayes has had a key role in the AFL–CIO as a vice president and executive council member, as chairman of the ethical practices committee, and currently as one of the four members of a special top-level committee working for the passage of constructive anticorruption legislation in the 86th Congress.

When Congress acts, and there is little doubt that it will, chances are that the law it passes will have no major effects on the Machinists Union. So far, the reforms proposed on Capitol Hill—intended to guarantee democratic processes in unions and to safeguard labor funds—provide no more stringent controls than those written into the Machinists constitution.

Not long ago, an irritated employer criticized the Machinists Union for practicing too much democracy. He suggested that life could be made a lot simpler for everybody through a few shortcuts. What he urged was not dishonest or uncommon. He wanted certain shop officials appointed, not elected.

IAM negotiators explained that they couldn't be appointed; under the union's laws and traditions, they have to be elected. The men and women in shops, the machinists' rank and file, exercise authority. Power doesn't flow from the top down but upward from the membership, individual by individual. It may not make life any simpler,, but it does make actions more democratic.

The principle of power rising from the ranks is reinforced by the fact that all of the IAM's officers and all but a handful of its staff, those who require a special training or professional background, come out of the shops.

The basic unit of the IAM is the local lodge, which may range in size from 25 to 25,000 members. The lodges enjoy a high degree of autonomy. Their members set their own duties and elect officers annually. Local officers usually receive no pay, although many lodges make up whatever pay officers lose if they take time off from jobs to take care of union business.

LOCAL LODGES COOPERATE

Where there are clusters of lodges, the local units can, and usually do, coordinate their activities through district lodges. Such a lodge generally has the money, the pooled resources of affiliated locals, to employ one or more business representatives to conduct the affairs of the local lodges—grievance handling, contract negotiations, and so forth. The business representatives are elected either by delegates to district conventions or through a referendum vote of members of all local lodges. Their salaries are set and paid by the district, but up to $500 a month is repaid by the international union.

Local and district lodges in most States are organized into State councils, largely to further legislative and educational activities. In many instances, they may also be part of industry-wide or company-wide conferences created to coordinate contract bargaining.

While local lodges enjoy considerable autonomy, they may be suspended or put under a trusteeship where serious charges of misconduct are involved. During the past year of Senate labor investigations, trusteeships have been criticized sharply as undemocratic. The IAM, however, believes that trusteeships are necessary if union policies and standards are to be policed; the evil is in misuse of suspension powers, not the existence of takeover authority. Trusteeships are limited by a system of checks and balances in the Machinists Union. Since 1947, only six locals have been suspended.

Locals can suspend members for violations of the laws and policies of the IAM, but only under carefully specified procedures. Formal charges must be presented to the accused member, who must also be given time to conduct his defense—and to have another lodge member serve as his counsel. Charges are heard by a three-member trial committee, which reports its findings and recommendations to the local lodge. Members vote, by secret ballot, first on the guilt of the accused member, second on what, if any, penalty should be invoked. The local's decision may be appealed to the international president, the executive council, and finally the Grand Lodge convention.

The basic law of the IAM is its constitution, a comprehensive document that spells out, in detail, all rights and duties of members. Under it, the supreme governing body of the union is the Grand Lodge convention, which meets every 4 years or upon call of at least 20 percent of all local lodges.

Each convention reviews and conducts the general business of the organization. It may recommend changes in the constitution, but it cannot make them. Amendments must be submitted to the entire membership to be approved by a secret ballot referendum.

International officers are elected in the same way, by referendum, with every member of every lodge given an opportunity to vote by secret ballot. The election of union officers by secret vote is one labor reform proposed on Capitol Hill.

If vacancies occur, they must be filled through elections, not by interim appointments.

Quadrennial conventions are far less ideal than more frequent meetings; congressional proposals would bar, as undemocratic procedure, stretching the interval between conventions beyond an absolute 4-year limit. But conventions are a heavy drain on union finances and they're getting more expensive year by year.

The Machinists seek to meet this problem by giving between-conventions executive and judicial powers to the 11 general officers of the union, who sit as the executive council, and by giving local lodges a checkrein—power to institute recall procedures and, with the support of 15 percent of all lodges, to force a recall election.

The funds, property, and assets of the IAM are protected by strict constitutional control similar to those that guarantee democratic procedures. Eric Peterson, a former Union Pacific machinist, elected secretary-treasurer of the IAM in 1944, is the principal guardian of the union's financial integrity. When AFL–CIO decided to draft a code of ethics to govern financial practices of its affiliates, Mr. Peterson was one of the first men it called on as an adviser.

FUNDS CLOSELY CONTROLLED

IAM lodges control their own funds, but under the constitution they must give monthly financial reports to their members and to the international. Loans or appro-

priations for any purpose other than the legitimate work of the local are prohibited. Loans to private individuals, for any purpose, are strictly forbidden.

Local funds must be audited once every 3 months by an elected committee of three lodge members. Officers can't serve on the committee. The quarterly audit reports must be submitted to the lodge membership and to the international union's secretary-treasurer.

To make double sure that the books of Machinists locals are always in order, the international employs 25 full-time, trained auditors who are constantly on the move, from lodge to lodge, conducting thorough audits of all local funds.

The international—the Grand Lodge—has about $20 million in assets. The 11-member executive council, rather than any single officer, exercises control over the union funds and property. And it is limited in what it can do. For instance, the council may invest funds only in U.S. and Canadian Government bonds and such other securities as are approved for trust funds by the Probate Court of the District of Columbia.

The Grand Lodge publishes and submits to all local lodges, once a month, a report of its receipts and expenditures. If any local requests it, the Grand Lodge must also furnish a copy of the expense account of any paid representative of the union.

The international's books are audited every 6 months by a three-man committee elected by local lodges within a 40-mile radius of the IAM headquarters in Washington. The committee is authorized to select and employ a certified public accountant. A report on the audit findings must be published and circulated to members.

Stringent rules also apply to IAM health and welfare plans. Competitive bids must be obtained if they are to be underwritten by a commercial insurance company. No paid union representative is permitted to collect extra pay for services in administering such a plan or to have any connection with an insurance company or agency that handles such a plan.

According to the IAM, few organizations of any kind, in business, banking, or the professions, can surpass the record of financial integrity established by Machinists Union over the past 70 years.

The Late Robert Aufderheide, Supervisor of the Willamette National Forest in the State of Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD an editorial from the Bend (Oreg.) Bulletin of March 30, 1959, paying tribute to the late Robert Aufderheide of Eugene, supervisor of the great Willamette National Forest. Bob Aufderheide, who recently died at the untimely age of 50, was a splendid conservationist and forester who served his State and Nation well. I concur in the sentiments of the Bulletin editorial which is entitled "Bob Aufderheide, 1909–59."

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial appear in the Appendix of the RECORD, so my colleagues may know the qualities of a man who was a custodian of one of our great Federal forests and watersheds in the Pacific Northwest.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOB AUFDERHEIDE, 1909–59

Few in Central Oregon—outside of professional foresters—knew Bob Aufderheide, who died from cancer in Eugene Saturday.

Aufderheide was supervisor of the Willamette National Forest at the time of his death. A graduate of Oregon State, he had been employed by the Forest Service since his college days.

Although few over here were personally acquainted with Aufderheide, all of us owed him much.

Bob Aufderheide was in charge of one of our largest natural resources, the Willamette National Forest, which alone cuts more timber each year than 10 of 12 regions of the U.S. Forest Service.

He was our hired manager of this resource.

And we could not have had a more devoted man working for us.

Aufderheide was an exceptionally good forest supervisor—one of the two best we have seen in Oregon in recent years. It is ironic that the other, Jim Egan, should also have died of cancer in recent months.

Prior to going to Eugene, Aufderheide had made his reputation, and an excellent one it was, on the Umpqua and Siletz forests.

One of an editor's most difficult jobs is to note the passing of one whose ability he admired or whose friendship he enjoyed.

In the case of Bob Aufderheide, forester and friend, this is doubly difficult.

Oregon's Centennial Celebration Uncarths Interesting Douglas County Data

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, during this Oregon centennial year a number of interesting facts about my State and the 36 counties in it are coming to light.

Douglas County of Oregon's Fourth Congressional District can cite a good number of features which are found in no other area. These have been listed in the Roseburg (Oreg.) Douglas Fir of April 3, 1959, which is published by Dick Gilman. The article, "Know Your County," follows:

KNOW YOUR COUNTY

There are many items of interest in Douglas County and about Douglas County that everyone should be prepared to give the thousands of visitors who come here this year. This being our centennial year, we can expect many extra thousands to visit our area too.

Douglas County has four leading industries and they are, in order: Lumbering, mining, agriculture, and tourist trade.

Here are just a few of the interesting things you should know about our country and pass on to others.

We are the heart of the largest remaining stand of Douglas fir timber in the Nation.

The North Umpqua River is the longest river to originate, flow through and end in one county.

The only place in the world where two rivers meat head-on is where the North Umpqua and Little River meet at Glide, Oreg.

We have the lowest recorded wind velocity of any city in the world.

Douglas County has more square miles of land than three of the States in the Union. We are larger than Connecticut, Delaware, and Rhode Island.

At Tiller, Oreg., is the tallest Cedar tree in the world.

What Mutual Security Funds Buy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 13, 1959

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the common misunderstandings about the mutual security program is the belief that all these funds are spent abroad. As a matter of fact, more than 75 percent of all mutual security appropriations are spent in the United States, accounting for an estimated 500,000 full-time jobs for our citizens.

In the April 4 edition of the Christian Science Monitor, Mr. Neal Stanford has written an illuminating article on just how mutual security funds are used. In the belief that this article provides a valuable insight into the operation of the program, I include it in the RECORD together with my remarks:

WHAT MUTUAL SECURITY FUNDS BUY
(By Neal Stanford)

To understand the $3,930 million mutual security program you really need a primer or handbook, for how many people really know the difference between military assistance, defense support, technical cooperation, special assistance? And what about the mysterious pipeline that plays such a large part in mutual security programs, or section 402 that deals with surplus agricultural products?

Before getting into these terms and their meanings and differences it is necessary to correct a misapprehension, in fact, a great big mistake, namely, that mutual security is foreign aid.

The trouble with the foreign aid handle to this program is that it suggests a give-away, a handout, Operations Santa Claus. The fact is that while mutual security is aid it is not foreign. The only foreign thing about it is that its end products wind up abroad.

Actually more than 75 percent of all mutual security appropriations is spent in the United States; and that which is spent abroad benefits the American economy, for it makes it possible for the countries where mutual security money is spent to do just that much more business with Uncle Sam through trade. Also, mutual security spending in this country accounts for over 500,000 full-time jobs from Maine to California. Now, on with the primer:

Pipeline: This term refers simply to money committed but not spent. For example,

some jet planes are to be built for an ally with mutual security funds. They have to be ordered, manufactured, delivered. It may be 3 years between the order and the delivery. But the money for these planes is earmarked for that purpose all this time.

Six years ago there was some $8,500 million in the pipeline. This has been cut over the years to $2,600 million. It possibly could be reduced more, but not much. In other words there always will be a pipeline. In a sense mutual security has been living off its pipeline these last years to the tune of nearly $1 billion a year. But that process cannot go on forever. Today's pipeline is down to about its irreducible minimum.

Section 402: This is the amendment to the mutual security act that requires that a minimum specified amount of MSA funds be used to buy and export surplus agricultural products, in exchange for foreign currencies. To date nearly $2 billion worth of wheat, $2½ billion worth of cotton, and half a billion dollars of both corn and fats and oils have been exported under this program.

Military assistance: Of the $3,930 million the President is asking for mutual security, $1,600 million is scheduled to go for military assistance. This means the military equipment, training supplies, and services going to foreign military forces as part of America's own military defense program.

Defense support: This is the second largest item in the MSA program—$835 million this year. It covers the economic assistance that the United States will make to 12 countries—in effect subsidizing their economies to make it possible for them to maintain larger military forces than they otherwise could afford.

Most of this goes to Korea, Formosa, Vietnam, Turkey—and except for Spain these 12 countries lie around the southern and eastern boundaries of the Sino-Soviet empire.

Development Loan Fund: This new Government corporation set up to make soft loans to underdeveloped countries would get $700 million out of 1960 MSA funds. It could do a land-office business if it had more money. There are some $3 billion in requests on hand—but the Fund has had only $400 million to work with. Loans from this Fund go for power, transportation, and communication projects, for health and sanitation programs, industry and agricultural development.

Special assistance: This is the economic aid going to countries that do not get economic assistance through defense support that accompanies military assistance. The President is asking for $272 million for this coming year. It is economic aid that does not come under other specific categories.

Contingency fund: The $200 million the President wants for this emergency fund would give him the means to meet economic and political crises without having to ask Congress for special funds. In the past, money from such a fund has gone to keep Jordan from collapsing, to help Chile when copper prices collapsed, to rush aid in case of flood, earthquakes, hurricanes.

Technical assistance: This is just what its name implies—the sharing of U.S. know-how through training foreigners in this country, sending U.S. specialists abroad. Last year nearly 10,000 foreign nationals came to the United States for training; nearly 7,000 U.S. technicians went abroad under this program.

And, finally, other programs—a catchall phrase to cover whatever is left out of any operations and also pay increases.

Bataan Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the evil days of World War II bequeathed us many unhappy memories and untold miseries. For more than 3 years our fate and future seemed to be in jeopardy, and at times the whole issue was kept in precarious suspense. The day of infamy, which began with Pearl Harbor, cast a pall over the Nation that grew darker with the fall of Bataan 4 months later. During those months and long thereafter the whole free world, and we in the United States as its leader, were on trial—physically, spiritually, ideally, and morally. And in that supreme trial, that life-consuming and soul-scorching trial, many had their finest hour. We survived; we overcame the enemy; and finally were victorious through the sterling qualities of our fighting forces on all fronts. And those qualities: resourcefulness and resiliency, tenacity and ingenuity, proved their worth better at Bataan than anywhere else during the early phase of the war.

OUR FORCES OUTNUMBERED AND EXHAUSTED

Our forces, numbering about 20,000, plus about 100,000 Philippine citizen army, were not match for Japan's more than 200,000 seasoned troops. The enemy had succeeded in eliminating our Air Force there; the island was cut off from the outside world; and the best of the combined American-Filipino forces were cornered at the strategic Bataan Peninsula. At Bataan our isolated and far outnumbered forces withstood the unrelenting and intensive enemy attack for more than 3 months. Finally, when sheer physical exhaustion doomed our forces, they surrendered to the enemy on April 9, 1942, 17 years ago. In that great battle, waged far from our shores, our men proved their bravery and courage, and they willingly sacrificed their lives for the good and glory of their beloved country. On this anniversary we bow our heads and pray for their blessed memory.

CURRENT AMERICAN-PHILIPPINES RELATIONS

Mr. Speaker, the New York Times of last Thursday printed a timely editorial on the Bataan Day anniversary and it pointed up recent events in American-Philippines relations which should be of concern to every Member of this House.

I had originally asked permission last Friday to include this editorial with my remarks above, but later I learned that the New York Times editorial had been inserted in the RECORD by Senator KEATING of New York. I want to take this opportunity to express my complete agreement with the editorial relative to Filipino loyalty and the matter of outstanding Philippine claims.

Wonderful Wilderness Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in its March 23 issue, the New Leader magazine published an excellent article written by William E. Bohn about our country's wonderful wilderness areas. This is one of the finest pieces of writing I have seen in support of the National Wilderness Preservation Act, S. 1123, which I have introduced on behalf of myself and several colleagues from both sides of the aisle.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEAKING UP FOR WILDERNESS
(By William E. Bohn)

When in the great assizes of creation the judge's voice rings out: "Who speaks here for the trees, the animals, the birds, the flowers?" one determined voice answers back: "I do." That reply is launched by Joseph Wood Krutch, the shy, thoughtful, and accurately informed disciple of Henry David Thoreau, who went west some years ago in search of health in the pure air of mountain elevations.

I wrote a week ago that my guess was that the wilderness bill which had been introduced into Congress would pass triumphantly. I laid that optimistic wager because the bill is supported in the Senate by 15 of the finest fellows, most of them Democrats, but a few of them the very pick of the Republican crop. I can't imagine defeat for a bill supported by such men. But friend Krutch writes under a recent date: "The bill is having a tough time. The Arizona hearing ended by voting against it, too many interests unwilling to have withdrawn from possible future exploitation of 'resources' on which they might make a profit. If you can say a word in favor of the bill, it might help."

I can do better than that. Krutch has sent me a couple of pages about our woods and given me permission to print them. I challenge anyone to read this declaration without being thrilled. If there is a Member of Congress who can read this without feeling his patriotism tingle clear down to his boots, he must be a dead man. Krutch writes:

"A few years ago the distinguished English naturalist, James Fisher, made a 20,000-mile trip through 'Wild America' in the company of our own ornithologist, Roger Tory Peterson. His parts of the book which he wrote in collaboration with his companion are exclamations of wonder and paeans of praise for a land for whose richness, beauty, and variety even all his book knowledge had not prepared him. 'Why is it,' he asked, 'that Americans show us Europeans so little of their earthly paradise and publicize too little their determination to share it with wild nature?' And he concluded with this tribute which the wisdom of our fathers earned for us: 'Never have I seen such wonders or met landlords so worthy of their land. They had, and still have, the power to ravage it; and instead they have made it a garden.'

"All too ominously true is the last part of that sentence: 'They had, and still have, the power to ravage it.' Theodore Roosevelt asked us to stay the hand, and we did. Will an American Congress of this generation follow the example set a generation ago, or will it deny the wisdom of that example and reserve no areas as not to be ravaged?

"What we have are things which no other nation can recover. If we permit them to be lost, we cannot recover them, either. This generation may very well be the one which will make the irrevocable decision whether or not America will continue to be for centuries to come the one great nation which had the foresight to preserve an important part of its heritage. If we do not preserve it, then we shall have diminished by just that much the unique privilege of being an American.

"The natural areas which the wilderness bill proposes to establish are logical and necessary corollaries of the system of national parks which the wisdom of our fathers set up some 40 years ago. Those parks are now the wonder and envy of Europe which can boast nothing remotely comparable because no European nation had the foresight to establish anything of the kind while there was yet time. The question now is whether or not we can be as farsighted as our immediate predecessors or whether we shall soon be compelled, like the inhabitants of Europe, to admit that we let the last opportunity slip by.

"If it should be asked why, since we have the parks, the wildernesses are also logical and necessary, the answer is simple: It is because parks are inevitably partly tamed and our descendants have a right to know also the beauty and the majesty of Nature herself as they can exist only when it has been neither exploited nor 'improved.'

"That such unspoiled wild beauty was once everywhere had much to do with the foundations of American character. It is as much of our past as Mount Vernon or Williamsburg. But it cannot be preserved in books or museums. Not to preserve some specimens in the only way they can be preserved is to be guilty of vandalism comparable to the razing of Mount Vernon or the burning of the Congressional Library.

"The grandest feature of grand nature is her forests and they are nowhere grander than they were (in some places still are) in America. But things move fast in the United States. Not long ago the problem was 'to clear the forests'; today it is to preserve at least a few of them. Trees are useful of course—for lumber and for paper. But are they not useful also for themselves? And who can say that we are too poor to afford a few examples of what we can so easily destroy but cannot possibly create?"

Interstate Highway Repayment Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced H.R. 6303, designated as the "Interstate Highway Repayment Act," authorizing appropriations to reimburse States which have built toll and free highways which have been made a part of the national system of interstate and defense highways.

The proposed bill authorizes the appropriation over a 15-year period of the total net reimbursable amount shown on the annexed exhibit A. This amount is based upon the report—House Document No. 301, 85th Congress—of the Secretary of Commerce concerning the depreciated cost of the free or toll roads, or portions thereof, included in the Interstate System.

All funds proposed to be appropriated under this bill are required to be used by the States solely for highway construction on the Federal Aid Primary System. These funds are to be expended under the present Federal aid legislation with certain exceptions. No matching by the States is required. The bill provides for the apportionment of the funds on the basis of the relative contribution made by each State so that the result is that at the end of the 15-year period each State shall have received the matching ratio of its depreciated cost, less any Federal aid payments already made.

This statement supports the proposed bill for the following reasons, each of which is discussed below:

First. There is an obligation to the contributing States.

Second. This obligation should be met at once.

Third. It is feasible to meet it now as done in the proposed bill.

Fourth. Toll roads are entitled to the same credit as free roads.

Fifth. The national interest is well served because the proposed bill provides for the construction of roads where the need is great.

I. THERE IS AN OBLIGATION TO THE CONTRIBUTING STATES

The construction of the Interstate System is a project national in scope. This is recognized by the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956 when it states in section 108(a):

> It is hereby declared to be essential to the national interest to provide for the early completion of the National System of Interstate Highways.

That section further states that:

> It is the intent of the Congress * * * that the entire system in all the States be brought to simultaneous completion. Because of its primary importance to the national defense the name of such system is hereby change to the "National System of Interstate and Defense Highways."

This declaration by Congress made only a few years ago would seem to make it clear beyond any doubt that we are dealing with a national project.

Other factors also indicate that this conclusion is inescapable. The Federal share payable for this construction varies between 90 and 95 percent of the cost. The standards are uniform throughout the country and are so developed that the highways and bridges will carry military equipment, which was not the case formerly, since in some States the bridges were not designed to support heavy loads and the grades were too steep or the roads were too narrow. It was planned and designed as a National System of Interstate Highways as indicated by the requirements of section 7 of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944.

Since in law and in fact it is a national project, it is distinguishable from the usual Federal aid concept. Federal aid is given to the States for a multitude of purposes including the construction of roads. In the usual Federal aid case, funds are required to be matched by the States on a 50 percent basis. Generally Federal aid highway projects are dispersed into a number of different places within a particular State so that all of its counties within a few years may receive the benefit of some new Federal aid road construction. The aid is given to assist and foster highway construction within that particular State. This is a vastly different concept than the concept of the Interstate System which is a National System of connected roads, which is to be brought to simultaneous completion, and constructed because of a national interest in its construction.

The difference is emphasized by the difference in mode of payment. The amount of Federal aid authorized to be appropriated in any given year has been based in a general way on the realization that the States needed assistance in road building and the amount has been gradually increased over the years. But there has been no criterion other than the general need. In the case of the Interstate System the amount of the authorization was based upon the original estimated cost. For ordinary Federal aid, the amount authorized has been apportioned to the individual States on old and established formulas of area, population, and road mileage. The apportionment in the case of the Interstate System is based upon the cost of construction to the individual State of its specified mileage in that State, and when such construction has been completed the apportionment ceases.

Once the difference between usual Federal aid and the construction of the Interstate System is clearly understood, few will dispute that a State which contributes highways or a portion thereof to the Interstate System is entitled to a credit for that construction. The point can be illustrated in numerous ways. For example, if the Federal Government in connection with its establishment of post offices should find certain public buildings in some States adequate and adaptable for use as post offices, certainly no one could contend that because these had already been constructed and were ready for use, the Federal Government would not be required to pay for them; but that it would be required to pay some other State to construct a post office which was not at the time in existence. The position that payment should not be made in either case is clearly untenable. The reason that it seems so clear in the post office case is that the establishment and operation of post offices is a Federal function carried out entirely by the Federal Government.

There is no distinction between the post office case and the highway case, once it is conceded that the construction of the Interstate System is a national project 90 to 95 percent of the cost of which is paid for by the Federal Government. If a State has supplied a road, or a portion thereof, already constructed, it is just as entitled to a credit for this as it would be if it had con-

tributed an established public building that could be used as a post office.

This point of view has important backing. The Clay Committee report which was submitted to the President in January 1955 after stating that some States had already constructed sections of the Interstate System made this comment at page 21:

> Such construction should not be discouraged by this report since our goal is maximum highway improvement.

It continued at page 22 with the definite recommendation that:

> Those States in which sections of the Interstate System have been provided to meet the presently established standards for the completed system should receive appropriate credit.

The suggestions in this report were incorporated in H.R. 4260 and similar bills introduced in 1955. These bills were generally believed to be the administration bills, so that as late as 1955 it may be said that the administration was in favor of giving States a credit for their road construction to the Interstate System.

While it is a fact that in the following year the Secretary of Commerce reversed this position and opposed the inclusion of a provision authorizing a credit in H.R. 8336 it was opposed not so much on the ground that the States were not entitled to a credit, as on the ground of expediency. In his statement to the committee the Secretary said that he did not favor a credit at the present time—see hearings before Subcommittee on Roads, 1956, page 11. He also stated:

> Obviously more roads can be completed, if those already built are not bought. Furthermore, the States would not appear to be hurt by failure to extend credit for such roads. In general, toll roads have been set up on a sound fiscal basis, and have not cost the States a penny. No amount has been included in the authorizations for the Interstate System for toll and free road credits, and it would, therefore, be necessary to increase the authorizations or cancel a part of the needed program if such credits are to be extended.

The last sentence probably expresses the fundamental reason for the change in position of the Secretary of Commerce. It is usually the principal reason relied on by other persons who oppose recognizing this obligation. The argument is that there is not enough money; that it is not feasible. These persons do not take the position that it is unfair to give the States credit, but rather that it is not feasible so to do. Few persons say that it would be unfair. It is difficult to see how they could.

In conclusion, fair play and equity demand that this obligation be recognized and that a credit be allowed those States which have constructed highways or portions thereof on the Insterstate System, and thus relieve the Federal Government of a tremendous expenditure for a project of national scope which was planned in the national interest.

II. THIS OBLIGATION SHOULD BE MET AT ONCE

Four years have elapsed since the Clay report and the introduction of the first bills with respect to authorizing funds for the Interstate System. Three years have elapsed since the passage of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956 which did authorize the necessary funds. Section 114 of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956 represented a temporary solution of the controversy between those persons favoring a credit for free and toll roads and those opposed. It was a solution that seemed sound at the time. No one could state with any accuracy at that time which roads would be incorporated into the Interstate System and what they cost. A definite basis for action prior to a final decision by Congress seemed advisable. This was accomplished by section 114.

The report called for by section 114 was transmitted to the House on January 7, 1958, and has been designated as House Document No. 301. A hearing was held on this report before the Committee on Public Works on March 25–26, 1958. No action was taken following that hearing.

The necessary facts are set forth in that report and there is no reason for further delay. Fair play requires the immediate recognition of this obligation to the contributing States. It is no answer to say that the Federal Government cannot afford at this time to meet this obligation. These are the most prosperous times according to all business statistics that this Nation has yet encountered. If this obligation cannot be met today, it never can be met. Postponement is not an answer.

Most persons who urge postponement, and yet do not argue that it would be inequitable or unfair to allow this credit, are in effect stating that the Federal Government is not in a position to meet its just obligations. It is, indeed, a sad commentary on our moral conscientiousness that expediency should rule, rather than equity. There is an obligation or there isn't an obligation. If there is one, it should be repaid at once. Part I of this statement clearly demonstrates that there is such an obligation.

III. IT IS FEASIBLE TO MEET THIS OBLIGATION TODAY

The proposed bill authorizes appropriations over a 15-year period commencing with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962. While these authorizations total the net reimbursable amount shown by exhibit A of $4,295,600,000, the amounts involved for any one fiscal year range between $225,000,000 and $360,000,000. These annual authorizations are clearly within a feasible area.

Apportionments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, must be made prior to January 1, 1961, and therefore will be made probably in the fall of 1960. Thus, the States will be entitled to contract for the work on the basis of the apportionments next year. They will also have the knowledge of the definite amounts that will be apportioned to them over the ensuing 15 years.

The proposed authorization for a 15-year period departs from the usual authorization of Federal aid for roads in that the regular Federal aid authorizations are generally for a 2-year period. However, this would not be the first departure from the usual practice, since the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956 authorized the entire original estimated cost of the interstate system to be spread over a 13-year period. The reason in that case was the need for constructing the interstate system as an entirety, and for the States to have knowledge of their apportionments so that they could engage in long-range planning. The reason was adequate, and Congress approved the long-term authorizations spreading over 13 years. There is also an adequate reason for a similar long-term authorization in the proposed bill. There is an obligation to be repaid, and the only way to repay it is to authorize payment of the entire obligation. Spreading it over a 15-year period does this in a feasible way.

It is provided in the bill that appropriations can be made from general treasury funds, not otherwise appropriated, rather than from the highway trust fund created by section 209 of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956. The reason for this is clear. The Federal Government is repaying an obligation. The repayment of an obligation should not be contingent. It should be certain and fixed. The highway trust fund is contingent, depending upon the amount of revenues collected. The proposed bill is a clear authorization for appropriations and apportionments which will permit contracts to be entered into by the States after the apportionments have been made. The only way the Federal Government can repay its obligation is to make it fixed and certain.

Certainly it is clearly feasible in this day of $70 billion budgets to authorize the appropriation of from $225 million to $360 million per annum over a 15-year period. The contention that the Federal Government cannot afford to meet its just obligation to the contributing States has no basis whatsoever under the proposed bill.

IV. TOLL ROADS ARE ENTITLED TO BE PLACED IN THE SAME CATEGORY AS FREE ROADS

At the outset, it is important to understand the distinction between Federal aid for the construction of a toll road and the inclusion of a toll road on a Federal aid system. In 1921 Congress enacted a provision—section 9—in the Highway Act of that year to the effect "that all highways constructed or reconstructed under the provisions of this act shall be free from tolls of all kinds." At the time of the enactment of this provision there were many toll bridges throughout the country, toll ferries, and also some toll roads. Many of these facilities were entirely private; that is, had been constructed by privately owned corporations for profit. Congress undoubtedly felt that it was undesirable to have Federal money go into private enterprise. It is important to bear in mind that there was no opposition to toll facilities as such, but rather to the use of Federal funds in their construction. The proposed bill contemplates the construction of free roads, like any other Federal aid funds.

That the Federal Government was not opposed to toll roads as such is indicated by the fact that in many instances toll bridges and toll ferries were included in the Federal aid primary system. There has not been any opposition to this inclusion down to the pres-

ent time. In fact, in the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956 Congress included section 113 which specifically provides for the inclusion of toll roads, bridges, and tunnels within the Interstate System. The entire history of Federal road legislation therefore indicates clearly that the Federal Government has never opposed toll facilities. It not only has made use of them to complete its earlier Federal aid systems, but now is making use of them on the Interstate System.

Not only is the foregoing true, but since 1927 the Federal Government has participated in the cost of toll bridges and tunnels. The 1927 act and subsequent acts have been incorporated into section 129 of title 23, United States Code. While Federal participation is subject to certain restrictions principally directed towards making the facility free as quickly as possible, it is clearly another indication of the fact that the Federal Government, far from opposing toll roads, even goes to the extent of participating in the cost of the construction of toll roads and bridges.

In view of the foregoing, it is difficult to understand the objection to giving a credit for toll roads. One of the most frequent arguments used is the statement that the traveler has to pay a toll, as well as a tax on gasoline, motor fuel, and any other so-called highway user taxes, the proceeds of which are used for highway construction. An analysis of this argument indicates that it is based upon a false premise. The false premise is that the highway user taxes in all States are the same. In fact they are not. The rates of these taxes vary from State to State.

If these taxes were uniform in all of the States it might be claimed that the toll road user was being subjected to an extra burden for the use of the highway. Whether such an extra burden should, by itself, warrant a refusal to allow a credit for a toll road is highly questionable. The road is there and available for use. Its use must be economical or travelers would not pay the tolls. The construction of a free parallel road would be an economic waste. All of these considerations indicate that the contention is invalid even if the premise were sound.

However, these taxes are not uniform. A person traveling across the country pays one tax in one State and another in another. When a traveler goes from State A where he has paid a 4-cent tax into State B where he has paid a 7-cent tax he is paying more for the use of the highway just as he is when he uses a toll road and pays the toll. Can it be claimed that State B, because it charges a higher tax, should not receive credit for its free roads since it places an extra burden on the traveler from State A? To put the question is to answer it. Obviously our whole form of government contemplates that the different States may have different laws and different taxes. When the user of a toll road pays a toll, he does no more than pay a higher tax, just as he does in a State which charges him a higher tax for his gasoline. Certainly the payment of the toll cannot be a fair ground for differentiation between giving a State a credit or not giving a State a credit.

This is clearly true when it is borne in mind that roads usually are paid for by the people who use them. It is indeed difficult to understand why the form of the tax should require a distinction. In some States roads are paid for out of the general treasury and it is not possible to trace just which taxes were used, although the so-called highway user taxes contribute to the general funds. In other States containing constitutional provisions against diversion of certain highway user taxes it is easy to point to the particular tax which pays for the roads. In the case of toll roads the construction is paid for by the person who actually uses that particular road. Whether the taxes are paid from the general funds, from specific so-called highway user taxes, or by the person using the road is immaterial insofar as the ultimate fact is concerned that the road is there, that it is being used, and that it is part of the Interstate System.

Another argument advanced against the recognition of toll roads is that those States contributing toll roads would not be hurt, because the toll roads do not cost the States a penny. In the first place, the question is not whether the States would be hurt or would not be hurt, but whether they are entitled to a credit. It has been pointed out above that, since these States have supplied the roads and the toll is merely another form of tax, they clearly are entitled to a credit. Accordingly, this negative approach or argument loses its force at the outset.

However, it can be said with equal force that the free roads have not cost the States a penny where there is a constitutional provision against diversion of highway user taxes, or where there has been no increase in such taxes since the passage of the Hayden Cartright Act by Congress. In these States the highway user taxes are paid, but they are not received by the State as general funds. They are required to be used only for road construction purposes, and for no other purpose. What is the difference between one of these States and a State that has created an authority for the construction of a toll road which is being paid for by those persons actually using the toll road. In neither case has the State paid a penny out of its general funds. In both cases the tax or the toll has gone directly into the roads. Whether it cost the State a penny is immaterial to this discussion. The effect on the State treasury is the same in both cases. When these considerations are taken into account it is indeed difficult from this point of view to distinguish between free and toll roads in many of the States of this country.

Before closing on this point the actual economic benefit of the toll road should not be forgotten. The toll road would not have been constructed at the outset unless it was believed that the need was there. In most cases the estimates were accurate enough so that the toll roads have succeeded. They must be considered beneficial by the traveling public or persons using them would not continue to do so. It is also true that no one is compelled to use toll roads and that there is always a road paralleling the toll road which may be used by a person not desiring to pay the toll. Toll roads are not monopolies, but the traveler always has his choice and can take either a toll road or a free road.

Toll roads are entitled to consideration and should be placed in the same category as free roads. The Federal Government has not been opposed to toll roads and in fact has included them in the Interstate System. It is therefore getting the use out of them. The toll in fact is analogous to a user tax. Taxes vary in the different States so there is no uniform base upon which a person from one State can claim to be penalized by traveling through another. There is variety in every State. It is a question of degree rather than kind. The contention that a toll road does not cost a State a penny is a negative argument rather than a positive argument, and is equally applicable to many States with antidiversion provisions. Finally, the proposed bill does not contemplate the use of Federal funds in the construction of toll roads. It will not be contrary to the longstanding provision of the 1921 act that highways constructed with Federal funds shall be free from tolls.

V. THE NATIONAL INTEREST IS WELL SERVED BECAUSE THE PROPOSED BILL PROVIDES FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF ROADS WHERE THE NEED IS GREAT

The proposed bill requires the States to use the funds authorized for construction of highways under the Federal aid primary system. It limits the use of these funds to this system because it is felt that the primary system is the most important system and construction of roads on it will contribute most to the present highway needs. It does not provide for use of these funds on the Interstate System because it is felt that the mileage of the Interstate System should be limited to the 41,000 miles now authorized, at least until those 41,000 miles have been entirely completed.

Use of the funds for more roads on the primary system will be helpful in contributing to the highway needs of this country where the need is clearly apparent. The States which built the free roads and toll roads in the decade following the war did so to meet the pressing needs of that decade. No toll road could succeed unless the demand of the traffic was sufficient to insure its use. No freeway would be necessary except for heavy traffic. It must be borne in mind that all these roads eligible for the interstate system were built to standards which accommodate a heavy traffic load. Those States which were the largest contributors to the interstate system had the heaviest traffic demands. It seems likely that this demand will continue just as heavy in the ensuing decade. The proposed bill will contribute to this need and will place the

funds in those States where the need is clearly urgent.

VI. CONCLUSION

The proposed bill will accomplish two important objectives.

In the first place, it repays a valid obligation of the Federal Government to the States. The Federal Government has used facilities of the States to support a project clearly national in its scope and purpose, and their contribution to this national project is an obligation which in all fairness and equity should be repaid.

In the second place, it requires the funds to be used exclusively for highway construction, and they will be so used to the greatest extent in those States where the need is clearly urgent. Both objectives make serious consideration of the proposed bill imperative.

EXHIBIT A.—INTERSTATE HIGHWAY REPAYMENT ACT

Net reimbursement amounts based on 90 percent of depreciated original cost less Federal aid already paid toll and free roads

[Dollar amounts in millions]

State	Miles	Total cost less depreciation	Less State's share of cost	Less Federal-aid payments already made	Net reimbursable amount	Percent of national total	State	Miles	Total cost less depreciation	Less State's share of cost	Less Federal-aid payments already made	Net reimbursable amount	Percent of national total
Alabama	93.3	$18.2	$16.4	$9.7	$6.7	0.16	New Hampshire	$24.0	$10.1	$9.1	$2.3	$6.8	.16
Alaska							New Jersey	84.2	356.4	320.8	22.0	298.8	6.96
Arizona	457.9	41.9	39.5	25.0	14.5	.34	New Mexico	321.5	20.0	18.5	13.7	4.8	.11
Arkansas	52.6	14.0	12.6	8.9	3.7	.09	New York	568.6	1,036.2	932.6	133.5	799.1	18.60
California	850.2	379.9	348.1	87.5	260.6	6.07	North Carolina	270.4	58.5	52.7	24.2	28.5	.66
Colorado	272.7	45.8	41.8	24.8	17.0	.40	North Dakota	145.4	6.9	6.2	4.5	1.7	.04
Connecticut	143.6	326.6	293.9	15.5	278.4	6.48	Ohio	328.4	300.1	270.1	50.7	219.4	5.11
Delaware	4.1	34.9	31.4		31.4	.73	Oklahoma	251.5	101.8	91.6	13.7	77.9	1.81
Florida	97.4	35.5	32.0	5.4	26.6	.62	Oregon	378.9	106.0	97.9	31.9	66.0	1.54
Georgia	137.6	68.7	61.8	24.2	37.6	.88	Pennsylvania	388.2	432.6	389.4	102.4	287.0	6.68
Idaho	117.7	11.8	10.9	7.5	3.4	.08	Rhode Island	10.4	19.2	17.3	6.9	10.4	.24
Illinois	549.7	550.1	495.1	84.4	410.7	9.56	South Carolina	63.1	9.5	8.6	5.4	3.2	.07
Indiana	306.9	180.6	162.5	16.2	146.3	3.40	South Dakota	137.3	9.8	8.9	5.2	3.7	.09
Iowa	52.1	12.1	10.9	7.0	3.9	.09	Tennessee	16.7	14.8	13.3	9.2	4.1	.10
Kansas	307.9	109.3	98.4	10.3	88.1	2.05	Texas	1,440.6	285.1	256.6	97.7	159.5	3.71
Kentucky	86.4	37.6	33.8	10.2	23.6	.55	Utah	208.3	18.3	17.4	13.5	3.9	.09
Louisiana	37.8	33.3	30.0	12.6	17.4	.41	Vermont	7.8	3.2	2.9	1.9	1.0	.02
Maine	72.9	38.7	34.8	3.7	31.1	.72	Virginia	161.8	123.0	110.7	14.5	96.2	2.24
Maryland	178.1	165.3	148.8	13.4	135.4	3.15	Washington	378.6	90.3	81.9	20.8	61.1	1.42
Massachusetts	152.7	292.0	262.8	13.2	249.6	5.81	West Virginia	92.2	105.9	96.1	4.5	91.6	2.13
Michigan	291.3	283.1	254.8	59.8	195.0	4.53	Wisconsin	62.3	12.7	11.4	5.5	5.9	.14
Minnesota	159.4	25.9	23.3	10.8	12.5	.29	Wyoming	304.0	23.1	21.5	15.6	5.9	.14
Mississippi	92.5	12.5	11.3	6.6	4.7	.11	Hawaii						
Missouri	373.1	113.8	102.4	50.8	51.6	1.20	District of Columbia	4.8	16.2	14.6	9.2	5.4	.12
Montana	206.9	15.0	13.7	11.1	2.6	.06	Puerto Rico						
Nebraska	13.2	1.4	1.2	.5	.7	.02							
Nevada	226.9	10.9	10.4	9.7	.7	.02	Total	10,953.9	6,018.6	5,432.7	1,137.1	4,295.6	100.00

Crucible for the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks, I include an important address made by Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, Chief of Research and Development of the Department of the Army to the members of the State Club of Boston, entitled "Crucible for the Future" on April 2, 1959.

There is no one better qualified to express the thoughts and opinions in the address than General Trudeau, who is a dedicated American:

CRUCIBLE FOR THE FUTURE

Colonel Bunker, Mr. Adams, distinguished guests, members of the State Club, fellow Americans, I consider it a distinct privilege to address you today. It is a stimulating experience for me to sense the history, courage, determination, and sense of duty that is so much a part of your heritage here in the great State of Massachusetts.

This month of April is an auspicious time of year in this cradle of liberty. I need not remind you of the momentous events, some 184 years ago that started the most significant chain reaction in history by establishing a free Republic and the greatest power the world has yet seen. A nation of free citizens extending into the Arctic regions of the north and into the blue vastness of the Pacific Ocean. A Nation which embodies the finest hopes of mankind.

Since the battles of Lexington and Concord, your forefathers, and yourselves, have fostered the pattern of growth and development that has continuously established the highest standards for all of the Nation to follow. Your eminent colleges and universities, important factories, and your vital defense industries and laboratories contribute so much to both the moral and physical strength of our country.

Today, I am very much concerned about our national moral and physical stature in the face of the vicious challenge of communism. We must recognize that this threat endangers your splendid accomplishments that I have just noted. We must recognize, also, that preparedness and readiness to meet this challenge is the key to the survival of Western culture and that scientific, technological, and social progress are the essential ingredients if we are to meet the challenge of the future.

I submit, then, that the amalgam of preparedness and progress form a crucible for the future. It is on this subject that I wish to speak to you today, and I am delighted to have such a distinguished audience whose forefathers sacrificed and contributed so much during the growth of our country.

Preparedness is a condition that has affected our Nation's course throughout the fabric of history. We have seen the cycle vary from complete indifference to serious concern too many times. From the days of your Minuteman to today's great national debate on the adequacy of our defense program, the tides of preparedness have risen and fallen so sporadically that it is difficult to evaluate our national posture based on past events. Too often these tides have been inadequate to bolster a positive and dynamic foreign policy.

However, we have survived the earlier challenges to our national existence and the question in our minds now is: "Can we do so again?" Can we do so now in the face of the most insidious threat the world has yet seen? I am not going to attempt to answer that question—because I don't know the answer—but I do want to emphasize why we must be prepared and what your Army is doing about it.

During the time of the Revolutionary War and the heroic actions of those patriots who fought to gain our freedom, there was no question about peaceful coexistence or the type and kind of a threat to our fledgling Nation. Those staunch citizens took the action they devoutly believed was necessary and banded together to fight at Concord, Lexington, and Bunker Hill.

I know all of you have seen Bunker Hill and thought about its meaning. It is not a very impressive hill, at first glance, in fact it is not a very big hill at all—but it is preeminent among American hills because the men who fought there were very tall men. They stood for principle and determination. When our country takes a firm position today with respect to Quemoy and Berlin or the Middle East as frontiers of the free world, it is taking the same firm attitude that those couragous men took at Bunker Hill long years ago, even though the purpose might be somewhat different and despite the dissenting notes of those appeasers who haven't the courage or loyalty to support our national position in these difficult and delicate times.

Like the immortal fighting patriots of our American Revolution, you citizens of Boston are still dedicated to preparedness and to preserving and defending our Nation, and I urge you to let no other motive disrupt this high sense of purpose,

Once again, we are in a most severe crisis: An implacable threat stares us in the face—today, next year, and on into the foreseeable future.

The name of this threat is communism—godless, imperialistic, materialistic communism—which aims at the destruction of individual freedom and justice and our Amer-

ican way of life, and the creation of a world slave state.

The Communists regard the struggle between themselves and us as a matter of life or death—as it truly is.

Lenin put it this way: "A funeral dirge will be sung over the Soviet Republic or over world capitalism."

Khrushchev says it in just four words: "We will bury you."

The question is often asked: "Why can't we coexist peacefully with the Communists?" Perhaps the best answer comes from them, embodied in their dogma, their policies and clarified by their leaders.

Basic Communistic doctrine states that peace can only exist in a classless world and that any means used to achieve that goal is justified and, hence, peaceful.

Lenin said the existence of the Soviet Republic side by side with imperialist states for a long time is unthinkable. One or the other must triumph in the end.

The latest Communist communicator, Khrushchev, said last year: "Of course, we must recognize that we cannot coexist externally. One of us must go to the grave. We do not want to go to the grave. They (the West) don't want to go their graves, either. So what must be done? We must push them to their graves."

That sort of talk is the answer to any peaceful coexistence question, as far as the Communists are concerned.

As a result, they have initiated an endless, an all-out, and an all-around offensive against us. They attack on every front and by every tactic—ideological, technological, political, and economic—as well as military.

In the ideological field you must have noted the subversion and brain washing that some of our citizens undergo and some of our soldiers succumbed to in Korea. Are our homes, our churches, and our schools doing enough to indoctrinate, motivate, and orient our children? How about your own part of the effort? Do you still feel a thrill of pride at the sight of Old Glory waving in the breeze? If all the flag poles from which she flies were of solid gold, they still wouldn't pay for the treasure, the blood and the suffering it has cost to keep her on high. And the cost is higher every day; but better that it be paid in treasure for defense than with blood for indifference.

It is interesting to note that Napoleon, in his biography, said:

"Is not Russia the head of Hydra, the Antaeus of the fable, which can only be subdued by seizing it bodily and stifling it in the embrace? But where is the Hercules to be found? Should there arise an Emperor of Russia, valiant, impetuous, and intelligent, a tzar with a beard on his chin, Europe is his own * * *. When I am dead and gone my memory will be esteemed, and I will be revered in consequence of having forseen and endeavored to put a stop to that which will yet take place. It will be revered when the barbarians of the North will possess Europe."

Napoleon recognized the potency of the Soviet's central position on the Eurasian land mass with its great manpower and natural resources, and so have Mackinder, Haushofer, Beukema, Walsh, and other geopoliticians and strategists. We must be sure that our policymakers do likewise.

I would also like to mention a remark made in 1915 by Hudson Maxim, the great inventor and stanch patriot who was also a very farsighted man. Maxim said, and this is something we hope will never come true in this country: "Fate has decreed that our pride shall be humbled and that we shall be bowed to the dust. We must first put on sackcloth, ashed in the embers of our burning homes. Perhaps when we build anew on the fire blocks and desolation, our mood may be receptive of the knowledge that we must shield our homes with blood and brawn and iron."

Today, we see Soviet rubles going into Egypt's high dam at Aswan; Soviet arms and technicians moving into Egypt, Syria and Iraq; Soviet puppets in East Germany putting the squeeze on the brave enclave of West Berlin; Soviet propaganda and falsehoods being broadcast worldwide 24 hours a day; Soviet agitators infecting the Near East and Middle East with their vast oil reserves that are so vital to the survival of Europe; serious Soviet subversion in Africa and Latin America; Soviet submarines charting the seven seas; and Soviet Ambassadors practicing "sputnik diplomacy" and ballistic missile blackmail in the capitals of the world. All of these constitute the most concerted, deliberate, and abominable attempt ever perpetrated to shatter and disrupt the peace and stability of the world and reduce it to anarchy.

Let me refresh your memory very briefly on the two facets of the overall Communist threat that most directly concern you and me—the military and economic threats.

As you know, the Soviets have more than 25,000 warplanes. Many of these, such as their Bison and Bear, are long-range bombers capable of destroying this Boston metropolitan area with just one hydrogen bomb.

The Soviets have about 500 submarines. We have about 200.

The Communists have 175 standing divisions in Russia alone, plus 2½ million men in the Chinese Communist Army, and another 1½ million in the satellite forces. We have less than 15 ready U.S. divisions, the same number as Rumania.

In atomic firepower, Khrushchev is talking about dismantling some of his atomic and hydrogen bombs because he already has more than he needs.

In rockets and missiles, Khrushchev claims a missile with a range of more than 8,000 miles. Even as long ago as 1957 the Communists claimed an intercontinental ballistic missile capable of reaching any target on earth. The three sputnik satellites lend substance to these claims and their lunar probe should clinch it.

Next, let's consider very briefly the Soviet economic threat:

Through Stakhanovism, slave labor and one ruthless 5-year plan after another, they are making themselves a truly formidable industrial power. Now Khrushchev is pushing through his new 7-year plan, the most ambitious yet.

When you compare the figures since World War II on American industrial production versus Soviet industrial production, you see that the Soviet production base has expanded at a rate about double that of our own and for the year 1958 I believe it may be nearer 3 to 1.

When you extrapolate the present yearly rate of increase, you can see that before many years Soviet industrial production may exceed our own, particularly if you contrast our shrinking markets and sources of raw materials to the economic autarky established by the Soviet bloc over more than one-third of the world's underdeveloped surface and its population. If this happens, our American arsenal of democracy will be surpassed by the Soviet arsenal of communism.

This could spell disaster for America. And this is just exactly what the Soviets are determined to do, by further reducing our access to the markets and raw materials of the world and the absorption of fringe areas now contiguous to the Iron and Bamboo Curtains. Now their concerted and expanding activities on the awakening African continent and among our Latin American neighbors are becoming more apparent. Our actions to meet these challenges will go far in determining whether our way of life can continue and whether world trade by the year 2000 will be based on 4 rubles to the dollar or 4 dollars to the ruble.

In this duel of industrial expansion and production, let us therefore keep a wary eye on the Russian Bear—but let us not become so preoccupied that we forget the Chinese Communist giant or the basic cleavage in ideologies which is the keystone to the arch of our problems.

The Red Chinese, in their current industrial revolution, are achieving greater industrial gains faster than ever known in the world before but from a very low starting point as of now.

Let me suggest, parenthetically, that it may be well, too, for the Russian Bear to keep a wary eye on the Chinese Communist giant—for the pupil may outdo the master, even ultimately absorb him. Red China is quite unhappy today over the diversion of Russian aid and machinery to others.

I have given just a few highlights of the Communist military and industrial threats. Let us also keep in mind all the other facets of the Communist offensive. Let us remember that the Communist threat is a monolithic whole, using, seriatim, whatever means or tactics seem most likely at that moment to penetrate and crumble free world defenses without regard to morals or ethics, in fact our western code is anathema to the men who rule the Kremlin.

Obviously, our superior industrial and military strength are both indispensable parts of our over-all defense against this all-out Soviet offensive—and this is the measure berof the responsibility you and I and all Americans share to help keep Americans strong and safe.

I know that your sense of dedication to this responsibility has always been outstanding. And I hope that in this time of crisis you share with me an increasing sense of urgency about matching our industrial and military strength to the Soviet threat I have outlined. I consider it of real significance that the Soviet claim superior military strength and announce belligerent policies at this time.

As your Congressman McCormack has said, "It is only from a position of strength that our diplomats can negotiate with the Kremlin, for their anti-God ideology not only denies, but fights God. They have no moral origin, therefore Communist ideology has no idealism. We cannot deal with them on a moral level, or the level of idealism, but they cannot deny that the law of self-preservation applies to them as well as to other nations and other peoples.

"If I am going to err in connection with our defense posture, in the world of today, I prefer to err on the side of strength rather than on the side of weakness."

In those fringe areas where the will to resist communism still exists and in those great underdeveloped areas of the world in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, we must by direct aid, if necessary, and by private enterprise, where possible, launch a more dynamic program to weld the free peoples of the world more closely together.

Not only is the Soviet ready conventional military strength far greater than ours today but their industrial base, presently 40 percent as great as ours, continues to expand at a rate more than twice as great as ours. Even this doesn't quite paint the full picture as their denial of consumer goods to their own people plus their absolute control of the price structure permits an unusually large portion of their gross national product to be devoted to military goods and selected items for export to areas where they seek economic and subversive penetration. For instance, we know shoes are expensive and limited in Russia but the fact remains that a tank only costs the equivalent of 2,000 pairs of shoes in Russia while a tank for our Army costs us 20,000 pairs of shoes in our price structure.

We have much to do in this particular area to meet the Soviet challenge. It is a real challenge to the Nation and to the free world to match the wide and shifting range of

Soviet capabilities. Within our country, we must do it in many ways: leadtime of developing and producing weapon systems must be reduced; management of our human and material resources must be improved; and we must shake ourselves loose from the complacency that continues to engulf us.

Malcom P. McNair of the Harvard Business School restates it like this, and I cannot overemphasize the real significance of this statement if we are to emerge victorious: "As individuals we shall have to change our scale of values so that we do * * * such things as spending more on defense, taxing ourselves more, working harder, sacrificing something from our standard of living, disciplining ourselves more, curtailing special and costly benefits to privileged economic groups, developing rigorous standards and competitive excellence in education, and channeling our best brains into needful activities for national survival."

I deal daily with outstanding scientists in our country and I fully appreciate the important part they play in our fight for survival. With all due respect to them however, I must say that the future of America depends just as much on developing more Ch. D.'s as it does on developing Ph. D.'s. Not everyone can be a Ph. D. but all can be Ch. D.'s, and by that I mean doctors of character, if we will but return to the faith and ideals of our fathers. Where is the real faith in our institutions, the burning patriotism, the adventuresome spirit that challenged the unknown, the steadfastness to principle, the courage to seek the harder right rather than to accept the easier wrong, the pride in personal accomplishment and reputation and the willingness to sacrifice for God and home and country? We must actually live by this code, now as never before if we are to emerge victorious. The hypocritical acceptance or profession of such a code is inadequate and the eagles of victory will not perch on false colors. There is still a greater destiny for our country, if we have the courage and wisdom to seek it. We need the boldest of the clipper ships that carried our flag, our philosophy and our trade to the farthest corners of the globe as they set sail from this New England coast.

No military expert can prophesy exactly what kind of war we may have to fight, or with what means, or when, but I give you my own reasoned and very earnest conviction that if war should come, no matter what kind it might be, there, in the thick of the action, we'll still find "the loneliest man in the world"—the man on the ground—the combat soldier—you, your husbands or your sons.

This leads me into the second part of my remarks: What progress is the Army making toward a real state of preparedness?

First of all the mission of the Army is synonymous with being prepared. Our mission is to maintain a fighting force that can win the land battle as well as defend the Nation and its armed services from air attack. We accomplish our mission, in part, by maintaining the necessary forces all over the world, forces that embody the motto of our Strategic Army Corps, STRAC: "Skilled, Tough, Ready-Around-the-Clock."

The other way we accomplish our vital mission is by a dynamic and vigorous research and development program. It is our objective in Army research and development to provide the most effective weapons and materiel for our future Army. The scope of this research and development mission covers an extremely wide spectrum of developments and we feel our responsibility very keenly whether we are predicting future needs in mobility, communications, firepower, or logistical support.

Our efforts with satellites and space vehicles, for example, have been reasonably successful; but insofar as it lies in my power, I intend to see to it that no single part of our space effort within the Army is made at the expense of building land combat power as the foundation of our military strength. Only on terra firma can man be sustained for any period.

Rather, our space effort must contribute to our land combat power. I believe that it does, and will continue to do so.

As you remember, Explorer I was placed in orbit by the Army on January 31, 1958, and others followed.

Together, America's satellites and space probes have gained for us our first real knowledge of conditions in outer space—particularly with regard to electromagnetic radiation, micrometeorites, and density of the earth's atmosphere on the fringes of space.

Incidentally, speaking of spatial transmissions, the Army was proud to participate in the latest and most successful moon probe that the free world has yet placed in space. I think that the most significant result of Pioneer IV was the transmission and receipt of a radio signal over the longest distance in history—over 400,000 miles. This tops the Russians or anybody else, as far as we know. This was a distinct milestone in space when you realize that we surpassed over twofold the distance it takes an electromagnetic signal to travel in one second. It is an equally amazing fact that the transmitter power for that signal was only one-quarter of a watt.

A satellite communications relay shows real promise of helping to solve the growing traffic jam in the radio wave spectrum in worldwide ground-to-ground military communications. We still need satellites or space vehicles to gather data for mapping and geodesy. We need better communications. We need more meteorological data. We need data for terrain appreciation and for navigation. Finally, we need data for ballistic missile warning; for satellite tracking and identification; and for missle defense systems. As you see, each of these needs is not only related to the needs of the ground combat soldier and the Army but to our country and our people as a whole.

We look to you for your help in giving us all the support you can. The accomplishment of all these goals is no longer primarily a scientific problem. It is well within our current technological capabilities and is only a question of policy, management, and funding.

Recently at the 21st Congress of the Soviet Communist Party, the facts were made plain to us that the might of the long-range Soviet artillery—their ICBM's—were trained on targets in our Western world. When the enemy artillery has you in range during combat, there are very few conferences on the battlefield. That is the time to act, devise a plan, make decisions, and do what is necessary to counter the threat.

I believe we are in that position now. Is there any room for complacency, for wishful thinking, for anything but action? The fate of our Nation depends on our determination, vigilance, and preparedness. We must replace fear with faith, complacency with courage.

Adlai Stevenson said it this way recently: "I doubt if any society in history has faced so great a moral challenge as ours, or needed so desperately to draw on the deepest source of courage and responsibility * * * what we decide to do, we can do."

We need a resurgence of faith and confidence and the "can do" attitude in all of our citizens. This must be translated into action, a public reaction that bridges the gulf between easy living or indifference and the aroused temper of a free nation and provides the base for positive and dynamic policies.

Our potential enemy's capabilities are unbelievably great and are growing greater in both the military and economic fields. The hour grows too late to tolerate that seed of death called complacency any longer. Arnold Toynbee has pointed out that 19 of 21 notable civilizations have died from within and not by conquest from without. We must not be number 20.

I opened my remarks with the observation that the month of April has been significant in your history here. April has been noteworthy in recent history, also; just 1 year ago Khrushchev, while visiting the scene of the Hungarian Revolution, said that the Soviet Union will help crush any future satellite uprisings. And now he has pointed his guns, missiles, and insinuations at the free world. We must be alert to further veiled threats and be prepared to unmask them for what they are and stand up to the real purpose of the Communist master plan: to dominate the world. There will be more Bunker Hills, Quemoys, and Berlins, and we must meet the test again and again.

That vital challenge of tomorrow is our greatest opportunity today—the opportunity to so advance, so build, so defend, and so cherish this land of ours that in the far distant America will still be enshrined and sustained as the leader of free men in the hearts and hopes of all the people of the world.

I believe that we can accept our guidance for preparedness and progress for the future from your Massachusetts State motto. It aptly sums up my remarks and reflects your heritage as we prepare the crucible of the future. The motto reads: "By the sword we seek peace, but peace only under liberty."

The kind of spirit I believe we should have was expressed clearly by a fellow Vermonter of much earlier vintage. His name was Ethan Allen.

After he had captured Ticonderoga and turned in the booty, the Congress in its timidity considered turning the captured cannon back to the British, whereupon Ethan Allen wrote a letter to Congress, and this is what he said, among other things:

"I wish to God that America would, at this critical juncture, exert herself. She might rise on eagle's wings and mount up to glory, freedom, and immortal honor if she but knew her strength."

Thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen. It has been a pleasure to be with you.

Ocean "Farming" To Provide Fish for Starving Millions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. OLIVER
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, the struggle to provide assistance to the needy countries of the world is only one aspect of the cold war between the United States and Russia; however, it may well prove to be the decisive factor. Just as the people in our own country have responded to the political party which displayed a genuine interest in the people's needs, so will the population of needy foreign countries respond to the great power which has the basic human requirements of their country at heart.

Distribution of our surplus food products to foreign countries, after assuring that our own needy are adequately provided for, is an excellent short-term solution to this problem. However, if we are even to begin to solve the food shortages faced by many of the world's undernourished countries, we must locate new food sources.

The following article originally published in the New Bedford Standard-Times, suggests a solution to this problem in the development of increased oceanographic research. We are certain that the Soviet Union has not hesitated to institute a crash program in this vital field. But what of the oceanographic program of the United States? Not only the food requirements of the world but also our very physical survival dictate the urgent necessity for adoption of the National Academy of Sciences program for increased oceanographic research:

SEA BATTLE 1958: KEY TO SURVIVAL, X—OCEAN "FARMING" TO PROVIDE FISH FOR STARVING MILLIONS

(Whether it be for war or peace, the oceans of the world probably hold the secret to humanity's future. The nation that unlocks those mysteries first will direct the future course of mankind. One of the world's outstanding ocean study centers is the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution. There and at other marine-science research centers in the East the Standard-Times conducted a 2-month study to determine who is ahead. These stories tell the results of that research.)

(By Everett S. Allen)

The ocean will turn over by itself, if given a slight push, because it is basically unstable. Marine scientists already are experimenting to determine what kind of a push is most effective. Once the problem is solved, it will be possible to plow much of the coastal sea areas of the world, turning them over as soil is overturned and for much the same reason—to renourish the ocean and increase its productivity.

Here is a way it could be done: In most areas, a vertical pipe shoved down into the sea would carry a stream of water either up or down, once it was started, and, if uninterrupted, would go on forever.

This is because ocean surface water is saltier and, therefore, heavier, than deep water, when the two are at the same temperature. As surface water goes down the pipe, it tends to be cooled to the same temperature as the water outside the pipe—but being heavier because of its salinity, it keeps on flowing downward.

WORKS IN REVERSE

It works in the opposite direction, too. If bottom water is started up the pipe, it tends to get warmer—becoming the same temperature as the water surrounding the pipe. But because bottom water is slightly fresher, it also is lighter than the surface water surrounding it, so it tends to rise and flow out the top of the pipe.

It is the unequal salinity distribution in the water that tends to make the ocean unstable when water from the top and bottom of the sea are brought together at the same temperature.

The French Government already is experimenting with a system of such pipes. In this instance, the French seek to produce fresh water from the ocean, by utilizing these temperature differences to operate a distillation process, but such an operation would serve very well to turn over the sea.

There are many situations in which such installations would work and be helpful. They could be placed around all islands and continents and provide fresh water, or power; they also would serve to pump up plant nutrients now lying on the ocean bottom. This would increase the amount of plant fishfood in the area, and ultimately, the amount of fish, too, per cubic foot of water.

BIRDS CATCH MOST FISH

With regard to the world fisheries, there are many paradoxes and problems which now are the concern of marine scientists looking toward the day when increasing humanity must turn to the sea to feed itself.

At present, sea birds catch millions of pounds more fish a year than do men. And some of the most productive areas of the world are not fished at all, for various reasons; Argentina is a good example—its waters abound with fish, but fisheries are limited because the nation has a beef economy.

Further, of the 16,000 or so species in the sea, only a dozen or two are utilized in any quantity commercially; thousands of marine creatures are good eating and nutritionally valuable, but men don't eat them because they haven't been accustomed to doing so—and, up to now, they havent' felt they had to. But the world is tightening its belt, even now.

The fisheries of the world are very unevenly distributed, undoubtedly due in large measure to the lack of stirring in the ocean. Roughly 98 percent of the fisheries are located in the Northern Hemisphere, although the Southern Hemisphere has much more water.

CHEAP FOOD POSSIBLE

Here are some of the things ocean scientists think about with regard to better utilization of fish as a food:

All the modern developments in fishing are keeping fish from going where it is needed—to hungry people who don't have much money. Only Portugal continues to encourage the production of cheap fish, once properly called the poor man's meat, since it, like meat, is a valuable protein source.

It is virtually impossible to think of reviving or improving the fishing industry in any country without finding some way to make fish less expensive. With existing techniques, it is possible to make money with a fish product selling as low as 1½ cents a pound, but nobody, except possibly the Russians who, from a background of starvation, can appreciate the value of cheap food is thinking about moving fish where it's really needed.

A chemical engineer unquestionably could convert food fish into some form, perhaps like a sausage meat, that could be stored indefinitely without canning or freezing.

Ideally, this material should be cooked on the boats that catch it; as it is, draggers spend far too much time coming and going, and too little fishing—some redfishermen, for example, take 3 days each way to go to the Grand Banks for 36 hours' fishing. All of that nonproductive time makes the end product cost more.

SALT COD IS GONE

Who would buy this product? Millions of the world's hungry—the people who want and need fish in their diets, but who can only afford to pay what salt cod used to cost.

The freezing of fish, one of several steps aimed at upgrading the product, ruined the salt-codfish industry Down East, because everybody would rather freeze it and get more for it. Consequently, the people of the West Indies go without Newfoundland salt codfish, even though they can't afford the frozen product that has taken its place.

Fish is a luxury on the market these days. Very little of it, worldwide, penetrates more than a few miles inland, even in a country like India, where hundreds of thousands are starving for lack of the very nutrition it could provide.

As an example of what can be done, South Africa has a very effective fish-meal process; a certain amount of this product is combined with hominy, as part of a government policy of providing cheap fish protein.

OCEAN CULTIVATION

Ocean cultivation to increase the efficiency of production and harvest is the other principle concern of marine scientists studying the food problem.

No one yet has invented a fence to aid harvesting in the ocean, to keep what man wants to grow in a given area from wandering off. A farmer grows grass, cows eat it, and he catches the cows and sells them. But if he had to drag a net around on unfenced field, he wouldn't catch many cows becouse they would stray away.

In the ocean, there is no ownership, no fences; these factors make it difficult for mankind to introduce the elements of cultivation, even though in terms of increasing food needs, this is highly desirable.

Local resources, such as salt ponds, are being wasted, for there man could enter into cultivation. The Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution staff estimated that one New England harbor (Barnstable) could produce 9 tons of clam meat per acre per year if cultivated efficiently. This is three times better than the best Ohio farmer can do on his land.

CRABS FOILED PLAN

The experiment didn't work, because in order to harvest the ocean successfully, one must be able to control the environmental situation. What happened was that horseshoe crabs ate the small clams in prodigious numbers; if the harbor could have been "fenced" off, the flats could have been reseeded with clams and the program would have produced as anticipated. But blocking off a harbor that is used regularly by marine traffic obviously is impractical and impossible.

Other salt-pond efforts in New England have been frustrated by similar circumstances, in which ducks, gulls, crabs, and humans all have played a part.

But the opportunity for marine farming remains, and as the worldwide food demand increases, it will be practiced more. Surely, the pioneers of land agriculture had their difficulties, too.

Right now, however, there doesn't seem to be a way to make money in farming the sea. Ocean scientists say what is needed is an experiment station on a large enough scale to be meaningful to commercial interests. This is reasonable; if all the corn in America were confined to a handful of laboratory specimens, no farmer would be interested in raising it.

It is only a matter of time before some marine-minded country looking for more cheap food will start a large-scale marine agricultural station. Whether it is Russia or the United States—and these are the two most likely prospects—the world's hungry will look in that direction with even more respect than was generated by sputnik.

A Member of Congress Takes the Pulse in Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks, I include, with pleasure, an excellent article about our distinguished

colleague the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WOLF] appearing in the New York Times magazine of April 12, 1959, entitled "An magazine of April 12, 1959, entitled "A Member of Congress Takes the Pulse in Iowa."

While a new Member of Congress the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WOLF] has already evidenced his great ability, as well as devotion to his duties and to the people of his district, and has made a most favorable impression upon his colleagues.

A MEMBER OF CONGRESS TAKES THE PULSE IN IOWA

(By Cabell Phillips)

WASHINGTON.—Congressmen are back in their offices in Washington this week after the 10-day Easter recess, which provided many of them with the first opportunity for serious fence-mending and pulse-taking among their constituents since the session began last January. One such is Representative LEONARD G. WOLF of the Second Iowa Congressional District.

An exuberant 32-year-old, LEN WOLF is the first Democrat to serve his stanchly Republican district in more than 20 years, and a devout internationalist who paid his own way on a factfinding tour of Europe and Russia last year. I went along on his visit home to see the fence-mending process and—particularly—to learn what the people in a presumably typical slice of the Middle West feel about the current state of our foreign affairs.

"You'll find that I'm a pretty controversial fellow out here," he told me over coffee late on the night of our arrival in Dubuque, where his tour was to start. "Years ago this used to be isolationist country. That label doesn't mean much any more. But my predecessor, who represented this district for five straight terms, generally took a pretty dim view of such things as foreign aid and cooperation with other nations through the U.N.

"My outlook is frankly internationalist. I stressed it in my campaign and I've taken as active a part as I could in foreign policy matters in the 3 months I've been in Congress.

"My feeling is," he went on earnestly, "that there's nothing more important for humanity today than seeing to it we don't destroy ourselves and everything else in another war. This country has got to lead the way in that—nobody else can do it. And that means that we have got to do a hell of a lot more than we have done in resisting Communist expansion and in helping the emerging new nations of Asia and Africa to stand on their own feet.

"I can't say I got any clear mandate on that in the election. My margin of victory was just barely over 1 percent, and I'm still breathing hard. I think most of my people are with me, but I can't be sure. Anyway, that's what I'm here to find out."

Congressman WOLF's district, with a population of 414,000, comprises 12 counties in the northeast corner of the State, stretching about 150 miles southward from the Minnesota border and, at its widest, some 100 miles westward from the Mississippi River. Its only cities are Dubuque, Cedar Rapids and Clinton, but industrially it is the most important district in the State, with manufactures valued at $303 million annually.

Beyond the cities the landscape stretches in limitless vistas of rolling prairie dotted here and there by villages and small towns, with occasional clumps of trees on the high land and with rivers and streams snaking through the valleys. This is corn-hog country, among the best anywhere in the world. These incredibly fertile stretches of black glacial loam yield annual harvests of up to 100 bushels of corn per acre. Town and country, the impression you get is of substantial middleclass well-being.

To keep in touch with his constituents, Congressman WOLF has converted a house trailer into a mobile congressional office, with a private conference room in one end, a waiting room in the other. At regular intervals his resident administrative assistant, Al Link, a former Dubuque newspaperman, hauls the trailer around the district, setting up shop in one small town after another.

The trailer was our portable headquarters for the pulse-taking tour. After a 6:30 factory gate appearance at the John Deere works on the morning after our arrival in Dubuque, we set off westward for Manchester, a county seat of about 5,000 population. Our itinerary had been announced in the weekly paper a few days earlier and when we pulled up to the parking space reserved for us before the courthouse a little after 9 o'clock a score of men and women, most of them farmers, to judge by their mud-stained galoshes and striped overalls, were waiting for us.

The Congressman greeted them genially, shaking hands all around, calling most of them by name, asking about their crops, their infirmities, their families. His natty attire and brisk youthfulness were in sharp contrast to the stolid, weatherbeaten appearance of his visitors, but they seemed to respond warmly to his presence.

"Come on in out of the cold, folks," he said, leading the way to the trailer, "and let's get this show on the road. Al, you be sure to get everybody to sign the guest book so we can make certain they are on our mailing list. * * * Now, who's first?"

For the next 3 hours LEN WOLF took the political pulse of some 40 of his constituents. Singly and in groups, often a husband and wife with their brood of children, they filed through the doors and sat for a few minutes or as much as half an hour.

Some just wanted to say a friendly hello and to assure their young Congressman that he was doing fine. Some came by for no better reason than to salve their self-importance. Some came to complain and to criticize. But mostly they came with problems, real, or imagined, that involved them in some way with the great, distant bureaucracy in Washington.

"Congressman, there's four of us families on this mail route that have to go as much as half a mile to our boxes. We've talked to the postmaster about it, but he says, * * *."

"I'm a Purple Heart veteran from the First World War, Congressman. Now, I just got this letter from the Veterans' Administration * * *."

"My boy, here, Mr. WOLF, wants to go to the Naval Academy next year * * *."

"I hope you'll vote against that bill to make us pay a dollar and a quarter an hour for farm labor. * * *."

"I had a heart attack last winter, Congressman, and if my boy has to go up for the draft I just don't know how we are going to make out. * * *"

From early morning to late at night, in one small town after another, the routine often interspersed with a Lions Club luncheon or an impromptu stop at a farm home, we heard hundreds of such observations and petitions as these during the week we were on the road. Rarely did a visitor broach a subject touching on foreign policy, but frequently the Congressman would bring the matter up himself, and we were often surprised by the intensity of the response.

"A summit conference? Sure, why the hell not? What have we got to lose? The cold war don't get any colder as long as we and the Russians sit and glare at each other there in Berlin and sort of dare each other

This was from a small town auto dealer, who added that his information was "pretty skimpy, because there's not much to read to make the first move."
about these things in our papers, you know."

Often, discussion of the Berlin crisis elicited a note of skepticism: "I just wonder if it's worth going to war over," a gray-haired farmer with two draft age sons observed. But most frequently we were told such things as: "We can't afford to back up 1 inch there, that's for certain"; or, "If we let the Russians push us around in Berlin they'll wind up pushing us out of Germany and everywhere else"; or, "I'm glad to see Eisenhower has got his mad up enough to stand his ground at last. I thought he'd never get around to it."

Strangely, to me at least, there seemed very little apprehension about the prospect of another war. In the district there are many German, Czech, and Scandinavian families with strong roots in Europe, and each has had at least one close kinsman soldiering somewhere in the world during the last 10 or 15 years. Yet, while their political esteem for President Eisenhower runs the gamut from active dislike to high praise, they all seem to have faith in his ability to keep us out of war.

"I think those Russians are just pulling a bluff in all this war talk," said Joe Holthaus, who raises hogs and beef cattle on 220 acres just outside of Oelwein, and with whom we had an impromptu 7-o'clock breakfast one morning.

"Look what the paper says this morning." He held up a copy of the Oelwein Daily Register with an 8-column banner proclaiming: "McElroy Says United States Is Invincible."

"Well, I figure that's just about right, and that the Russians know it. We've got bases all around them—87 I think I read somewhere. If they send up a plane or a rocket against us we can loose planes or rockets against them from all those bases.

"They won't want a war as long as we keep strong ourselves. I think Ike is handling it just about right."

The topic on which they were most articulate was foreign aid, for this is something they can translate into terms of their own experience. In general, they are opposed to the idea of the Government handing out large sums in grants to foreign powers—"You give a man something, he doesn't appreciate it; but if you sell it to him, or make him a loan, he respects you. We gave Nehru $100 million around Christmas time, and I can't see that we have made any better friends of the Indians."

On the other hand, they seemed generally to accept the obligation of the United States, or even of the United Nations, to help the underdeveloped nations of the world to get on their feet; this country, they said, was once a struggling colonial nation itself.

But why, many of them asked, could not our vast and so far, useless food surplus be used instead of dollars to further our mutual aid program?

"Why can't we send them corn and wheat and dried milk and even processed meat instead of money?" one asked. "Most of those people over there can't do a decent day's work because they are hungry all the time. And here we sit with more than we know what to do with. If they had enough food in their bellies they could build the roads and the dams and the things they need instead of our building them for them."

They were keenly interested in the Congressman's plan to introduce legislation to expand the operations of Public Law 480, which provides for a limited use of agricultural surpluses in the foreign aid program. Many, it turned out, had written to him in Washington about this. For this is a subject that has been much discussed in farm organization bulletins.

More often than not, the Congressman's visitors protested embarrassedly that they just didn't keep up very much with what went on in the world beyond their own farm gates. But occasionally his probing would strike an unexpectedly sensitive nerve, as it

did one night in the little city of Vinton. His visitor at the moment was a stolid, leather-complexioned farmer he called Emil. When the business at hand was concluded the Congressman tilted his chair back and asked speculatively:

"How do you think we are doing in the field of foreign affairs, Emil? Do you have any special thoughts or worries about that?"

The older man's forehead was furrowed momentarily in thought, then he said:

"You want to know what I'm worried about, LEN? It's that we ain't getting anywhere with the Russians on this atom bomb testing. I'm as sure as we are setting right here that if we keep it up—and they keep it up—all that fallout is going to affect our land. It's going to get into the crops we grow and it's going to get into our hogs and cattle, and God knows what it will do."

The Congressman's chair came down with a bang.

"Say, that's an interesting viewpoint, Emil. How much are other people around here worried about this? Let's call in some of these other folks waiting in the other room there and let's kick it around some."

He opened the door to the waiting room of his trailer, where a dozen men and women were awaiting their turn to see him.

"Some of you folks crowd in here," he called. "Emil was just telling me that one of the things he's most concerned about is what the fallout from atomic explosions might do to a farmer's crops and his cattle. Any of the rest of you been thinking about that?"

"You danged right we have over in my neighborhood," an overalled farmer said belligerently. "We were talking about it at the Farmers Union meeting just the other night. 'Course you can't see where it's done any harm now. But the thing about this stuff, as I read it, is it creeps up on you, and once you've got it, or once it gets into your soil, it's there for good."

"I read in the paper the other day," a woman broke in, "that Iowa and Minnesota get more of this strontium 90 than any other States in the Union. It gets into the milk * * *."

"Looks to me," said another, "that the Russians are willing to call a halt but that our people ain't. Why should that be?"

"You know you can't trust the Russians. Look what they are trying to do in Berlin, right now. * * *"

"All right; but if they sign an agreement not to fire off any more bombs, and then they do fire one, we've got ways of finding out about it. * * *"

"One thing for sure, the United States ought not to be the one to back away from trying to get an agreement on this thing."

After about 10 minutes of this lively colloquy the Congressman held up his hands for quiet.

"OK, OK," he said. "This is real news to me, to find out how you feel about this. I agree with you that it's a terribly important problem. Now what can I, as a freshman Congressman, do about it? What do you think I ought to try to do about it? * * * Emil?"

"Well, I don't hardly know, LEN; if we could just get to some sort of understanding with the Russians. * * *"

In a week of such give and take as this, repeated many times a day in communities all over his district, Congressman WOLF did not pick up many usable ideas on what to do about the Nation's ills, but he got a vivid picture of which of those ills are closest to the hearts and minds of his constituents. Price supports, mounting surpluses of corn and wheat, the price of hogs and milk, unemployment and inflation, how to get a job as a mail carrier—these are universal concerns.

But a great many of those who came to see him—one in four or five, perhaps—voiced more cosmic worries. Volubly sometimes, haltingly at others, rarely with sharp insight and definition, they talked feelingly of things beyond the limits of their own creek bottoms and townships.

"What they want," Representative WOLF said at the end of his visit, "is more information about these things than they are getting from their local newspapers and radio and television stations. They have begun to see that the problems of Berlin, of the underdeveloped nations, of international control of atomic energy all have meaning for them as farmers and businessmen.

"I'm going to give very serious thought in the next few weeks to trying to set up a series of foreign affairs forums for them, bring out some experts from Washington. I believe it would go over big."

These people's range of interests has expanded substantially in the past 10 years—since, say, an oldest boy came home from Korea or since they have become aware of the brutal paradox of their bulging grain bins and the starving masses of Asia.

They may not be attuned to the subtler nuances of the international power struggle, but they firmly believe that American abundance is a good currency with which to buy world peace. Food, they have been told, is our greatest natural resource, and the only one that is replenishable year after year. Someway, somehow, they believe, the answer to the cold war lies in their hands.

Firm Answer to Gloomy Prophets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO E. ALLEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial, entitled "Firm Answer to Gloomy Prophets," which appeared in the Rockford (Ill.) Register-Republic of April 9, 1959:

FIRM ANSWER TO GLOOMY PROPHETS

The number of Americans holding jobs increased by 1,106,000 persons between mid-February and mid-March, a gain about twice as large as normal for that period, the U.S. Department of Labor said Tuesday. Although the rise in employment was greater than the drop in unemployment, the number of persons without jobs declined 387,000 during the 30-day period.

These official Government figures clearly refute the prophets of gloom in Congress, who want to pour hundreds of millions of dollars into pump-priming and spending programs, such as Illinois Senator PAUL DOUGLAS's area-redevelopment bill and the catchall public housing measure in the Senate.

The Labor Department's report also shows the muddied thinking of economists who have been telling the Joint Congressional Economic Committee that another round of inflation is preferable to the balanced budget called for by President Eisenhower.

Employment statistics speak for themselves. There are nearly 64 million Americans gainfully employed; those who obtained jobs between February 15 and March 15 included many housewives, students, and others not normally in the labor force—but at the same time, practically all the decline in unemployment was concentrated among men 25 or older who comprise the Nation's primary working group.

Equally significant were the reports by Labor Department statisticians that both hours of work in manufacturing industries and weekly earnings of factory production workers increased during March.

The President's campaign for a sound dollar, an end of deficit spending, and for Government economic policies which encourage business growth—and thus create employment opportunities—is continuing to show results. By keeping the national economy strong, the administration is protecting the purchasing power of Americans, millions of whom are living on pensions or fixed incomes, and is avoiding the inflation-stoked boom which brings on a business downturn to correct the excesses.

As Congress returns to Washington after the Easter recess, its Members should take due note of the improvement pointed up by the current report on employment. The freespenders who wring their hands in despair can no longer claim that administration fiscal policies are leading the Nation on the path to ruin. Instead, as Secretary of Commerce Lewis Strauss points out, American business is much better than was anticipated at the start of the year. Moreover, the economy is expected to show further gains, due to seasonal factors.

Mutual Security and Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 13, 1959

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, nowhere in today's world is the pace of change greater or more significant than in the vast continent of Africa. The onrushing tide of African nationalism has brought profound economic, political and social change to nearly all of her 220 million people. Independence has been attained by a half dozen countries, and as many more stand on the threshold. In recent weeks we have seen violence erupt in areas where progress toward self-determination was deemed insufficient.

In our hearings on the mutual security legislation for the coming fiscal year, the Committee on Foreign Affairs has been well-briefed on recent developments and problems in Africa. The background statement on April 10 by Mr. Joseph C. Satterthwaite, Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, was particularly helpful to an understanding of those problems and the role played by our mutual security program.

Believing that Mr. Satterthwaite's statement will be of wide interest, I insert it in the RECORD at this point together with my remarks:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE J. C. SATTERTHWAITE, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR AFRICAN AFFAIRS, BEFORE THE HOUSE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE IN SUPPORT OF THE MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM FOR FISCAL YEAR 1960, APRIL 10, 1959

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am glad of this opportunity to discuss with you the mutual security program and Africa. My appearance before you may in itself be of some significance, since it is the first time that an Assistant Secretary of State for the Bureau of African Affairs has made such an appearance before this Committee on

the mutual security program. This fact, of course, reflects the recognition on the part of the Congress, which last year approved a new position of Assistant Secretary of State to head the Bureau of African Affairs, of the growing importance of Africa to the free world.

I hardly need emphasize the fact that there is probably no area on earth today more alive with change, more politically, socially, and economically on the move than Africa. Seldom in history have such tremendous changes come to any continent as those we have seen in Africa since the end of World War II. The pattern of the new Africa is unfolding rapidly. While we still talk of much of this vast continent of 220 million people as an uncommitted area, it is difficult for me to emphasize sufficiently the urgency of the problems we face in Africa. As nation after nation reaches independence—and we have seen this happen in Libya, Morocco, Tunisia, Ghana, and Guinea since World War II—almost the first concern of these new governments is the imperative need to show reasonable results in improving the standard of living of its people. This becomes of decisive political importance to the survival of these new governments. One thing is certain: We must understand the vast political potential of this great continent, and to do so we must understand the aspirations of Africa's people. The surge toward self-government will again be reflected during 1960 when Nigeria, Cameroun, Togo, and Somalia will emerge as independent nations.

The past year in Africa has been marked by this onrushing tide of African self-determination. Nationalism has erupted in area after area in places where a year ago its rise would have seemed most unlikely. Some of the most recent manifestations were the achievement of full independence by Guinea, as a result of its voters' decision in a referendum on September 28, 1958; the All-African Peoples Conference at Accra, Ghana, in December 1958, and the riots in Leopoldville and Nyasaland. In short, little of Africa remains unstirred by the desire for greater self-expression. The disorders we are now seeing in Africa can be infectious and the separate but spreading outbreaks over the continent of Africa are disturbing. While there is great distance separating these disorders, there is for many of them a basic common denominator. It is the struggle for independence, the powerful appeal of nationalism even before institutions to channelize it constructively can be evolved.

The aspirations of the Pan-African independence movement were recently highlighted by the gathering of nonofficial delegates from all over the continent at Accra to the aforementioned All-African Peoples Conference. One result of the conference was to set up headquarters in Accra to coordinate the various nationalist movements. Although some of the resolutions adopted at Accra were controversial, it is evident that they generally reflected the aspirations of the Africans for self-government and economic and social progress, as well as their basic and determined opposition to colonialism and racial discrimination.

The new African states which have emerged—as well as those of longer duration—are governed by regimes which are moderate, friendly, and dedicated to the maintenance of their independence. In this we are most fortunate for these are tremendous assets to the free world which must be conserved and strengthened. But if these moderate regimes are to maintain themselves and justify their present orientation, they must be able to demonstrate to their peoples, in concrete and understandable terms, the advantages of cooperation with the West and of middle-of-the-road approaches to the solution of their current pressing problems.

I do not believe I need stress the importance of Africa to the free world, because by now this has become an accepted fact. We all know of Africa's strategic importance to the free world as evidenced in the major U.S. air, naval, and communications facilities maintained in Morocco, Libya, and Ethiopia. There is also of course a direct relationship between north African stability and peace and that of the European and Mediterranean areas. Sub-Sahara Africa's contribution of strategic raw materials—uranium, diamonds, manganese, tin, copper, chrome, to mention a few—is of vital importance to Africa's own development and to free world strength and security. The influence of African leaders and African "blocs" in world affairs and in international councils is growing. The use of this influence voiced in support of free world aims is a significant factor in debates on international issues.

THE COMMUNIST THREAT TO AFRICA

The yearnings and aspirations in Africa that I have previously discussed indicate quite clearly that we must accept the fact that the Communists will seek to gain influence on this great continent. It has been demonstrated time and again that they have techniques with which to exploit local difficulties and emotional issues. They particularly espouse nationalism in dependent areas and in new nations outside their own zone of influence. Above all they seek to exacerbate difficulties from whatever trouble they spring—economic, racial, and tribal—and there is always an adequate quota of trouble in new, inexperienced States.

During the past year, the outlines of the Communist offensive in Africa have emerged with startling rapidity. The organizational groundwork for Communist penetration was laid at the Cairo Afro-Asian Peoples Solidarity Conference in January 1958, with the establishment of a permanent secretariat under indirect Communist control.

In addition to the utilization of the Afro-Asian solidarity mechanism, the Communist bloc has made considerable progress in establishing diplomatic, cultural, and economic ties with the newly independent African states. Trade agreements have already been signed with Ethiopia, Morocco, Tunisia, and Guinea, while full diplomatic relations are now established with Ethiopia, Libya, and Morocco, and are about to be established with Guinea and Ghana. Communist offers of loans, grants, and technical assistance are being effectively exploited on a widespread basis in conjunction with anticolonialist and pronationalist propaganda. It is anticipated that Communist efforts to infiltrate and dominate trade union, student, and professional groups will be greatly intensified and will take advantage of the various conferences of such groups organized under the auspices of the Afro-Asian Solidarity Council.

The immediate Communist objective in Africa is the liquidation of all Western and particularly U.S. influence. In the pursuit of this objective, it can be anticipated that diplomatic, economic, cultural, and subversive weapons will be employed in coordination to exploit to the full the openings created by the revolutionary political and social ferment now sweeping the continent.

Thus far the Kremlin has appealed to the instinctive neutralism of the newly independent nations, which are eager for economic as well as political independence. Soviet officials have hitherto used Cairo as a platform from which to offer sweeping easy trade and aid terms to all of Africa.

ECONOMIC PROBLEMS AND THE MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM

Our most important tool in helping Africa with her economic problems is the mutual security program, through which we can help the many emergent nations in their need for the technical and managerial skills which are a must before any country can hope to start on the road toward development. Without these skills, no amount of capital will bring about growth.

Africa's economic and social needs, like its political and racial problems, are as great as the continent itself. The realization of its economic potential is a tremendous task which has barely begun.

Unemployment, trade deficits, scarcity of skilled labor and managerial personnel, lack of resources, lack of educational and health facilities, paucity of private and public investment capital and economic dislocations arising from uncertainties in their foreign relationships with other countries are but some of the problems facing the independent nations of Africa today.

All of these social and economic problems constitute a major challenge. No one nation can possibly solve them alone. Africa must have and deserves the cooperative support of her free world friends in this endeavor. To the extent that the African states are successful in maintaining their independence, in developing their human and natural resources, and in assuming a constructive and responsible role in world affairs, so will they inspire others and demonstrate to those about to achieve self-government the practical results of moderation and cooperation. In this context it is clear that external aid is a key to the realization of these advantages.

European countries continue to play a major role in the economic advancement of Africa, particularly in the dependent territories. European governments through bilateral efforts have been providing significant amounts of assistance and investments in African areas, much of which is for economic development. The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and United Nations Technical Assistance have also been making valuable contributions to Africa's growth. In addition, private capital has made an enormous contribution to the development of Africa. I cannot emphasize too strongly the urgent need for additional private investment abroad and the enlistment of private managerial and technical talents so desperately in demand in Africa.

The mutual security program, as a vital arm of U.S. foreign policy, is becoming an increasingly important factor in Africa in achieving both short- and long-term objectives in that continent. Its personnel carry out programs which are often as important to the success of our foreign policy as the efforts of our more traditional diplomacy.

U.S. objectives in Africa are simply stated. As a responsible world power the United States seeks to contribute to the peace, stability and prosperity of the African continent. We favor the orderly development of the area toward self-government. To the extent possible, we stand ready with positive programs to assist the newly independent states to remain strong and able to work out their own destinies without outside interference by inimical interests.

The United States encourages these developments without seeking to displace anyone in Africa. We regard sympathetically the legitimate aspirations of the African peoples, while at the same time encouraging their retention of mutually advantageous ties with European powers.

Mutual security assistance is now being provided to six independent African countries and five dependent areas, two of which, Nigeria and Somalia, are scheduled to become independent next year. The interest of the United States in the progress of these areas has led to the expansion of economic and technical assistance programs. The major increase is in the field of technical cooperation in order to provide skilled technicians and administrators on whom will

rest the responsibility for manning the institutions of a modern economic society.

By our economic and technical aid programs, we are assisting the leaders and people of Africa to tackle their pressing internal problems and giving them a sound basis to hope for meaningful progress through nontotalitarian methods. This hope, and the challenge to make good on it, offer a healthy focus for the strong nationalism of the newly independent peoples, a focus much needed to nullify the appeal of irresponsible extremist movements which feed on hopelessness.

While economic development is primarily a task for the peoples of Africa, our mutual security program is helping to remove such bottlenecks to development as a lack of capital and a shortage or lack of certain kinds of technical and administrative knowledge and skills.

Africa's most pressing needs for economic growth are in the infrastructure of the economies—communications, transportation, power, ports, and public services. It is in these areas of development that the Development Fund will become one of the most important elements of our mutual security effort in Africa.

Because of the uncertainties we face in Africa, with new nations being born almost overnight, we must have flexibility to handle the unforeseen situations and emergencies. It is for this reason that I consider a substantial contingency fund an indispensable element in this year's aid request.

I am convinced that the yearning of Africa for a better way of life presents us with one of the great challenges of our time. If we fail to respond adequately, we may stand accused as a people who proclaim our own satisfaction with the benefits of freedom and well-being, but who are insensitive to the yearnings and needs of others. We must recognize that our posture before the world can be no better than the manner in which we fulfill obligations that flow from our status as the most materially favored nation in all history. The objective must be to help raise other peoples' standards of living. In doing so we shall also help to quicken the pace of personal and political development, a goal which is impossible of achievement in the absence of economic growth.

The orientation of Africa will, in the long run, depend on where the leaders and peoples feel their best interests lie. The ability of the West to encourage the pro-Western orientation of Africa will, moreover, probably depend less on our ability to convince Africans of the dangers of communism than on our demonstrating to them in positive terms the advantages of cooperation with the West.

A responsible Africa is emerging on the world scene. We must stand prepared to give it sympathetic support and assistance if its great potential is to be achieved in a manner which will also benefit the free world.

Letters to the Editor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, you will remember that sometime ago Elmo Roper made a study of the earmarks of of the active citizen. One of these behavior patterns was the habit of writing letters to the editor. It is for that reason that I call your attention to two major articles in the Editor and Publisher, the fourth estate's trade journal, dated January 31 and February 14. These articles were based on two reports issued by the Center for Practical Politics located at Rollins College in my Fifth Florida District. These reports, in which there has been national interest, are entitled "Policy of Florida Newspapers on Letters to the Editor" and "Letters to the Editor," a content analysis case history of letters written by a citizen with a socialist background to a conservative southern newspaper.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my reason for mentioning these studies is that the Orlando Sentinel, one of the great newspapers of America, is located in my district, prints more letters to the editor than any other newspaper in Florida. The study makes that fact clear. Martin Andersen, the Sentinel's publisher, says he thinks he publishes more letters than any other newspaper in the world. Anyway, I want to emphasize the importance of these letters in our great democracy. The Sentinel says it has found it good business, that it gets more reaction per printed word from its 100,000 circulation than most newspapers twice the size. It provides readers with a voice of their own. The Sentinel uses that voice to back up its editorial policy or to make the editor back down. In either case, it circulates ideas for the improvement of the Sentinel's service to the community.

Mr. Andersen says he gets letters written in stubby pencil on penny tablets and old wrapping paper; on rag paper with electric typewriters; on special stationery from elderly people; on childish sheets from youngsters just beginning to form words. About half the daily volume of letters are handwritten.

I wish to say "on the record," Mr. Speaker, that the Orlando Sentinel is operating as an engine of democracy in providing this important channel for the interaction of opinions. I congratulate Martin Andersen and the Center for Practical Politics on their teamwork in encouraging active citizenship.

Democrats Give Washington State Highest Sales Tax in Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the State of Michigan may be shorter of money or more insolvent, but my State of Washington heads the list when it comes to collecting the highest sales tax of any State in the Nation. That is the situation since the recently adjourned special session of the Washington State Legislature, which broke every record in Washington State's history for imposing new taxes.

Heretofore the average family was taxed $345 per biennium for the State's general fund. Now that family will pay about $125 more, and in all fairness Democratic State legislators must take full blame or credit for establishing this record of increasing taxes, because our State senate and house of representatives are two-thirds Democratic and likewise the Governor who ran for office on the platform of no taxes needed is also a Democrat.

One of our able new Republican State representatives, James A. Anderson, had the following to say after the recent session of the State legislature on the subject of the increase in Washington State's taxes, which indicates that taxes may be a State partisan political issue in my area in 1960. Meanwhile, may I suggest it is not the first time Democrat politicians have risen above the principles and platform when it comes to observing their New Deal-Fair Deal policy of spend and tax—spend and tax:

What a difference there is between promise and performance.

The Democratic platform on which all of the Democratic legislators ran in the last general election not only opposed any increase in the sales tax but advocated removing it entirely. The Democratic majority, however, at the session just concluded raised the sales tax to 4 percent. This is an 18 percent increase in the sales tax and gives Washington the highest sales tax in the Nation.

UNFAIR TO BUSINESS

The Democratic platform also decried the business and occupation tax as being a grossly unfair burden on business and urged its removal. Yet the Democratic 2-to-1 majority in both the senate and the house solidly supported and passed a large increase in this tax.

Every single one of the Republicans in both the house and the senate voted against these tax bills rammed through the special session by the Democratic majority. The Republican position reduced to its essence is simply that these huge new tax programs would not have been necessary if the legislature had faced up to the task of insisting upon some basic commonsense economies in government.

The Republican sponsored program aimed at reforming existing abuses in the welfare laws would, alone, have saved approximately $60 million, but the bills containing these programs were handily killed by the majority party.

The Greater Cleveland Council No. 440 of the Boy Scouts of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 13, 1959

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, in January of this year, Greater Cleveland Council No. 440 of the Boy Scouts of America adopted an ambitious 10-year program known as the Greater Cleveland plan. It is designed to make possible a tremendous growth in Boy Scout membership each year until 1968, when it is hoped that the Greater Cleveland area can serve some 82,000 boys. This would be 50 percent of all available boys at that time. The plan not only envisions reach-

ing all boys who desire to be scouts, but provides for a continual up-grading of the program offered.

It was gratifying for me to learn last week, Mr. Speaker, that the plan now having been in effect for 3 months, can point to more than 110 new scout units registered during that short period. One hundred ten units in 3 months is more than the number registered in any previous 1-year period.

I wish to congratulate the leaders in the Greater Cleveland council. They are men of vision and high purpose. They seek to make the opportunities of Scouting possible for thousands of new boys each year, and they are ever alert to see that the quality of the program offered shall be increasingly good. During these past 3 months, the leaders have seen that the master plan of operation was carefully drawn and is both practical and workable. The one element yet to be proven in their faith that the people of Greater Cleveland will back their council with the necessary support, in both time and money.

Service hours totaling hundreds of thousands are given each year by dedicated volunteers in order to make effective the splendid character-citizenship training program of the Boy Scouts of America. If these hours were to be translated into dollars and cents, the price of the Boy Scout program would be staggering. Since this is not the case, however, Scout budget needs are very very modest indeed. Particularly is this seen by comparing the Scout budget with a recent request from two correctional institutions in the Cleveland area, which have asked for $185 million for rehabilitation purposes. How much better to put only a fraction of this cost into the ounce of prevention the Scouting movement represents.

The Boy Scout program all over America is doing a truly magnificent job in fostering the ideals of true Americanism in our growing boys. In fact, I am inclined to agree with the statement once made by the beloved Will Rogers, "The only trouble with the Boy Scouts is there just ain't enough of them."

The Greater Cleveland council is to be commended on making a sincere effort to remedy that situation.

President Carlos P. Garcia of the Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to include for the RECORD a very interesting letter I received from an old friend, Mr. P. W. Reeves, and since the letter relates to the Philippines and President Carlos P. Garcia, I feel that the letter would be of interest to my colleagues in the House:

MARCH 24, 1959.

Hon. GEORGE ANDREWS,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR FRIEND: When the United States is sending the Secretary of State to the four corners of the world to patch up differences with other nations, when U.S. Government officials are being sent all over the world on goodwill tours, it seems foolish for certain American magazines to continue dishing out irresponsible journalistic tripe which is utterly unfounded and unwarranted.

An American magazine's ill-timed article recently provoked rioting in La Paz, Bolivia, and caused the American Embassy in La Paz to be stoned. At least three leading magazines in America have recently attacked President Carlos P. Garcia of the Philippines. America can ill afford to lose friends in any part of the world at this time.

There is a political group in the Philippines which has done everything conceivable to undermine President Garcia since he assumed the office of President on March 17, 1957. This is understandable. Those fellows are out of power and they are anxious to get into power, but it is beyond me to figure out, as an American, why certain writers in the United States have joined in this fight on President Carlos P. Garcia. Since April 21, 1958, seven different vicious attacks have been made on President Garcia and the Philippine Government, and the attacks were made by two leading magazines in the United States.

The Philippines tries to emulate the United States in the operation of its government. More than 95 percent of the Filipino people love America. No Filipino loves America better than President Carlos P. Garcia. On March 10, 1959, while addressing a group of American business executives in Manila, President Garcia stated: "I don't want to see the Philippines veer away from America. God knows I am not anti-American. I want to make the Philippines a bridge between America and Asia * * *."

On June 24, 1958, speaking in New York City, President Garcia stated: "I give this pledge on behalf of the Filipino people that we shall stand with the American people in defense of freedom as we have stood with them in the past—loyally without counting the cost. It would appear that a policy of neutralism has the net effect of abetting the aggressive purposes of international communism. The proof of this is to be seen in Asia and Africa where neutralism is a much-favored philosophy and where communism has been encouraged to make heavy inroads by stealth or armed intervention. In Western Europe, where communism has been rejected, communism has found it less easy to pursue its objectives. I dare to stand and be counted with the American people on the side of freedom."

President Carlos P. Garcia stated his public service 34 years ago, in 1925 as a Congressman. He served as Congressman 6 years, 9 years as Governor of his home Province, almost 14 years as Senator, 3 years and 3 months as Vice President, and 2 years as President. He has not been touched by the breath of scandal during these 34 years. President Garcia has not lost any of his popularity. The small group in the Philippines which is opposing him in 1959, also opposed him when he was elected President in 1957; and the opposition to President Garcia now was the opposition to him when he was elected Vice President in 1953 when he was the running mate of the late Ramon Magsaysay.

The Garcia administration has taken steps to harness the resources of the country. A program has been charted to improve the country's economic position, both agriculturally and industrially. In trying to industrialize the nation, it has been necessary to help many new industries. Assisting these new industries during the past 2 years has been a heavy strain on the dollar reserves of the country.

When I saw the President a few days ago, he quoted the immortal Abraham Lincoln when he said to me: "I do the very best I know how, the very best I can, and I mean to keep on doing so until the end."

The facts which I have conveyed to you have not been told to the American people by the poisonous pen writers in the United States who are attacking this man whose honesty, integrity, statesmanship, and faithful service is unimpeachable.

With kindest regards.

Sincerely,

P. W. REEVES.

Journalism, They Call It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert a letter which I received from an attorney in Manila, together with an editorial from the Daily Mirror, published in Manila, dated March 7, 1959.

This letter together with the editorial show how our relations with a friendly ally can be severely damaged by irresponsible attacks upon the administration of one of our allies.

Our relations must be cemented by patience, understanding, and cooperation.

The letter and editorial follow:

MANILA, PHILIPPINES, *March 29, 1959.*

Hon. JAMES UTT,
House of Representatives Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN AND SIR: I am sending you an editorial from the Daily Mirror, one of the leading newspapers in Manila, of date March 7, 1959. I thought you would like to include this in the proceedings of the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

It is a shame the way Time has attacked our President. Time did this dirty work in six different issues. The first attack was in August or September 1957, and we ignored that one. The next attack was April 21, 1958, and we staged a rally of more than 25,000 Filipinos. We bitterly denounced Time and Time's reporter. We burned Time magazine in front of the crowd at Plaza Miranda.

Since that attack in 1958, there have been four more attacks by Time on our great President. We are not perfect but we do not need anybody from Time magazine to wash our dirty linen. We have enough dirty linen washers of our own right here in Manila.

Time has done much damage here. Pickets marched in front of American Ambassador's office, also his house. Signs appeared on some streets telling Americans to go home. That is just a sample. Our people—95 percent—love the Americans and we want to keep it that way by throttling filthy magazines like time. Time apparently has two objectives in making all these attacks, viz: (a) to turn our people against our President; and (b) to make trouble between America and our country.

Hope you publish the editorial from Daily Mirror of March 7, 1959.

Yours for justice,

REMIGIO V. BARNES.

[From the Manila Daily Mirror, Mar. 7, 1959]

JOURNALISM, THEY CALL IT

Not the least of the matters brought up at the World Press Congress in Columbia, Mo., was the case of Time magazine. This is the first time that an international conference of journalists and publishers has dealt with this subject. Heretofore, responsible newsmen in the United States have privately deplored the brand of journalism practiced by Time, but have not seen fit to express their opinion in any public forum. Even their remarks at the World Press Congress were more inclined to deplore than to condemn. This is perhaps understandable; among the intelligentsia in the United States, Time is known for what it is, namely, a weekly entertainment rather than a source of news.

But one may well wonder how long Time will go on its merry way amusing Americans and insulting the governments, leaders, and institutions of other peoples. When a U.S. Embassy in a friendly South American capital is stoned because of what Time attributed, allegedly in jest, to one of its officials, it can no longer be taken lightly, even by Americans. Because it is identified with the interests of the Republican administration, what Time prints about the affairs of foreign countries will always be taken seriously. This weekly has been banned abroad time and again for ridiculing leaders and regimes it dislikes. When the targets were dictators with a bad name to begin with, Time was able to cloak its officiousness with the mantle of democracy. But Time, now accustomed to the sport, has made the mistake of lumping Afro-Asian nationalist leaders with Communists. And in Latin America, Time treats presidents and ministers as if they were straight out of a comic opera.

The latest Latin-American incident concerning Time occurred while the World Press Congress was still sitting. This was a providential event, for it forced the delegates to take cognizance of the happening. Quoting a U.S. Embassy official, Time said that Bolivia should be divided among her neighbors. The Bolivians reached by stoning the American Embassy. It would have done no good to explain that the supposed diplomat was jesting. The seeming levity of the remark, whoever its author was, was an obvious shield for a malicious intent, namely, to influence international opinion against the Bolivian Government.

When Vice President NIXON was stoned and spat upon in the other South American capitals he visited, the people of La Paz made the headlines by giving him the most cordial reception of his trip. No one would have suspected then that the same people would be stoning the American Embassy within such a short time. But it has happened, thanks to Time's handiwork.

It would be comforting to know that Time intends to mend its ways from now on. But there is no sign of repentance, and probably there never will be as long as the weekly's circulation remains unaffected by isolated boycotts abroad. To the contrary, the more people it offends the more arrogant and unfeeling Time seems to get. Americans may have learned to live with it, but not the people of most other countries, especially the newly independent countries of Asia and Africa. It is in these areas that a magazine like Time does the most harm, and much of this is harm to America and what it stands for.

A Constitutional Amendment to Control Federal Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to a House concurrent resolution which has been introduced in the Iowa Legislature by State Representative Kenneth Stringer, of Scott County, and two of his fellow representatives, Grassley and Flatt.

The resolution proposes an amendment to the U.S. Constitution for the purpose of holding Federal expenditures within income. In view of the mounting national debt and the pressure to run the Government on a deficit basis, I feel that the resolution has so much merit that we should give every consideration to its promotion.

The resolution follows:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 8

Concurrent resolution making application to the Congress of the United States for the calling of a convention to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States

Whereas there is much concern about Federal spending and the Federal debt; and

Whereas article V of the Constitution of the United States provides that upon application of two-thirds of the States, Congress shall call a convention for proposing amendments to such Constitution, which shall be submitted to the State legislatures or State conventions for ratification: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of the State of Iowa, That this general assembly hereby makes application to the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing one amendment to the Constitution of the United States, such amendment to provide for the following:

1. That the annual appropriations of Congress shall not exceed the estimated receipts which shall be transmitted to Congress by the President on the first day of each regular session of Congress. Such estimated receipts shall be for the ensuing fiscal year under the existing tax laws. If, however, Congress revises the tax laws, the President shall estimate the effect of such revisions and transmit a revised estimate of total receipts to Congress, which shall be the amount to which appropriations shall be limited.

2. That if Congress appropriates money in excess of the estimated receipts for said fiscal year, the President shall be authorized and directed to reduce such appropriations so that they do not exceed the receipts transmitted by the President.

3. That the foregoing limitations shall not apply in time of war or during the period ending on the date of the expiration of 1 full fiscal year after the termination thereof.

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Iowa is hereby directed to send certified copies of this concurrent resolution to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, to the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, to each Member of Congress from the State of Iowa, and to the Chief Executive and presiding officers of the legislative bodies of each of the several States.

Contrasting Political Philosophies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, families living in the United States who were on moderate and fixed incomes suffered great hardship due to rising prices and the cost of food, shelter and clothing from 1939 to 1952 when, except for the 80th Congress, control of both the legislative and the executive branches of the Federal Government was in the hands of the Democrats.

On March 9, 1959, the House-Senate Joint Economic Committee issued its 12th annual review of the President's economic report and the budget. The 10 Democrats on this committee must have forgotten about what happened during those previous years because in their views on the review they charge the present Republican administration policies reflect too much concern with price rises. Committee Republicans reject that criticism, as do, I am sure, all lower income persons who have experienced the effects of a shrinking buying power of the dollar.

Very rightly, it seems to me, an administration must concern itself from day to day and month to month with the threat of the possible diminishing value of the dollar and a resultant rise in the cost of living. The time to give attention to such a situation is before any such drop in the value of the consumer dollar occurs—not afterward when counteraction is too late.

Let us remember that prior to 1952 under Democratic administrations, the cost of living rocketed some 90 percent, shrinking the value of wages and true income to about 52 cents. A $1,000 laid away in a savings account in 1939 for a rainy day as a result shrank to about $520 by 1952.

Let us not forget either another thing which added to the economic plight of the wage earner during this same period. In addition to the cut in income dollars of nearly one-half, due to lower value of the dollar, his burden of taxes was increased. Between 1939 and 1952, lower

income groups were drastically hurt by the Democratic Congress through a reduced personal income tax exemption from $2,500 to $1,000 for a married couple, and from $1,000 to $500 for a single worker.

On top of this, adding to a worker's woes, the Democrats increased the minimum rate of taxation from 4 percent on the first $4,000 of income to 23 percent on the first $2,000 of income.

This is the record as to the treatment of lower income workers and retired persons.

Furthermore, only once during those years was there a tax reduction—that occurred in 1948 when the Republican 80th Congress, over the veto of a Democratic President, increased exemptions and reduced the minimum income tax rate.

Of course, the New Deal-Fair Deal philosophy of economics embraces bigger taxes and more spending. The Democrat Party in its basic principle has been consistent in this respect over the past 27 years. It is still the party of high taxes and a shrinking dollar. The Democratic Advisory Council goes further and advocates keeping Federal spending of borrowed, deficit dollars as a vital factor to a growing national economy.

Not all Democrat legislators believe in Federal Government controls and big spending. Many Democrats oppose the welfare state idea, but these are out of step with the program of the majority party of the Congress. The outstanding Democratic savers, economizers, and those who consistently represent a basic ideology contrary to their own party leadership, of course, are entitled to full credit as individuals. However, under our political system it is the party that offers a program and, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion the record is clear that between the two political philosophies it is the Republicans who favor low taxes and seek to protect the economy of the consumer.

TVA Spends Your Tax Dollars Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, the inabilty of our own U.S. industry to compete with foreign made goods is becoming a threat to labor and to our entire economy. The latest example being the purchase by the Tennessee Valley Authority of a huge generator from a foreign concern, at a price far below the bids submitted by Westinghouse and General Electric.

The two domestic manufacturers are being criticized by certain union bosses for their inability to submit a winning bid. Hence, I felt it my duty to get the facts, as stated in a letter to me from Westinghouse under date of April 3, 1959, and which I here insert in the RECORD.

Now, of course, the Tennessee Valley Authority would like to have all the American taxpayers believe that by accepting the low foreign bid for this generator, they saved money for all the American taxpayers—but, to a very great degree it is only the people in the Tennessee Valley who will benefit, since it is only those people who profit by the cheap subsidized TVA electric power made available to them due to the over $3 billion of all the American people's tax dollars, which Congress has appropriated interest free and tax free to TVA over the past 25 years.

If the businessmen and the farmers of a neighboring State, Iowa for example, were furnished all the money they would need to buy a business or a farm—stock and equipment—interest free, and then be tax free, they would soon drive every Iowa businessman and farmer to the wall. Is it any wonder TVA can sell electric power far below private power producers, who pay both interest and taxes?

And Mr. Speaker, a comparable competitive situation applies with almost equal force as between Westinghouse and General Electric and the successful foreign bidder. The Westinghouse letter follows:

WESTINGHOUSE ELECTRIC CORP.,
Pittsburgh, Pa., April 3, 1959.

Hon. BEN F. JENSEN,
Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. JENSEN: We appreciate your interest in getting the facts concerning the TVA 500,000-kilowatt steam turbine order referred to in the letter you have received from the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America.

In this letter, the general president of the UE has done a great disservice to the union's membership and to the Nation with absurd charges of 265 percent profits in the electrical industry of the United States. The letter presents an argument based on false assumptions, incorrect figures and distortions of fact. Its resulting conclusions are ludicrous.

For example, while the UE does not deny that U.S. electrical manufacturers pay wages at least 2½ times those paid in England, they somehow calculate that our labor costs on this $18 million job are only $91,000 more than Parsons labor costs.

They calculate further that the total cost of building this giant steam turbine generator would be only $5,300,000. The fact is that this amount wouldn't cover the cost of materials—to say nothing of wages and salaries, the costs of providing and operating our factories and their great number of machine tools, transportation, research and development, and many additional expenses.

I am sure that Westinghouse stockholders would be delighted if our profits could be a little closer to the 265 percent that UE says we earn, instead of the 4 percent or slightly less that we actually have earned in the last several years.

The UE letter bases its charges of profiteering on what it says are company figures. It then quotes a statement by Mr. A. C. Monteith which appeared in the Westinghouse News to the effect that the TVA order in question would have meant 1,080,000 man-hours of work for Westinghouse employees at the Lester and East Pittsburgh, Pa., plants and 375,000 man-hours of work for employees in plants of supplier companies.

What the UE does not say is that these figures represent only the direct factory labor which would have been involved in production of the steam turbine generator—the labor of those factory employees who would have been working full-time on this particular job and who are directly affected by the loss of this order. When we cited these man-hour figures to show the possible effect of this lost order on employment, we were intentionally conservative, limiting the figure to direct labor only.

The figure does not include the host of service personnel such as crane operators, materials handlers, production clerks, plant guards, supervisors and others. Such indirect labor costs are at least double the direct labor costs. This means that the total labor cost of manufacturing this type of giant electrical equipment is approximately three times the actual direct labor cost. And that covers only the people in the manufacturing plants. In addition, there is the cost of the people in the research and development departments and laboratories whose efforts keep American electrical apparatus ahead of the world in reliability and efficiency. And there are sales costs and administrative costs. The UE letter ignores all these.

As a second step in its series of miscalculations, the UE takes this small portion of total labor cost and multiplies it by several industry average wage figures—which also are incorrect when applied to the Westinghouse plants involved. The skilled employees who build these giant machines earn well above the average industry wage.

Then, to muddle even more the already completely inaccurate "calculation," the UE applies a mythical productive efficiency advantage which, they imply, the heavy electrical manufacturers in this country have over similar plants abroad. This, they claim, is 244 percent. If such an advantage exists in the production of heavy electric power apparatus, we are not aware of it. And judging from the low bids of foreign electrical manufacturers, they haven't heard of their great disadvantage either.

It is indeed unfortunate that the officers of a national labor union who represents thousands of American workmen spread this type of economic nonsense which can only work against the best interests of their members in a segment of industry where reduced employment has been and still is a problem.

Such propaganda is serious also in that it encourages those who fail to see the dangers involved in our Government buying heavy electric power apparatus from foreign companies which could not provide the necessary repairs and maintenance in time of war.

The UE letter dismisses the security question as a "hypocritical issue" raised to justify our inability to meet the low bids of foreign suppliers. We are willing to leave to your judgment whether or not the continuous supply of electric power to key defense production areas of the country during a national emergency is a real or a "hypocritical" issue. In 1957, TVA supplied more than half the power used by the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, for example.

Despite TVA reassurances on the ability of foreign suppliers to provide service, the fact remains that the Parsons company does not have a steam turbine generator manufacturing plant on this continent. Nor is there any plant in Canada capable of handling major repairs of large steam turbine generators. Parsons, in its bid, said it has just three technical men in all of North America to handle repairs and maintenance. By contrast, Westinghouse has more than 1,000 field service engineers, and, in addition to our major manufacturing plants, we have service and repair plants throughout the United States. Any major repair or replacement on such a steam turbine generator

as the TVA Colbert Station unit would require Parsons to ship the unit overseas or ship parts from overseas—something which could be impossible in time of war or other national emergency.

This very real issue of national security should not be screened from view by the smoke of misinformation emanating from UE or any other source.

Sincerely yours,

C. H. BARTLETT,
Vice President.

James H. Gray, Editor and Publisher of the Albany, Ga., Herald, Named Citizen of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. FORRESTER
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, on March 24, 1959, Hon. James H. Gray, publisher and editor of the Albany Herald and owner of WALB radio and television station, received the highest honor that can be bestowed upon a Georgia citizen for loyal and outstanding services to his State, when he accepted the Georgia Citizen of the Year award from the Association of the County Commissioners.

The county commissioners are the managers of the affairs of their respective counties and the action of the Association of the County Commissioners reflect the views of the people of all the counties of Georgia as no other organization can.

A short newspaper account of Mr. Gray's nomination and acceptance reads as follows:

"MAN OF YEAR" STATE AWARD GOES TO EDITOR

ATLANTA.—James H. Gray, editor and publisher of the Albany Herald, today was presented the Association of County Commissioners' citizen of the year award.

The presentation was made by Dr. W. A. Blasingame of Moultrie, past president of the association. He described Gray as a native of Massachusetts but a Georgian by choice.

Blasingame said Gray "sees and understands our situation * * * above all he is a Georgian."

In a brief acceptance speech the Albany publisher said he was "profoundly grateful for this significant award."

TIME OF STRESS

"You and I are living in highly emotional times for the Nation and our beloved State," Gray said. "The isues—political, economic, and social—are many-sided and susceptible to solutions that do not come clear, unfortunately."

He told the commissioners that clamor is most apt to drown out the voice of reason. The result is "confusion that we find swirling about us."

Gray then added: "The colossal folly of our history, that here and nowhere else will we find the clues to solving our problems."

FREEDOM'S DANGER

He said freedom gets lost in big government and that as a government grows its spokesmen "presume to tell the people what freedom is and what freedom is not."

Gray said the South has seen such an interpretation "infringe upon our freedom in such highly exclusive matters as social relationships and the education of our children."

Gray then added: "The colossal folly of this unholy business has been well illustrated. It leads to the rule of force which completely ignores that old American principle of consent of the governed."

Mr. Gray came to Albany, Ga., from Springfield, Mass., and, as he says, he "became a southerner by choice." Mr. Gray has great respect and admiration for the people of Georgia and the South, and we think "Jimmy" Gray is one of our outstanding citizens, and that we are lucky indeed to have him. The experience of "Jimmy" Gray is simply additional proof that prejudice is something a person must help build up against himself, while friendship can never be denied to a genuine friend.

Mr. Speaker, I have the idea that the Georgia people would not deny "Jimmy" Gray any honor he might seek.

Greek River Became a "Horn of Plenty"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CARLTON LOSER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including the second article written by Mr. Coleman A. Harwell, editor of the Nashville Tennessean, while on a world tour under the auspices of the State Department Exchange Program.

This article on Greece will be of particular interest to each Member of the House and I commend it to your reading.

The article follows:

GREEK RIVER BECAME A "HORN OF PLENTY"

(By Coleman A. Harwell)

ATHENS.—The other morning we were having breakfast at the Mediterranean Hotel, in Salonika.

A couple seated at the table next to us was in animated conversation. They were speaking German.

"The place is loaded with German salesmen," said my companion.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

"Yes, so we noticed today," I replied. "As we drove through the Thessaly Plains, we saw a tractor being demonstrated to a village crowd. It was a Porsche."

That is item number one in a series of three which are being cited under the heading: Little Things May Have Big Meaning.

The others are these: (1) Ground has been broken on Queen Sophia Avenue for the $7 million Athens Conrad Hilton Hotel, and (2) French and German private capital is supporting the bid of an American firm to construct the largest powerplant in Greece.

PROGRESS AHEAD

These facts add up to such an impressive total, in my view, that the following rash forecast is justified: Greece will make significant economic progress in the next 10 years.

Few people qualified to do so will make such a forecast openly. There are too many hindrances. But conversations with several informed people whose confidential predictions range from hopeful to positive, plus some readily available encouraging data, strengthen my conclusion.

The importance of economic stability here is obvious. With a strong economy, Greece is a vigorous ally in a key spot between East and West. Without it, communism is a continuing threat, and that in the face of the fact that Greeks on the whole are as strongly antagonistic to communism as any people could be.

Consider some obstacles:

1. Lack of economic confidence: Monetary values have been wiped out three times in a lifetime for the Greeks. So now, when they have money they put it in real things: Houses, automobiles, household items, etc. Bank savings, which spur industrial development, are negligible, despite 8-percent interest.

2. Lack of political confidence. The nation's sentiment is largely middle of the road, perhaps a little to the left. (It is overwhelmingly Greek Orthodox in faith, which is rightist, anti-Communist). Its heavy unemployment spurs the leftist party. And the big problem is that the center groups are split up in squabbles, causing many voters to turn right or left, with the result that leftists get more votes than justified.

3. Heavy industry which is necessary to create jobs, is contrary to Greek tradition. Instance: Family loyalty is the big thing. Everybody wants to help Uncle Vasilly or Cousin Costas, but no one is inclined to do and die for deal old Westinghouse. Instance: Department stores and supermarkets don't exist. Business is small, run by the family. Instance: Greeks buy suits from tailors, shoes from cobblers. No Fashion Park or Genesco here.

4. Cafeneion-itis: The cafeneion is the world's foremost coffee klatche. It is no casual thing, such as the guys or gals slipping out for a quick cup of java at Do's Grill. It is a fundamental social institution for all men, morning and evening. A tiny cup of coffee, a huge amount of talk. What started as a relaxing social event has become a symptom of frustration, in the opinion of many Greeks. Problems that might be solved are talked to death. Cyprus is an encouraging exception—and Greeks "blame" this on U.S. pressure.

So much for the negative. On the positive side, we submit these points:

1. An industrious, buoyant people.

2. World interest centered on Greece, politically and militarily.

3. An historic attraction that no area can outdo, increasing in value as Western culture advances. Our civilization came to life here; the spread of Christianity began here. Climate is a plus factor.

4. Industrial potential that has been underestimated.

We will let the first three points speak for themselves at this time, taking up No. 3 (including the Conrad Hilton) in a subsequent article on tourism. For now, consider No. 4.

PLENTIFUL RESOURCES

Greek resources have long been underrated. For instance, it has bauxite deposits in the hundreds of millions of tons, sufficient to establish an industry. It has similar deposits of chromatic iron ore and of lignite, some of which is being used already to create power. It has large amounts of unused waterpower.

Greek powerplants, water and lignite, produce 490,000 kilowatts of energy today, thanks, in large part, to U.S. aid. This is more than twice the prewar figure, and since

a grid system has boosted efficiency, it amounts to an actual increase of 5.9 times the prewar rate.

At long last there is reason to hope, even to believe, that the great Achelos River Dam, or dams will be built soon. There has been a good deal of waste motion, starting with a survey by Ebasco, the U.S. engineering firm which, incidentally, faced considerable criticism for a survey in the TVA area. For whatever reason, it was only a partial survey.

Now bids have been made, based on that survey. The bids must obviously be inexact because they cover not only construction and financing costs, but also a completed survey setting out final details of the project. So, the bids are based on what the bidder considers the most feasible way to develop the site. Thus, they vary widely and the Greek Government must choose between them in that light.

It is understood that the United States is trying to persuade the Greeks to have a final detailed survey made, and take bids on that. That sounds reasonable.

Meanwhile, Morrison-Knudsen, U.S. engineering firm, has private German and French financial support in its bid of $44 million. This firm, incidentally, built Boulder Dam, has done much work in Europe, and is doing the big Helmland project in Afghanistan, where we go soon.

MAJOR COMPETITOR

Considered a major competitor for the job is an Italian group, bidding $37 million, financed in part by money from war reparations due from Italy to Greece. The time factor is perhaps as important as the basic money bid and Morrison-Knudsen is ahead in this.

Incidentally, Greece's Deputy Premier Kanellopolous, who is in the United States for NATO's 10th anniversary fete, is reported planning to discuss development loan funds in Washington for the project. Request for such a loan already was in. It is understood that this would not give American bidders any preference in the competition.

These factors to one side, however, there is reason to be encouraged toward realization of this long-discussed project which would add 180,000 kilowatts to the Nation's power grid from the river in western Greece. It is understood that an additional 60,000 kilowatts would be readily available with a fourth turbine, and even this might be increased.

Thus, there is within sight (for the optimist) 1 million kilowatts of power, many times Greece's prewar production.

CAN MAKE ALUMINUM

And what could be achieved thereby? For one thing, instead of shipping its bauxite ore for $5.40 per ton, most of it to Russia, and importing aluminum products at $500 per ton and up, Greece might be processing its own bauxite all the way to the finished products. Greek workers would benefit, stockholders would make profits, more foreign exchange would be provided, fringe industries would spring up, etc.

Upon these things is the optimism for Greece based.

Bear in mind, she had only 10 years of peace, and 4 of those wracked by Cyprus, compared with nearly 14 continuous years for the rest of Europe. If war clouds stay away, Greece may have a sunny future.

The Achelos River is no exception to the fact that the Greeks have a legend for everything. Hearing it, I am reminded that we are similarly blessed as to the Cumberland and Tennessee Rivers—with Indian legends.

The Greek legend is that Achelos fought Heracles twice for the love of Deianira. He was defeated both times and took the form of a snake, then that of a bull. Heracles seized him, wrenched off a horn and threw him into the river Thoas, which was thereafter called the Achelos. Then, says the legend, the horn was rescued by the Naiads, who filled it with flowers and it became the horn of plenty.

The legend might well apply to our rivers, too.

Jobless March Flops: Too Much Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, last week we witnessed the so-called march on Washington, by members of the AFL–CIO in an effort to stampede the Congress into enacting their grandiose schemes for further Federal support programs.

I am happy to report that in my congressional district, where last year we were suffering considerably from layoffs in the heavy machinery industry, practically all of the men furloughed have now being recalled. As a matter of fact, following the editorial entitled, "The March on Washington," I include for printing in the RECORD the news dispatch entitled, "Jobless March Flops: Too Much Work," appearing in the April 7 issue of the Peoria Journal Star:

[From the Peoria Journal Star, Apr. 8, 1959]

THE MARCH ON WASHINGTON

Because the 1-day AFL–CIO conference today has been called a march on Washington, many of us have visualized a parade of some kind. Actually it is a shrewdly timed device to remind Congress that organized labor is looking over its shoulder; shrewdly timed becaues the House Ways and Means Committee was scheduled to start hearings yesterday on general unemployment compensation proposals.

By meeting in Washington today, some 5,000 representatives of labor unions will dramatize their insistence on Federal broadening of unemployment compensation. But we think President Eisenhower's position on this question is right. The Federal Government ought to wait to see what State governments do before it considers any permanent revision of Federal law. The extension of unemployment compensation to July 1, already passed, is a stopgap measure.

On March 23, the President told the executive committee of the governors' conference that States have the authority and responsibility to provide adequate benefits under the Federal-State unemployment insurance program. Governors agree that it is primarily a State program. It is to be dealt with "without imposition of Federal standards, governing eligibility, duration, or the amount of benefits." Basic reason is that the States should act first because they can act quickest, each to suit its own needs.

The President recommends that States pay benefits of 50 percent of average weekly wages for a minimum of 26 weeks. Of the 49 State legislatures, 46 are meeting or have met this year. When Congress sees what these legislatures have provided, then, and not until then, can it make a decision on broadening the law.

The Georgia Legislature has met and gone home without doing anything. Montana made some changes but they were vetoed by the Governor. Six other legislatures have voted to increaes benefits and duration in various degrees.

Present maximum payment of unemployment varies from 36 weeks (Utah) to 16 weeks (Florida). Maximum amounts range from $26 to $70 a week.

These basic conditions will not be changed by labor's march.

[From the Peoria Journal Star, Apr. 7, 1959]

JOBLESS MARCH FLOPS: TOO MUCH WORK

Unemployed? OK so try to find some.

United Automobile Workers, Local 974 had to go into the ranks of its retired members to find delegates to send to an AFL–CIO unemployment demonstration Wednesday in Washington, D.C.

Other Peoria area labor locals also had some trouble finding members to attend the conference which will be given a start by Walter Reuther, president of the UAW Wednesday morning at the National Guard Armory in Washington.

The Caterpillar union will send a contingent of 20 retired members, but Fred Schraeder, business agent of the Brewery Workers said his local has notified the international union that delegates will have to come from eastern locals where there is more unemployment.

The Peoria Trades and Labor Assembly is not sending a delegate, according to T. C. Salzer, president. Canton's United Automobile Workers local at the International Harvester Co. plant will send a dozen men to join an expected 1,000 leaving Chicago this afternoon by special train.

Reds Sell Wares on TV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include an article written by Arthur E. Fetridge, and appearing in the Boston Sunday Herald of March 29, 1959:

REDS SELL WARES ON TV—PROPAGANDISTS GET FREE HAND

(By Arthur E. Fetridge)

Television and radio have been patting themselves on the back for the wonderful so-called news-in-depth programs they have been offering. Many of them are wonderful and deserving of high praise, yet I have a reservation because of what the producers of these programs thus far, to my knowledge, ignore.

I have yet to hear the narrator, moderator or host of any of these news-in-depth programs say, either at the start or end of the program, "We realize that this interview or film presents only the side of the person interviwed of what our cameraman was allowed to take."

Let's take a recent film taken inside China. Since Red China is a police state, no one takes photographs or makes motion picture films without the express sanction of the Communist government.

GREAT SELLING

When this particular film was shown on television the Reds were hard at work establishing communes, which in this country would be tantamount to slave labor camps.

As I watched this film I was struck by the happy attitude of the people, by the

willingness with which they threw themselves into their work and by their general acceptance of regimentation.

It was a great sell for this type of living and for communism. Everyone was working away merrily. Everyone loved to work 12 hours a day. Everyone loved living in communal bunkhouses and not having to worry about getting meals, or taking care of children, or having their own home or own land to till.

Somehow I suspect every scene shown in that film was carefully staged by the Communists. Since seeing the film I suspect it all the more by small items I've seen in the daily press telling of people who have risked their lives to escape the communes.

RED PROPAGANDA

I wonder why no mention was made of this staging by the narrator of the film? He must have realized it.

As another example let us consider the interview by U.S. newsmen in Russia with Russia's dictator, Nikita S. Khrushchev, on June 2, 1957. This interview received wide publicity and without doubt was an outstanding bit of brilliant coverage. However, it stands out as one of the best examples of television in this country being used to spread Red propaganda.

When a newspaper runs such an interview, either in the story containing the interview or in an adjoining column we'll find an interpretation of various statements. If the man being interviewed comes out with an outright falsehood the reporter has the opportunity of saying so. If he evades or delivers doubletalk that, too, is pointed out in the story.

This is rarely done in these news-in-depth programs. It almost seems as though they are granted of a take-it-or-leave-it basis.

ANSWERS UNTRUTHS

In that particular interview, of which President Eisenhower was rather critical, we saw Khrushchev give a masterful exhibition of sidestepping critical questions. Some he evaded. Others he pretended to answer by launching into long harangues that had little to do with the subject at hand.

His interview was filled with propaganda galore, with not a soul to answer it. The questions were perfectly all right but the answers were not.

Many people who do not follow newspapers too regularly could not be aware that some of Khrushchev's answers were untruths. They would not catch the evasions because of their lack of knowledge of world affairs. Many others, for similar reasons, missed the veiled attack on the United States.

All of this could be cleared up if the producers of these programs would point out the omissions in the interviews at its close, or even warn the viewer that some of the material to be heard is pure propaganda. However, our feeling is that they have no desire to rob the show in any way of the glory they hope will be heaped on it.

Pennsylvania Supreme Court Justice Michael A. Musmanno Delivers Brilliant Address on the Sacco-Vanzetti Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, on April 2, 1959, my good friend, Pennsylvania Supreme Court Justice Michael A. Musmanno delivered a brilliant address before the joint judiciary committee of the Massachusetts Legislature on the celebrated Sacco-Vanzetti case, which, I believe, will take its place in the literature of eloquent expression in behalf of the sacred principle of justice. I have followed the Sacco-Vanzetti case ever since I was a student at the Harvard Law School and I have always felt that somehow here justice went astray. It certainly appears to me that the men did not get the kind of a fair trial which everyone is entitled to, in accordance with the best traditions of a fair trial in America.

All of America is interested in the Sacco-Vanzetti case. It is being studied in many universities and colleges throughout the Nation, and I am certain that every lover of justice will be enlightened and gratified to read what Justive Musmanno has to say on the subject. I am, therefore, pleased to submit Justice Musmanno's address to the Congress:

ADDRESS BY PENNSYLVANIA SUPREME COURT JUSTICE MICHAEL A. MUSMANNO BEFORE THE JOINT HOUSE AND SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE OF THE MASSACHUSETTS LEGISLATURE CONSIDERING THE CELLA RESOLUTION, CALLING FOR THE POSTHUMOUS PARDON OF SACCO AND VANZETTI, STATE HOUSE, BOSTON, APRIL 2, 1959

Mr. Chairman and members of this distinguished joint judiciary committee of the Massachusetts Legislature, this committee is undertaking a task which is destined to inspire mankind everywhere, because it is dedicating itself to the most sacred cause which can exist in the relationship between human beings, and that, of course, is justice. The resolution introduced by Representative Cella seeks to do justice for whom? It asks for justice for two humble creatures, creatures so humble that they are not even listed among the living. To what greater heights of nobility can the human spirit climb than the desire to do justice to men who cannot pay, who cannot vote, and who cannot even proffer a hand of gratitude? But though these two men do not live, their lives and the true, unimpeachable story of their death may well become the moral barrier to save other men from annihilation for the gratification of venal ambition.

While nothing can be done to bring back the lives of a good shoemaker and a poor fish peddler, now dead over 31 years, your acknowledgment of their tragedy will still fulfill their profound aspiration, as it was eloquently and touchingly spoken by Vanzetti: "Never in our full life could we hope to do such work for tolerance, for justice, for man's understanding of man as now we do by accident."

However, what you accomplish will not be the result of accident; it will be the result of study and of dispassionate consideration. What you do will be done in accordance with the traditions of the just and equal laws enunciated in the Mayflower compact and which have been the guiding genius of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Your conclusions will show that if Massachusetts departed from her traditional path of tolerance, justice, and man's understanding of man, it was not because of the will of the State but because of some men who erred unintentionally, some who erred maliciously and purposefully, and some who simply were not worthy of the honored accolade of Massachusetts citizenship.

I pray of you that when you open the book of the Sacco-Vanzetti case you will read all its pages. And as you turn those pages, do not let your eyes leap over the passages of unworthy deeds committed by unworthy men. Massachusetts does not need to fear for its greatness because of a few individuals who wore robes of office too big for their moral frames and accomplished evil which spread far beyond the shadows of their boundless conceit and selfish projection.

No worthy citizen of Massachusetts today would entertain any qualm about criticizing the prosecutors of Rogers Williams, even though it was the Massachusetts General Court, presided over by the then Governor, which condemned that great man whose only crime was that of advocating liberty of conscience. No estimable person today would hesitate to censure the same General Court of Massachusetts which in 1637 condemned the ineffable religious leader Anne Hutchinson to perpetual banishment. I am sure that this committee approves, without reservation, the action of your legislature, and the action of Governor Furcolo, taken only 2 years ago, in pardoning Ann Pudeator and other women who were hanged as witches in 1692 after a so-called trial in Salem. By suitable legislation you removed from the glorious escutcheon of Massachusetts the last lingering stains of the Salem witchcraft executions by pardoning those who had not been exonerated in 1711.

Whether it is pleasant to contemplate or not, it cannot be denied that in 1927 the world saw a similar type of stain appear on the resplendent banner of this State when two men were executed while efforts were still being made by their attorneys, of whom I was privileged to be one, to obtain a stay of execution from members of the Supreme Court of the United States where a petition for a review of their cases had already been filed. That stain had begun to form 7 years before when these two men were cast into prison, and ambitious prosecutors with clever brains and ingenious plans plotted to entangle them in a series of circumstances, some real and some invented, so as to make them appear robbers and killers, never pausing to reflect on, or care about, the possibilities and probabilities that their quarries might be innocent. That stain deepened and widened through 7 years of misconduct, fabrication, perversity, and willful blindness to fact and truth, all performed and perpetrated in the name of Massachusetts by ambitious men unconcerned about the badge of shame which might follow after they had left the scene of action.

District Attorney Frederick G. Katzmann was so lacking in shame that he connived with a firearms expert, Captain Proctor, to have him testify in such a manner as to deceive the jury into believing that a bullet found in the body of one of the dead payroll guards had been fired through Sacco's pistol when he knew that Proctor had no such evidence. He and the witness even agreed upon the lying language which was to be used.

The prosecution connived to keep away from the trial an eyewitness to the murder, Roy E. Gould, who told the prosecution that one of the bandits shot at him at a distance of 10 feet, the bullet perforating his coat, and that he got a good look at the man the Commonwealth claimed was Sacco. Gould said it was not Sacco. Gould was not called as a witness nor was his name given to the defense, as in law and conscience the district attorney is required to do.

When a proved criminal by the name of Celestino Madeiros confessed to being a participant in the South Braintree crime and declared that Sacco and Vanzetti were not in the crime, the district attorney's office, instead of immediately launching an investigation to determine the truth of Madeiro's statement, assumed an air of indifference to this extraordinary development in the case and then later manifested opposition and hostility to any revelation which supported Madeiro's confession. It

was left to Herbert B. Ehrmann, a highly reputable and exceedingly able lawyer, to make an independent investigation, and the material which he found in exoneration of Sacco and Vanzetti was not disproved. An honest and conscientious district attorney and staff would have been as eager as defense counsel to inquire into the Madeiros confession because the district attorney is not hired by the people to obtain convictions at all costs, but to see that justice is done.

It is not my purpose here, nor, of course, would there be time, to review all the evidence in the Sacco-Vanzetti case, but I confidently make the statement that in my 27 years as a judge and some years as a practicing lawyer, and in all my wide study of cases, I have never encountered a case where the forces of the prosecution were so unscrupulous, so unethical, and so diabolically skillful, as they were in the Sacco-Vanzetti case. Nor have I ever encountered in life or even in fiction a judge presiding over a murder trial who was so lacking in the high standards which make an upright judge, so deficient in jurisprudential knowledge, and so saturated with personal animosity and prejudice against the men on trial before him, as was Judge Webster Thayer who presided over the murder trial of Sacco and Vanzetti at Dedham and over the attempted robbery trial of Vanzetti at Plymouth.

It is not a pleasant experience to have to criticize a judge or a State's attorney, but the unbudgeable facts justify the assertion that Judge Webster Thayer and District Attorney Katzmann contributed an enormous share of the taint and tarnish which went into the stain on the banner of Massachusetts; and I urge you not to assume that in removing that stain you may be reflecting on the honor and dignity of Massachusetts. On the contrary, I respectfully submit that by scouring away that stain, and thereby restoring the immaculate beauty of that banner, you will demonstrate where the fault lay for the great injustice for which the Commonwealth of Massachusetts suffered in a moral way as much as Sacco and Vanzetti suffered physically.

To speak of the greatness of Massachusetts is indeed to gild the lily. Daniel Webster rightly eulogized her:

"I shall enter on no encomium upon Massachusetts; she needs none. There she is. Behold her, and judge for yourselves. There is her history; the world knows it by heart. The past, at least, is secure. There is Boston and Concord and Lexington and Bunker Hill; and there they will remain forever."

But it was in the hallowed environs of Lexington and Concord and in this illustrious city of Boston that there was committed the judicial offense which blemished the fair name of Massachusetts throughout the world. It was in the very shadow of the immortal Bunker Hill that two men were killed without a fair trial, one of the things for the attainment of which blood was shed at Lexington and Concord.

Even a slight reading of the history of the Sacco-Vanzetti case must reveal that Sacco and Vanzetti did not have a fair trial. For instance, after the Dedham trial it was discovered that Walter Ripley, the foreman of the jury, had taken into the jury room some cartridges of his own which he exhibited to the other jurors in support of his argument for conviction of Vanzetti. This illegal performance was in itself enough to vitiate the verdict. And then there was the affidavit of William H. Daly who had known Ripley for 38 years. Mr. Daly declared under oath that prior to the beginning of the Dedham trial when Ripley knew he was going to be called as a juror for that trial, Daly asked Ripley about Sacco and Vanzetti, stating that he did not believe them guilty. Ripley replied: "Damn them, they ought to hang them anyway." In the whole English-American legal world, this would have constituted an ironclad reason for ordering a new trial. That is, anywhere but in the courtroom of Judge Webster Thayer who abhorred the idea of doing anything to change the verdict of guilty which he had labored so much to bring about. Throughout the trial he made degrading and profane remarks, both inside and outside the courthouse, against the defendants. One of the almost conclusive evidences of this judge's rabid incapacity to insure the defendants a fair trial resides in his hateful utterance that he would "get them good and proper." His appalling misconduct did not even exclude the shameful offense of misrepresenting the official record.

Mr. Chairman, I assert that Sacco and Vanzetti did not receive what we Americans regard a fair trail, which makes no distinction between original nationalities, races, creeds, colors, or political opinions. Both defendants were ridiculed and lampooned by the prosecution in a manner which today would draw the reprobation of every court in the land.

But Thayer did not only not stop Katzmann in this degrading practice. He found ways to participate in it himself. At the Plymouth trial Katzmann made light of Vanzetti's defense witnesses because they were Italian. But what was sinister about that? Vanzetti was Italian, he lived with Italians, as a fish peddler practically all of his customers were Italians, he associated with Italians. Naturally the majority of his witnesses would be Italians.

Katzmann and the entire prosecution staff used other devious means to prejudice the defendants in the eyes of the jury. An atmosphere of terror was purposely built up so as to convey the impression that Sacco and Vanzetti were desperados of the most dangerous character. Uniformed guards brandishing rifles, shotguns, and pistols patrolled the courthouse, inside and out. The defendants, manacled to officers, were marched back and forth between the jail and the courthouse by 28 of these guards bristling with firearms. Four times a day this miniature army tramped in and out of the courtroom, awing the jury and electrifying the surroundings with suggestions of mysterious foes to be met and combated. Doors were barred and all visitors searched for concealed weapons. Even defense counsel were subjected to this treatment. Place a harmless gazelle into a cage and surround him with guns and other paraphernalia of assumed defense against an assumed ferocious creature, and spectators will quickly conclude (especially if the view is reinforced by oral exhortations about the savageness of the animal) that they are looking upon a beast of maneating propensities. Yet it must be noted that neither before nor during the trial did there occur the slightest incident or even the remotest suggestion of a threat which justified the arsenal and the daily parade of armed might in the Sacco-Vanzetti trial.

I submit to this committee that the conviction of Sacco and Vanzetti constituted a monumental miscarriage of justice, which this committee should be eager to correct. A study of all the evidence will show that not a single witness who placed Sacco or Vanzetti at the scene of the murder displayed that caliber of reliability which, in an American trial, is absolutely required to support the irrevocable penalty of death. The main witness, Mary E. Splaine, testified that while looking through a window she saw Sacco at a distance of 70 feet. This was 14 months after that look, which incidentally was limited to a frightened glance of two seconds' duration. Yet on April 20, only 5 days after the murder, she had identified a totally different person as the robber she saw, a Tony Palmisano whose picture she selected out of a series of photographs exhibited to her.

Another witness, Frances Devlin, also looked through a window and saw the murder car before her panicky view for less than 3 seconds, and she also testified that the man she saw in that fragment of time was Sacco. But at the time of Sacco's arrest she looked at Sacco and said she could not say that Sacco was the bandit she saw. In fact, like Miss Splaine, she also claimed that Tony Palmisano was the bandit she had seen.

Louis Pelser was another person who was close to a window when the robbery occurred. When Sacco and Vanzetti were arrested, Pelser was taken to the police station to study the prisoners for possible identification. He said: "I did not see enough to be able to identify anybody." He lost his job. Later he was reemployed. His foreman talked to him, and now he went on the witness stand and said that Sacco was the "dead image" of the man who did the shooting.

Another witness, Mr. Levangie, testified he saw Vanzetti at the wheel of the murder car. There was not the thinnest shadow of the remotest evidence that Vanzetti, the fish-selling pedestrian-philosopher had ever driven a car in his life. But Levangie's testimony was further discredited by the fact that all the other Commonwealth witnesses testified that the driver of the car was a lighthaired, light-complexioned man, which Vanzetti certainly was not. Levangie's testimony was utterly untrustworthy, but Katzmann leaped into the breach. He told the jury that what Levangie really meant was that Vanzetti was sitting in the back seat of the car. But if Levangie could make so gross an error as putting a backseat passenger at the driver's wheel, what reliance could be placed in his testimony at all? Moreover, if Vanzetti was in the back seat, nobody could see him, as the curtains of the car were down.

Judge Thayer collaborated with Katzmann on this point, as indeed on practically all points. He said to the jury:

"The law does not require that evidence shall be positive or certain in order to be competent. Overpositiveness in identification might under some circumstances and conditions be evidence of weakness in the testimony, rather than strength."

Why shouldn't a witness be positive when his testimony may invoke the awful penalty of death? And why would overpositiveness be weakness? Judge Thayer said further: "Any evidence that tends in any degree, however slight, to prove a likeness or similarity between the defendants and the assailants is admissible." This would mean that if a fleeting glimpse of a murderer revealed that he had black hair, then every person with black hair could be accused of the murder.

Sacco testified that on the day of the murder he was in Boston arranging for a passport at the Italian Consulate in anticipation of his forthcoming visit to Italy. Vanzetti testified that he was in Plymouth selling fish, his normal occupation. This alibi evidence on the part of both defendants, supported by 18 witnesses in all, built a formidable bulwark of security against the terrible charge of murder. If true, the men had to be innocent. Vanzetti could not have been at South Braintree and at Plymouth at the same time; Sacco could not have been in Boston and South Braintree at the same time. The Commonwealth did not call witnesses to challenge the veracity or accuracy of the alibi witnesses. Thus it was imperative that the jury be instructed fully by the trial judge on the importance of the alibi evidence. The jury should have had from the judge at least a résumé of the testimony which, if believed, could only lead to a verdict of not guilty. The alibi was entitled to as much attention

in the judge's charge as the Commonwealth's theory. But how did Judge Thayer balance these two conflicting contentions? He devoted 10 pages to a discussion of identification testimony, inanimate exhibits, and consciousness of guilt on the side of the prosecution. To the alibi he gave two paragraphs.

Berliners' Worry Is a Starve-Out, Not a War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, in a radio broadcast to the Seventh Congressional District of California I have discussed my observations of the situation in Berlin and West Germany while on a military inspection tour as a member of the House Armed Services Committee.

In this same regard, of great pertinency are the observations of Robert H. Estabrook, editorial page editor of the Washington Post, who has also just returned from a European tour. His thoughts are recorded in an article in the April 12 edition of that newspaper and I wish to include them in the RECORD for the attention of all Members of Congress, as well as my constituents in California:

BERLINERS' WORRY IS A STARVE-OUT, NOT A WAR

(By Robert H. Estabrook)

The closer one gets to the epicenter of the Berlin crisis, the fewer are the overt signs of tension. West Berliners, as they stroll through the spring blossoms in their beloved Tiergarten, display no apparent uneasiness over the squeeze threatened by Nikita Khrushchev. There is far more alarmed discussion in London or Stockholm or Paris.

Partly, this appearance of unconcern may result from the feeling that Berlin is merely a tool in Khrushchev's plan to force Western acceptance of Communist East Germany. Partly, too, the absence of visible worry may result from the conclusion that Khrushchev does not really intend war.

This is a conclusion easier to understand when one views the ghostly ruins of war 15 years ago which still are seen at every hand in West Berlin and make up unrelieved miles in East Berlin.

SOME CHANGE ACCEPTED

Yet there is an undercurrent of apprehension—an awareness that the fragile freedom in which West Berliners lead a politically comfortable if economically subsidized existence might be quickly suffocated if the pall which covers East Germany were extended.

There is confidence that the West, particularly the United States, will not allow this to happen. At the same time there is recognition that it will be difficult to maintain the status quo in negotiations with Russia, and that in fact some change may become necessary.

In other circumstances, the announcement in Bonn of Chancellor Adenauer's impending retirement to seek the presidency of the Federal Republic might be expected to cause some political satisfaction in West Berlin. The Social Democrats, or SPD, predominate in Berlin in contrast with the hold of Adenauer's Christian Democrats, or CDU, over the Federal Republic. Governing Mayor Willy Brandt has had policy disagreements with the Chancellor, not about Berlin, but about the larger problem of settlement with the Russians.

Khrushchev, however, has deflated the SPD hopes by making clear to other SPD leaders in East Germany that they do not hold the secret of agreement. He was scarcely less emphatic in his demonstration of contempt for SPD views than in his denunciations of Adenauer. At least in Berlin, this performance dashed some of the fancier hopes for disengagement.

AIRLIFT OUTDATED

Virtually no one expects a clash with the Russians involving allied military convoys. But there is considerable apprehension that if the coming East-West negotiations go badly the Communists may attempt to blockade German civil traffic to and from West Berlin.

This would create fantastic problems for the 2¼ million West Berliners. The city's economy has expanded fabulously since the 1948–49 Soviet blockade, when the allied airlift maintained a subsistence level for the population.

Today enlarged demand for food and goods, plus exports from West Berlin's considerable electronics and metal industry upon which employment and prosperity depend, would make another airlift impractical except as an emergency expedient. Besides, the Communists presumably could jam the radar used for bad weather landings at Tempelhof airport and the two military fields in the British and French sectors.

Mayor Brandt and his colleagues have been working hard to prepare West Berlin against such a contingency. There are now stockpiles of most basic commodities for at least 6 months, and supplies of food and coal are being doubled—with Soviet knowledge. A rationing plan is ready to take effect within 2 hours.

Such measures are designed to insure the continuation of industrial and business activity at reduced levels and to give the West time to make a deliberate decision in the event of a blockade.

ONE HUNDRED AND TEN MILE GANTLET

Still, over a longer period, Berlin inevitably would feel the effects of strangulation. It would be virtually impossible to export manufactured goods without use of motor, rail, and canal transportation through 110 miles of the Communist state to the West German border.

Allied planning is in hand to cope with any Communist interference with military convoys. The approximately 11,000 British, French, and American troops in West Berlin—4,000 of them American under Maj. Gen. Barksdale Hamlett—would strive to avoid shooting first but would resist if there were military interference.

There is no thought that Allied troops could hold out long against the more than 20 Soviet divisions in East Germany, but any direct clash in all probability would mean major war. The recent assertion of the intention to fly American military cargo planes at higher altitudes through the corridor from West Germany was only a step in the constant jockeying.

Such Allied access to West Berlin, however, is by legal right through the Potsdam agreement and the 1949 agreement with the Soviet Union following the Berlin blockade. That right, resting upon the military occupation, is flimsy enough, but the right of civil traffic to proceed through East Germany to and from Berlin is much flimsier.

It depends upon inter-German agreements under which East Germany controls and inspects shipments. Such traffic could be cut off at any time. Here is the heart of the problem as respects Berlin itself.

POOR LEGAL POSITION

In the event of a Communist stoppage of civil traffic, the West probably could surmount narrow legality and make it clear that access for such traffic would be enforced by military means. This might be justified in the larger sense that the Communists were trying to change the existing situation.

In such circumstances, if there were to be any shooting it would not particularly matter who shot first because Communist action would have precipitated the crisis. Interference would be deterred, in other words, by the possibility of war.

But such a position would have some moral drawbacks because of the poor legal underpinning. Unless there were a willingness to guarantee civil traffic by the sanction of military force—something American generals do not even speculate about—additional legal rights would have to be sought in order to insure continuation of even the present situation. To obtain such rights would, in the judgment of some observes, involve paying a price to Khrushchev.

Technically, all of Berlin remains under four-power military control, but West Germany has gone far in seeking to incorporate Berlin into its realm. Twenty-odd representatives from West Berlin have nonvoting membership in the Bundestag at Bonn, and there is voting membership for Berlin in the upper house or Bundesrat.

The West German Bundestag meets in Berlin once a year. There are numerous preparations to make the city the future capital of the Federal Republic, including the rebuilding of the old Reichstag and the readying of Bellevue Castle for occupancy by the Federal President.

A LEVER FOR KHRUSHCHEV

No doubt the Communists, who also have talked of incorporating Berlin and have their capital at Pankow within the city limits, want to end the pull to the west. Berlin is important as a symbol, and Khrushchev and the East German leaders surely would like to make it the capital of a Germany oriented toward the east.

But more important, Berlin to them is a lever by which to pry forth a larger agreement on Germany. Because the Allied position in Berlin is weak, Khrushchev hopes to use the issue to formalize the division of Germany along the present Elbe River line and perhaps to disarm West Germany and detach it from NATO.

In a word, he is attempting to compel acquiescence to the status quo in Germany as a whole by threatening to change the status quo in Berlin. One knowledgeable Berliner believes on the basis of information from East Germany that the November ultimatum by Khrushchev was planned as long ago as last May.

What is now altogether clear is that Khrushchev has no thought of any compromise which would endanger the sociopolitical system of East Germany. Indeed, Communist boss Walter Ulbricht, a holdover from Stalinism, is said to have something of a veto over Soviet policy as it effects East Germany.

Industrial revival has made East Germany the second largest producer in the Communist empire. Moreover, Ulbricht has cozied up to Communist Chinese leaders and ranks closely after Mao Tse-tung in the international Communist hierarchy. According to one theory, a major purpose of Khrushchev's recent trip to East Germany was to tell Ulbricht, over the latter's demand for a tougher line, that he had decided to postpone the May 27 ultimatum to the West.

It is doubtful that the Communist moves are prompted by West Berlin's position as a showpiece. Showpiece it certainly is, propped up by a substantial subsidy from the Federal Republic and by American aid. The plush, almost tropical style Hilton Ho-

tel to which Berliners flock in awe is a symbol of this emphasis on material wealth.

The contrast with East Berlin remains great. There has been little rebuilding in the east sector except along the gaudy and tasteless Stalinallee where Communist Party officials live. East Berliners can be distinguished readily by their drab clothing and woebegone look.

But the East German economy and standard of living have been expanding remarkably. The Russians have lavished economic benefits on East Gremany since the June 17 uprising 6 years ago and particularly since the Hungarian revolt. There are many articles in stores now which shoddy as they may be, were unobtainable a year ago.

This improvement emphasizes Khrushchev's determination to maintain the Communist hold on East Germany. The liberation policy so blithely proclaimed by American politicians in the past is as dead as the mastodon, at least without a war which no one wants.

What then is to prevent the West from acquiescing in the division of Germany and acknowledging the existence of a separate East Germany as Khrushchev seems to want? There is no burning enthusiasm for reunification in most of Western Europe, and even in West Germany reunification is more a political slogan than a practical hope. West Germany has in effect recognized East Germany de facto in the extensive trade between the two parts.

Several points must be considered. First, there is the argument that any formal acknowledgment of East Germany would end whatever moral leverage the West still exercises on the regimes imposed by force behind the Iron Curtain. A secure Western flank might encourage liberalization in the Soviet satellites, but it also might worsen the situation of such countries as Poland.

More important, sanction for the permanent division of Germany might purchase short-range accommodation at the expense of long-range instability. Whatever the present complacency and fatalism of many Germans, it is unlikely that over the years a dynamic people could be kept apart.

Finally, there is no convincing reason to think that Khrushchev would be satisfied with mere Western acknowledgment of East Germany. Despite his caution in so far avoiding a military clash, there are many evidences that he is in a cocky mood and determined to exploit what he believes to be an advantage.

Could the West afford to pay anything to promote a satisfactory agreement? The purpose of this article is not to propose solutions. Suffice it to say that there is disenchantment in Western Europe with the present possibilities of disengagement or troop withdrawal. There is discussion in Berlin and elsewhere of some sort of staged thinning out of troops back from the Elbe line, of inspection and control, of a freeze on nuclear arms and missiles—with no firm indication that Khrushchev would be willing to make equivalent concessions.

Whether any of these devices would be practicable would depend in the final analysis upon the situation of Berlin. So far, the Western position is that the status quo will be maintained by military force if necessary. But this begs the real question unless the West also undertakes to make a military guarantee of access for civil traffic—which it does not now seem prepared to do.

Many proposals have been advanced for West Berlin, ranging from Khrushchev's amorphous "free city" scheme, to plans for a unified neutral city under United Nations superversion, to offers of cessation of cold war activities in return for explicit rights of access.

Some persons, like Mayor Brandt, believe that the Russians will agree in the end to maintain the status quo and that this would be preferable to any change for the sake of change. Others think that standpatism leaves the West in a weak and perhaps untenable position.

There may well have been times in the past when realism and initiative in the West might have exerted more telling pressure upon Khrushchev. Even today, however, the West is not without bargaining points. One of these is nuclear weapons in West Germany. Another is the power to withhold the acknowledgment of East Germany which Khrushchev and Ulbricht plainly want. They also may be asked to pay a price.

The status quo may finally be the best that can be achieved, or it may be more than can be achieved; but the one obvious conclusion is that to cling to it, as respects either Berlin or the larger German questions is really to settle nothing. The West will not know what is possible until it proceeds beyond the "standfast" slogan to a more refined position based upon a candid survey of weak as well as strong points.

Meanwhile Berlin, the historic capital of Germany, is in the position of a piece of steel between two magnets.

Unemployment Compensation—Clash of Viewpoints

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in the Washington Post and Times Herald of April 13, 1959, a portion of the transcript of the unemployment compensation hearings before the House Ways and Means Committee quoted Mr. George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, and me.

Since this exchange between us represents a sharp conflict in basic ideology of the role of Federal Government in our lives, I feel that my colleagues and others would be interested in the entire transcript which follows; and I believe speaks for itself:

Mr. ALGER will inquire, Mr. Meany.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Meany, I had the privilege and pleasure of reading and studying your statement last evening. I want to stick close to this statement and limit my questions to the subjects I am particularly troubled about.

On page 1 and at the top of page 5 you discuss the people who are unemployed, and the figures keep coming up of labor force compared to unemployment. Here it is 5.8 million or 7.6 percent of the labor force.

Has the AFL–CIO made a comprehensive study at any time of the constituency of this labor force that is unemployed? Specifically, how many of them are heads of families with dependents, as compared with single people or wives or seasonal workers by choice that do not have to work? Have you ever broken it down in that way? I tried with the figures I have here, and I must tell you I have some, but I am not satisfied with the figures I have.

In fairness to this entire subject, I believe this committee should have such a breakdown, and we ought to benefit from whatever you have to give us.

Mr. MEANY. Our own unions have done it; we have not done it ourselves on a national scale. However, we have a report of findings made up by a special group, by the University of Michigan. We have that report which gives some information on it.

Mr. ALGER. I am particularly interested because I see in the report that I have here—and this is available for you to study later, to give us more information on if you can—that this particular publication shows that Michigan has 37 percent of the workers that are drawing unemployment compensation at this time—and this is a typical week—did not have dependents.

That is the exception almost to the rule of the other States. In almost all of these other States 50 percent or in some cases more than 50 percent of the unemployed had no dependents. Then before this committee, the gentlemen from Arkansas, Kentucky, Indiana, Utah, and elsewhere have pointed out and additional information has been submitted to us in the record that a number of workers are of the seasonal type where there is another breadwinner in the family.

I am not saying that single workers who are only supporting themselves do not need protection. Of course, they do. But if we are trying to eliminate the greatest suffering and need, we ought to work more with the family breadwinners.

That is what is troubling me in these things.

Mr. MUNSEY. Could we have the page reference there, please?

Mr. ALGER. Yes. It is table B–12.

I am mentioning these things, Mr. Chairman, so that if the record could be left open we could benefit from the help of the legislative staffs of the AFL–CIO to add to these figures.

I certainly will study them myself as you present them to us.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Meany, if it is the thought that any additional information can be added to this record in answer to any questions, we would like to have it.

Without objection, that information will be inserted in the record.

Mr. MEANY. Yes; we will be glad to supply, to whatever extent possible, any of the statistical data that either we have available or that we can secure for you on any of these questions.

(Material not furnished reporter.)

Mr. ALGER. What percentage of unemployment would you consider to be minimum if you defined minimum unemployment as the number of people who really do not have to work or are working by choice, or possibly too lazy to work unless they get exactly what they want? I think this is important.

Mr. MEANY. You are not talking about what we call technological unemployment. You are not talking about people who are between jobs. You are talking about people who just should not figure in the working force at all. In other words, they do not need to work or they are too lazy.

During the war there was a figure came up which was one-half of 1 percent of the working force.

Mr. ALGER. I appreciate your point on that. I have a feeling from some of the material I am getting that the figure is larger than that. But again I think here is an area that needs to be explored so that we do not feel mistakenly that a certain percentage means there is heavy unemployment when actually a lot of these people are the secondary breadwinners.

Mr. MEANY. Could I say this, that, by rule of thumb or some more or less accepted theory, with the potential work force of 65 million, something under 2½ million would be considered, let us say, a normal unemployment. In other words, people between jobs and people not seeking work because they want to lay off for a while and do not need work and so on.

Mr. ALGER. That sounds fair, and certainly I want to keep that in mind.

Mr. MEANY. In other words, we never got excited when the unemployment was at that figure or below, but when it starts to go up, then we get concerned.

Mr. ALGER. To continue on in the middle of the next page, page 2, and it refers again to it on page 3, you state, "When the fundamentals are so generally accepted, when the sights of so many are fixed on the same target, why is it that year after year we continue to fall short of the mark?"

I am impressed that the States are trying to do a job and that they seem to be doing it.

We of this committee report back to the people, and so do the State legislators. As a matter of fact, the State legislators have less latitude than we do, I think. They are right there at home with their people.

Has it ever occurred to you that, good or bad, the present unemployment compensation system is what the legislators and the people themselves actually think is proper?

Mr. MEANY. I cannot buy that.

When you say the people themselves, I do not know who you mean. You are surely not speaking for the potential beneficiaries of the system.

Mr. ALGER. These legislators keep going back home and are buttonholed by their constituents, and then they are reelected or rejected, and you mention Texas on the next page of your statement, and you find fault with our system.

But you know we have to go back to our people, and justify our positions up here. Even more with the State legislators. If they have not been pleasing the people in this matter of providing unemployment compensation, I am sure the people back home would have gotten after them. Or, to put it another way, maybe the people feel the unemployment compensation system is coming along satisfactorily enough. And they do not want us to cram something down their throats.

Mr. MEANY. You realize that the State legislature is made up of people with diverse backgrounds and obligations and from various areas, and the legislators who are in a nonindustrial area do not hear from the people on this because there is no problem. The problem lies in the large urban areas where you have an industrial situation.

Mr. ALGER. We all have unemployment whether industrialized or urban, and I think all of us are troubled by it.

Mr. MEANY. I might say in my State the dice are loaded against the industrial areas by a system of representation that has existed for many, many, many years. The people in two small counties, for instance, over in the southern tier of the State of New York, from the point of view of representing people, outweigh the cities 30, 40 to 1.

Mr. ALGER. I can appreciate that, and a lot of us have been very puzzled frankly by the pattern or the path that Michigan has taken and the city of Detroit. Is seems very odd to me that this heavily industrialized and heavily unionized area should be the one most in trouble.

Mr. MEANY. Your theory would be correct, I would say, if the legislators voted on the basis of numbers of people they represent affected by this law and the numbers of people they represent also who are unaffected by the law. In other words, if it was a weighted vote, if everybody had a numerical vote the same as we vote at AFL–CIO conventions, I would accept your theory that the law is what the people want it to be.

Mr. ALGER. That is a very interesting thought. In fact, I would like to paraphrase that this way:

If there are 67 million people in the work force, or whatever that total is, and 13½ million of them are unionized and use that union properly to direct their own legislative thinking and then try to effect changes in legislation, here we legislators are torn between what the entire work force of 67 million want from government in protecting labor as against what 13½ million want.

Mr. MEANY. May I submit to you that you do not know what the rest of the work force wants, and there is no one in America that can say that they speak for the rest of that work force.

The only work force that has a voice is the work force that is organized, and I challenge you to show me anything, any single little item that gives anyone the right to say that he speaks for the other 50-odd million of the work force who are not organized.

Mr. ALGER. I respect your opinion, but you are hearing my opinion, that I, as a Congressman, and my colleagues are hearing from our constituents all the time.

Mr. MEANY. But you say it is the weight of the 13½ million or the 17 million that are organized as opposed to the nonorganized work force. I say that nobody can speak for the unorganized work force because they do not speak for themselves, by the mere fact that they are not organized.

Mr. ALGER. I agree with that, but let me get back to my point.

The legislators and the Texas legislature, representing the entire constituency, which includes that percentage of the total work force that resides within the boundaries of Texas, have seen fit to set up the kind of unemployment system we have.

You can say we are wrong, and you are entitled to your opinion. But the people in Texas think that we are right.

Now, are we to completely negate what they say, at a Federal level, from 1,500 miles away, laying down the law and saying, "No. You legislators who are elected every 2 years, and you people whom they represent are wrong. We in Washington know better and feel that these Federal standards would be better for you than what you think yourselves."

That presents a dilemma, in a sense, which I think all the legislators face.

The Texas legislature sent me a resolution saying they feel that unemployment compensation should be left to the State.

Mr. MEANY. Is it not a historic fact that most of the legislators did not act until the Federal Government acted in this field?

Mr. ALGER. I think that is partly true, but I do not believe that that means the States do not have initiative. They have, but it is being taken from them.

I might say to you that when labor succeeds, if you are to succeed, in completely imposing Federal control on the States, labor itself could easily be the greatest loser. I do not think that is what you intend.

Mr. MEANY. I do not think this is so. But actually what we have here is Federal standards that are now imposed upon the States in this field, and we are pointing out from years of experience where we think these standards should be improved.

Mr. ALGER. I certainly appreciate your interest.

Mr. MEANY. We are arguing for a complete law, and certainly we do not agree there should not be any Federal standards, because the States have accepted some Federal standards, and Congress has enacted them.

We are saying, in fact, that the time has come to evaluate our experience in this field, and that the effect of Federal standards should be amended in certain respects.

Mr. ALGER. You mentioned original intent several times in your statement. While I was not so active in the original intent as certainly you were, I did listen with some interest to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FARMER], plus men from four other States of the Interstate Conference of Employment Security Agencies who testified about how the States they represented and the organizations in which they participated, the employment security commission, I think it was, say as to how the States felt with regard to original intent.

The original intent, according to their understanding, was that are areas of decision on such things as eligibility, duration, benefit amount, and the other provisions to be made in the compensation field were to be left to the States for the reason that they were closest to the people. They know the local and State needs better than the Federal Government. So, by intent, the States were to follow that. Is that not correct?

Mr. MEANY. Yes; I think so, but now we are saying it has not worked so well, and there is a precedent for Federal standards in this field. The Labor Department can verify that, and we are saying that the law has not worked so well. We are pointing out where, and we feel that the correction can be made by improving the Federal standards.

Mr. ALGER. In the final paragraph, on page 4, Mr. Meany, you mentioned something that I think is at the heart of this, and sometimes we miss the obvious. You point out that the question of where Federal responsibility starts and where it ends is what we should be studying.

This is something that has troubled me and possibly some of the other Members of Congress. I went back to find out and I got the Employment Act of 1946. If I am not mistaken, that came about at the end of the war when people thought there was going to be large-scale unemployment. We passed the bill, and yet the unemployment did not materialize as many people thought might be the case. But there is still the law today, and if you read the language in the preamble of that particular act, every conceivable Federal regimentation or control of the work force can be justified by this language; or the labor unions as a work force, and the working people, or of all of us throughout the entire economy. It is all covered by that particular bill.

I do not know whether you recall that language, but it is all-inclusive.

Mr. MEANY. You are referring to the Full Employment Act of 1946?

Mr. ALGER. Yes.

Mr. MEANY. That is another story, and I would like to discuss that some other time.

We like the act, and we wish someone would give real effect to it.

Mr. ALGER. I just wish that this committee and the rest of Congress would study the language of that act, and think about communism, socialism and free enterprise at the time they read the act.

I submit to you that every single facet of socialism is found in that one preamble of the Full Employment Act of 1946, and I think that is some of our trouble now. Once we admit that that is the law, then there is no reason why Federal standards cannot be imposed on everything, including everything the working force does.

Mr. MEANY. The Employment Act of 1946 has contributed nothing to our problem. In fact, it has not done anything one way or the other. It has just not been implemented.

Mr. ALGER. I guess it has just contributed to my problem. It is difficult to justify. Providing jobs is not the role of government.

On page 5 you mention the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act, and the fact that it is being continued partially for another 3 months shows a recognition on the part of the Congress of a degree of Federal responsibility in this area.

I can only speak for myself on the committee, but the termination of the TUC, as far as I was concerned, showed that we did not feel that it was the responsibility of this Congress but, rather, that it should be handled another way, if even we should have

had it in the first place. After all, only 17 States took advantage of it.

Mr. MEANY. But you will concede that the Congress felt that there was some responsibility when they enacted the law last year and said it would be in operation until April 1 of this year.

Mr. ALGER. Most certainly. But you are pointing out that our continuing it at this time shows our recognizing our responsibility. You are interpreting it for us quite the opposite of my own interpretations. I simply do not want that to stand.

I say I am among those who terminated it because we felt it was no longer our responsibility.

Mr. MEANY. You did not terminate it. You extended it to a degree, which we say indicates the acceptance of a degree of Federal responsibility.

Mr. ALGER. No, Mr. Meany; we did not intend to continue it, we "feathered it off" so as not to hurt those already qualified. We did not want to be unfair with the people who could qualify.

Maybe this Federal standard for unemployment compensation coming so soon after, was the reason that there was such quick agreement. I do not know, but I want you to know that that was not the entire concensus of this committee.

To move on quickly, the experience rating has been treated. I shall not dwell on that although I must tell you in fairness, after reading your statement and listening to the gentleman from Michigan who has been a fine spokesman for his viewpoint, Mr. MACHROWICZ, I am still slightly bewildered by the fact we are told you are giving a choice in this bill.

When I read the language on page 6 I think either it will result, intended or not, in destroying experience rating. I just leave it there. I realize it would be quite a debate in itself. I think we are going to have to resolve that before we are through.

Mr. MEANY. I am not going to argue that point except to say that, according to our experts—and I consider these people experts—they tell me that it does not wipe out the experience rating.

Mr. ALGER. I appreciate your statement. You did say in your statement that you did not think it was relevant. I maintain this is the one of the most relevant things in the act.

You say on the bottom of page 6 "it is not relevant to the proposals now before this committee."

I believe that experience rating is one of the most relevant things we are talking about because the whole idea of it is to preserve the incentive in the employer for stable employment, and this will make less unemployment, which is certainly desirable.

Mr. MEANY. We said it was not relevant because the bill does not wipe it out, and you disagree with that.

Mr. ALGER. On page 8 you quote the Manufacturers Association of Connecticut. This is what they say, as you quoted them:

"Our State is competing today for more markets and new industries. Hiking the cost of doing business in Connecticut is not the road to more jobs, but to less jobs."

As I read it, I do not find fault with competition because we all agree that competition is the heart of the free enterprise system, of course.

This matter of hiking costs and doing business. I wonder if study has been given this matter of purchasing power and the fact that if you hike the cost to a businessman he has got to pass it on. If he does not pass it on and collapses, then all the people he hires are unemployed and you have more unemployed. If, however, he passes on this cost to the consumer it makes higher prices of things that the entire working force of 67 million must buy, therefore limiting the purchasing power of all of them.

So on the one hand, if you unduly help provide money for those who are unemployed—it does have this effect of raising prices throughout the country—are you not hurting the very thing you would protect, and that is your purchasing power?

Mr. MEANY. You evidently have not studied the economic history of the last 50 or 60 years in this country, because actually purchasing power accompanied by increased production per man leads not to a greater cost but, in the final analysis, to a lesser cost and a wider market.

If you accept your theory, then there should never be any wage increase that is passed on to the consumer.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Meany, I have not been a student as long as you because I haven't been here as long, but I think in the time I have studied and I have tried hard to understand, that the increased productivity you mention has not accompanied the increase of prices and wages in this country, and I think that is one of our problems.

Mr. MEANY. I think statistically you can be proven wrong on that.

Mr. ALGER. If we increased the prices of these items without increasing productivity through putting additional cost on business which they pass on in higher prices, do you not then, by the very definition, cut down the purchasing power of the entire work force of this Nation?

Mr. MEANY. But the history of it shows it does not work that way.

Mr. ALGER. This is what history exactly shows, Mr. Meany.

I think you and I can agree that neither one of us has to yield to the other as to sincerity and interest in these workers.

I simply feel that is exactly what it shows, and if you can understand my concern and provide more information to me, you will help me in straightening out my thinking on this matter if that's what I need.

Mr. MEANY. We certainly can supply more information on that subject.

Frankly, we have a high price-high wage economy here in this country, and under it we have more prosperity compared to any other part of the world. I can remember when eggs were 25 cents a dozen and butter was 25 cents a pound. Of course, now they are almost three times that, but there are more people now who have the 60 and 70 cents than there were people who had the 25 cents during those days.

Mr. ALGER. That is exactly right. But that does not prove that increasing inflation necessarily solves the buying problem. We have got to have increased production to match the increased wages, else we are not accomplishing what we both want, that is, real increased purchasing power.

That study is actually in the field of the joint economic committee. I realize that, and I should not take more time on it now. But I want you to know, Mr. Meany, that unless I can have a little help solving this, you will have to recognize I might be opposed to Federal standards in all sincerity, not because I am opposed to solving the problem. As a matter of fact, I can go further and say that, based on what this committee has been told, this bill imposing Federal standards, if enacted, will actually limit purchasing power; it will create more unemployment, and therefore will accomplish what you, least of all, want to see accomplished—more unemployment and reduced purchasing power.

Mr. MEANY. I think you will concede that we do not want to cause more unemployment, we do not want to limit purchasing power.

Mr. ALGER. That is what I said. I know you do not.

Mr. MEANY. And I presume you do not want to either.

I do not question the sincerity of anyone who disagrees with me on this problem. But we certainly are prepared to try to convince you by whatever statistical data we have that we are right in our position on Federal standards.

Mr. ALGER. I know you feel that, and that is one reason I am taking the time to question it, because I am benefiting by what you are telling me.

Do you believe at this time that employees should match the employer in unemployment tax or not, to make it actually more an insurance program, since you have spoken so strongly and well for the need of preserving insurance feature as a basic principle?

Mr. MEANY. You have got me in an embarrassing position because from the very earliest days—and I took a large part in the writing of the New York State law; was a member of the commission that was set up by the Governor to study the problem before the bills were presented to the legislature—and I have always believed in employee contribution. However, some of our people do not so believe.

But you run into the problem of merit rating immediately as part of this problem.

Personally I have always felt and still feel that employees should contribute, if for no other reason than that it gives them a greater sense of responsibility for better administration of the law, and also a greater voice in improving the law on the basis of experience. But that, of course, is a case where there is a difference of opinion among labor people themselves.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Meany, I believe that there should be retained in this bill the right for the States to disqualify a worker in cases of fraud, dishonesty, or other matters. As I read the bill, unless I am wrong, it says that the State cannot disqualify.

Mr. MEANY. I don't think it says that.

Mr. ALGER. It is on page 3. Let me read it:

"Compensation shall not be denied to any eligible individual for any week of total unemployment during his benefit year by reason of exhaustion or reduction of benefit rights or cancellation of wage credit until he has been paid unemployment compensation for not less than 39 weeks during such year."

Am I misinterpreting that?

Then the next paragraph 9 restates that.

Would you be agreeable, in other words, to amending it?

Mr. MEANY. If it meant what you said I would be agreeable to that. I am not so sure it does.

Mr. ALGER. I read the exact language and am just talking about the idea now. But I am disturbed that from the States is entirely taken the right to disqualify who gets the unemployment compensation.

Mr. MEANY. I think this is subject to legal interpretation. I do not interpret it just the way you do.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the indulgence of this committee and yourself. This is the first time I have had the privilege of even meeting Mr. Meany much less questioning him on something with which I am so vitally concerned.

If I may, Mr. Meany, I want to compliment you further for what you had to say to Mr. Mikoyan and others of his type when they were here. The only thing that troubles me deeply is this—when I analyze the legislative program of the AFL–CIO that Mr. Biemiller and others send us every year and the critcism that you and the other members of the union send to us—but the criticism of legislative stands and legislative programs you ask.

I cannot determine in my thinking the difference between your program and what is honest-to-goodness socialism. If there is a difference—I am not talking just about wages, which is your field in economics, but the entire program you ask of us as Congressmen. I cannot see the difference be-

tween this total program and socialism, by basic definition. If there is a difference I would like an answer now or at any time you can give it to me.

Mr. MEANY. Let me say this. I do not know what socialism is. I have read Marx and I have read all the people who interpret him, and I still do not know what socialism is. If socialism is public ownership of the means of production, we are a little bit socialistic in this country, and we were before I was born and we have continued in that direction. In my lifetime, I have seen the means of transportation in the large cities of the country converted from private ownership to public ownership. Of course, that was always one of the things that the so-called socialists advocated.

Back in the early days of this Republic, water for instance was a medium for private profit. There were private water companies all over America. They sold water to the people. The people decided that they did not want water to be a medium of private profit. By process of legal condemnation and other processes, they put these people out of business and took that particular public service over themselves.

We hear about the socializing of the Bank of England. Our British friends claim that in 1916 America went much further in socializing banking and finance than the Britains have gone to date, when we established our Federal Reserve System. I am not an expert on that, but I am saying that is one of the charges.

If it is socialization to use public money to supply milk for school children—and of course, that charge is always made that it is socialization—then is it socialization to supply the airline companies, through the means of Federal subsidy, with an incentive to develop an airline industry, which we badly need in times of war? Was it socialization to appropriate $2 million to rehabilitate an abandoned lead mine in Colorado because the country happened to need some lead? Was it socialization when we subsidized a railroad company some years ago, when they pushed on to the Pacific coast?

I do not know, but I do know this: that during the Roosevelt administration, many things were done by the Federal Government, and very few of them that were advocated by the President under the so-called New Deal were not characterized as socialism. However, one of the officers of one of our national business organizations, according to the record, pleaded with President Roosevelt in the early days of March 1933 to take over all business at the time the banks were closed.

A few years ago I picked up, in about 1953, a brochure issued by the Central Hanover Bank of the city of New York. This is a bank which has the cream of the crop. This is a bank that is a private bank for the private fortunes of practically all of the big millionaire set in the city of New York, with a branch at 62d Street and Fifth Avenue, or somewhere close to that so-called "Gold Coast" up there. This brochure was written by some economist working for the bank, and it was distributed to the depositors of the bank. It said that there was going to be a slight recession, there was a slight recession on the way, which did come, of course, in 1954. This economist in this brochure distributed by the bank to its upper crust customers said that they did not have to worry too much because, unlike in the thirties, we now had built-in safeguards in our economy that would prevent this thing from going too far. He pointed out what they were: unemployment insurance; that we had a reservoir of money waiting to give something to the unemployed so that they would not be totally out of the market as customers of business the day after they got unemployed. That was one of the things. The Federal Deposit Insurance business was another thing, under which you did not have the problem of long runs on savings banks when people got unemployed, because the Federal Government, through this deposit insurance system, insured the savings accounts of the small people. I guess it is safe to say that there is hardly a savings bank in this country that is not under that system.

He pointed out that the Securities and Exchange Commission, with its restrictions on gambling in the stock market, keeps that down.

These were the safeguards that were going to prevent us from being in real trouble in 1954 because of a slight recession. May I point out to you, Congressman, that every one of these safeguards was characterized as being socialistic at the time they were before the Congress, every single one of them.

I still do not know what socialism is, despite the things that I have read. But if socialism means that under a democratic system this republican form of government that we have, there are people who desire to secure for the great mass of the people, the workers, the wage earners, the farmers, and others, a better share of whatever wealth the economy produces, and that by providing that better share we provide a broad base of purchasing power to keep the economy moving forward—if that is socialism, then I guess I am a socialist and have been a socialist all my life. I do not figure that, but if that is what socialism means, that is the sort of thing I am interested in.

Despite my belief in the American system, despite detesting almost everything I see done in other parts of the world under the banner of socialism, I am not too concerned when I am charged with being socialistic because I advocate something that brings a little more sunlight into the lives of the great mass of the people in this country.

I submit again that the record will show that almost everything that meant a better life for the little people was attacked as socialistic. I can recall when the National Association of Manufacturers, through its State branches, was opposing the installation, the mandatory installation of dust-eliminating devices in factories where abrasive materials were being used, materials injurious to the health of the workers were permeating the air. It was demanded that there be devices in the way of small fans, and as a matter of law employers were compelled to put in these devices to protect the health of their employees. There were safeguards on the cutting tools so that there would be less chance of an employee losing a hand through some kind of a cutting device. Many of the States have these laws, but I can recall, in every one of the States where these things were advanced, the National Association of Manufacturers and its State branches opposed these things, and they opposed them on the ground that they were socialistic in nature.

So the mere characterization of some proposal as socialistic does not bother me at all. I know that I believe in this American system, and there is no other system on earth I know of or that I can read about that ever compares with it. I believe it is the best system because under this system, a little better share of the wealth that is produced by management, labor, finance, and industry gets down to the little people; and that is the thing in which I am interested.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Meany, you have done a magnificent job of telling us here how you feel, and I think you practice in your daily life what you have told us here. But I want to close by saying this in rebuttal, since I asked you the question in the first place:

Some of us with children and others with grandchildren, possibly yours, are very concerned that in this concern for little people——

Mr. MEANY. That is one thing you and I can agree upon, is grandchildren.

Mr. ALGER. There are several other things we can agree on, Mr. Meany, including providing safeguards for workers and purifying the air. In fact, I suspect you and I, in our views as opposed to foreign isms witness Mr. Miyokan, are like two fingers on a hand. Maybe it is just that we do not get together enough to talk about it.

But I do feel this, Mr. Meany: generations yet unborn cannot vote, yet we are loading on their backs now not only taxes, if you please, but a staggering debt which they must inherit because we perpetuate what we are doing; we are not facing up to eliminating programs or paying as we go. We are passing on to future generations a staggering load.

Without discussing with you any one of these things you have mentioned, although I would love to discuss some of them with you, to try to find out where we could have drawn the line, I simply say you and your generation and now I in mine ought to do something instead of coming to Uncle Sam demanding more Federal control, more Federal expenditure. We ought to do something now to try to cut down this staggering cost.

All we are doing is coming up here and demanding more Federal programs and demanding more spending. Some of us have got to say, "No. We can't vote for that."

Why? Why not just vote for all these things?

It would be a lot easier when we got back home maybe. But it is because we are trying to cut the cost to be fiscally responsible.

If I can paraphrase everything you said, although that may not be a fair way to do it—I am oversimplifying it.

But what I think we are talking about are two ideas like this: On the one hand some believe in this country that we can all have more by sharing more equally what there is now here. On the other hand some of us believe that the only way for more of us to have more is to produce more.

I say we are not making the effort to produce more, but spending too much of our time trying to divvy up what already is here, and in the course of all this we are creating Federal centralization of power and the abridgement of personal liberty and freedom.

This is how I would like to take every one of these issues and talk about—What are we doing to a man's freedom?

Obviously when you protect him in his factory you are helping his freedom, but there are times when you are saddling generations coming on with bills and bills of debt that we are not paying for because of our nice cars and clothes and the way we think we should live today. I do not think it is right.

I have only made this little speech to you because I do not want you to think that whenever I criticize your viewpoint I am criticizing your sincerity, as some folks on your side have done to me and others. They have left the impression, when they have taken sides in this and come down to my district, since I am a zero according to labor's box score, to give me heck, saying that I am not interested in the little fellow.

I do not know who the "little people" are. Down in my country everybody thinks he is as big as he wants to be.

But whoever they are I am just as interested in feeding and clothing the poor as anyone. But I do not want to subsidize goldbricks or those who want to sit on their rockers and draw as much money as they can through almost a guaranteed annual wage proposition.

Some of the people coming in here representing the AFL–CIO seem to feel that we ought to give a man a guaranteed annual wage under unemployment compensation for doing nothing.

To close, I simply say to you that it looks to me in this bill like we are trying to do two things that this bill is not intended to do: On the one hand we are treating it as relief or welfare, and on the other hand we are faced with the stark realization there must be more jobs. That is what you want, and more jobs are not provided by the unemployment compensation bill. What we are doing is treating the result of the sickness in this bill and not the cause of one sickness itself.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I surely appreciate your forbearance.

Senator John F. Kennedy Moves Ahead—Joseph Alsop's Views on the Wisconsin Swing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, one of the best-informed and most astute of all newspaper columnists is Joseph Alsop. His opinions, his wealth of information and his conclusions are followed avidly by untold thousands of people throughout the country and the world. Apparently, he gets his information through incisive probing and hard digging of the facts. Thus, when he writes, he does so with knowledge and conviction. He goes to the scene of activities and the heart of the matter. His on-the-spot analysis of Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY'S visit to Wisconsin last week is worthy of note and study. It impressed me greatly and I am sure that it will so impress anyone who reads it. For here is a hardheaded, precise reporter—one who is not swayed by suave rhetoric or histrionic flair—jotting down his reaction to what he terms "the Kennedy question." He looks at the story and writes of the public's and his reaction to it.

Mr. Speaker, what Joe Alsop found in Wisconsin last week was not a new but an ascending KENNEDY—knowledgeable, eloquent, and persuasive to varying peoples and differing groups. His meteoric rise over the past few years has caught the favor of the crowd and the respect of a great part of our Nation. This stature has been acquired because the junior Senator from Massachusetts has dared to speak out in terms that are clear and in manner that is courageous. All the qualities that go to make a great leader and an outstanding statesman are wrapped up in his personality and his character.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that all of this points to the daily increasing fact that the Democratic Party's finest and best choice as its standard bearer for President in 1960 is Senator KENNEDY.

Under unanimous consent, I insert with my remarks Columnist Alsop's report on "The Kennedy Question," clipped from the Washington Post of April 13, 1959. I recommend it as thoughtful reading to the membership of the House:

THE KENNEDY QUESTION
(By Joseph Alsop)

MILWAUKEE.—What may be called the Kennedy question is now the most interesting, or at least the most puzzling, question in American politics. Unless the opinion polls are totally misleading, millions of Americans are eager to elect this still young, still incompletely tested man to the Presidency. But why?

To be sure, JOHN F. KENNEDY is no dully ordinary, ordinarily ambitious politician. Admiration or envy, or both, are equally inspired by his war record and his wife, his fortune, and his appearance, his public charm, and his private capacity for unlimited grim hard work. When there is so much to envy or admire, the result is a kind of glamor, no less real because it is indefinable.

All the same, one suspects that Alcibiades—even the Alcibiades of the great years before the fleet of Athens set sail for Syracuse—would not have appealed greatly to American voters. He might have succeeded in the movies, but hardly in the Senate. In short, the KENNEDY glamor, while it may highlight his other political qualities, is not the answer to the Kennedy question.

To try to find the answer, this reporter came out here to Wisconsin, where Kennedy has been looking over the ground in preparation for the crucial Democratic primary. The 2½-day barnstorming tour was a gruelling business. The pace was breathless. The crowds were stifling. And when KENNEDY and his beautiful wife escaped the crowds, coveys of politicians descended upon them.

KENNEDY positively seemed to enjoy it; but that is a usual requirement for a successful candidate. With the exception of a shrewd discussion of the great contest for Asia, KENNEDY'S speeches were also usual enough, at least in content. Republican sins, Democratic virtues, the needs of the old, the hopes of the young and the challenge of the age, were the topics.

But the style of the speeches was not at all usual, to begin with. When KENNEDY rises to speak, he seems angular and tense, despite the disarming grin. At first you think of an earnest, high school valedictorian. Yet he is eloquent, decidedly eloquent, his is a highly literate eloquence, too, with an odd reminiscence of Adlai Stevenson. In a single speech, before a university audience to be sure, he quoted Bismarck, Goethe, Swift, John Quincy Adams, Clay, Calhoun, Thomas Hart Benton and Queen Victoria. And then, as though to show he could do just as well without advance preparation, he added a verse by Robert Frost and a quotation from Winston Churchill in the question period.

Furthermore, this odd, almost aggressively literate KENNEDY eloquence can be exceedingly moving on occasion. When he was talking about the right attitude to the harsh perils of our time, he told the same university audience about the sudden darkening of the sun, which led the good people of 18th century Hartford, Conn., to think the Day of Judgment was at hand. The legislature was sitting in Hartford. The speaker of the house stilled the commotion by declaring that the darkness did not matter unless it announced the world's end; and if the world was indeed ending, he chose to meet his Maker while doing his duty.

"I ask that candles may be brought," the old man concluded, "so that this House can continue its business." When KENNEDY spoke that culminating line, it made the short hairs prickle on the neck.

Nor is the peculiar Kennedy style the only unusual feature of his public performance. The twin themes that recur in almost all his speeches are not exactly usual either, at least among politicians. The first is the theme of deep respect for the intellect and even for intellectuals (which is not surprising, considering KENNEDY'S huge private stable of egghead consultants).

"What we need now in this Nation most of all is a constant flow of new ideas * * *. We cannot obtain new ideas until we have a government and a public opinion which respect new ideas and the people who have them * * *. Our country has surmounted great crises in the past, not because of our wealth, not because of our rhetoric, not because we had longer cars and whiter ice boxes and bigger television screens than anyone else, but because our ideas were more compelling, and more penetrating, and more wise, and more enduring."

These are typical sentences on the first theme. The other theme is the gravity and novelty of the problems now confronting the United States. The following sentences are representative:

"For now the age of consolidation is over, and once again the age of change and challenge has come upon us. * * * The next year, the next decade, in all likelihood the next generation, will require more bravery and more wisdom on our part than any period in our history. We will be face to face, every day, in every part of our lives and times, with the real issue of our age—the issue of survival."

The note is unexpected, at least in a presidential candidate in a period of flaccid outward complacency. The performance, overall, is quite impressive enough to explain why KENNEDY has become a very serious candidate indeed in the past 2 years, but it remains for KENNEDY to outline his new ideas for meeting the new challenge which he so starkly and stirringly portrays.

Window Dressing at the Taxpayers' Expense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the New York World-Telegram, on April 9, 1959, an editorial which is brief and to the point. I place it in the Appendix of the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues:

PRESTO CHANGO, JOBS

Whatever else may have been achieved, if anything, the AFL–CIO unemployment rally in Washington seems to have inspired Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, the Democratic leader. He is the chief sponsor of a resolution—announced at the rally—to beef up support for bigger Government spending on housing, airports, public works, and aids to local areas.

Senator JOHNSON told the rally in almost (but not quite) so many words these things would put 4½ million idle back to work. The resolution calls for a committee "to get the facts." The committee would report to Congress in 60 days.

Then, presumably, Congress would pass all these bills and everybody would go back to work.

All of which remains to be seen, to say the least.

The Senator from Texas, and all the other speakers at the rally who clamored for this mountain of Government spending, seem convinced that is the way to solve the unemployment problem easily and quickly. They said nothing about raising the money.

If all this spending were to come out of debt, it would further deflate the savings of the people whence comes the capital which makes jobs. And, in that case, these same prestidigitators before long would be looking for new cures for another wave of unemployment.

What You Should Know About Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, since coming to Washington, D.C., I have been searching for some means of describing in as few words as possible the beauty and scope of our Nation's Capital. Recently I obtained a copy of a speech made by one of our U.S. Information Agency representatives to an audience in far away Australia. It seemed to me to be the best description I have ever seen of the city and its functions. The speech was given by Miss Carol V. Harford to the Quota Club in Canberra, Australia. Miss Harford is cultural affairs officer with the U.S. Information Agency in Canberra. Under unanimous consent, I include her speech as a portion of my remarks:

WHAT YOU SHOULD KNOW ABOUT WASHINGTON

(By Carol V. Harford)

A white haired gentleman of 58 years, who had gained a somewhat renowned reputation as being resourceful, a stern disciplinarian, a leader of extraordinary ability, and the one strong, dependable force for unity in the recently organized National Government was given an additional responsibility which by executing he effected an everlasting tribute to his decisiveness, his perception, and his remarkable ability to accommodate the future.

The gentleman under discussion is George Washington. The task was that of choosing a site for the Federal Capital of the United States of America. The action under discussion was prompted by the nomadic existence of our first National Government—the Continental Congress—during its early days. The action was acutely prompted when the Congress was set upon by irate continental soldiers demanding their long overdue pay, and Congress fled to Princeton, N.J. Following this, the need of a permanent seat for the National Government was no longer in doubt. But though all were agreed as to the need of a Federal town, the bitter dispute that raged between North and South about the site threatened to disrupt the Union. However, final agreement was reached to authorize the President to choose the site, limiting the region to the Potomac River, and the size to 10 square miles. Within 6 months of the passing of the residence bill in July 1790, George Washington had methodically investigated the various possibilities, and drawing upon the resources of the States of Maryland and Virginia, he proclaimed the District of Columbia. But even with his powers of perception, it would have been impossible for Washington to have realized when he appointed the commissioners and called in his wartime aide Major Pierre Charles L'Enfant, who used a combination of diagonals, squares, circles and parks to compound the plan for the new city, what proportions this dream would realize.

For Washington today is many things, many moods, it's brass hats and Presidents; it is white stillness at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldiers in Arlington National Cemetery; it's gossip-prone, celebrity-laden cocktail parties, and it's a city capable of the unpleasant little juxtaposition, and of many carefully designed green landscapes of undeniable beauty; it's summer concerts on the Potomac's floating stage; it's almost any modern city in the United States of America; it's golf in Rock Creek Park, or dining at any one of numerous colorful restaurants; it's history and reverence for the past; it's an electric understanding of today. Whatever the description, underneath it all is a treasured realization of the American heritage which makes itself felt, and all around you is knowledge in atmosphere that there's something terribly special and significant about this place. For no matter why you visit Washington, or what you plan to see, or what you're going to do, Washington, D.C., has but a single purpose, a single business—Government. It is an artificial creation, it is the city of the one big idea.

As you first walk about in the District, as Washington is usually called by its inhabitants, you discover countless monuments to this idea, and the figures and the words carved in stone, of men who have believed in it. Seeing the monuments, which are mostly large, and mostly marble, you are impressed and reassured by the durability and the simplicity of the idea, the big idea that freemen are wise enough to govern themselves.

It's in the simplicity of the Washintgon Monument, the immense white paperweight which looms 555 feet 5⅛ inches high. Since the late 19th century, the innate dignity of this monument has marked an appropriate memorial to the first President of the United States. An elevator, as well as 898 steps for the hardier souls, ascends to a chamber at the 500-foot level, from which the visitor may view a panorama of the city and surrounding countryside. Facing the Capitol on the east, the White House on the north, and the Jefferson Memorial on the south, the monument casts its first reflection on the waters of the Reflecting Pool looking west to the Lincoln Memorial.

"A shrine at which all can worship, an altar upon which the supreme sacrifice was made for liberty; a sacred religious refuge in which those who love country and love God can find inspiration and repose," so spoke Chief Justice Taft at the dedication of the Lincoln Memorial. This monument is created in memory of the man who promoted the big idea during the bitterest years of the Civil War. This white marble temple—for it cannot truly be said to be less—embraces the essence of his character, steeped in tolerance, in the belief that all people shall be free, free to think, free to see expression, and free above all else to apply themselves to all enterprise. The memorial is magnificent in the daylight, but perhaps even more breathtaking in the dim light of eventide when it's almost possible to see Lincoln breathe, for sculptor Daniel Chester French fashioned a gentleness, a power, and a determination which encourages you to await with expectation the words which you are sure Lincoln is soon to speak. Above the statue is carved these words: "In this temple, as in the hearts of the people for whom he saved the Union, the memory of Abraham Lincoln is enshrined forever."

A circular colonnaded structure of white marble rises from the banks of the Tidal Basin as a memorial to the author of the Declaration of Independence, Thomas Jefferson. The classic beauty of the Jefferson Memorial is further enhanced by its reflection in the waters of the Tidal Basin.

This building expresses the architectural preference of America's third President, being designed in the style of the circular-domed Pantheon of Rome, a structure Jefferson mentioned several times in his writings. On the interior walls of the memorial room are four panels bearing excerpts from Jefferson's writings. The first is the Declaration of Independence; the second, his Virginia statute for religious freedom; third, is his concept in the belief of freedom of education for all people; the fourth relates the tenets of his political philosophy, which was fundamentally that a nation's laws and constitution must change with circumstances.

The responsibility for implementing the big idea is vested in the three branches of Federal Government—the executive, the legislative, the judicial. It would hardly be fair to take even a brief glimpse of the Capital City without mentioning the grandeur of the Supreme Court Building, which has housed the members of the highest tribunal of the land since 1935. Upon approaching the building, the first tier of broad, white marble steps leads to a specious plaza of marble flagstones of subdued and slightly contrasting color, laid in simple geometric design. On either side are large fountains set in the landscaped terrace. The second and third tier of steps leading to the main entrance passes between two massive marble buttresses. On the one side is a majestically sculptured figure of a man guardian or authority of law, and on the other side a female figure of appealing beauty in contemplation of justice. Eight 50-foot Corinthian columns of white marble front the portico of the structure, and over this colonnade is carved this promise to the American people: Equal Justice Under Law.

Inside, the main corridor leading to the Supreme Court chamber is an avenue of quiet and simple dignity, all interior furnishings are also in keeping with the quiet thoughtfulness embodied in the stately silence of the chamber of the Court. When the Supreme Court was established there were six Justices; there are now nine. It is a thrilling reminder to the greatness of this body to be in the chamber when the Court convenes and the crier announces the formal opening of the Court "Oyez, Oyez, Oyez. All persons having business before the Honorable, the Supreme Court of the United States are admonished to draw near and give their attention, for the Court is now sitting. God save the United States and this Honorable Court."

Washington might realistically be called the city of magnificent distances, for the vistas to the north, south, east, and west are superb in natural and architectural beauty. Additional evidence to this fact is to be found in L'Enfant's placing of the Executive Mansion which was chosen first, followed by the location of the site of the Capitol Building, 1 mile southeast atop Jenkins' Hill.

Because of the import L'Enfant attached to the building of the White House it was the first public building erected in our Nation's Capital. Its cornerstone was laid on October 13, 1792, nearly 1 year before George Washington laid the Capitol cornerstone. The original manse, burned in 1814 when the British entered the city, was a light-gray sandstone. However, when the home was rebuilt, the exterior was painted white, and from that day forward the

Executive Mansion has been known as the White House. The Interior has suffered constant changes with each administration, its most recent refurbishing taking place between the years 1949–52, but the house is now well constructed to cope with the rigors of time and a constant swell and flow of visitors.

No thumbnail sketch of Washington, D.C. would be complete without reference to the Capitol Building where the big idea is repeatedly tested and tried by the representatives of the American people. For here, in the Senate and House Chambers is to be considered the legislation affecting 170 million Americans, and quite often a few more millions of peoples in other sectors of the world. It is reported that L'Enfant said in choosing Jenkins Hill for the location of the Capitol, "It is a pedestal waiting for a monument". Any American, and possibly other visitors, will testify that the edifice he chose to place on the site quite properly belongs on a pedestal, for all of a sudden, settled back in your seat in the Senate or House Gallery, with your chin resting in your hands, you're quite overcome with the high responsibility with which we have charged our statesmen and our representatives. At the same time, sitting there watching you wonder how they can ever pull anything out of the seemingly disorganized morass of men and speech. But if you stick around, listen and watch carefully, you remember that this is only the showcase of the system which insures the big idea, the visible tip of the huge legislative iceberg. Work is being done, and done to the accompaniment of politeness, protocol, long-windedness and a system of complex and cumbersome rules, but freedom must go slowly; it must take time for the expression of doubt, for disagreement, even for demogoguery. Pride comes from the realization that the system works nevertheless, for the big idea is preserved by the rules, and its daily work is accomplished. All the politeness and rules are a discipline, a highly necessary habit, that allows human and hard-working men to get their work done in a respectable banner, without an intrusion of violent personal and partisan feelings. Watching Congress at work the observer suddenly realizes that this after all is humankind at work under rules and restaints; it is civilization.

It is civilization composed of individuals who, as my Congressman expressed it, are "deeply moved by the challenges and the opportunities offered to a Member of Congress. Serving in these traditional Halls is far more than drafting a bill that becomes a law, far more than making a speech before the world's largest debating society. It is being the agent for Uncle Sam, with the power and prestige to open the doors of the Government to anyone who asks, to offer the services of the Nation to her smallest common denominator, an ordinary American citizen, to search out a solution to unseemingly unsurmountable human problems, and somehow finding a way of working them out. Being a Congressman means being a chaplain, a counselor, a tightrope walker, and a miracle man, all at the same time. It means listening to sad stories and corny jokes, to accepting insincere pats on the back along with tearful thanks for unknown or unremembered favors. It means opening the day's mail to find yourself called down and built up, torn to pieces or deified. It is excting, frustrating, nerve-wracking, and tremendously rewarding."

Somebody once threw a cat off the top of the Washington Monument. It spun, volplaned, did several half gainers and tucks, and landed, uninjured, on all fours. Several years later, the story goes, the cat finally died, probably from boredom, and somebody had it stuffed and had it sent to the Smithsonian Institution. The Smithsonian, to the best of anyone's knowledge, has never thrown anything away, and for this reason it has often be called the Nation's attic, housing over 30 million keepsakes.

And there's the National Gallery of Art, housing over 26,000 works including paintings, sculpture, prints, and drawings and examples of decorative arts. And the Federal Bureau of Investigation, considered the splashiest show in Washington, where no doubt is left in anyone's mind that crime never pays. And the Library of Congress, which needs no further introduction, as well as the National Archives, where historic documents and charters are displayed and promotion of the efficient management of records is kept current.

And so it goes, on and on and on.

But whatever your impression of Washington after its short, furious and often preposterous history, I hope you will agree that amidst the magnificent beauty of this Capital City, all persons concerned are trying to make the right decisions to insure the success of the one big idea, the idea that men can rule themselves.

The Appeal of U.N. "Presence" in Berlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a copy of a press release from my office, dated April 10, 1959, and a feature story by William R. Frye in the Washington, D.C., Sunday Star, April 12, 1959.

PRESS RELEASE, APRIL 10, 1959, FROM THE OFFICE OF REPRESENTATIVE CHARLES O. PORTER, WASHINGTON, D.C.

The U.S. Department of State has commented officially on the proposal by Members of the U.S. House of Representatives and the British Parliament that the whole of Berlin should come under United Nations responsibility.

In a letter dated April 9, 1959, addressed to Representative CHARLES O. PORTER, Democrat of Oregon, the Department of State termed the proposal "among the most carefully thought out of the various proposals on this subject which have been brought to the Department's attention" and said that it "has a very definite appeal."

The resolution was sent to the Department for comment by Representative PORTER on March 31. He conferred with members of the Parliament when he was in London about 2 weeks ago.

Answering for the Department of State, Assistant Secretary William B. Macomber, Jr., said the joint British-American proposal would be given serious study. In his letter to PORTER, he said:

"While the idea of United Nations action has a very definite appeal, the specific proposals generally overlook two important factors of the Berlin situation. The first of these is the special responsibility which the United States, the United Kingdom, France, and the Soviet Union bear for Germany as a whole and for Berlin. This responsibility is based on the Four Powers' occupation of Germany and upon the agreements which they concluded among one another during and after World War II. The problem which has arisen with regard to Berlin has its origin in an attempt on the part of the Soviet Union to evade its obligations under those agreements, notably the obligation to restore German unity in peace and freedom. The second factor usually overlooked in proposals for United Nations action is the danger of attempting to deal with the Berlin question in isolation. A real and lasting solution to the problem of Berlin can be found only in German reunification, and it is the Department's view that primary emphasis should be put on making progress toward a resolution of the larger underlying problem rather than on interim or palliative measures to deal with the lesser problem."

PORTER said he had hoped the Berlin proposal would be considered at the Foreign Ministers' meeting "along with other proposals." He said he was not ruling out such action.

Among the six British Members of Parliament signing the proposal was Clement Attlee, former Labor Prime Minister.

Signing the original proposal in this country were 10 House Democrats: STEVEN V. CARTER (Iowa), FRANK M. CLARK (Pennsylvania), BYRON L. JOHNSON (Colorado), WILLIAM H. MEYER (Vermont), CLEMENT W. MILLER (California), CHARLES O. PORTER (Oregon), HENRY S. REUSS (Wisconsin), GEORGE M. RHODES (Pennsylvania), RALPH J. RIVERS, (Alaska), and LEONARD G. WOLF (Iowa).

Other House Members indicated interest in the resolution. One of them, Representative CHESTER BOWLES, Democrat, Connecticut, wrote PORTER Thursday, "I agree that the suggestion for a United Nations force in Berlin is a constructive and meritorious one. I have felt all along that if there was some way to involve the U.N. more directly with the Berlin controversy, it would be helpful."

[From the Washington Sunday Star, Apr. 12, 1959]

USE OF U.N. PRESENCE ADVANCED AS A SOLUTION TO BERLIN PROBLEM

(By William R. Frye)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y.—To one who has just returned from 6 weeks in the Middle East, talk of a United Nations presence in and about Berlin has a familiar ring.

The U.N. has established its presence in the Middle East in a variety of forms, ranging from one man (Pier P. Spinelli) with a small staff in Amman, Jordan, to a 5,000-man army in the Gaza strip.

The U.N. is present on Israel's borders in the form of a small corps of observers (the Truce Supervision Organization). The U.N. came and went in Lebanon as a very different kind of observer team.

Exactly how the idea could be borrowed for Berlin, and in what form, is by no means easy to foresee. It depends in large part, of course, on Soviet Premier Khrushchev.

A good deal of preliminary thinking and planning has been done, however, on the Western side—notably by the Canadians, who are credited with the original proposal, and by Secretary-General Dag Hammarskjold, who has just come back from Moscow. Some of the thinking is still secret; some can be reported.

HOW IT MIGHT BE DONE

The starting point is that no conceivable U.N. army could be mustered to hold open the approaches to Berlin by force. Even if it did not have to clash directly with the 350,000-man Soviet occupation force in East Germany, it would still have an East German Army of some 200,000 men to deal with.

A military operation on this scale, against organized opposition, is well beyond the U.N.'s capacity. It would require, in practice, the deputizing of NATO forces to act on behalf of the U.N.—something the Security Council could not do, because of the Soviet veto, and the General Assembly would not do, out of fear of world war.

The U.N.'s role, therefore, would be that of executing, or supervising the execution, of a plan agreed upon by the great powers.

If the Big Four were to agree to make West Berlin a free city under international auspices, the U.N. could provide the government, and Western occupation troops could be called U.N. troops. The U.N. has never done this kind of job—governing a city—but was prepared to do so both in Trieste and in Gaza until events removed the necessity.

If a summit conference were to agree upon a new formula for Western access to Berlin, giving East Germans some or all of the functions now exercised by Russians, U.N. observers of the TSO type could be stationed along the route to see that there was no interference.

ANALOGY IN MIDDLE EAST

The analogy perhaps is not auspicious, but the TSO does this kind of thing now in relation to Mount Scopus, the Israeli enclave inside Jordanian territory in Old Jerusalem, next to the Mount of Olives. TSO observers check cargo manifests and try to make certain Jordan does not interfere with legitimate Israeli convoys.

There has been intermittent trouble despite the TSO's efforts, but no one doubts that it would have been much worse without the U.N. on hand.

If the East Germans must check Western convoys to Berlin—and Khrushchev seems inflexible on this point—the West obviously would rather have the U.N. there than leave the job wholly to the Germans.

There should be no illusions about the extent of the U.N.'s potential authority. It would not have power to compel the East Germans to do or not to do anything. It does not have that power today in the Middle East. The U.N. is not a super government.

If Khrushchev (and the East Germans) would let the U.N. actually man the checkposts, it would be a different matter. But preliminary soundings in Moscow appear to rule out that idea. Possibly—just possibly—the point can be negotiated.

In practice, however, the best attainable solution probably will be one in which the U.N. role would be that of a troubleshooter who would observe the checkposts, investigate complaints, iron out genuine misunderstandings, and publicize willful violations, depending on the pressure of world opinion in the latter case to provide the necessary sanction.

From the point of view of real politik, this would mean that if the West were forced to ram its convoys through to Berlin by force, the moral justification for such action would have been established in advance by an authority few would challenge.

All this, of course, is in the realm of preliminary thinking and planning. There are those within NATO who resist the whole idea.

Why, they ask, should the West purchase from Khrushchev at the price of a considerable contribution to the stability of Communist East Germany—including its de facto recognition by the U.N.—a set of rights and privileges which should belong to the West in any event? There should not, of course, be any challenge to the West's position in Berlin. A U.N. role should not be necessary.

Those who argue in favor of the purchase contend that, like it or not, the West's position in Berlin has been challenged. That position, they say, cannot be maintained by force without unacceptable risk of world war. A segment of NATO is unwilling to face up to that risk.

This preliminary question—whether to accept any change in the status of Berlin—will obviously have to be settled before the West dickers with Khrushchev over the nature and functions of a U.N. presence there.

A FACE-SAVING DEVICE

If, however, the ultimate decision is to buy off the threat to Berlin at the lowest price available—and Chancellor Adenauer's sudden decision to give up the reins of power in Bonn suggests that it probably will be—then use of the U.N. should be an excellent face-saving device.

A U.N. regime in and about Berlin need not look like a diplomatic defeat; it might not even be one. It would not be a defeat if the West, as part of the same package, got from Russia compensatory advantages, say in the field of inspection and arms control.

For maximum face saving, U.N. people believe the negotiations at one stage or another should become, in fact or in appearance, U.N. deliberations. They should take place, it is argued, under a U.N. roof.

This is why there is private urging that the summit conference be held at U.N. headquarters—or if this is not considered feasible, then elsewhere, but still as a meeting of the U.N. with heads of state acting as U.N. delegates. The agreement then would partake the moral aura of a U.N. decision.

A U.N. presence is not an automatic cure-all. UNEF is generally credited with being a success; the TSO is helpful, but by no means wholly effective. Spinelli has practically nothing to do, which perhaps means he is a success. UNOGIL was very nearly a flop, because it was put into an impossible position without adequate tools to do the job.

In Berlin, given a reasonable chance, U.N. people believe a presence could be the smoothest way out of a very deep hole.

A Truman Commission Sorely Needed To Curtail Waste and Extravagance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEWELL A. GEORGE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, for several years the Hoover Commission served this Nation well and made many important and valuable contributions to our Federal Government. The Commission was disbanded when its services were most needed.

With the tremendous expenditures being made in the name of foreign aid and by the Armed Forces and with the accompanying waste and extravagance, a new Commisison is sorely needed to safeguard the rights of the American taxpayer.

A Commission chairmaned by the Honorable Harry S. Truman, former President and former U.S. Senator, could do an outstanding job for this country and would be a great help in arriving at a balanced budget.

His piercing and penetrating investigations during the existence of the Senate Truman committee and the huge amount of tax money saved by that committee constitute an ironclad warranty that, if a Truman Commission could take up the traces where the Hoover Commission dropped them, a great saving would result and our Government would be more open, more efficient, more honest, and less susceptible to the lure of greedy and powerful influences.

The Kansas City Star, which has never been criticized for its failure to support Republican candidates for high office, has taken notice of the waste in our armed services in its editorial columns on March 18, 1959.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include that editorial, published in the Kansas City Times, the morning edition of the Star:

MUCH CAN BE DONE TO REDUCE THE WASTE IN DEFENSE

Waste in the Armed Forces is an old story that never fails to dismay the American public. Neither Congress nor the Pentagon has ever been able to explain satisfactorily why military equipment originally valued at billions of dollars is declared either surplus or obsolete. A new survey by the Associated Press shows that the Defense Department wrote the equivalent of at least $7½ billion off its books last year.

This is a prodigious amount of money to be kicking away. The services won't admit it, but what they need is centralized buying as recommended by the Hoover Commission. They now have it on a limited single-manager basis. For example, the Navy buys oil for the other services. But there is duplication and triplification in many fields. Sometimes one service discards usable equipment of a type that another service is buying. The trouble here lies in inadequate methods of keeping inventory.

Another apparent fault is too much reliance on negotiated contracts. In many cases this method is necessary because of the time factor and production problems. Where competitive bidding is possible, it is likely to bring a big saving.

Each of the services is constantly at work to improve its weapons and equipment. Vast sums are invested in research. Money spent on subsequently abandoned projects isn't necessarily wasted. The findings are often applied to future requirements.

Huge investments in weapons and equipment become antiquated. A new missile may be far more efficient than the artillery shell or manned plane it replaces. You can't charge obsolescence to waste.

But it does seem at times that the services are too quick to declare a relatively unimportant item obsolete simply because something a little better has been found. Perhaps it's human nature for a general or admiral dedicated to his profession to place its needs ahead of every other consideration.

Overall, it's a vast problem. Some say that the job of the Secretary of Defense is too big for any man. He now has increased authority under changes in the so-called unification law. But to a large extent the individual services are still run separately. That's the way a majority of Congressmen and professional military officers want it. Congressmen fear any loss of control over the spending of defense funds. They are particularly concerned with money that might be spent in their home States or districts.

More than half of the Federal revenue is allotted to defense. Probably some waste is inevitable in our political system. But the people do not need to be so tolerant. Greater unification could bring greater efficiency and economy. That should remain the ultimate objective. The national security demands it.

Billions that go down the drain could be well spent on missiles and other vital military hardware. Americans will be reconciled to their heavy burden of defense only when they are convinced that they're getting something like their full money's worth.

World Law Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, world peace can only be accomplished through world law. How do we attain world law? We strengthen the United Nations. This means revising the charter in accordance with studies which can start later this year.

It means enacting the resolution set out below.

The Committee on Arrangements for a United Nations Charter Review Conference meets this June. The United States should at that time urge the committee to recommend to the United Nations General Assembly that governments establish national commissions, or instruct appropriate national bodies, to undertake studies to determine their position on charter review.

Here are some facts about United Nations Charter revision:

In order to provide for revision and amendment, the United Nations Charter provides two mechanisms. Article 108 provides for the General Assembly to recommend amendments. Article 109 specifies procedures for calling a Charter Review Conference to draft revisions.

In either case, amendments are then to be referred to member states for ratification. They become effective on approval by two-thirds of the member states, including all five permanent members of the Security Council.

Pursuant to article 109, charter review was placed on the agenda of the General Assembly in 1955, which then decided—43 in favor, 6 opposed, 9 abstentions, and approved by the Security Council, 9 in favor, 1 against, 1 abstention—that a Charter Review Conference shall be held at an appropriate time and expressed the belief that review of the charter should be conducted under auspices international circumstances. At a meeting in June 1957 the committee established by the General Assembly to consider the time and place for a review conference concluded that the appropriate time and auspicious international circumstances referred to in the 12th General Assembly, the committee recommended that it be continued in being to report again with recommendations not later than the 14th General Assembly—1959. This recommendation was adopted by the General Assembly with no negative votes—54 in favor, 9 abstentions.

Factors which seem to have led to postponement of a Charter Review Conference, as indicated by committee debate, are not only political tensions and Soviet opposition, but fears that irresponsible and divisive charter amendments would be proposed. This fear is no doubt enhanced by the fact that no formal or official proposals for significant amendments have been made by our own or other governments.

As regards Soviet opposition, the following facts are significant:

First. No further Security Council action is required with respect to a Review Conference, or proposals adopted by it.

Second. The Soviet Union cannot veto the holding of a Review Conference.

Third. The U.S.S.R. cannot veto proposals made at that conference, or prevent the conference from officially approving and submitting for ratification amendments endorsed by a two-thirds majority.

Fourth. Of course, the Soviet Union, under the charter's present provisions, must ratify amendments before they can go into effect.

Fifth. Failure to ratify, unlike a veto, is not a final act and leaves open possible future consent to the amendments.

Sixth. The U.N. Charter does not put a time limit on the ratification period for charter amendments, so Soviet approval can be sought as long as may be required.

Should careful United States study of charter amendment lead to conclusions that important changes should be proposed and would have widespread international support, then approval for these amendments could be sought through a two-thirds vote in the General Assembly rather than by a Charter Review Conference. Here, also, there would not be veto on procedure, but the same considerations on ratification as outlined above would hold.

The text of the resolution which will be introduced within the next 10 days is as follows:

Whereas the basic purpose of the foreign policy of the United States of America is to protect the freedom of its citizens; and

Whereas the United States seeks freedom, peace, and prosperity for the peoples of all nations; and

Whereas the United States has joined with other nations to pursue these goals through the United Nations; and

Whereas enforceable law has proven to be indispensable to the attainment of these goals and to the peaceful and just settlement of disputes within all civilized communities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that it should be U.S. policy to seek, through the United Nations, the development of world law to protect the freedom, peace, and just aspirations of all peoples, to provide for the peaceful settlement of international disputes and to permit the elimination of national armaments; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution will be sent to the President of the United States, who is hereby requested to initiate studies of the changes which should be made in the Charter of the United Nations or in the charters of other international organizations to further the development of world law for the purposes enumerated in this resolution; and, pursuant to this goal; be it further

Resolved, That the U.S. Government should urge the United Nations Committee on Arrangements for a United Nations Charter Review Conference, when it meets in June 1959, to recommend to the United Nations General Assembly that governments establish national commissions, or instruct appropriate national bodies, to undertake studies to determine their positions on charter review or revision in order to facilitate fruitful consideration of suitable measures to strengthen the United Nations Charter as an effective legislative, executive, and judicial instrument of world law when a Charter Review Conference is held.

The Program for Education of the United Steelworkers of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NEWELL A. GEORGE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, seldom do the good things that labor organizations do appear in the public press. More often it is those acts of labor that may be subject to criticism by some that are given publicity in newspapers and magazines.

Recently, the lead editorial in the Kansas City Star, a great midwestern newspaper which throughout the years has made a valiant attempt to be fair with all segments of our society, told of the seventh annual union leadership training institute of the United States Steelworkers of America and the University of Kansas Extension. It is such efforts as this to diffuse knowledge of world affairs that may bring about a better understanding between management and labor. The more knowledge one possesses, the more he understands the problems of other segments of our society.

The labor education program, Mr. Speaker, does, I believe, and will continue to contribute to a better America. Under leave to extend my remarks, the editorial which appeared in the Kansas City Evening Star on April 10 is included herein:

IN THE CLASSROOMS OF THE LABOR UNIONS

Once a week a little group of men has been gathering in the old Maccochaque School in Kansas City, Kans. The trappings of the evening are the trappings of any classroom session: Notebooks and pencils, a blackboard, lecturers and the sharp questions of students seeking information. The men are members of the United Steelworkers of America, AFL–CIO. They are attending the seventh annual Union Leadership Training Institute of their union and the University of Kansas Extension.

The institute, spread over a period of several weeks each spring, is symptomatic of the thirst of everyone for more knowledge. Among unions, the steelworkers have spearheaded the search for education. In this area the first 1-week Steelworkers Institute was held at Lawrence in 1947. That has become an annual period of compressed classroom work attended by both union and management representatives. The spring institute is an outgrowth. Both are aimed primarily at giving the students more knowledge of the world that immediately affects them.

Now the labor education program of the steelworkers is carried out at more than 50 colleges and universities. Some other unions have adopted similar programs. In New York recently the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers began a mandatory, once-a-week course in international affairs for all paid union officers. The purpose, in

the words of one official, is "to get the feel of the world." In this complex civilization that is essential not only in union-management relationships but in all dealings between men.

Nor are the unions alone in this field. Management long has recognized the value of off-the-job training. An example is provided by several Los Angeles corporations that finance summer college courses in the liberal arts for their executives. Last year Congress authorized similar training for some Government workers in specialized fields.

The pattern is encouraging for the future of the Nation. We hold no starry-eyed belief that adult education will solve all our problems. Collective bargaining will remain the tough, give-and-take institution that it is. As one union worker commented at an institute session this week, "When you go into the bargaining room, you leave your religion at the door." Personalities and interests will continue to collide.

But such sessions, for labor, management, or anyone else, stimulate thought and create a recognition of the problems of others. And that is a vital first step in bridging the gap of misunderstanding that sometimes separates people.

Custard's Last Stand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, may I call to the attention of the Congress an excellent editorial which appeared in last Sundays' Washington Post and Times Herald.

It does seem to me that the Battle of Gettysburg is too important to lose the ground upon which it was fought, to have the gallantry of Pickett's charge immortalized in flashing neon, to have the words of Lincoln alternating with rock 'n roll from a souvenir stand jukebox and to have such honored dead buried alongside a flowering of motels.

The editorial follows:

CUSTARD'S LAST STAND?

Why do Americans insist on blighting even a historic site like the Gettysburg battlefield with blinding neon signs, garyish souvenir shops, and junky frozen custard stands? Only complete public ownership of historic areas, or private control by an organization such as Colonial Williamsburg can keep these tourist attractions from being surrounded and even invaded by a Coney Island atmosphere.

Further encroachment by commercial interests at Gettysburg can be prevented if the Senate restores $750,000 to the National Park Service budget. This sum, which was taken out of the budget by the House, is needed to purchase 350 acreas adjacent to the present 2,762-acre Gettysburg National Military Park. Unless the land, which has been farmed, is bought soon by the Government it will probably be sold to commercial interests, including a real estate subdivider. Part of the area in question was the site of the first day's battle at Gettysburg.

So much of the Gettysburg battlefield has been preserved by the National Park Service that it would be shortsighted now to allow commercialization to invade the unreserved area. Gettysburg means too much to the United States to be turned into an unseemly jungle of tourist traps or even a suburban housing development.

Where Federal Aid to Schools Would Have No Strings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I am joining certain other Members of the House of Representatives and have introduced legislation to provide that expenditures in connection with the submission to an electorate of issues affecting the business of a taxpayer shall be allowed as a deduction under the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

This bill would read in part as follows:

No expenditure which otherwise qualifies as an ordinary and necessary business expense * * * shall be disallowed as a deduction because incurred in opposing or advocating measures duly submitted to an electorate upon any issue affecting the business of the taxpayer.

My thought is, Mr. Speaker, that in many local matters, such as school bond issues, the cost of informing the public is a business and civic, not a political, expense and has an important effect on the taxpayer and his business.

I have in mind that other desirable or necessary elections for local improvements not alone for schools but for municipal and State facilities of all kinds would be affected. Public support could be enlisted, with the incentive in my bill, for parks, playgrounds, civic centers, urban renewal projects, and all manner of worthy and meritorious issues requiring a vote of the people. However, I am thinking in particular of educational bond authorizations or school levies where under election laws many times the referendum fails for want of information or adequate public interest. The outcome of these elections is certainly one of community welfare and affects the customers and employees of business firms themselves in the area. In my congressional district often bond issues voted on to provide funds received majority approval, but the measures fail due to an insufficient number of voters going to the polls and a required legal percentage of total votes not being cast. Defeat is due to lack of publicity and promotion.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that with passage of this legislation contributions to groups such as parent-teacher organizations and chambers of commerce, by public spirited citizens or organizations would become tax deductible as a normal and proper business expense. I want to make it clear my purpose is not to allow deductions of gifts to personal political campaigns, although frankly I would not be against limited deductions of that nature, but this legislation would cover public issues only and not personalities or people.

Also, let me explain, as one who fears Federal controls, that the purpose of my bill is to make it easier for local communities to do things for themselves rather than to be forced to come to the Federal Government for help.

Take education as the case in point. If State and local financing is insufficient, the pressure increases on the national level. The only answer, I can see, is to assist communities and encourage them to accept their responsibility. In the case of schools, classroom shortages must be filled and teachers must be paid decent salaries. To turn to the Federal Treasury in order to provide these needs may be the easier way but it is the wrong way in my opinion.

For example, the National Defense Act was passed last year. I voted against it because I just could not, in all conscience, support a program putting the Federal Government further in the education business. Most educators in my district did not seem to worry on this score, but I am sure they have recognized that my opposition to Federal aid is genuine and they respected my objections. Educators do not favor Federal controls, but they favor adequate funds, and I do too. So we agree to a great extent. Our State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Lloyd J. Andrews, has agreed with me about the danger of Federal school aid and on the basis of actual experience he has found that Federal programs always include Federal requirements and standards, which a State must accept or else it forfeits the funds. I support his stand as to the threat of Federal aid.

However, I agree if local communities shirk their responsibilities then there is no alternative—the school boards must look to other sources of income.

Out in my State recently in order to increase voter activity and obtain needed percentage of votes in a school election, voter registration campaigns have been conducted. Teams of members of eight parent-teacher association units covered shopping districts of Bothel, Woodinville and Kenmore, which is mostly in my congressional district. With registration books scheduled to close shortly, prospective voters in Northshore School District 417 were canvassed. Through the courtesy of the Aero Mechanics Union a mobile registration bus was stationed in the population centers, and PTA workers in various stores enlisted new registration. A special deputy registrar was appointed so it was not necessary for eligible voters who were not registered to go to the county official's office.

If business contributions toward advertising this drive had been deductible, the drive could have been much more effective, and of course this is only one example of where donations in behalf of community or State campaigns submitted to the electorate could increase voter response and make democracy more effective.

Here is a means of assisting local groups to inform the voters on issues. It deserves consideration.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of April 11, 1959, to constituents:

WASHINGTON REPORT
(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER)
APRIL 11, 1959.

The clash of traditional constitutional government of Federal-State prerogatives against ever-increasing Federal centralization was never better demonstrated than in the Unemployment Compensation Act of 1959, during public hearings which are now before the Ways and Means Committee. The proponents of the bill are attempting to prove the bill's stated findings that: (1) States are failing to carry out the purposes and objectives of employment stabilization and security against unemployment; (2) the benefit amounts paid aren't enough; (3) State programs vary, are not uniform in eligibility, amount, and duration of benefits. Therefore, to strengthen the economy and provide for the general welfare of the Nation, it is necessary to impose Federal standards on the States. Witnesses testifying included economists, employment experts, business representatives (mostly opposed), and AFL–CIO spokesmen, culminating this week with Mr. George Meany, AFL–CIO president.

Present law continues the original intent of leaving jurisdiction in the States. State legislatures, therefore, have each developed their programs to solve their own unemployment. Employers of four or more pay a tax generally of 3 percent on each employee's first $3,000 of income. Federal Government requires States to pay in three-tenths of 1 percent of this for Federal administrative costs. States are permitted to charge whatever tax they choose to meet their needs, although all States must extend each employer a reduced tax rate commensurate with the stability of employment in his company. This is called experience rating. In 1958, the estimated average State tax was 1.4 percent; 5 States were paying 2.7 percent, while 12 States were paying less than 1 percent. Each State maintains its own reserve fund and can borrow without interest from the Federal Government. The States have $7 billion on hand for unemployment contingencies. The legislatures are representative of the people's wishes and the present law is the result of agreement of labor and management at the State level. The very flexibility of State law matches the varying economic patterns and needs of the Nation.

So it is a matter of grave concern to me that labor leaders now attempt to brand the States as failures in this field. Should they succeed in changing the law without proving their allegations with facts, this Nation will have sustained another body blow threatening the very freedom and solvency of every citizen. Consider these facts, in relation to imposing Federal standards: (1) The employer pays all the tax, the employee nothing; (2) we are told we must force the States to broaden eligibility, to increase benefits and duration, regardless of State experience; (3) increased taxes to business means higher costs, thus higher prices to consumers. Labor leaders, therefore, would be cutting everyone's buying power in imposing arbitrary increases; (4) increased taxes and costs to business could force more labor layoff and so more unemployment; (5) the unemployed drawing benefits are over 50 percent without dependents, including seasonal workers, and family members where others in the family work, too—so it isn't the family head primarily being helped; (6) actually, we have gone beyond the area of temporary unemployment compensation and are treating welfare and relief on the one hand or the need for more jobs on the other; (7) the increased benefit wages are getting close to the worker's take-home pay; we are placing a premium on idleness and evasion of working, drawing benefits instead; (8) we are asked to forget the judgment of 7,613 State legislators; (9) the most heavily unionized areas, represented by the Detroit mayor and AFL–CIO leaders, are the ones most desiring Federal control. Having the greatest failure in providing jobs, these men plead most for unemployment compensation.

It seems it's time we tried to create new job opportunities locally—not beg for Federal control and aid. Whether new jobs or relief are needed, it's certainly not a "guaranteed annual wage" for not working. Oddly enough, that seems to be the aim, intended or not. Labor leaders want Federal control—why? So they can straitjacket the Nation? To do what they've done to Michigan—a bankruptcy of economy and ideas? No matter how sincere their intentions, leaders of the 13.5 million AFL–CIO workers cannot be allowed to run roughshod over the 67 million labor force—nor should labor leaders get by unquestioned as representatives of 13.5 million workers.

I suggested to Mr. Meany that the U.C. Federal standards would defeat his stated purposes to relieve unemployment and increase purchasing power; rather it would do the opposite. The real trouble (beyond the political power of labor leaders over Congressmen) is the Full Employment Act of 1946 which Mr. Meany admittedly likes. This act, through broad language, makes the Federal Government responsible for everyone working—this exceeds the constitutional prerogatives of Federal Government. It should be repealed.

The U.C. debate proves again the failure of some to understand, even recognize, the blessings of the constitutional balance of power between State and Federal Government, and the dangers in destroying this balance.

Westover AFB Receives SAC Management Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the 814th Air Base Group at Westover Air Force Base in Chicopee Falls, Mass., commanded by Col. Edward D. Wooten, has won the Eighth Air Force's highest award for achievement under the Strategic Air Command's Management Control System.

I want to take this opportunity to congratulate Colonel Wooten and the personnel in his command who made this distinctive award possible. Last week, Maj. Gen. Hunter Harris, Jr., the Eighth Air Force deputy commander, with headquarters at Westover AFB, presented Colonel Wooten with a shield-shaped plaque during ceremonies witnessed by Brig. Gen. Perry M. Hoisington II, Commander of the Strategic Air Command's 57th Air Division.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that the following news article printed in the Westover AFB Yankee Flyer concerning the award be included with my comments in the Appendix of the RECORD:

AIR BASE GROUP WINS EIGHTH AF AWARD FOR TOP MCS RATE

Eighth Air Force's highest award for achievement under the SAC Management Control System last week went to Westover's 814th Air Base Group.

The MCS shield-shaped plaque, bearing Eighth's famed eighth-in-the-circle opposite the command's own crest, was presented to Col. Edward D. Wooten, 814th Air Base Group commander, by Maj. Gen. Hunter Harris, Jr., Eighth's deputy commander.

Cited was the high performance achieved during the period ending December 31. The 814th finished the quarter with the highest MCS score in Eighth Air Force in SAC's Air Base Group Management Control System.

In addition to topping all Eighth Air Force Air Base Groups, the 814th was also first in the entire Strategic Air Command, competing against some 35 other SAC bases.

"Individual Diplomats From Main Street"—Address by Supreme President, Order of Ahepa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, on April 10, 1959, over one thousand Americans, members of the Order of Ahepa, sailed from New York City on the 30th annual Ahepa Excursion to Greece.

Upon their arrival in Greece, these Americans will serve as individual diplomats from Main Street, U.S.A., bringing the good will and friendship of the people of the United States to the people of Greece.

Mr. Speaker, these annual Ahepa excursions are a splendid example of President Eisenhower's people-to-people program in operation.

I am pleased to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the address of Constantine P. Verinis, supreme president of the Order of Ahepa, to the Ahepa excursionists on the eve of their departure.

The address follows:

INDIVIDUAL DIPLOMATS FROM MAIN STREET
(By C. P. Verinis, supreme president, Order of Ahepa)

"Today the country needs more individual diplomats from Main Street traveling abroad as part-time ambassadors to help build understanding as a foundation for lasting peace."

These are the words of the President of the United States, as he spoke recently at the Third National Conference on Exchange of Persons. And this statement by President Eisenhower further emphasizes and underlines the importance of his international people-to-people program.

On April 10, 1959, the Ahepa excursion to Greece will depart from New York City on board the TSS *Olympia*, of the Greek Line, with some 1,100 excursionists. The annual Ahepa excursion to Greece is now in its 30th year of existence, and has been a distinct people-to people contribution of its own since 1928.

Ahepans have been outstanding examples of individual diplomats from Main Street in their many excursion activities.

President Eisenhower has stated of the 1959 excursion to Greece: "This is a fine example of the work your organization is doing in strengthening the historic bonds which unite the citizens of our country and Greece.

"To those who are taking part in this excursion, I send a hearty bon voyage and best wishes for a pleasant and meaningful visit. I know that each one of them will be an effective ambassador in carrying to the Greek people the good will and friendship of us all," the President concluded.

The people of Greece, by meeting and exchanging views and ideas with the Ahepa Main Street excursionists who travel throughout Greece as ambassadors without portfolio, have come to understand and appreciate the genuine desire of the American for world peace. At critical moments in recent history, the people of Greece have responded by proving to us their realization of the value of our friendship and our dedicated ideals of freedom.

Grassroots diplomacy has no protocol to follow, but that of a genuine meeting between people of all nations. The Ahepa has tried to take an important part in all aspects of the creation of better understanding between the peoples of America and Greece, in accordance with the President's expressed desires, as exemplified in his people-to-people program.

In these annual Ahepa excursions to Greece, the members of Ahepa, as American citizens, have traveled and visited every village and town of historic Greece, as friend, tourist, and benefactor. The Order of Ahepa has built hospitals, medical clinics, convalescent homes, schools, and contributed greatly to the welfare and well-being of the Greek people over the past 37 years of Ahepa's existence.

Many of our members travel again to Greece this year, and they will carry with them the good wishes of all Americans, for the continued progress and welfare of our good friends, the people of Greece.

National Milk Sanitation Legislation Favored by Land O' Lakes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 23, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, delegates to the 1959 annual meeting of Land O' Lakes Creameries, Inc., Minneapolis, Minn., came out in favor of the national milk sanitation bill which I have introduced in the House. Under leave to extend my remarks, I want to include a copy of their resolution on the subject in the RECORD:

Whereas milk of superior quality is produced in many areas; and

Whereas the use of this milk for fluid consumption is sometimes limited either to regulated or unregulated markets, by the rulings of the public health officer; and

Whereas the bases for such rulings are sometimes arbitrary and open to dispute; but

Whereas in the marketing of milk, there is no procedure for the arbitration of disputes or the redress of unrealistic and arbitrary decisions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we are in favor of the passage of national milk sanitation legislation which will set up a public health standard for milk in interstate commerce applicable to all markets, and place the supervision and administration of this law in the hands of a qualified authority of the U.S. Public Health Service to be administered by existing qualified public health authorities.

It Could Be You

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial by Carl M. Davidson, editor of the Hammond, Ind., Times, reveals the economic condition of thousands of older folks in America today.

This retired businessman thought he had provided for his old age back in 1939.

The editorial follows:

[From the Hammond Times, Apr. 9, 1959]

IT COULD BE YOU

When Mr. J. J., a Lake County businessman, retired at age 65 back in 1939 he thought he had provided adequately for his old age.

Since he was self-employed, he was not eligible at that time for social security benefits, but he had saved $20,000 and thought that sum should be adequate to maintain him in comfort the rest of his life.

At the time he retired, the $1.25 restaurant breakfast of today cost 35 cents; when a large, new house could be bought for $8,000; when one of the "low priced three" cars could be purchased for around $800, and good gasoline to run it cost 18 cents a gallon.

Five years ago, Mr. J. J. found himself, as he expressed it, "sick, unwanted, and useless," and nearly flat broke. His $20,000 had dwindled down to $101.

He applied to the Lake County Department of Public Welfare for old age assistance. He is still living, 86 years old, in a nursing home, thanks to the old age assistance program. He is in good spirits, mentally alert, in better physical shape than he was 5 years ago, and able to get about fairly well.

His story, related in the 1960 budget presentation of the Lake County Department of Public Welfare, shows how even a person who has provided for his old age can be forced into a position where old age assistance is necessary.

In the first place, he had only himself to take care of, since his wife had died shortly before his retirement. On the other hand, he had no children to take care of him.

For 16 years, according to the Lake County Department of Public Welfare, he had lived on a yearly budget of about $1,250. In the 3 years before he applied for old age assistance, he had paid out more than $1,500 in hospital and medical bills.

When he noticed his savings were going, back in 1947, he took a part-time job covered by social security and as a result now receives $53 a month in old age assistance benefits.

"There are many more like Mr. J. J.," the Welfare Department's presentation points out. "The average life span after reaching age 65 is 13.6 years. In order to provide for one's retirement on the basis of this life span (it) requires at least $16,000."

This, explains the Welfare Department, is based on $100 a month income, and does not allow much for medical care "which is an inescapable item of the aged." If one lives beyond the average expectancy of 78, the $16,000 will be exhausted.

Not everyone who applies to the Welfare Department for old age assistance gets it, the department points out. It rejects about 2 out of every 5 applications, following careful investigation of each case.

This "Cure" Can Kill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, last week the AFL–CIO marched on Washington under open umbrellas, stubbornly refusing to admit that the employment skies are rapidly clearing. No one is oblivious to the plight of the remaining unemployed who are anxious to get back to work. No one should want to play politics with such human misery. By refusing to face facts squarely, by demanding massive, inflationary Federal programs which stifle full employment, labor leaders last week did no service to the cause of the jobless men and women. The Cleveland Press most effectively expressed this view in an editorial Saturday, April 11. The editorial follows:

THIS "CURE" CAN KILL

The unemployment rally just concluded in Washington has, in effect, condemned a system which has produced more than a million new jobs since March.

Speeches by both labor leaders and politicians were depression talks—overlooking the fact that there are nearly 64 million employed today, something near a record.

It's true that statistics show almost 4,500,600 unemployed, but this figure shrank by more than a third of a million in this same month.

By no means all of those listed statistically as jobless are unemployed in the sense they are hunting work and can't find it. Those temporarily incapacitated, seasonal workers, those shifting from job to job, make up a hard core of technically unemployed—some 2,500,000.

The rest—the actual jobless—are the remaining victims of last year's recession. At the present rate of recovery they have a good chance to get back to work this summer.

As long as there are substantial numbers unable to find jobs in this prosperous country, it is a matter for deep, national concern.

But frantic cures most vigorously demanded add up to just one thing—spend more Government money. Don't worry too much about what you are buying. Just spend it. This despite the fact that the Government already is spending at the rate of more than $80 billion annually and running a $13 billion deficit this year alone.

This irresponsible spending of printing press money waters down the dollar, raises living costs and was a main cause of last year's recession—a buyers' strike against exorbitant prices.

Tobacco and Our Nation's Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to commend to my colleagues an article appearing in the March issue of Tobacco News. The article to which I make reference was written by our distinguished former colleague, the Honorable James P. Richards, president of the Tobacco Institute, Inc.

I believe that all will find this article most informative and interesting. It was of particular interest to me inasmuch as the Fifth Congressional District of Maryland grows some of the finest tobacco grown in the world. Maryland's tobacco industry is over three centuries old and today brings to the farmers of the tobacco counties a sum in excess of $20 million a year.

The article follows:

INSTITUTE HEAD ASKS HALT BE CALLED ON HARASSMENT OF TRADE

(By James P. Richards)

Today the United States is doing its level best to preserve a healthy national economy as the only means, under our free system, of supporting the tremendous demands of national defense in this age of peril. It is democracy's answer to communism.

One of the foundation stones of that economy is tobacco. With its annual business of $6.1 billion, its tax yield of $2.5 billion and its total or partial support of some 17 million people (one out of ten of our population), tobacco is more important to the national welfare than at any other time in history.

We, in the tobacco growing and manufacturing States, are proud of the great contributions our product has made to the growth of America, to the support of our governments, and to the relaxation and pleasure of the people of America.

Tobacco helped to build this country. It is one of the pillars of our healthy national economy. As our oldest industry, tobacco gave our colonists their first needed cash through exports. And where there was no cash, it served as money. Throughout our history as a nation, tobacco has always been one of our most important industries.

Yet, for all of that, tobacco is not a luxury item, even though it is often a whipping boy of taxation and regulation. It is a pleasure for every man. It belongs to the worker as much as to the capitalist, to the plodder as much as to the dynamic thinker, to the housewife as much as to the breadwinner. And in this modern time when tensions are inclined to build to the breaking point, tobacco proves a mild tranquilizer that eases the strain. That is probably why more people are using tobacco today than ever before in history.

The average user probably never stops to think just why he smokes or chews tobacco. Yet, I venture to say that some of our greatest ideas were first envisioned through rings of tobacco smoke. From the long clay pipes and pinches of snuff of our Founding Fathers, to Grant's stogie, Roosevelt's cigarettes, MacArthur's corncob, Steinmetz's stubby cigar, and Churchill's panatella, tobacco symbols have been identified with greatness. Well-filled ashtrays dot every board of directors' table of industry. Many great writers spin their stories through wisps of smoke.

These are some of the reasons it distresses me to find tobacco harassed by new moves to burden its users with disproportionate taxes and a renewal of centuries-old "scare" attacks.

ONE-HALF GOES FOR TAXES

Today, the smoker pays an average of about one-half of the price of a package of cigarettes in taxes. And the trend of taxation is still upward in many States and municipalities. The rash of publicity given to statistical efforts to link tobacco use with health impairment is stirring up anti-tobacco zealots to push for legislation leading toward abolishing tobacco use. Not liking or using tobacco themselves, these crusaders have decided that others should not enjoy the solace of tobacco.

The antecedents of today's anti-tobacco crusaders have threaded through 300 years of our history. They used to rant that tobacco would "grow hair on women" and it would "make men bald." It would "pauperize the workingman" and it would cause people who used it to "fall in the scale of nations." It would "stunt our growth." As our country is proof, none of these dire predictions has come true. But now the attacks against tobacco have returned. And the charge now is that they are contributing to the early death rate of its users. And this comes at a time when the longevity of our people is higher than it has ever been—nearly 30 years longer today than it was in 1900, before cigarettes became popular.

The big difference between the earlier attacks and those of today is that our modern means of mass communication carry the charges instantly to all points of the compass. The questions and the doubts and the answers of scientists never quite catch up with the lurid charges. But the charges still lack any acceptable proof.

Isn't it about time that we put the brakes on these harassments? The American people need to be reminded of the facts about tobacco, about its place in our culture, our history, our economy, and about its good citizenship as an industry—from the 800,000 tobacco farm families to the friendly retailers everywhere who serve their customers?

After all, it is the people themselves who have raised tobacco to its high estate. The major proportion of our adult population enjoys tobacco products in one form or another—and would like to continue to do so.

I do not think anyone should be penalized for indulging in this pleasure. And I don't think all the millions of people who derive their livelihood by supplying tobacco should be penalized by discriminatory taxation or other restrictive measures.

Moreover, we should not forget that tobacco is supplying rich red corpuscles to the economic bloodstream of the Nation in a critical period of our history, and that enough taxes are paid on tobacco annually to cover more than the entire expenses of the State, Post Office, Commerce, Interior, and Justice Departments for a full year.

Hon. Walter S. Robertson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, "dedicated public servant" is an overworked phrase, but I believe there is a broad bipartisan agreement that it describes aptly the Hon. Walter S. Robertson, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs.

It is a matter of sincere regret to his many friends that Mr. Robertson, for reasons of health, has been obliged to tender his resignation, and it is their prayer that relief from the tensions of his heavy diplomatic duties will restore him rapidly to full salubrity.

Mr. Robertson's relinquishment of his responsibilities in the Department of State will remove from the implementation of our foreign policy the services of a conscientious observer and negotiator of highest competence. The replacement of his skill and experience will be most difficult.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include editorial comment:

[From the Staunton Leader, Apr. 9, 1959]

Assistant Secretary of State Walter S. Robertson, who has just resigned, will be remembered in Staunton for one of the most notable addresses during the Woodrow Wilson Centennial celebrations. Those who have followed our policies and actions in Far Eastern affairs know him for his firm, brilliant handling of our relations in that field, in which he was the State Department's specialist.

This distinguished Richmonder's resignation means a severe loss to the Nation, but he has served beyond the call of duty and needs to mend his health. The Richmond Times-Dispatch appropriately observes: "It is seldom that a public official goes out of office with as many tributes to his ability, his dedication and his integrity as those which are being heard" for Mr. Robertson. His hometown newspaper makes further comments, which reflect nationwide opinion. Too much cannot be said about this statesman's fine service and personal qualities. To quote the Times-Dispatch:

Walter Robertson's steadfast and unyielding determination to fight Red China with all the power he possesses, is now seen by practically everybody to have been the right policy. That country's brutal and cynical attack on Tibet has opened the eyes of those who for years were inclined to pooh-pooh Mr. Robertson's clear-sighted realism as "narrowness" or "fanaticism." Even Nehru of India has had his eyes opened * * *.

All these qualities were needed, as Walter Robertson battled for years against a clique in Washington and throughout the country which was trying to undermine his adamant opposition to Red China and his unyielding support of the Nationalist Chinese on Formosa. What made his struggle doubly exhausing were the recurring ulcers which have plagued him intermittently since he took his present post in 1953 * * *.

He says he wouldn't be resigning now, despite his health problem, were he not convinced that there will be no yielding in Washington to Communist China.

[From the Richmond Times-Dispatch, Apr. 8, 1959]

It is seldom that a public official goes out of office with as many tributes to his ability, his dedication and his integrity as those which is being heard for Walter S. Robertson, of Richmond.

Mr. Robertson's announcement last week of his retirement as Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, effective July 1, would have been noted ere this in these columns, but for the urgent and pressing necessity for extended comment on the Perrow Commission's report and Governor Almond's message dealing therewith.

Walter Robertson's steadfast and unyielding determination to fight Red China with all the power he possesses, is now seen by practically everybody to have been the right policy. That country's brutal and cynical attack on Tibet has opened the eyes of those who for years were inclincd to pooh-pooh Mr. Robertson's clear-sighted realism as "narrowness" or "fanaticism." Even Nehru of India has had his eyes opened.

Columnist William S. White, one of the keenest observers in Washington, paid a glowing tribute to Mr. Robertson in this newspaper yesterday and David Lawrence called him in yesterday's News Leader "truly one of the great public servants of our time." Marquis Childs, who is as liberal a columnist as Lawrence is conservative, wrote last September that "the administration's policy on China is embodied in one man" (Mr. Robertson), and paid admiring tribute to his "skill, intense conviction and unflagging persistence."

All these qualities were needed, as Walter Robertson battled for years against a clique in Washington and throughout the country which was trying to undermine his adamant opposition to Red China and his unyielding support of the Nationalist Chinese on Formosa. What made his struggle doubly exhausting were the recurring ulcers which have plagued him intermittently since he took his present post in 1953.

A less dedicated man would have given up long ago and returned to Richmond, where he could work a normal eight-hour day, instead of remaining at his desk in Washington 12 or 14 hours a day, usually 6 and often 7 days a week.

He says he wouldn't be resigning now, despite his health problem, were he not convinced that there will be no yielding in Washington to Communist China. His confidence in this regard is reassuring, for with Secretary of State Dulles seriously ailing, and Acting Secretary Herter apparently scheduled to take over, many wondered if the policy toward Red China would be as strong as ever. Apparently it will.

This should make it possible for Mr. Robertson to return to Richmond and regain his health, sure in the knowledge that the policy for which he fought so ably—and despite such physical handicaps—has at last been vindicated before the world. The Red Chinese butcheries in Tibet have made that vindication certain.

[From the Lynchburg News, Apr. 8, 1959]

WALTER ROBERTSON STEPS DOWN

Elsewhere on today's page William S. White, our Washington correspondent, writes with some regret that Walter S. Robertson, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, has decided to return to private life. Mr. Robertson is a Richmonder, so every Virginian can join in expressing regret with Mr. White.

In the Far East Mr. Robertson's principal concern, of course, was Communist China and, to a large measure, Mr. Robertson was responsible for the U.S. firm policy of nonrecognition. He helped draft many of Secretary of State Dulles' speeches setting forth this Nation's Red China policy.

On June 28, 1957, Secretary Dulles delivered a major foreign policy address entitled "Our Policies Toward Communism in China." It was an excellent speech, clear, complete, unequivocal, and Walter Robertson, we understand, had a big hand in its preparation.

Then on August 11, 1958, as sentiment for recognizing Red China again swept the world, the State Department issued a memorandum to its missions abroad. One may safely assume that Walter Robertson was its principal author. Speaking of Chinese Communist leaders, this memorandum stated:

"Their primary purpose is to extend the Communist revolution beyond their borders to the rest of Asia and thence to the rest of the world."

Prophetically, now that the world has witnessed recent events in Tibet, this memorandum warned:

"Chinese Communist leaders have shown by their words and their acts that they are not primarily interested in promoting the welfare of their people while living at peace with their neighbors."

If it is with regret that Virginians must greet the news of Walter Robertson's stepping down from public office because of his health to a more tranquil civilian life, it is also with a warm sense of pride that we can commend him on a most difficult job done exceptionally well.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 13, 1959]

MR. ROBERTSON TO LEAVE

Few officials in postwar Government service have been as single-mindedly dedicated to fighting the spread of communism in Asia as has Walter S. Robertson. Since 1953, the Richmond banker has been Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs—a post he is relinquishing on July 1. It was a decade earlier, however, that Mr. Robertson first became acquainted with the Pacific area as lend-lease administrator in Australia and, in 1945, as Minister and Counselor for Economic Affairs in our Embassy in Chungking. It was in the latter assignment that he formulated his uncompromising position that American policy must be directed unequivocally toward resisting Communist power and influence in China.

As Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Robertson has applied this policy most notably in his unwavering support for the Chinese Nationalist Government of Chiang Kai-shek, in opposing every move for admission of Communist China to the United Nations and in resisting any proposed relaxation of our position of nonrecognition of the Peiping government. He has, at the same time, employed his close personal friendship with Chiang and with President Syngman Rhee, Korea, to persuade them to modify policies which might have led to a military showdown with the Chinese Reds. And he has applied himself to the duties of a difficult position with a loyalty and depth of conviction that won the respect of his State Department colleagues.

Fair Trade—Legalized Price Fixing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Sunday Herald which points out that fair trade will hurt 175 million people for the benefit of manufacturers—and allegedly the retailers, too, although they may perish by their own hand in giving the manufacturers such control of their merchandising:

[From the Boston Sunday Herald, Mar. 15, 1959]

LEGALIZED PRICE FIXING

Again Congress is being called upon to decide between all the people and some special interests. This time the issue is fair trade, the device by which manufacturers are given legal sanction to fix retail prices on trademarked goods.

This week the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee will hold hearings on two bills which would, for the first time, establish fair trade as a Federal law, thus overriding even those States that have consistently rejected the system for themselves.

Fair trade is anti-consumer. It is promoted largely by certain retail groups which are interested in establishing the same fixed profit margins in as many lines as possible for all stores.

The fair trade backers insist that they have the interest of the consumer at heart; that they merely seek to prevent cut-throat competition and loss-leader practices which are said to be harmful to the consumer. But their insistence has a hollow ring.

Low prices do not hurt consumers very often, and it is pretty hard to prove otherwise.

Price fixing, however, in the particular interest of the retailer, can hurt.

Let's say a particular trademarked product can be sold by Retailer A for a dollar less than the price Retailer B must get. This doesn't mean cutthroat competition. It may mean that Retailer A has a cash-and-carry store on a back street with the simplest of furnishings and a minimum of service, while Retailer B supplies all sorts of services, with every sale in gracious and attractive surroundings.

Fair trade would deny the consumer the cash savings obtainable by trading with Retailer A. It would end price competition at the retail level.

But this is not the only drawback. The manufacturer is likely to believe that the larger the profit he gives to the retailers (within reason), the greater will be the effort made by these retailers to push his product. So the fair trade fixed price may prove to be even more than enough to assure Retailer B his extra dollar.

So the consumer suffers even more.

As a matter of fact, fair trade price fixing is likely to encourage bootlegging to favored customers at below the marked price. It will encourage more firms to enter retailing until the falling volumes of sales for all retailers will nullify the profits guaranteed by fair trade. Even the retailers themselves will find fair trade no help.

But the straight moral issue is whether Congress is to serve 175 million people or the misguided interests of a few groups of retailers. Unfortunately, the loudest noise in Washington next week will be made by the latter.

Statement of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce on Mutual Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit the excellent and well considered statement of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce on mutual security presented to the House Foreign Affairs Committee by Attorney William C. Culbertson, former U.S. Ambassador to Chile, and Dr. J. Warren Nystrom, manager, international relations department, U.S. Chamber of Commerce on April 13, 1959. The Chamber of Commerce of the United States describes itself:

The national chamber is the voice of business. It is the organization through which business as a whole expresses itself—to let the public and the Government know where business stands on national issues, and the reasons, working creatively in the public interest and for the good of business, representing 3,450 business organizations with an underlying membership of 2,500,000 businessmen in 49 States.

The statement follows:

My name is William S. Culbertson. I am a member of the law firm of Culbertson & Pendleton, Washington, D.C. In the past I have served as a member and Vice Chairman of the U.S. Tariff Commission and have had the honor of representing the United States as its Ambassador to Chile.

Today, I appear on behalf of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States to present its views on the administration's proposed mutual security program for the fiscal year 1960. I am a member of the chamber's foreign policy committee and am chairman of that committee's subcommittee on mutual security.

The national chamber has endorsed the principle of mutual security repeatedly since inception of the program. Today the expanding capability of the Soviet bloc to apply military, political, and economic pressures against the free world gives renewed urgency to support of the program's broad purposes.

Our views are summarized in the following statement approved by our board of directors last January:

"Congress should support the mutual security program as an instrument of U.S. foreign policy dedicated to the purposes of (a) promoting the security and foreign policy objectives of the United States; (b) increasing the security of our allies; (c) assisting in the development of economic resources and higher living standards for the peoples of the free world; and (d) encouraging the growth of stable governments and political freedom in lesser developed countries."

This does not mean that the chamber endorses, without question, every phase of a particular mutual security program or proposed level of spending.

In the interest of improving the effectiveness of foreign aid as an instrument of American foreign policy, our board has said:

"Congress should enact whatever legislation is necessary to insure: that the returns are commensurate with the costs; that the capacities of free enterprise are utilized to the utmost; that military assistance to our allies is included in the annual appropriations of the Department of Defense."

The national chamber makes the following recommendations, which are based on our most recent studies:

1. The administration's appropriation request of $3,929,995,000 for the fiscal 1960 program should be reduced by $288,995,000 to $3,641,000,000.

This recommendation affects the following phases of the proposed program: Military assistance; defense support; contingency fund; and the broad category termed "Special Assistance and Other Programs."

Specifically, we recommend:

(a) That the appropriation request of $1,600,000,000 for military assistance be reduced by $85,000,000 to $1,515,000,000;

(b) That the request of $835,000,000 for defense support be reduced by $85,000,000 to $750,000,000;

(c) That the request for $200,000,000 for the contingency fund be reduced by $45,000,000 to $155,000,000; and

(d) That the request of $383,995,000 for "Special Assistance and Other Programs" be be reduced by $73,995,000 to $310,000,000.

Our recommended figures for military assistance, defense support, and the contingency fund are the same as the amounts appropriated for these categories last year. We are not convinced, on the basis of studies and available information, that the amounts should be increased this year.

Similarly, we do not believe that all of the requested increase in the broad category termed "Special Assistance and Other Programs" is necessary. Funds appropriated for this category last year totaled $306,592,500. Our recommendation of $310,000,000 would still give the administration $3,407,500 more for the purposes of this category than it received last year.

We believe that the amounts recommended above would be adequate to support the foreign policy of the United States. More money for mutual security might tend to encourage lavish spending and the kind of waste outlined in the recent interim report of your subcommitee. On the other hand, more drastic curtailments in the mutual security program, particularly in military assistance, would present the United States with highly undesirable alternatives. The most important of these would be the need for much larger and more costly U.S. standing forces than are now contemplated. That, in turn, would require a substantial increase in the number of involuntary inductions into the Armed Forces and overseas duty for much larger numbers of American troops.

2. Military assistance appropriations should be made to the Department of Defense, as a separately identified part of the Department of Defense budget.

The basic structure of the Nation's security program is no longer built upon U.S. forces alone. The defense resources of the free nations have been integrated in order to provide the greatest degree of economy and efficiency in achieving maximum security against aggression. The military assistance program is merely one part of the total preparedness effort of the United States. Therefore, when considering funds for these purposes, Congress should review all aspects of the Nation's defense program—including those for military assistance—as a whole.

The present appropriations system creates unnecessary administrative difficulties, particularly in budget and accounting processes. In addition, it results in questionable procedures within Congress when requests for defense funds are reviewed each year.

For example, our recommendation would make it easier for the House Appropriations Committee to evaluate the annual military assistance appropriation request. We can find no justification for having the House Appropriations Defense Subcommittee pass judgment on the President's request for billions in funds for major defense procurement, while another subcommittee independently considers a request for funds for the same purpose, to be programed and spent by the same people, the only different being that the equipment purchased will be sent abroad instead of used by our own troops.

3. Congress should support the Development Loan Fund on condition that it serves to (a) foster the eventual and meaningful shift from purely government-to-government dealings in the economic development of the less developed countries; (b) to provide a basis for long-range planning of projects essential to the efficient conduct of U.S. assistance to other countries; and (c) aid in the creation of basic economic development and economic stability within the less developed countries which will, in turn, promote greater private capital investment and enterprise.

In reviewing this matter last January, the chamber's board of directors stated:

"Before additional obligational authority is approved for the Development Loan Fund, however, assurance should be had that knowledgeable and competent personnel will continue to administer thhe Fund; that full and effective coordination with other governmental agencies and private lending organizations will be endorsed, and that the stated objective of fostering the role of private capital investment and enterprise be strictly adhered to; and in view of the unusual nature of these loans, that consideration in each instance will be given as to the effect of the proposed project on the American economy."

4. Programs of economic and technical assistance should be designed to provide realistic benefits to the United States as well as to the recipient countries.

We believe that these programs should assume neither the aspect of a welfare project nor that of an attempt to outbid the dubious offers of the Soviet Union. In order to add to the overall strength of the free world, their prime purpose should be to help the recipient nations in their efforts to attain stability.

Because the funds that the United States can dedicate to economic assistance are necessarily limited, the end objective of these programs should be to assist countries so that they themselves, by their own remedial actions, can reduce or eliminate the the causes which create the need for outside assistance.

The amount of capital that can be productively invested in a given time in the less-developed countries also is limited. Illadvised or precipitous forcing of industrialization of areas where conditions are not conducive to constructive and effective absorption of development capital should be avoided. To obtain optimum development in the less developed nations, encouragement should be given to private enterprise, rather than to Government projects.

5. When the appropriation request for mutual security is first submitted to the Congress in the Federal budget, a detailed breakdown of the request by specific activities should be provided.

We can see no reason why the administration's request for mutual security consists of little more than a lump-sum figure when the Federal budget is submitted to the Congress in January.

Public acceptance of the mutual security program is dependent on public under-

standing. Such understanding is not fostered when there is a delay of several months in providing the public and the Congress with complete information concerning the proposed program.

The committee may recall that in our testimony last year, we urged that more information concerning the mutual security program be furnished when the Federal budget is made public in January. We were heartened when Congressman HARDY submitted an amendment to the Mutual Security Act requiring the President to submit to the Congress on or before January 10 of each year a report detailing the assistance to be provided for the next fiscal year and containing a clear and detailed explanation of the method by which the proposed levels of aid for each country have been arrived at. It was disappointing to us when the Congress failed to adopt this amendment.

We urge the Congress to insist that the administration furnish the public complete information when a new mutual security program is first proposed. It is especially important during this period of international tension that there be no delay in keeping the Congress and the public as fully and accurately informed as possible.

6. The resources of free enterprise should be utilized to an increasing degree in carrying out the purposes of the mutual security program and in countering the Communist bloc's economic warfare.

Because free enterprise is the best way to achieve and sustain beneficial economic development, Congress should encourage expanded private investment and the buildup of foreign private economies. In this way private investment, coupled with a healthy and growing international commerce, may eventually replace tax-supported economic aid.

We recognize that there are many obstacles to increased private investment in the less-developed countries. These include the growth of ideologies favoring State ownership and control of industry, political instability, extreme nationalism, economic difficulties involving trade and exchange controls, and deep-rooted suspicion of private enterprise. All these facts are being exploited and aggravated by enemies of the United States.

To overcome such obstacles, the United States needs a clear, active and consistent national policy with respect to the protection of American citizens and business interests, including investments in productive and distributive facilities in foreign countries. Such a policy should be actively implemented through treaties and agreements with other countries. Congress could do much to further the objectives of the Mutual Security Act by insisting that these agreements include firm and clear-cut assurances of fair and nondiscriminatory treatment for existing and future investments.

Whatever other actions Congress may consider to stimulate the flow of private capital abroad and to improve the investment climate, it is of fundamental importance that such efforts be buttressed by an imaginative and dynamic information campaign in support of the principles of free enterprise.

We recognize that much is already being done in this field through the U.S. Information Agency. At the same time, a recent survey the National Chamber made of the Agency's operations overseas discloses an urgent need for more effective efforts to explain to foreign peoples the nature of free enterprise and its achievements. The results of that survey, along with a number of recommendations, were presented to the State, Justice and Judiciary Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee on March 18, 1959.

Free enterprise in the United States contributes directly, not only to the welfare and progress of our own country but, through sizable investment abroad, to that of other countries. Continual publicity, therefore, should be given to the true and important facts about the contributions which private investment makes to the improvement of many less-developed nations throughout the world.

In this way our various private economic activities abroad can be joined with the larger battle for the minds of men. By demonstrating that free enterprise can do an effective job in the field of economic development, we not only help to dispel distrust and misunderstanding of the free enterprise system abroad, but do much to win local support in foreign countries for the free as opposed to the totalitarian way of life.

The Communist-dominated countries seldom pass up an opportunity to promote the Communist ideology among the world's new and lesser developed nations. All Soviet so-called aid is extended on a government-to-government basis. State control and direction as contrasted to individual initiative is continually stressed and extolled.

We should not hesitate to demonstrate and explain the virtues of the free enterprise system among people who have recently achieved independence. Seeking out and extending loans to responsible, public-spirited businessmen may be a more difficult task than government-to-government loans, but the growth of a stable and responsible private business is a mortal blow to Communist ideology. We should plant the seeds of a free enterprise system in these countries.

In summary, the national chamber supports the principles of the mutual security program and recommends that it be continued. Adoption of the foregoing recommendations will not only save approximately $289 million but should, by encouraging the prudent administration of funds, result in a more efficient and effective program.

Minutes Don't Measure Events

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I would like to include in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Minutes Don't Measure Events," which appeared in the Phoenix Gazette, Phoenix, Ariz., March 18, 1959:

MINUTES DON'T MEASURE EVENTS

A declaration of war could be processed through Congress in 2 or 3 hours. A housewife might need 4 hours to get her laundry done. The Federal Communications Commission does not need to go much further than it has gone to conclude that the housewife deserves more time than the declaration of war on television news broadcasts.

The FCC ruled recently that newscasters in Chicago had to give equal attention to an inconsequential political candidate as to two major candidates. It wasn't a question of equal free or paid time for a political broadcast. It was a matter of telling the newscasters they had to train their cameras as much on someone who didn't count as on someone who did.

Lar Daly was the man who didn't count. He seems always to be running for something in Chicago. Most recently it was for mayor, on both Republican and Democratic tickets. Everyone knew he was just in there for the exercise, and very little of that. The fight was betwen Democratic Mayor Richard Daley and Republican ex-Congressman Timothy Sheehan. Public interest was on them. The outcome of the election depended on what these two did. Reporters and newscasters wrote and talked on that basis.

Then on February 19 the FCC ruled that the newscasters, specifically on WBBM–TV, had to give Lar Daly equal attention in their news broadcasts. It was the first ruling of its kind ever made, and we hope it is the last in America. It was as if some overreaching bureaucracy, claiming jurisdiction because telegraph lines run between States, had tried to tell American newspapers that they had to print as many inches of news in the 1956 campaign about a Mugwump candidate as about the Eisenhower-Stevenson contest.

The FCC relied for its ruling on section 315 of the Federal Communications Act. This is the section providing that if one candidate buys time or is given time on radio or television, his opponent may demand equal time. It was intended to govern campaigning, not to establish censorship of reporters who are not campaigning at all, but are merely reporting the news or picturing it. The ruling stretched commonsense outrageously. It misused the law dangerously.

Dr. Frank Stanton, president of Columbia Broadcasting Ssystem, Inc., spoke of the ruling in Chicago last week. He noted that the decision "addresses itself, with deadly effect, to the use of television as journalism." He noted that it "spawns a monstrous idea in a democratic society—the idea that quantitative mechanics are more important than the qualitative considerations".

Dr. Stanton said that in the last presidential campaign some time on virtually every newscast from Labor Day to election day was devoted to the campaign. Under the Lar Daly decision, television would have been required to give equivalent time to reporting the activities of 24 presidential and vice presidential candidates of 12 parties. How ridiculous can a Federal Commission get when it tries to control news with a clock?

A bill has been introduced in Congress by Representative GLENN CUNNINGHAM to protect news programs from abuse under "equal time" provisions of the Federal Communications Act. The bill is H.R. 5389. It should be passed immediately.

The question is not one of granting rights or privileges to television. It is one of denying bureaucracy the power to measure the news the public gets, even in small doses. Every attempt to seize such power must be resisted.

American Diplomacy in Sports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, about 2 weeks ago a plane touched down at La Guardia Airport bringing back from Paris an important American diplomatic mission. The leading member of the mission did not wear striped pants or carry a briefcase. In fact, the leader of this good-will group was a lovely young lady. She had spent 10 days in the important European capitals involved in

the present tense situation, but she had not appeared at a conference table or in front of a lecture during her tour. In Berlin, in Paris, in Geneva, she had gone directly to the people with a simple message of human understanding and light and hope from the United States. Her name is Carol E. Heiss. She is the world ladies' figure skating champion.

I do not mean to treat the present difficult world situation lightly when I speak of Carol as an instrument of American diplomacy. This young lady, who represents the best of the spirit and skill of amateur sport, speaks to the people of the world in a common language of art and athletic skill that can help to bridge the gap built by misunderstanding between the citizens of different countries. Along with other amateur athletes who take part in trips and exhibition tours to other countries, she helps to prove that the interests that unite people throughout the world will prove, in the end, stronger than the interests that divide them. And at the same time, by developing habits of mind for peaceful competition and fair play, great athletes like Carol Heiss bring to life the famous words: "On the playing fields of our land are sown the seeds that, on other fields, on other days, will bear the fruits of victory."

There are a number of reasons that ice skating and Carol Heiss should be specially chosen as a model diplomatic courier for our Nation. One of them is that skating is a universal sport, not only because its techniques and rules spread uniformly to all countries, including those behind the Iron Curtain, but because it is a sport which can be participated in and enjoyed by persons of all ages and all classes. It is a sport where the premium is on the difficult virtues of patience, control, consistency, and sportsmanship. I speak from experience, because my own tentative attempts to figure skate have taught me both the perils and pleasures of the sport. I also have had the pleasure of knowing Carol Heiss and have admired her not only for her achievement but for her unassuming charm and warmth of character.

Ice skating offers the attraction of speaking in the same language in any country, and Carol Heiss holds unchallenged sway as its leading interpreter. Those who have seen her skate never forget the soaring mastery, the perfect precision of her performances. All this has come from patience and dogged determination, the two great requirements of any athlete. She has fought her way to this pinnacle of art and skill against great odds. Born the daughter of a baker in New York City, she and her family have known the sacrifices which are necessary to train the raw skill of a little girl into the grace of a champion. For 12 years, 5:30 in the morning has meant rising time for Carol; and even as champion, she spends 4 or more hours a day on the ice, both to maintain her rank and to help improve the technique and art of the sport for future champions. After years of this regimen of work, when only 16, she captured the coveted world figure-skating title in 1956, at Garmisch-Partenkirchen in Austria, and she has successfully defended it three times since. In Colorado Springs, Colo., in February of this year, she outskated all the competition again to secure her fourth world crown.

Only one new laurel still remains open to Carol, and it is the symbol of world brotherhood through sport that she embodies so well. The five linked rings of the Olympic games will fly from a flag at Squaw Valley, Calif., just a year from now. At the Olympic Village, athletes of all nations, from East and West, from the farthest reaches of Scandinavia to the villages of Africa, white, black, brown, and yellow, will meet together to speak through strength, skill, and beauty universal language that always unites man. Among those athletes will be skaters from many lands, who will give Carol battle for the prize that every champion hopes for. This will be the great test of her diplomatic skill, and of her ability to carry this country's message, through herself, and her skates, from a humble home in America to all the world. We wish Carol good luck on this most difficult mission.

The Extreme Urgency of a Realistic Urban Renewal Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, we will soon be considering on the House floor the housing and urban renewal bill, which is designed to assist local governments to eliminate slums, eradicate blight, and to renew our Nation's cities.

No thinking person can deny that the United States has progressed from a rural to an urban Nation at a phenominal rate of speed. Even with our suburbias we are still essentially a nation of city dwellers. I do not intend to review all of the facets of urban expansion today, but I do want to emphasize the need for a vast and realistic program of urban renewal.

The two substantial factors in this expansion process have been, first, population growth; and second, the migration of population and industry. The problems created by this growth and resettlement are of a scope which could not be predicted by even the most expert of population analysts. New industries, urban sprawl, and highways have diminished available space. Substandard residential areas are becoming more and more prevalent in our suburbs, our larger cities, and our smaller townships. In this, the space age, we cannot afford to develop an age of less space, nor can we condone less than the highest attainable economic use of all available space.

A recent editorial appearing in a Washington newspaper warned against the apparent indifference to the gobbling up of our great open spaces in the face of a growing population which bids fair to reach 200 million in less than 10 years hence. The editorial noted:

> The simple fact is that the country cannot absorb 25 million additional inhabitants every 8 years without careful planning on the one hand or chaotic consequences on the other.

Recent history should make it clear to all concerned that efficient planning, rural and urban, is a must if we are to save our blighted cities, and preserve our rich farmlands and other natural resources and create desirable future cities. Time and again we have read and heard the warnings against the creation of rural slums and against haphazard growth of large cities. We must furnish our communities with every possible tool for orderly development and necessary redevelopment.

The Housing Act of 1959 which will soon be before us contains many of these needed tools. This act consists of provisions for several programs which are aimed at stimulating home construction—public and private—and the improvement of housing standards, chief among these are proposals for expanded and continued urban renewal aids. It is for these vital urban renewal tools that I am urging your support today. Through this program we have helped cities to help themselves, by clearing slums, by removing blight, and preventing further deterioration. Only through an adequate, continuing program of Federal aid can we help meet the needs of the cities and townships of the Nation in their efforts to halt blight; and only through planning can we hope to prevent a recurrence of the run-down conditions which currently necessitate such a program.

The House bill also provides for an effective housing program to meet the special housing needs of our senior citizens. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that the first housing project—Highland Gardens Apartments—for elderly persons in the United States under the Federal program was constructed last year in Somerville, Mass., which is a part of my Eighth Congressional District. The success of this project proves that we need more of this type of housing. I am, therefore, very pleased that the House bill provides for a new program designed to provide rental housing for elderly persons at rentals which they can afford.

There are those who argue that urban renewal is not a problem of the Federal Government, that it is a local problem, to be solved by local government and local private enterprise. I am in complete agreement with this. The Federal program under title I of the 1949 Housing Act is based upon this very premise. Urban renewal programs are initiated, planned and executed locally. The Federal Government shares the cost of the project—that is, the difference between the cost of the cleared land and the price offered by the developers. This sharing with the local government is on a two-thirds Federal, one-third local basis. Each step taken by the local government is subject to Federal approval based upon the proper and effi-

cient operation of the basic law. I am sure we are all agreed that in any instance in which Federal aid is granted, an accounting of the use of funds is not only necessary, but desirable. I do not agree, however, that the Federal Government should not render assistance.

It is obvious that the local units do, and should, bear the brunt of the responsibility for planning and execution of urban renewal projects. But, this does not mean that it is solely a local problem. Urban renewal and redevelopment, the clearance of slums, are undeniably and clearly a part of a national problem to provide a decent home and suitable living environment for each and every American family. Urban renewal will play a large part in stemming the rise of juvenile delinquency. Federal urban renewal aids are investments in better families, better citizens and better communities. These are investments which will return dividends in higher national income, and increased sources of revenue for local, State and Federal Governments. These are investments which, if neglected, can result in economic and social retrogression in place of progress.

Currently, the urban renewal program is moving along at a reasonably rapid pace. Testimony at hearings of the Committees on Banking and Currency, and other published data have revealed that one of the reasons for some of the lack of interest in this field was that many communities were reluctant to launch into the projects because they were afraid that Federal aid would not remain available. Cities were acutely aware of the need for renewal and the prevention of further deterioration, but they did not feel that such a financial venture was within their means. Since the program has taken on a air of permanency, more and more communities, large and small, have availed themselves of the various aids which are a part of the Federal urban renewal program. Should the Congress fail in providing a well-rounded, fully adequate program for the next several years to come we will be sorely remiss in our duty to maintain economic stability.

Albert M. Cole, former Housing Administrator, predicted in 1958 that "any city that does not set in motion by 1960 a comprehensive program to halt blight will be flirting with municipal ruin by 1965." Now is the time to guard against municipal ruin by 1965, 1975, or 25 years hence. Now is the time for the Federal Government, through the Congress, to provide our municipalities with the necessary financial and planning guidance which will assist them in their fight against decay and deterioration and help them in the provision of healthy, sound communities. We cannot afford a lapse in our support of this worthwhile program such as occurred in the failure to pass a Housing Act of 1958. The 85th Congress was the first Congress in several years not to rally to the support of our communities in their war against stagnation and retrogression. We cannot let this happen in the 86th Congress. I for one, shall do everything in my power to see that a meaningful urban renewal program is forthcoming.

What would constitute such a program? First, and foremost, the urban renewal authorization must be adequate to assure the continuation of the urban renewal program at a sufficiently high level to avoid any curtailment or postponement of urban renewal projects contemplated. In addition, it must not bar the applications of cities which for one reason or another, have not completely set in motion their urban renewal plans. It would seem to me that an adequate measure could be no less than the program provided by the house bill. This bill provides for a total authorization of approximately $2.1 billion. Under this bill $500 million would be available for urban renewal grants in each of the next 3 years. It would also increase relocation payments to relieve the hardship suffered by families and businesses displaced from urban renewal areas by government activity. An additional $10 million would also be provided for urban planning grants. Under this bill all communities would be provided with incentive to move forward with needed projects. Under this bill the Federal Government, the local government, and local private enterprise could work together, cooperatively, to assure all citizens a livable home in desirable surroundings. Under this bill, some of our unemployment problems will be erased through an increase in construction volume. Under this bill, we could assure healthy national, State, and local economies. Realistic Federal urban renewal will preserve tax values, stimulate private industry and thereby increase our tax returns.

Mr. Speaker, if a program of this magnitude is enacted into law it will provide hundreds of communities across the Nation, including my Eighth Congressional District of Massachusetts, with reasonable assurance of the availability of adequate funds so that the urban renewal program will continue to be carried out. This program, it seems to me, is one that we all should promote as having the highest priority of a forward looking program for the benefit of all the United States.

German Reunification and the Cold War—an Article by Prof. Georg Stadtmuller

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. CARROLL REECE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in these days when the eyes of the world are turned to Germany as the center of a push-pull cold war between the Western World and the Communist nations I believe it would be well to look into the problem from the viewpoint of the West German people.

Prof. Georg Stadtmuller, professor of Modern European History of the University of Munich, is an able writer on Germany and the history of southeastern Europe. He speaks with great authority. Writing in the January issue of Free World Forum he has brought into focus the many problems we face whenever German reunification is discussed.

I am pleased to ask that his article be printed in the RECORD in order that the Members of Congress and all America might have the benefit of this historical background and his experienced views on the future of this great and important part of Europe:

GERMAN REUNIFICATION AND THE COLD WAR
(By Prof. Georg Stadtmuller)

The foremost aim of West German foreign policy remains the restoration of German unity. Any discussion of German reunification must be based on a sober recognition of the circumstances created by the events of 1945. Only then will we be able to realize the difficulties which stand or seem to stand in the way of a German reunification policy. These difficulties are so numerous and tremendous that the realization of German unity seems almost impossible at the present. We know, however, that one way to achieve it does exist. We could be reunited tomorrow if we were willing to recognize the political rule of Moscow over Germany. Under such conditions, reunification would pose no further problems, but would be followed very soon by the unification of all of Western Europe under Moscow's suzerainty. We are, however, unwilling to pay this price.

Is there another way to achieve German reunification? Can we overcome by other means the unnatural partition of the German nation?

GERMANIA EST DIVISA IN TRES PARTES

Since 1945 Germany has been divided into three parts: (1) The main part of the country in the west which was consolidated into the state of the Federal Republic of Germany with a constitutional order that has applied the painful lessons of the failure of the Weimar Republic; (2) the Soviet Russian occupation zone which calls itself the German Democratic Republic (DDR) within which lies isolated the divided city of Berlin, a sorry reflection of the present German fate; and (3) the German areas east of the Oder and Neisse Rivers which, transferred to Polish administration by a unilateral action of Russion power politics, later sanctioned by the Potsdam agreement in August 1945, have become the stage for those barbaric expulsions resulting in the virtual disappearance of the German population from these provinces.

The events preceding the partition of Germany are well known. The administrative division of defeated and occupied Germany was based on the community of interests of the four, then allied powers who united themselves into a military coalition against Hitler Germany. History teaches that alliances of divergent partners, concluded for the purpose of destroying a common enemy, usually survive only until the day of common victory. This old maxim of history was also proved in 1945.

The conferences of Teheran (November 1943), Yalta (February 1945), and Potsdam (August 1945) resulted in certain agreements concluded among the Allied Powers. They foresaw first a division of Germany into three, later into four, zones and its administration through an interallied control council in Berlin. The tug-of-war between Moscow and the western allies began at the conference, ended neither in a formal treaty system nor in an informal understanding, but in a declaration consciously formulated

in rather general terms which, true to the character of such statements, only concealed or ignored the differences of opinion. They could not well publicize to the world that the coalition of victorious powers was breaking apart as early as a few months after the surrender of Germany and before that of Japan.

Reflection upon postwar political developments reveals that it was about 2 or 3 years before American foreign policymakers finally came to the conclusion that cooperation with Moscow on global issues is just not possible. Secretary of State James Byrnes' September 1946 speech at Stuttgart was the first undeniable sign of a gradual reorientation of American foreign policy. Still, massive breaches of existing treaties, resulting in the gleichschaltung of political life in the satellite states, and the attempt, accompanied by extreme pressures, to compel the concession of "common control of the Straits" by Turkey were needed before the United States awoke from the dream of a democratic transformation in the Soviet Union. The Truman doctrine and the guarantee to Turkey against Soviet attack were the obvious signs of the great turn in American foreign policy. Repeated offensive moves of Soviet Russian policy on a global level, like the coup at Prague in February 1948, the attempt to gleichschalt Tito after his defection from the Cominform, and the Communist invasion of South Korea in 1950 compelled America to continue on the path of the policy of the Truman doctrine. In the meantime, the new lines of global policy were permanently drawn. The United States which, in 1945, brought home its soldiers in too great a hurry and disarmed them in a spirit of almost irresponsible credulity, recognized the absolute necessity of rearmament. This rearmament took place in such a rapid, methodical, and global manner that Moscow soon began to talk of a planned American policy of encirclement.

THE ODER-NEISSE LINE AND GERMAN-POLISH RELATIONS

The Soviet Union encouraged the Polish administration in the Oder-Neisse provinces to expel the German population from their native homes, at first under quite barbaric circumstances which are known to us through the great documentation works of Theodor Scheider and his coeditors (Dokumentation der Vertreibung der Deutschen aus Ost-Mitteleuropa) and of Johannes Kaps (Tragedy of Silesia, 1945–46). Slowly the external circumstances of the expulsion became more regulated and now, in the case of the last repatriate transports, the measure is implemented in a civilized and humane fashion. The Communist Polish Government in Warsaw attempted thereby to create and strengthen a fait accompli and to confirm the new status by expelling, or refusing to readmit, 8 million Germans of East and West Prussia, Pomerainia, East Brandenburg, and Silesia who had resided there for long centuries. The statement that this expulsion constitutes a breach of international law and morality must precede any discussion of German-Polish relations. But the expulsions, too, must be looked upon in a broader context.

The frontiers established as a result of the Treaty of Versailles (1919) were for both neighbors equally unfavorable. Germany was separated from East Prussia by a Polish corridor, and Poland was surrounded on three sides by German provinces (Silesia, Pomerania and East Prussia). The strong German minorities in the territory of the Polish state represented areas of political friction, and the artificial frontiers at the mouth of the Vistula and in the industrial regions of Upper Silesia cut across organically united economic areas. That the city of Danzig, inhabited almost completely by Germans, was against its will turned into a free city with a commissioner from the League of Nations rendered the situation even more difficult.

Thus, German-Polish relations between the two World Wars were very bad, indeed. Some unfortunate moves of Polish statesmen and the pressure of Polish public opinion increased the determination of the National Socialist Government of the Reich to solve the outstanding differences by military aggression. The treaty of partitions, signed by Hitler and Stalin on August 23, 1939, first made war possible. Almost one-half of Poland, including her eastern provinces, was occupied by the Soviet Union at that time. This was the area east of the so-called Curzon line which was to remain in the possession of the U.S.S.R. even after World War II. In these eastern provinces, the higher classes and town population was mostly Polish, but the rural population was Ukrainian or Belorussian. As, at the end of the war, these areas had to remain with the Soviet Union, Poland, too, had to accept a large number of Polish repatriates, the expellees of Poland. These Poles who had to move from the ceded Polish areas to central and western Poland and to the Oder-Neisse areas must have numbered approximately 3 million persons. The government of Warsaw uses the argument that it was necessary to expel the native German population from these provinces in order to make room for the Polish repatriates.

Poland and Germany are definitely those two nations in Europe who had to make the most painful sacrifices as a result of forced changes of frontiers, followed by expulsions at the close of World War II. This statement must be made at the start of any German-Polish discussion, for the Poles were the victims of the same catastrophe which befell us and had to pay a heavy price.

We also know that the horrible way of the cross that the Polish nation went through in the Second World War will remain a heavy mortgage on German policy and a debit on the balance of future German-Polish negotiations. Still, we have to state clearly and distinctly that we cannot accept the present Oder-Neisse line. We have to fight as a nation for our right. Of course, our goal should not be a clumsy demand for restitution. The argument of international law is important, but it is never alone decisive. The problems of German reunification and the Oder-Neisse frontier form neither an isolated German, nor an isolated German-Polish problem. The fate of the Oder-Neisse line will be decided only by a great modus vivendi of international politics. The Oder-Neisse line cannot be confirmed, recognized or revised by a German-Polish understanding alone. It involves problems of global politics which represent a cross-section of the tug-of-war between the United States and the Soviet Union.

If the situation is considered without illusions, it becomes clear that there is no sense in commencing discussions with the so-called People's Republic of Poland, for the government at Warsaw is not permitted today to follow an independent line of policy. At first, Washington and Moscow would have to make the attempt to solve the global questions in a broad negotiating framework. Only then will it be possible for Poles and Germans to sit down and search for a solution that must be neither recognition of the existing situation nor a clumsy restoration of the old frontiers. Neither solution would be desirable, either from a Polish or a German standpoint.

A permanent solution of Polish-German questions must include a total settlement of all conflicting claims and problems and must result in good neighborly relations for the German-Polish problem includes so many historical mortgages that a correct "neutral" relationship cannot be imagined. We German will either live with Poland on the best neighborly terms or as enemies. A longstanding, calcified hostility can only be overcome by total revision. This, in my opinion, should be obtainable as Polish history, in contrast to Russian history, is not one of imperialist conquests.

THE NEW GLOBAL BALANCE OF POWER

The international system of great powers of the 19th century has in our times become simplified in an almost crude manner. Between the Congress of Vienna and the First World War, we had in Europe a nearly balanced system of five and, after the entrance of Italy, of six great powers. Their status, the requirement for Bismarck's foreign policy of alliances, no longer exists. Today, we have two blocs which, because of the failure of Moscow to disarm and because of America's rearmament, are facing each other, suspicious and alert. Negated by all the historical experience of mankind, this situation cannot long endure.

What opportunities do we Germans have, under such a distribution of global power, to realize the reunification of Germany?

First, let me sketch the extraordinary difficulties which face us from abroad. Of course, those profiting from the existing division of Germany will oppose us. First and foremost among these is the U.S.S.R., which has pushed its sphere of influence deep into Central Europe, through Eisenach to the gates of Fulda. Consequently, the Soviet Union will not voluntarily or without exacting a high price evacuate this area which represents both a pawn and a glacis. Others profiting from the division of Germany include Poland and Czechoslovakia.

How can we cause Moscow to abandon this region politically and militarily? Not by German-Russian talks at Moscow, for the Federal Republic is no longer an equal partner with the Soviet Union. The shift of power that occurred after World War II basically changed the global balance of power existing in Bismarck's time. Bismarck's policy was based on the assumption that there are in Europe half a dozen great powers which, in regard to their area, population and industrial and general economic potential, are divided in such a manner as to place the German Reich in a genuine central position, enabling it to exercise a certain option between East and West. If the German Reich supported the Russian side wholeheartedly, this Eastern coalition would enjoy complete superiority in Europe. If, however, the German Reich joined the Western side, i.e., France and England, then the West would possess superior power.

The possibility of such an option, the basis for Bismarck's foreign policy, exists no longer. Should the Federal Republic join the side of the Soviet Union today, the West German state would simply disappear in the gigantic Russian-Chinese bloc. But even then, the Communist bloc would not have acquired clear superiority over the Western Powers. Only one thing would be sure: the political independence of the Federal Republic would be lost and the remainder of Western Europe mortally menaced.

Therefore, German foreign policy has to find another way. Such a path can, however, be recognized only after the exclusion of certain other paths and the evaluation of the difficulties which prevent German reunification at the present. They are: (1) Moscow would like to retain its German occupation zone as a springboard for the Communist subversion of Western Europe; (2) Poland and Czechoslovakia would like to keep the areas under their control, in part

because of a natural need for security, in part because of their genuine fear of Germany in view of past events.

COOPERATION WITH THE WEST AS PREREQUISITE

As the difficulties facing German unity are due to global conflicts, the Federal Republic of Germany cannot overcome them alone. They can be removed only within the framework of the controversy between the United States and the Soviet Union.

We must recognize that America is not immediately interested in this vital German problem. U.S. policy will only be ready to defend German interests when they are identical with their own. American foreign policy will not intervene out of an estoteric idealism for the sake of German interests. Of course, the American people and American public opinion have a very highly developed sense of justice and affinity for legal norms, their Anglo-Saxon heritage. But in regard to the major problems of world politics, American national interest is and should be decisive. Consequently, the axis of our reunification policy and our efforts to restore German unity must be confidence between Washington and Bonn. Arguments which would carry sufficient weight in Moscow could not be submitted by us alone, but only together with the United States, for only the United States can discuss such arguments with the necessary forcefulness and fight for their acceptance. American policy, however, will assume the risks inherent in supporting German unity only if it can expect cooperation on other political questions from the Federal Government. The basis of German foreign policy must thus be the unreserved confidence of our allies, especially that of the United States.

If we intend to change the present policy of the Soviet Union, we have to make it clear to Moscow that its campaign to subvert the West is doomed to failure for the foreseeable future. It seems that Moscow, too, wants to avoid a big war as the risks would be too great for the Soviet Union.

MOSCOW'S POLICY OF COEXISTENCE AS A BREATHING SPELL

Moscow is well aware of the technical and economic overall superiority of the West and, therefore, it is almost impossible to believe that Moscow would start a general war as long as the West remains even only partially united. Soviet foreign policy aims rather at the infiltration and takeover of Western bastions by subversive methods that have been developed into a science since Lenin's "The State and the Revolution" was first published in 1917. This science involves conflict creation and conflict management between officers and enlisted men, employers and employees, masters and apprentices, police and teenagers. In Moscow there are several schools where functionaries learn to become political agents by studying courses on the various kinds of explosives and bombings, strike techniques, the subversion of armed forces in both peace and war, and the exertion of extreme pressure on people through the application of secret police methods.

The education of agents in Moscow is perfected by the decades-old experience of the teachers, of which the procoexistence contemporaries in the West do not have the slightest inkling since a middle-class fantasy is insufficient to paint the entire picture. On the basis of the former practice of underground activity (podpolnaja rabota) in the Russian revolutionary movement, Lenin developed the social revolutionary cold-hot, hot-cold "Kneippcure," changing from open breaches of treaty obligations to coexistence relaxation of tensions. We do not live for the first time in an era of peaceful coexistence. The Soviet Russians know the concept of "peredyschka," a breathing-spell, a limited interval, which has to be applied if one cannot achieve the goal by using certain predictable methods, usually because the enemy has armed successfully for defense. In such cases, it is necessary to interpose a coexistencelike relaxation period in order to divert the enemy's attention and lull him with tactics of almost scientific precision into a feeling of false security. Then can the enemy be hit with a balled fist and wiped out.

Political events since 1955 give us an excellent first-hand course in this method of the breathing spell. It is obvious that this interval was made necessary for Moscow by the immunity of the Federal Republic toward Communist infiltration and subversion.

Without a shadow of a doubt, the ability to resist Communist subversion and ideology is greater in the Federal Republic than in many other European countries. The Federal Republic of Germany has practically no Communists, and the question of banning them as a political party was a legal one only. France and Italy, however, have strong Communist parties. Should the Federal Republic that forms a defense barrier before these states fall, all of Western Europe would be subverted from the inside without any military casualties for the Red Army.

This spectacular immunity of the Federal Republic of Germany to Communist subversion is based mainly on two factors: (1) Millions of German soldiers have seen the reality of the Soviet paradise in the East with their own eyes. They cannot be expected to fall for Communist propaganda. (2) Twelve million German expellees and refugees rightfully consider themselves victims of Soviet Russian policy. As long as these two pillars of West German immunity remain decisive in the formulation of West German public opinion, we may assume that the Federal Republic of Germany will continue to be immune to Communist infiltration.

After the accession of the Federal Republic of Germany to the NATO and WEU treaties in 1955, exactly the opposite of that predicted by the speakers of the West German opposition occurred. Moscow's position failed to stiffen; the doors were not closed. Instead, Chancellor Adenauer was invited for talks to Moscow, and the Kremlin was at least ready to continue negotiating. Even after the new recent crisis, the Soviet Union will not be ready to break off relations with the Federal Republic.

Moscow will not abandon its aim to conquer Western Europe. The Soviet Union bases its hope upon a weaker and more illusionist successor to Adenauer. Perhaps it would again send the specialist in gleichschaltung, Sorin, to Bonn. But Moscow will probably wait until the resignation or death of the Chancellor. Should the picture even then remain the same in Germany, should Italy in the meantime become more immune to communism, should West European politics experience a stronger internal coordination—there is already such a cooperation in major questions of foreign policy among the Schuman plan countries—and should the Federal Republic succeed in expanding such coordination in Europe, then it is possible that Moscow, perhaps pressured by domestic difficulties, would realize that the subversion of Western Europe is a hopeless task. Therefore, the immunization of the Federal Republic and Western Europe against Communist infiltration remains the foremost requirement of German reunification and of German foreign policy in general.

CONCLUSIONS

Some signs affirm the speculation that the new problem of China's growing power and the oppressed but still dynamic forces of freedom in the Soviet Union and the satellites, as demonstrated by Poland and Hungary, might in the foreseeable future bring the Soviet Union into a situation where the evacuation of the advanced Western glacis might offer a possible solution. Of course, such an unfavorable solution would only be an ultima ratio to be considered only after the complete failure of the Communist campaign of infiltration and subversion of Europe. And should such a retreat ever become necessary, flexible Soviet Russian policy would still attempt to derive a politico-economic advantage from it.

The consequences for West German foreign policy are, therefore, first, to preserve our immunity against Communist infiltration, especially in view of the new young generation which does not have the same experiences with Communist reality as we do. The Federal Republic has to continue to form a barrier to the Communist subversion of Western Europe, especially of France and Italy. Particularly, the Federal Republic has to follow the line of American foreign policy and cooperate with the United States, for we cannot expect the Americans to fight our battles unless they are absolutely certain of our loyalty. They would not be interested in a Federal Republic which was conducting a fluctuating domestic policy and which fails to follow American policy in some decisive phases of global politics. This would by necessity arouse doubts about our loyalty while any hope for reunification in freedom and peace rests for us in an unreserved alliance with the United States.

Address by Representative William B. Widnall, of New Jersey, to National Committee of Section 608 Owners, Sherman Hotel, Chicago, March 18, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress and the public generally have an important interest in the continuing success of the various housing programs carried on under the National Housing Act. One of the most important of these was the veterans emergency housing program carried out under section 608 of the act. By the time the program was completed in 1953, 7,045 apartment houses containing 465,683 rental units were built, with mortgages insured by the FHA in the sum of $3,439,678,928. The program was a great success and now that nearly a decade has passed, it is increasingly important that we continue to review its progress.

Recently, Congressman WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, a member of the House Banking and Currency Committee, Subcommittee on Housing, made a speech to the national committee of section 608 owners at Chicago. His report and recommendations on this particular program should be of interest to all of us, and I am including it in the RECORD for that purpose. Carl L. Shipley, counsel for the section 608 owners, is well known to me and I am sure that with his help the national committee of section 608 owners can perform a real public service by cooperating with the FHA in promoting

the economic stability of these apartment house projects.

The address follows:

As I left Washington, the omnibus housing bill was going through the same procedure that always seems to delay and confuse housing legislation. There is substantial agreement in the Congress on many programs. Typical is FHA, where an open-end authorization is fully warranted and would be supported wholeheartedly by members of both political parties. However, administration efforts in this direction and toward meeting the critical needs of the college dormitory and urban renewal program have been sidetracked because of the early effort to force public housing through the Congress.

Last session there was no housing bill because of these tactics and because of the unwillingness of the majority leadership to sever the noncontroversial items from those that were highly controversial. Senator LYNDON JOHNSON issued a forceful statement at the beginning of this session, saying that the Democratic leadership would have a housing bill on the President's desk by the first part of February. There is almost a 2 to 1 Democratic majority in both the House and the Senate and yet the first day of hearing before the House Rules Committee has just been scheduled for April 8. This situation occurs purely and simply because of the attempt to stuff down congressional throats new vast spending programs and 190,000 units of public housing.

A sound, progressive, well-rounded housing program can be enacted tomorrow with just a few changes well known to the Democratic leadership that would bring the presently proposed House bill within the borders of the budget.

Why does one undertake a quick round trip from Washington to Chicago in the middle of a congressional session? My answer would be because I feel the subject matter to be discussed before the national committee of section 608 owners, under the National Housing Act, is one demanding full recognition and far more attention than it has been given until very recently. When I say "attention," I am sure you understand what I mean, and not the type of attention accorded the 608 program by Congress several years ago. Although I was not in Congress at the time that your program came into being, I am fully aware of the intent of Congress through reading the RECORD and discussions with Congressmen who were present at the time. There was urgent need for housing and it appears to me the bill as originally conceived was loosely drawn with the intent of encouraging the prompt building of critically needed units. Out of that looseness came the windfalls and the practices that caused so much public clamor and placed the whole program in public disfavor. It seems to me this is the time to take a second look at the history and present status of the 608 program.

One of the very considerable accomplishments achieved under the National Housing Act was the FHA rental housing program in the period during and after World War II. At that time rental housing was badly needed, and private builders and investors like yourself cooperated with the FHA in filling that need. Section 608 was added to the National Housing Act on May 26, 1942. It authorized the FHA Administrator to insure mortgages on property: "Designed for rent, for residential use by war workers." The principal amount of any such mortgage was limited to $5 million; and there was a further limitation of $1,350 per room. The act also provided that mortgages could not exceed 90 percent of the Administrator's estimate of the "reasonable replacement cost" of the completed project "including the land; the proposed physical improvements; utilities within the boundaries of the property or project; architects' fees; taxes and interest accruing during construction; and other miscellaneous expenses incidental to construction and approved by the Administrator." A further limitation was that the mortgage could not exceed the "amount which the Administrator estimates will be the cost of the completed physical improvements on the property or project exclusive of off-site public utilities and stores, and organization and legal expenses."

In addition, the FHA Administrator was authorized to require the mortgagor to be regulated or restricted as to "rents, or sales, charges, capital structure, rate of return, and method of operation." In order to enforce these restrictions effectively, the Administrator was authorized to acquired $100 of stock in any such mortgage corporation. In 1946 Congress amended section 608 of the National Housing Act to give priority of occupancy to veterans of World War II and their immediate families. The basis for the Administrator's estimate of cost was changed from "reasonable current cost" to "necessary current cost." In 1948 a maximum limitation of $8,100 per family unit was substituted for the previous maximum limitation of $1,800 per room which had been in effect since 1946. This turned out to be a very significant change in the law, and thereafter many projects were authorized in which 70 to 90 percent of the apartments were 1-room efficiencies. The 1948 amendment also provided that the principal obligation of the mortgage could not exceed 90 percent of the Administrator's estimate of the replacement cost of the property or project on the basis of costs prevailing on December 31, 1947, for properties of comparable quality in the locality. Also, a new requirement was added that the mortgagor must certify that in selecting tenants for the property covered by the mortgage, he would not discriminate against any family by reason of the fact that there were children in the family. During the years 1942–53, a total of 7,045 projects containing 465,683 rental units were built under section 608, with mortgages insured in the sum of $3,439,678,928. The great bulk of these projects were located in the East. For example, 18 percent of all the dwelling units were located in New York, 11 percent in New Jersey, 7 percent in Maryland, 6¼ percent in Virginia, approximately 4 percent in California, Pennsylvania, Texas, the District of Columbia, Georgia, Illinois, and Ohio. Florida, Alabama, Missouri, North Carolina and Michigan each had about 2 percent and the balance of the States had less than 2 percent, with 28 States having less than 1 percent. All in all, the 608 program was a remarkable feat, and while arguments have been made in some quarters as to the economic soundness of these projects, experience has shown that they are basically sound, and if well managed, will continue to be. This presupposes that the FHA will manage this program intelligently.

A Senate investigation in 1954 indicated that 6 or 7 percent of these projects had mortgages in excess of costs. There was some feeling at the time that mortgaging out, plus the fact that rent schedules generally were based on the FHA estimates of cost rather than on actual cost, resulted in higher rentals in some projects than might otherwise be the case. However, the impact of the approximate 500,000 rental units built under the section 608 program must have had considerable competitive effect upon rent levels generally. In all likelihood the mass effect of the units developed under the 608 program reduced rents far more than rents were increased as a result of mortgaging out.

I know that some of you have been much concerned about rent ceilings which continue to be imposed by the FHA Commissioner on these projects. The charter of each section 608 corporation permits the FHA to establish maximum rentals. These rentals were determined in advance of construction by the FHA project analysis which was the basis of the FHA commitment to insure the mortgage. Rentals were based upon the lower of market rental being paid for comparable accommodations or rentals which would provide a return of all operating expenses (excluding interest and amortization) and a 6½ percent net return on the estimated cost of construction, after an allowance of 7 percent for vacancies and for other loss of rental income. I believe it is fair to say that in actual practice the yardstick for measuring such rents was the 6½ percent net return on the estimated cost of the project. It is my understanding that the present FHA policy is to permit an increase in rents if operating expenses, taxes, or other recurring items of expense increased to a level beyond those used in the original FHA estimate. I heartily concur in this policy, because I believe it was the firm intention of Congress when section 608 was written into the National Housing Act, that investors in such rental housing should make a fair return on their investment. Indeed, I cannot imagine how such a program could have succeeded then or can succeed now unless these properties continue to be an attractive investment. I am aware that some mortgagor-owners of these projects feel that rent ceilings should be removed or should be revised to bring the rents into line with true market conditions.

In this connection, we must bear in mind that the apartment houses built under section 608 were originally intended for warworkers and later intended for the occupancy of veterans and their immediate families. As a Member of Congress, I firmly believe we must hew to this statutory purpose. However, as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, Subcommittee on Housing, I have come to realize that veterans and warworkers are no longer in desperate need of housing. Quite the contrary, many in these groups of persons have found accommodations in single family dwellings, many of them built under FHA programs. I believe the FHA must conform its present policies to the facts of economic life. Section 608 projects must be kept sound and healthy in order to protect the Government's contingent liability in the $3 billion of mortgages it has insured. The rental housing market in the areas where 608 projects predominate has changed from a sellers' market to a buyers' market. Competition has increased, newer projects which do not operate under FHA restrictions have swimming pools, tennis courts, offstreet parking, garage facilities, air conditioning, drugstores, and restaurants, and other facilities which make them competitively far more desirable. The FHA must help 608 projects meet this competition.

Most 608 projects have very substantial accumulations in their replacement reserves. I believe that the FHA, consistent with keeping enough money on hand to replace refrigerators, stoves, and similar items, should discontinue adding to this reserve after the 10th year of the life of a project. By that time, the 608 corporation has reduced the mortgage, and has a substantial equity in the property and an increased interest in replacing capital equipment as it wears out.

There may be occasions when it is necessary for the FHA to permit use of funds in the replacement reserve for capital improvements, such as swimming pools, air conditioning, awnings, landscaping, and other features, in order for a 608 project to maintain its occupancy and meet competition from newer rental housing. The rule of reason ought to be the test in every case, and not some outdated or inflexible regulation which was perfectly valid in 1944, but has no application today.

As I read the FHA annual reports, I am much concerned at the rate of defaults in

608 projects. If my memory serves me, nearly 700 of these apartment houses have been acquired by the FHA through assignment of the mortgage without foreclosure, or foreclosure and transfer of title to the FHA. This is a very serious matter both from the standpoint of the 608 program and the standpoint of the mortgagor-owner of the 608 corporation. I believe the FHA Commissioner has enough authority under section 223 and other provisions of the act, more particularly section 608 itself, to provide for indefinite deferral of amortization, or perhaps an administrative set-aside of a portion of the mortgage, to keep a project from going into default and ultimate foreclosure because of loss of occupancy, where this condition is due to causes beyond the control of the owner. Sometimes an important factory moves out of a community, or there is a localized recession and a 608 project loses more occupancy than can be absorbed and still meet monthly payments. In other cases, loss of occupancy may be due to the FHA single family dwelling program where, in some cases, the total downpayment and closing costs amount to less than the initial month rental and additional month security deposit required to get a new tenant into a 608. In these circumstances, it seems to me both the National Housing Act and the public interest require the FHA Commissioner to exercise all the authority he has to cooperate with the mortgagor-owner in saving the project from foreclosure.

Of course, I want to emphasize, I would not favor any help for 608 owners who give poor management or drain off all the earnings of a project so that it is in poor financial condition, or fail to cooperate fully with the FHA in maintaining the project.

In closing, let me say that section 608 of the National Housing Act places great authority in the hands of the FHA Commissioner. However, we Members of Congress on the Banking and Currency Committee have a responsibility to see that the law is administered fairly and intelligently and in keeping with its basic purpose. To that end we try to keep the various FHA programs under continuing review. There is at the present time pending in Congress a bill (S. 57) which gives former mortgagor-owners of 608 projects a priority of opportunity to reacquire a project in the event of foreclosure and ultimate resale by the FHA. Our committee reported out the Housing Act of 1959 with this amendment, and I hope it will stay in the bill when it becomes law.

In my opinion, 608 properties are basically sound, and given good management and a sympathetic and cooperative application of the law by the FHA Commissioner, will prove to be excellent real estate investments for their owners, and will continue to furnish excellent housing for the rental housing market.

It has been a pleasure for me to be here with you today and I congratulate you and the other members of the national committee of section 608 owners on the good job you are doing in cooperation with the Government.

The Problem of Nepotism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Peoria Journal Star of April 9, 1959:

THE PROBLEM OF NEPOTISM

A great deal has been written lately about the employment of relatives by Members of the Congress in positions on their staffs.

A few rather nasty disclosures, indicating overpayment for the performance of meagre chores, have been made and there has been a general inclination on the part of the country to condemn Members of Congress disclosed to have employed relatives.

The padding of payrolls by the placing on them of the names of wives or children is a dishonest practice and, judging from some of the revelations, some Congressmen have been grossly guilty.

There is another side to the question, however. A Congressman's staff is highly important to him and it is necessary that he have people on it in whom he can place the most implicit trust. A man usually knows his relatives better than he knows anyone else and is likely to have more confidence and trust in them than in strangers.

Should a Congressman be barred from employing a relative if that relative performs his work efficiently and actually earns the salary which he receives?

The proper test of whether or not an employee is properly on the payroll is not whether or not he is a relative but how well he does the work for which he is paid out of Government funds.

In many cases relatives are improperly on the payroll but there are instances where a wife or son or daughter is the best aide a Congressman could possibly employ. In those instances, a case can be made out for the employment of relatives.

Federal Checks Returned to Treasury

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following recognition to Mr. Peter W. Gifford, of Dallas, who has returned $67.20 to the U.S. Treasury, a GI check, after learning of the earlier check sent in by James C. McCormick, Dallas. Mr. Gifford, like Mr. McCormick, is deeply concerned over our insolvent Federal Government because of a Congress that continues to spend money without relating the outgo to the income. Both of these men, typical patriotic citizens who served their country in war, are just as concerned in peace in preserving a Nation and a way of life from financial collapse.

They hoped their contributions might start a trend. Well, one check has begotten the second. Who knows, maybe citizens, disgusted at Congress' lack of discipline in spending, may now try to tell us this way, and take pride in positively trying to do something. Millions now get Government checks. Is it foolish to refuse taking easy money? There is still self-respect and conscience in individuals if not in big Federal Government. Maybe the people then can lead the way. Congress might follow. Here is a newspaper account of other return of money to the Federal Treasury:

SINCE 1862 PUBLIC GIVES $35 MILLION TO TREASURY

WASHINGTON.—The Treasury Department discloses that Americans have donated $35,420,209.72 to their Government from 1862 through 1958.

The figures were furnished after two Dallas men sent back their Government insurance dividend checks which were deposited into the Treasury.

During 1958, the Treasury reported donations of $140,842.69. The smallest amount received in any year was 10 cents in 1892.

The $35,420,209.72 did not include conscience donations which came to $2,273,204.84 from 1811 through 1958. $88,014.76 was received from these conscience stricken citizens who wanted to right their wrong of cheating the Government.

The donation total covers some amounts not properly donations. They include in 1937 a deposit of $250,000 by the Interior Department which the Comptroller General overruled for transfer to the National Park Service Trust Fund. There also was included $18,123,741.57 from profits in operating Army post exchanges donated to the Government.

Equal Time Nonsense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Peoria Journal-Star of April 9, 1959:

EQUAL TIME NONSENSE

Who would have thought that Chicago's Lar Daly would stir up Frank Stanton, president of CBS, and Dwight Eisenhower, President of the United States, in that order, no matter what he did?

Well, he did. And Lar Daly may have, at long last, accomplished something of significance in the political field where he has been running and running for years.

His demand for "equal time" on a TV newscast was only topped in ridiculousness by the fact that the FCC supported it (as required by law).

Such a provision completely subverts TV journalism, and the Lar Daly case only serves to dramatize that fact.

It may well be that the laws will be changed as a result. They certainly ought to be. "Equal time" is another beautiful theory, which in actual fact turns out to be such a penalty on TV journalism that it doesn't dare be anything but sterile.

It does no good, and it isn't fair to abuse and to criticize TV for its failures in public service and particularly in the area of news and editorial, when the law ties the industry's hands behind its back to start with.

Any time a TV show dares to be in any way controversial, it exposes itself to a gift of fabulously valuable time to a variety of crackpots—and worse still is thus forced to surrender its audience to its competitors.

Ed Murrow would have been closer to the mark, fairer, and more realistic if he had attacked this limitation instead of going around piously protesting that TV doesn't do enough powerful news and editorial.

Maybe this miserable situation will get fixed, or at least partially fixed, now, and we can eventually get a little zip into TV journalism.

If so, Lar Daly will have made a great contribution to the American scene—in spite of himself.

Maryland General Assembly Urges Passage of Retired Officers Pay Equalization Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. FOLEY
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, 42 Members of this House have introduced bills to provide for the equalization of the pay of retired officers of the Armed Forces. This legislation would rectify the inequitable provisions of the military pay law enacted by the 85th Congress, which law departed radically from the traditional method of computing retired officer pay. I am one of hte cosponsors of this legislation. I introduced the bill—H.R. 3164—on January 22, 1959.

In their recent session, the Maryland General Assembly adopted a joint resolution memorializing the U.S. Congress to enact this much-needed revision of the retired pay provisions of the military pay law. I should like to have their resolution, Joint Resolution 6, reprinted in the RECORD for the information of my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly agree with the memorial resolved by the Maryland General Assembly. I sincerely urge the members of the Armed Services Committee to give this legislation favorable consideration, and I call upon my colleagues in the Congress to press for early action on this important return to principle in the computation of retired pay for our retired officers who sacrificed so much for their country.

The resolution follows:

JOINT RESOLUTION 6

Joint resolution urging the enactment of appropriate legislation by the Congress of the United States to amend the Military Pay Act of 1958 to equalize the retirement pay of members of the Armed Forces of the United States

Whereas there is now pending before the 86th Congress of the U.S. legislation, including S. 269, S. 541, and H.R. 703, to equalize the pay of retired members of the uniformed services who receive their retired pay under the provisions of the Career Compensation Act of 1949; and

Whereas the Military Pay Act of 1958, Public Law 85-422, failed to provide for the computation of the retired pay of such members of the uniformed services, retired prior to June 1, 1958, on the basis of the newly established pay rates provided in said law, at the same time providing that the retired pay of those retired after that date be computed at the newly established higher rates; and

Whereas there appears to be no basis for this gross discrimination against such retired personnel who, by reason of past meritorious services, should be equally entitled to benefits granted to retired personnel retired after the effective date of the Military Pay Act of 1958, Public Law 85-422; and

Whereas a failure to maintain the same standard for the computation of retired pay of all members of the uniformed services of the United States, regardless of the date of their retirement, will cause defections from active service of career officers and thus prove detrimental to the national defense and security of the United States; and

Whereas retired members of the uniformed services of the United States reside in every portion of our country, however, the State of Maryland is privileged to have great numbers of such retired personnel who have served their country faithfully and with distinction: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of Maryland, That the General Assembly of Maryland respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact appropriate legislation, similar to that proposed in S. 269, S. 541, and H.R. 703 of the 86th Congress, to provide that the retired pay of those retired before June 1, 1958, be computed on the same basis as the computation of the retired pay of such members retired after June 1, 1958; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to each Senator and Representative from the State of Maryland in the Congress of the United States.

Texas Democrats Offer Debt Reduction Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JIM WRIGHT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, as evidence of the continuing and growing editorial interest in the necessity for a systematic program of national debt reduction and eventual retirement, I am taking the liberty of including here for the reading of those Members who are interested, an editorial published in the Tampa Times, Tampa, Fla., on Friday, March 20, 1959:

TEXAS DEMOCRATS OFFER DEBT REDUCTION PLAN

The situation on Federal taxes and our huge national debt is getting so topsy-turvy that you can't tell the politicians without a program.

For example, many Republicans, from President Eisenhower on down, keep saying that the Democrats are spenders and wasters.

It must be admitted that the Democratic-controlled Congress has been more generous than the Republican administration in requests for funds in measures like the housing and airport bills. Yet, when Democratic Senators and Representatives talk about trimming the Eisenhower foreign-aid bill, administration officials insist it can't be cut even a little bit without doing damage to our national security.

On the other hand, the Republicans have talked a good fight about the necessity of reducing the Federal debt. But it has remained for two Democratic Representatives from Texas to propose a definite debt reduction plan to this Congress.

Representatives JIM WRIGHT and FRANK IKARD have pointed out that the American people are ready for the self-discipline necessary to carry out such a program. They have called for passage of a bill that would require an annual reduction of 1 percent in the debt. If it were on the books now, for instance, the $283 billion debt would have to be reduced by $2.8 billion this year.

"In 100 years," Representative WRIGHT said, "we could completely retire the debt by paying $496 billion in interest and $283 billion of principal, a total of $778 billion. But if we pay nothing on the debt itself, the interest alone for 100 years would be $980 billion, and we will still owe the debt of $283 billion, or a total of $1,263 trillion."

The Texas legislators admit that their program would require some sacrifices. But they are so right in emphasizing the fact that the United States cannot continue indefinitely piling more and more on an already burdensome debt.

There may be some ground for criticism that the plan is too rigid in that it would require a fixed annual cut. We feel more leeway should be provided in case of emergency.

But the overall idea is sensible and sound. We commend the Texas Democrats and the thinking behind their program. It is a plan that deserves to be supported strongly by all Members of Congress regardless of party affiliation.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Voters Support Eisenhower Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1959

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, following the recent Easter recess, the chairman of the Republican policy committee, Mr. BYRNES, joined with me in inviting Republican House Members to report informally on current sentiment in their home congressional districts on these four topics: First, the fight for a balanced budget; second, the adequacy of our defense program; third, the Berlin crisis and the international situation; and fourth, resistance to spendthrift Federal programs.

The response from our membership was gratifying and enlightening. The replies were carefully examined by Mr. BYRNES and myself and were the subject of a detailed report made to the President this morning at the White House leadership conference.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following joint release reporting on our findings by topic and by geographical area:

JOINT RELEASE BY HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK, OF INDIANA, HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADER, AND HON. JOHN W. BYRNES OF WISCONSIN, CHAIRMAN OF THE HOUSE REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE

WASHINGTON, April 14.—Reports from Republican House Members, back in Washington after spending the Easter recess in their own districts, indicate overwhelming support for administration policies on several fronts, according to House Republican Leader CHARLES A. HALLECK and JOHN W. BYRNES, chairman of the Republican Policy Committee.

HALLECK and BYRNES earlier had asked their Republican colleagues to pass along reactions of the folks back home to four current issues.

A survey of replies indicated widespread voter support of efforts by the President and Republicans in Congress to achieve a balanced Federal budget.

By the same token, an overwhelming majority of people back home trust President Eisenhower's judgment on the Nation's defense needs, the returning Congressmen told HALLECK and BYRNES.

The President's firm stand on the Berlin situation is receiving widespread approval, most citizens being convinced that appeasement of the Russians would be a grave mistake, in the opinion of Congressmen answering the Halleck-Byrnes inquiry.

Spendthrift programs got a thumbs-down reaction almost everywhere, the GOP members reported.

Following are some of the typical replies received by HALLECK and BYRNES from their colleagues:

ON A BALANCED FEDERAL BUDGET

Middle West

"The President's fight has taken solid root to a point where Democrats are visibly stunned by the 'spender' label" (Ohio).

"I found overwhelming support for a balanced budget and resistance to Federal spending programs" (Ohio).

"My constituents are definitely for a balanced budget and express a keen interest in reducing expenditures to the fullest extent possible" (Illinois).

"Republicans, particularly, are encouraged over the President's apparent decision to stand firm and hold expenses in line" (Illinois).

"The people of my district overwhelmingly support the President in his drive for a balanced budget" (Michigan).

"The President's position in favor of a balanced budget is extremely popular" (Indiana).

"The people of my district are insisting on a balanced budget. They fear the inflation tendencies now all too prevalent" (Iowa).

"The people of my district want Congress to match any unbalancing of the Eisenhower budget with tax increases, and a large percentage have told me to vote against any spending bills which would unbalance the budget unless taxes are provided to cover them" (South Dakota).

Atlantic States

"The residents of my district strongly favor our efforts to curtail spending and balance the budget" (Pennsylvania).

"The people * * * continue to insist on a balanced budget" (Pennsylvania).

"The people are generally for a balanced budget" (New York).

"The fight for a balanced budget is generally supported" (New York).

"Basically, the people are concerned with prices, which is an indirect way of saying they want a balanced budget and stable economy" (New York).

"The President must continue to show that the Republican Party stands for a balanced budget, a budget providing for progress and economy in Government at the same time" (Massachusetts).

"I found repeated expressions in support of keeping Federal expenditures under control" (Maine).

"Moderation in Government spending makes sense to the grassroot voters" (New Jersey).

Pacific States

"I have more than 27,000 signatures of citizens of my area on petitions urging that the Government live within its means" (Washington).

"People are saying more and more that inflation must be stopped" (Washington).

"I have been in receipt of over 7,000 letters asking me to back the administration's stand for a balanced budget with no new general taxes" (Washington).

"The general public is demanding retrenchment in spending which will lead to a reduction in taxes" (California).

"The people of my district are quite vehement that I do everything I can to fight for a balanced budget. They feel very strongly that the President should veto any excessive spending bills" (California).

ON THE ADEQUACY OF OUR DEFENSE PROGRAM

Middle West

"Most people are inclined to rely on the judgment of the President rather than the rantings and wails of some of the self-appointed political experts on the other side of the aisle" (Ohio).

"Republicans and Democrats alike believe that the decision of the President can be trusted" (Ohio).

"They believe our defense program to be wholly adequate" (Illinois).

"My people feel that the President is the best authority in determining our defense program" (Illinois).

"The people have confidence in his (the President's) judgment on defense requirements" (Michigan).

"People are pretty much ready to trust the President's position with respect to our preparations for defense" (Indiana).

"They have confidence in President Eisenhower * * * and have no time for the so-called defense experts in the Congress who seem to have all the answers" (Iowa).

Atlantic States

"I received no complaints in regard to our defense program" (Massachusetts).

"They are satisfied that our defense program is satisfactory because they have confidence in the President" (New Jersey).

"My constituents have faith in the President as a military leader" (Pennsylvania).

"My people do not seem inclined to follow the armchair generals who would ignore his (the President's) military exeprience" (Pennsylvania).

"They believe that our defense program is adequate" (New York).

"The administration's defense program is generally supported" (New York).

Pacific States

"Most citizens realize the President is better qualified by training, education, and access to all facts than anyone else to say what the Nation's defense needs are and that they stand ready to support his judgment" (Washington).

"The people in general believe our defense program is adequate" (California).

ON BERLIN AND THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

Middle West

"The firm stand on Berlin received almost unanimous approval" (Ohio).

"They are solidly behind him on the Berlin crisis" (Michigan).

"There is renewed appreciation of Secretary Dulles' policy of firmness toward the Communists and concern lest a possible successor be less firm" (Indiana).

"There was almost unanimous support of the present stand in the Berlin crisis, and constant statements that we should be firm, and under absolutely no circumstances attempt to appease the Communists" (Illinois).

"They like our firm position relative to Berlin" (Illinois).

"The people of my district are not too optimistic about a summit conference unless it is first determined that some progress can be made at a meeting of foreign ministers" (Iowa).

"My people want us to stand up to Russia on all issues" (Kansas).

Atlantic States

"The people appreciate that we must keep a stiff upper lip and meet our responsibilities in the Berlin crisis" (New York).

"Many people seemed to feel that the illness of Mr. Dulles has returned the President to more vigorous leadership and that its effect on the country was excellent" (New York).

"I found great enthusiasm among the voters for the President's recent television speeches. Folks agree with his firm stand on the Berlin crisis and are rallying behind him" (Massachusetts).

"Most people have just become immune to crises" (Massachusetts).

"I found strong support of the President's position and a feeling that this is no time for compromise" (Maine).

"They believe he is doing what is best for the country in relation to Berlin" (New Jersey).

"The confidence of our people in the ability of the Republican Party to meet the Soviet challenge is one of our major assets" (Pennsylvania).

"A recent poll showed 99 percent of the people favoring a strong stand on Berlin. Where criticism exists it is almost always that Ike is not rough enough" (Pennsylvania).

Pacific States

"My people expressed confidence in Secretary Dulles and hope that he will be able to return to his position" (California).

"Since the President's speech concerning our firm stand on Berlin, there has been a feeling of general relaxation in tension and worry and confusion" (Washington).

ON SPENDTHRIFT FEDERAL PROGRAMS

Middle West

"For the most part, the people that I talked with are opposed to spendthrift programs. A departure from this is noted only in the top echelon of labor organization" (Ohio).

"Iowa people are definitely opposed to spendthrift Federal programs. They hope the President will exercise his veto power in an attempt to hold things within a proper balance" (Iowa).

"The President should continue to emphasize the point that deficit spending feeds the fire of inflation, which imposes a cruel, unfair tax on low-income groups which can least afford to pay it" (Michigan).

"In my opinion we have failed to make a definite impression on the minds of the people of the vital need for a balanced budget and a sound economy. The spenders still have glamour and get headlines" (Illinois).

"My constituents are against all welfare spending programs" (Kansas).

Atlantic States

"There is strong resistance to spendthrift Federal programs" (New York).

"The people are tax conscious and understand that if they are going to spend, they can expect to be taxed. It isn't politically helpful to be labeled as a spender" (New York).

"I found repeated expressions in support of keeping Federal expenditures under control" (Maine).

"The people are deeply concerned about excessive Federal spending. They are restive about the heavy tax burden and would like some hope of eventual tax relief" (Pennsylvania).

"The Pennsylvania Dutch, whom I represent, have always opposed Federal welfare programs. In my recent chats with them I did not discover that they have changed their viewpoint in any particular" (Pennsylvania).

Pacific States

"The general public is demanding retrenchment in spending which will lead to a reduction in taxes" (California).

"I feel we need to dramatize more of our issues because factual talk about balanced budgets, and inflation, and fiscal responsibility doesn't have the emotional appeal of the 'doing something for somebody' programs" (Washington).

"My mail indicates the public generally is for curtailing new and costly programs" (Washington).

President Eisenhower's Mandatory Oil Import Control Program Will Prevent Further Destruction of the Nation's Coal Industry and Stop the Decline in Employment in the Mining and Railroad Industries

---

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1959

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the White House decision to restrict residual oil imports through mandatory controls has been received with grateful enthusiasm in areas whose economic distress is directly attributable to the unfair competition that emanates in alien refineries. The news is particularly appreciated in coal-producing communities and railroad centers, where the erosion of job opportunities has been more and more noticeable since international shippers began their insidious invasion of east coast fuel markets more than a decade ago.

Although Congress included in its extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act a provision honoring the import-regulation recommendations of the Presidential Advisory Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources, the fuel profiteers who peddle their wares over the sealanes chose to make their own rules in a campaign to monopolize coastwise markets. The voluntary program, which the U.S. Government very generously adopted on the assumption that importers would comply with findings of the executive department and the intent of Congress, was no more effective than a wire fence would be in stemming the tide of residual oil imports.

Let me give you just one example of the arrogance exhibited by those oil runners operating between Venezuela and the Dutch West Indies and our own Atlantic seaboard. From January 1 to March 27 of this year an average of 807,500 barrels per day of foreign residual oil was poured into this country. These shipments, which are in sharp contrast to the 603,400 barrels averaged during the corresponding period of the preceding year, set a new alltime record of abuse and disrespect for the national economy and security by international oil.

You are aware of what unreasonable import policies are doing to the working people of this country. You need only to look at the Department of Labor's statistical tables on surplus labor to recognize the hardship which excessive residual oil imports have brought to central and western Pennsylvania. Many of our miners and railroaders have been unemployed for several years, the number mounting as torrents of imported residual oil swamped industrial fuel markets in continued intensity. It is unlikely that we are going to get many miners back to work as a consequence of the White House order imposing mandatory controls, but you may be sure that the decision will have an important psychological effect. The miners whose working time has been cut down to 2 or 3 days a week have understandably looked with fear to a continuance of policies permitting oil from abroad to threaten their very economic existence. With the new cutback, these workers are greatly relieved and have come to hope that the fuel they produce will once again be accepted in its traditional and legitimate industrial markets.

And what about the thousands of other members of our labor force who long ago were deprived of their means of livelihood because the market for coal had been usurped by traders in a foreign product? They are not so optimistic as to assume that the Presidential action will stimulate a sudden upward spiral in demand for bituminous coal. They are, however, highly encouraged at the recognition which has finally been accorded the coal industry. They are optimistic enough to feel that the decline in coal production will now be reversed and before too long output will reach a point where greater manpower will be required.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we hail President Eisenhower's action. It was based upon coal's importance to the national security, but without question it will also have a favorable economic effect.

The Nation as a whole should join us in welcoming the action of the executive department. No one can be blind to the fact that an explosive situation centers around Berlin. The ruthless aggression by Communist China in Tibet is further evidence that America's military structure must be sustained at full strength until the Soviet propensity for world domination is neutralized.

President Eisenhower recognizes that excessive residual imports are destructive of important components of the mobilization base. He is aware that a vigorous domestic fuel industry is essential to the national safety. The decision to enforce mandatory controls on residual oil imports was based on the fact that our coal industry could not be expected to meet the accelerated demand of an emergency period unless reasonable output and development are possible in the interim period.

Collaterally, the Nation's railroads must not be neglected if we are to maintain the defense capability essential in this crucial period. The cutoff of railroad coal traffic because of inequitable residual oil import competition has posed a serious logistics problem. Unless sufficient gondolas and hoppers are activated now, coal could not be moved with expediency to points of consumption when the chips are down.

Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to continue to seek legislation restrictions that will further reduce the amount of residual oil permitted to enter this country. Meanwhile, the President is to be congratulated for his forthright stand on this all-important issue.

The Foreign Aid Hassel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, we are soon to consider the subject of foreign aid in this Chamber and, because I want my colleagues and the people generally to think about this important subject, I am asking unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a recent editorial and a news dispatch.

The editorial is from the Coshocton Tribune for March 26, 1959, and is a very pertinent contribution to the debate on foreign aid, in my judgment. This is a newspaper in one of the principal cities of my 17th Ohio District whose editors are extremely able and alert and, in my judgment, have every desire to see that the people who read their newspaper are informed fully about the salient questions of the day.

The news dispatch is a United Press International dispatch from Washington, sent on April 8, 1959, and relates to the administration of the foreign aid program in just one country, Pakistan. If the attempts of our international planners to make friends for our side, as reported in this dispatch, are typical of their attempts in other countries, then it may well be that the time has come to cut foreign aid appropriations to the bone. I find it difficult to believe that otherwise sensible men could be so callous of the American taxpayer and so careless in the use of our funds as the administrators of the Economic Cooperation Administration apparently have been in Pakistan. It is well for those who read this UPI dispatch to bear in mind that Joseph Campbell, the Comptroller General, was appointed to his post by President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

The editorial and the news release are as follows:

[From the Coshocton (Ohio) Tribune, Mar. 26, 1959]

THE FOREIGN AID HASSEL

No sign exists that Congress in 1959 will be any friendlier to foreign aid than it has been for the last several years. So we can expect the lawmakers to bite fairly hard into President Eisenhower's $3.9 billion request.

Conservatives in both parties have a cummulative feeling that the aid program inescapably involves waste. They hope to minimize it by reducing the available total.

Others see cuts in foreign assistance as an easy way to win the "economy" tag without hurting themselves in the eyes of their constituents.

Some congressional liberals this time are said to feel that if foreign aid is slashed there will be more "budget room" for new programs they believe the voters want.

And there are those who have taken to objecting not because they dislike foreign aid or see it as an easy mark but because they feel the recent emphasis on military rather than economic help is a mistake.

The truth, of course, is that Congress as a whole grew so hostile to economic aid that it was slashed sharply, and the administration tries to work some of it back in each year by liberal interpretations of the phrase "defense support."

With assaults coming from so many quarters for such divergent reasons, only a miracle or an imminent threat of disaster somewhere among our foreign friends would be likely to salvage the President's program whole.

The program's prospects are not helped by the fact that its proponents seem to have lost most of whatever knack they had for presenting the case for foreign aid forcefully and persuasively.

We hear again and again that the Soviet economic challenge in the world is great, that there is a crucial testing between Red China and free India.

But the words the foreign aid advocates speak lack fire. They don't stir the blood of the citizen who wonders why he should care. The cause is made to sound tired.

The results of the voting in Congress will be tired, too, unless the supporters of the aid program find strong new drums to beat.

WASHINGTON, April 8.—Congress' watchdog on Government spending said today the United States was sending too much foreign aid to Pakistan, so much so that neither country could handle it.

Comptroller General Joseph Campbell said his auditors found "serious deficiencies" in the U.S. economic and technical aid program to the southeast Asian nation.

He charged in a report to Congress that "foreign policy considerations" and such things as poor planning and too many aid projects actually had hampered assistance efforts.

American aid to Pakistan has totaled almost $407 million since 1955. In addition, the United States has sent more than $250 million worth of surplus farm goods.

"The annual level of aid has been beyond the technical and financial capacity of Pakistan and the administrative ability of the United States," Campbell said.

He said the International Cooperation Administration (ICA) "and its predecessors have dispersed their efforts over such a wide range of projects that effective administration has been difficult, if not impossible."

Campbell also took a crack at operations of the ICA mission itself which has its main headquarters in Karachi, Pakistan's capital city.

He said his investigation showed an excessive number of household furnishings and automobiles. Although there were only 271 Americans working there, auditors found they were equipped with 229 autos, 529 refrigerators, 650 stoves, and 666 air conditioners—all paid for by the Government.

ICA cut the number later and explained that the items were ordered for the mission when it was thought 475 Americans would be employed.

The auditors also discovered an unusually high number of native clerical workers, guards, gardeners, and drivers working for the U.S. aid mission—1,021 of them. ICA got rid of 300 after the Government investigators became critical.

Campbell also charged that the sending of $47.7 million worth of surplus farm products to Pakistan for flood victims "did not receive the expected favorable publicity for the United States."

Auditors said Pakistan did not do a good job of getting the idea across that the food came from America. An agreement provided that some of the food could be sold rather than given away to cover internal relief costs.

The report said resentment was reportedly created among local people who had to buy rice furnished in bags marked, "Gift of the people of the United States."

Campbell said even food distribution programs conducted by American voluntary relief agencies showed "improper procedures and black market sales," involving up to 15 percent of the goods shipped.

"Two private relief agencies backed out of the program rather than continue working under those conditions," he said.

Other conditions turned up by the Government investigators showed:

ICA-financed imports, including industrial machinery, sat unclaimed in the port of Karachi's warehouses and later were put up for auction by port authorities to satisfy customs and port charges.

Three pumps costing $650,000 for the Ganges-Kobadak irrigation project in East Pakistan have sat unused since November 1957. Earthmoving and transport equipment for the project also have remained idle, the report said. The pumps, manufactured in Japan, once were loaded on board ship and then unloaded when ICA officials changed their minds about sending them to Pakistan. The cost of this was $22,000. Later they were loaded again and shipped. Engineering studies now raise serious doubts as to the soundness of the project, the report said.

Malpractices on the part of some local business men and public officials who resold import licenses for ICA-financed import commodities. Auditors also found that political influence had been used in obtaining licenses. Pakistan adopted strict and punitive regulations after U.S. protests, the report said.

One aid project, a new water supply and sewage system for Karachi, is still uncompleted because of considerable delays. The U.S. investment was $5.5 million. The project was to be finished in 1957 but now won't be ready until 1960.

Campbell said such factors as political instability, inexperience in government and the shortage of technical and administrative skills in Pakistan have made effective conduct of the U.S. aid program difficult.

The geographic division of the country and fundamental differences between East and West Pakistan also have had a negative effect, he said.

"We believe that the program has been more costly and less beneficial for the economic development of Pakistan than would be expected by reasonable standards of competent management," the report said.

The investigators pointed to the Ganges-Kobadak irrigation project as one example. The original cost was estimated at $15 million. Now it has jumped to $56.7 million.

The Pakistan Government must now decide whether it wants to go ahead with the project. Then the United States will have to decided how much it will help, if any.

"ICA has made it clear that this determination will be governed not only by recent technical studies," the auditors said, "but also to a large extent by foreign policy considerations."

"The project," they said, "was calculated to have a significant impact upon the economy of East Pakistan, and through its accomplishment, strengthen the position of the central government in East Pakistan. Failure to accomplish these objectives may have unfavorable repercussions in Pakistan."

All Senior Citizens on Fixed Federal Pensions and Annuities Should Be Permitted To Have Adequate Outside Earnings and Should Be Given Proper Exemption From Taxation in Keeping With the Present Day Cost of Living

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a series of bills to relieve some of the hardships now facing the senior citizens on fixed incomes in the United States.

Most of our senior citizens live on fixed incomes and a considerable portion is from pensions and annuities. These pensions and annuities were much larger in terms of purchasing power a decade or more ago. Today the same pensions and annuities have shrunk to a fraction of their worth. Pensions and annuities and fixed incomes are caught between the devalued dollar and the higher cost for purchases of processed goods, food, and other necessities of life.

Our senior citizens for the most part derive little benefit from the substantial increase in wages which came about since World War II. Few people beyond the age of 65 are able to be gainfully employed in more than part-time pursuits. However, since they cannot live on the depreciated fixed incomes, more and more of our senior citizens are turning to odd jobs for help and many are feeling the pinch of taxes.

I have been greatly concerned about these two problems, that is, the limitation on outside earnings contained in many of the annuities and pensions of the Federal Government as well as the areas in which those pensions and annuities are taxable. I have had an exhaustive study made of this problem during this session of Congress and I am introducing today a series of bills to rectify some of the inequities that exist, to provide for addition of $600 in outside earnings in all funds that have such a limitation, and further providing for nontaxability on all such pensions and annuities where such are taxable in the types of funds where contributions have been made to the fund or disabilities have been incurred by the employee.

The social security system was inaugurated in 1937 as a supplement to other savings and other income for persons over 65, and yet Congress has limited outside earnings to $1,200.

Let us examine some of the changes that have come about since 1938, the first year of monthly payments under the social security plan, and let us contrast that with the situation as we see it today.

In 1938, the Department of Labor cost of living index stood at 60.3. In February of 1959, the index stood at 123.7. In other words, the cost of living has doubled in the past 21 years.

In this period of time, from 1938 to today, our population has risen from 130 million to 172 million. Yet, in spite of this increase in numbers of people, the per capita national debt has gone from $286 to $1,650 per person. How high it would or could conceivably go if complete retirement were paid to all senior citizens is purely a matter of conjecture because we are already finding difficulty in raising funds to meet the requirements of our current national budget.

Back in 1938, a single person with no dependents and an income of $3,000 per year paid a Federal income tax of $68. Today, a single person with no dependents and an income of $3,000 per year is paying a Federal income tax of $488.

Furthermore, the excise taxes, those "consumer" taxes that we pay on cosmetics, women's handbags, household equipment, radios, new automobiles, and many other items that we regard as essential, have increased from $13.50 per capita in 1938 to $58.38 per capita. In other words, the Federal Government takes proportionately a much bigger chunk out of the incomes of the retired people than it did back in 1938.

Yet, what the Federal Government takes in taxes is far from all. The increase in local taxation per capita has risen from $71.47 in 1938 to $253.32 last year.

In other words, in addition to the double cost of living, we have a greatly enhanced tax burden which bears down on the old and the young alike. The taking of a heavy tax burden out of fixed incomes of the elderly is truly a serious matter.

The Government recognizes this inequity and already the people over age 65 have been granted an extra exemption under the income tax. They may deduct all of their medical expenses except medicines. However, there are many more ways in which we can ease the burden on those who are retired on fixed incomes without materially adding to the cost of Government.

The best of these opportunities is to increase the allowable earnings of those who receive social security and other Federal benefits. In 1937, when the social security system was adopted, a beneficiary could only earn $14.99 per month without losing his social security payment. Incidentally, the payment at that time was $41.20 for a man plus $20.60 for his wife, or a total of $61.80 for a couple. This $14.99 limitation on earnings continued until 1950 when Congress increased the allowable earnings to $50 a month. In 1952, this was increased to $75 a month and in 1955 became the present $1,200 a year. Today the maximum social security payment is $116 for a man and $58 for his wife, or a total of $174 per couple. I have introduced a bill which would again increase the earned income limitation and make it $1,800 a year instead of $1,200 a year.

In this connection, I want to say that I feel that $1,800 is a realistic figure that has a real chance of becoming law, although I would personally favor a larger amount. There are many part-time jobs, particularly in the smaller communities of the United States, which can be filled by people who have retired from full employment and who have many unique qualifications. In too many cases, $1,200 a year is not adequate or sufficient pay for such part-time employments. It is much better to raise this figure to $1,800 and have more of our senior citizens gainfully employed, than to continue today's needless hardship.

If, however, we are going to make such an increase for those under social security, a similar $600 a year increase in the income limitation should apply to disabled annuitants under the Railroad Retirement Act. They now are limited to $100 a month and I am introducing a bill increasing this to $150. It is wholly incongruous anyway for nondisabled railroad retirees to have no limitation and disabled annuitants to be so limited.

A similar increase in the Veterans' Administration pensions as relates to outside earnings for World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict is raised under my bills from $1,400 to $2,000 for a veteran with no wife or child and from $2,700 to $3,300 a year if he does. The same figures apply for a widow.

Earlier this year I introduced H.R. 2469, a bill to equalize the pay of retired members of the uniformed services. After further study and considerable correspondence with those involved, I am today submitting a further bill which I think will achieve the purpose of equalizing the rates of retired pay for all members of the uniformed services who have previously retired, including those who are now prejudiced by their election made to not come under the Career Compensation Act of 1949. It was unfortunately the case that the recent revision of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 and when applying the 1958 increase created some inequalities for those who elected to not come under the 1949 act. The bill I am introducing today irons out these differences.

At this point I would like to submit for the RECORD a letter received from the legislative counsel in regard to my bill to "restore the traditional relationship between active duty and retired pay for members of the uniformed services":

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OFFICE OF THE LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL,
March 24, 1959.

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CRAMER: You have asked that I prepare for you a summary of the provisions of a bill I drafted for you entitled "A bill to restore the traditional relationship between active duty pay and retired pay for members of the uniformed services." The bill, in general, provides (with one exception) that where it is to the advantage of a member of a uniformed service retired before June 1, 1958, his retired pay will be computed on the basis of the rates of pay prescribed by the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended by Public Law 85–422.

The first section of the bill repeals section 3 of Public Law 85–422. That section today provides that, with exceptions specified therein, the changes in rates of pay under the Career Compensation Act of 1949 (ranging from no increase at all for some grades to over 40 percent for other grades) shall not operate to increase the retired pay of any person.

Section 2 of the bill revises section 4 of Public Law 85–422. Such section 4 today provides, with exceptions specified therein, for an increase of 6 percent in the retired pay of all persons entitled to retired pay as of May 31, 1958.

As revised by the bill, such section 4 would provide—

(1) in section 2(b) of the bill, that all persons whose retired pay is computed on the basis of the rates prescribed by the Career Compensation Act of 1949 would have that pay computed on the basis of the rates prescribed by that act, as amended by Public Law 85–422;

(2) in section 2(a) of the bill, that all persons entitled to retired pay (other than for disability) under laws in effect before the effective date of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 (October 1, 1949), would have that pay (A) computed on the basis of the rates otherwise applicable as of May 31, 1958, plus 6 percent thereof, or (B) computed, in accordance with the formulae prescribed in section 511(b) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 (37 U.S.C. 811(b)), on the basis of the rates prescribed in the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended by Public Law 85–422; and

(3) in section 2(b) of the bill, that all persons entitled to retired pay for disability under laws in effect before October 1, 1949, would have a 5-year period in which to elect (A) to continue to receive retired pay at the rates otherwise applicable as of May 31, 1958, plus 6 percent thereof (B) to receive retired pay computed under the formulae prescribed by the Career Compensation Act of 1949 for disability retirement, with the rates of pay on which such retired pay would be based being the rates prescribed by the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended by Public Law 85–422, or (C) to receive retired pay computed, in accordance with the formulae prescribed in section 511(b) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 (37 U.S.C. 311(b)), on the basis of the rates prescribed in the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended by Public Law 85–422. This method parallels the method prescribed by section 411 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as originally enacted, for the computation of disability retired pay for persons on the retired lists as of October 1, 1949.

Section 3 of the bill amends Public Law 85–422 by striking out language included therein which was necessary in view of the provisions of that act providing that retired pay of persons already on the rolls would not be affected by the changes in rates of pay made by that act.

Section 4 of the bill strikes out, as superseded by your bill, two subsections in section 7 of Public Law 85–422 which provided increases in retired pay for certain classes of retired officers. These officers will receive greater increases under the amendments made by your bill.

Section 5 of the bill is a savings provision. Because of the amendments made by Public Law 85–855, it is possible that there are individuals presently on the disability retired lists who are receiving larger amounts of retired pay than they would be receiving if their retired pay were computed on the basis of the rates of pay prescribed by the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended by Public Law 85–422. Section 5 of the bill provides that these individuals shall not have their retired pay reduced by reason of the enactment of the bill.

I hope that this analysis is of assistance to you. If I can be of any further assistance, please do not hesitate to call on me.

Respectfully submitted,

JAMES M. MENGER, Jr.,
Assistant Counsel.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with these problems raised by our senior citizens, I found that not all pensions were treated alike in terms of the payment of income tax. These are the ones that are not taxable: Social security pensions, Veterans' Administration pensions, railroad retirement pensions and annuities, Panama Canal employees pensions, civil service pensions by reason of death or injury, military pensions based on percentage of disability, firemen and policemen disability pensions, and widows pensions.

The Government still has under study the question concerning the taxation of pensions to widows of Supreme Court Justices and to wives of former Presidents of the United States. Income taxes are collected on civil service annuities, State pensions and annuities for teachers, firemen, policemen, and so forth, military pensions, industrial pensions, insurance annuities, and endowments, and on pensions of retired ministers and widows of ministers. In these taxable pensions, excepting one, the custom is for the beneficiary to make no contribution whatever. The one exception is the Federal civil service annuity. The retired Federal employee may recover against income in the first 3 years the sum of money that he personally paid in but he cannot collect on the interest which his savings provided. The military, by contrast, pay nothing toward their pensions and their pensions are fully taxable unless said pension is based on disability or partial disability.

I am also introducing today a new bill as a substitute for H.R. 489, one I previously introduced, which would exempt the U.S. civil service pensions from the Federal income tax, thus giving these recipients equal treatment with other similar pension and annuity groups.

A moment ago I listed the types of pensions and annuities that are nontaxable. I append herewith the reasons given by the Treasury Department for these exemptions. Mostly the exemption were set up by statute which is precedent enough for my bill in regard to civil service pensions:

NONTAXABLE PENSIONS

1. Social security: The Supreme Court has held that insurance benefit payments made to individuals under title II of the Social Security Act, as amended, are made pursuant to the authority of Congress to appropriate money in aid of the general welfare. (*Helvering* v. *Davis*, 301 U.S. 619, 640 (1957)). In view of that characterization of the payments by the Supreme Court, which characterization was urged before the Court by the United States, the Internal Revenue Service has concluded that the payments do not constitute taxable income in the hands of the recipients. (I.T. 3447, C.B. 1941–1, 191.)

2. Veterans' Administration pensions: Section 1001 of the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1957 (71 Stat. 83), replacing section 3 of the act of August 12, 1935 (49 Stat. 607), provides in part as follows: "(a) Payments of benefits due or to become due under any law administered by the Veterans' Administration * * * and such payments made to or on account of, a beneficiary shall be exempt from taxation."

Based on the foregoing the Service has concluded that pensions and other payments made by the Veterans' Administration to veterans and their beneficiaries under the acts and laws referred to in the act of 1957, are not subject to Federal income tax.

3. Railroad retirement pensions and annuities: Section 12 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1935, as amended by Public Law No. 162, 75th Congress (50 Stat. 307), approved June 24, 1937, provides that no annuity or pension payment shall be assignable or subject to any tax or to garnishment. Accordingly, the Service holds that annuities or pensions paid under the provisions of this act are not subject to Federal income tax. (I.T. 3115, C.B. 1937–2, 62.)

4. Panama Canal employee pensions: Amounts received by former employees of the Isthmian Canal Commission or the Panama Railroad Company under the provisions of Public Law 319, 78th Congress (58 Stat. 257), approved May 29, 1944, constitute gifts under section 22(b)(3) of the 1939 Code and are not includible in gross income. (I.T. 4098, C.B. 1952–2, 74.) This ruling follows the decision in the case of *Andrew W. Dewling* v. *United States* (101 Fed. Supp. 892).

5. Civil service (death or injury incurred in line of duty): Amounts received under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act (39 Stat. 742), as amended, are exempt from Federal income tax under the provisions of section 104(a)(1) of the 1954 code. This act, which is similar to the so-called workmen's compensation acts in the various States, provides that the United States shall pay compensation on account of death or disability of an employee of the Federal Government resulting from a personal injury sustained while in the performance of his duty (I.T. 3281, C.B. 1939–1 (pt. 1), 97).

6. Military pensions (exempt to the extent of the percentage of disability): Section 104(a)(4) of the 1954 code excludes from gross income "amounts received as a pension, annuity, or similar allowance for personal injuries or sickness resulting from active service in the Armed Forces of any country. The Internal Revenue Service has held that under the aforecited provision of law the retired pay of a member of the Armed Forces who retired for physical disability is excluded from gross income (I.T. 3641 and I.T. 3691, C.B. 1944, 70 and 73). By section 402(h) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, 63 Stat. 802, 37 U.S.C. 272, now 10 U.S.C. 1405, however, Congress limited the amount equal to the retiree's basic pay multiplied by his percentage of disability at the time of his retirement.

7. Firemen and policemen disability pensions: Section 104(a)(1) of the 1954 code continues without change the exclusion provided in section 22(b)(5) of the 1939 code with respect to amounts received under workmen's compensation acts as compensation for personal injuries or sickness. Section 1.104–1(b) of the regulations provides that the exclusion applies not only to amounts received under workmen's compensation acts but also to amounts received under a statute in the nature of workmen's compensation act which provides compensation to employees for personal injuries or sickness incurred in their employment. The principle stated has been established in numerous court decisions and Internal Revenue Service rulings (*Frye* v. *United States* (D.C. 1947), 72 F. Supp. 405; *William L. Neill* (1951), 17 T.C. 1015; I.T. 3281, C.B. 1939–1 (pt. 1), 97; I.T. 3877, C.B. 1947–2, 15; and I.T. 3917, C.B. 1948–2, 10).

8. Widows' pensions: Pensions received by soldiers' widows from the U.S. Government held not taxable income (O.D. 957, C.B., June 1921, 84).

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to repeat that the greatest hardship in our domestic economy is the privation faced by our senior citizens on fixed income. To be unemployed and in want is certainly not pleasant, but the average American can look forward to new employment and another job as long as

health and youth are enjoyed. I have every sympathy for the unemployed, particularly for those with families, but they have hope, while the future of many of our senior citizens seems hopeless under present laws. Oldsters cannot look forward to earned incomes, to youthfulness, or the bloom of health. Consequently, I consider that the series of bills I am introducing today covers a problem area of utmost importance to the present Congress. I plead with my associates for action and for help for millions of senior citizens on fixed incomes who have done their part to make this great land.

They now are in need of our due recognition of their problem.

The Report on California Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 14, 1959

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Evening Outlook, Santa Monica, Calif., Saturday, April 4, 1959:

THE REPORT ON CALIFORNIA COMMUNISTS

The House Un-American Activities Committee has just released a revealing report about the present state of the Communist Party in southern California. It shows the party to have grown in strength, though losing in card-carrying members. Its strength is due to the ability of its leadership and the centralization of its control. The weeding out of dissenters, such as the resignation of 26 highly placed members in 1958, makes it easier for surviving heads to dominate without resistance.

At the top is a women of considerable brains, Dorothy Healey, wife of Slim Connelly, editor of the Communist People's World. Miss Healey is a veteran party leader of indefatigable energy. She is revealed in the report as having been quite active in the Los Angeles school board elections of 1957, influencing the votes of many on behalf of Mrs. Mary Tingloff and helping to unseat the incumbent Mrs. Stafford. Healey today is active in the support of the reelection of Mrs. Georgiana Hardy, chairman of the board. If Communists here do not get out and work in the school campaign, they are berated by Miss Healey. "Our job is not to invent issues," she says, "but to participate in the existing issues which put people in motion." She is not bad at inventing issues, either.

The report shows that the party leaders of 1952 who were then convicted of subversive conspiracy under the Smith Act are still leaders today. Ben Dobbs, Frank Spector, Rose Chernin Kuznitz, Slim Connelly, are names familiar to all followers of the insidious workings of the party, and they are all crafty and deceptive people. They would not be here as leaders today had they not been set free from the prison sentence imposed on them in 1952. The top elite of communism's hard core here, they have no business to be at large. Their experience should not now be available, but it is, in persuasion, in recruiting among the youth of the community and among racial minorities, and in doctrinal education and planning and scheming. But the U.S. Supreme Court let them go, and their time has not been wasted, as this very comprehensive report of Congressman DONALD JACKSON'S committee reveals. It is a tragic commentary on constitutional interpretation they are at large today.

Division of Civil and Military Air Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 14, 1959

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the controversy between civil and military aviation, the following excerpt from an article in the April 1959, issue of Air Facts magazine is of interest:

THE FACTS

Today's widespread despair about the allegedly forthcoming domination of the military over civil aviation is not based on facts. It is true that the new Federal Aviation Act mixes up military and civil aviation as never before, but that grew out of the increasing critical necessity of having a single agency in charge of air traffic control, provision of and research and development of air navigation facilities, and allocation of airspace. It was specified that this new agency must be under civil control, for the lawmakers were as circumspect about turning these functions over to the military as the average civilian pilot would be.

Naturally, in carrying out and carrying on the integration of military and civil air traffic, the FAA Administrator has to deal with the military, and the act provides how this shall be done. The Administrator can request the services of military personnel which he needs because of their recent experience, technical, and operational knowledge, and for liaison purposes. Such personnel become FAA employees for a 3-year period, with a maximum possible extension of 1 year, and are not subject to direction or control by the military department from which they are detailed, directly or indirectly, with respect to their responsibilities within FAA. The FAA will prepare each military officer's effectiveness report in accordance with the regulations of the officer's service. Every 6 months the Administrator is required to report to the Congress on agreements entered into with the military services for the detail of military personnel to FAA, including number, rank, and position in FAA and give an evaluation of the effectiveness of such agreements and assignments of such personnel.

In the first semiannual report on participation of military personnel in the FAA, published on February 20, appendix C, shows a total of 138 planned military officer personnel, and appendix D from this report shows that the bulk of them will go into the Office of Plans and Requirements, Bureau of Research and Development, Bureau of Flight Standards, and the Bureau of Air Traffic Management. Appendix F shows the extent to which they will serve in deputy positions. In all, 138 employees of FAA being military personnel on loan out of a total of 30,000 FAA employees does not suggest saturation.

An as yet unsolved problem which is quite a cranky one and whom may give rise to an additional lot of bogey merchandising is in connection with air traffic controllers. At present there are some 15,000 military personnel engaged in the control of military air traffic, domestically and abroad. As soon as it can be worked out, the functions of these people are to be taken over by civilian employees of FAA, and this creates a hatful of problems. As an example, 78 civilian employees of an independent contractor, being unable to give a rank and serial number, were executed as spies when the Japanese captured Wake Island. What would be the status of tower personnel at a foreign military field in case of hostilities, and air traffic controllers and FAA personnel maintaining navigational aids in combat areas? Their being given a reserve status in some military organization would prove beyond doubt that FAA had become militarized, wouldn't it?

Finally, there's the question of airspace allocation of which there is much calamity talk these days. The military, of course, has some serious problems in this area. They are flying airplanes which cruise 1,500 miles per hour that they talk about, and must have some which fly even faster. But put it down for sure that in recent months the military has been knocked down on airspace requests as never before. In the past, CAA Administrators had no control at all in this. Requests were made by the military direct to the White House for Executive orders. Now the FAA Administrator is in complete charge. It is far better to have the man responsible for the entire pie doing the slicing. He also has authority to see whether the slicing done in the past was reasonable and whether the need is still valid.

Republican Presidential Candidates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most effective techniques the Democrats have used in the past—as documented in Jack Redding's book "Inside the Democratic Party"—is to pretend they believe a man easy to beat when in fact they consider him their most difficult opponent. Mr. Redding, a former public relations director for the Democratic National Committee, has clearly outlined this strategy.

Apparently former President Truman strongly favors this technique. Last week he said in Los Angeles—Los Angeles Examiner, April 8, 1959—that Vice President NIXON would be the easiest Republican for the Democrats to run against in 1960. It looks as if this is the line which the Democrats, for their own special reasons, have decided to peddle.

However, as is often true with Mr. Truman, he gives too little attention to the facts. Let us take a look at some of the public opinion polls recently published:

Gallup poll

	Choice of candidates (Republicans only)	
	Today	January 1959
	Percent	*Percent*
Nixon	56	56
Rockefeller	23	27
Lodge	8	6
Stassen	7	3
Others	2	3
None; no opinion	4	5

Now let us take a look at NIXON'S strength among the independent voters:

Gallup poll

	Choice of candidates (Independents only)	
	Today	January 1959
	Percent	*Percent*
Nixon	41	32
Rockefeller	23	31
Lodge	18	13
Stassen	9	11
Others	2	1
None; no opinion	7	12

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I should like also to include the Gallup poll published Sunday, April 12:

	November 1958	January 1959	April 1959
Republicans	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Nixon	57	61	69
Rockefeller	36	32	27
Undecided	7	7	4
Independents:			
Nixon	38	40	53
Rockefeller	40	48	36
Undecided	22	12	11

Frank Lloyd Wright

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 14, 1959

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Hartford (Conn.) Courant relating to Frank Lloyd Wright:

FRANK LLOYD WRIGHT

To his untold number of admirers, Frank Lloyd Wright was America's master builder. To uncounted critics, he was "the Mahatma of architecture." And critics meant that phrase to deride alike his theories and accomplishments, his self-proclaimed "honest arrogance," and the capelike wrap and broad-brimmed preacher's hat he often wore.

Yet the cloak and the hat were not inappropriate. For Frank Lloyd Wright preached the gospel of a new, organic architecture for 60 turbulent years. All his life he fought for functional, individualistic buildings that blended precision machine-age lines with nature's own living forms in stone and steel, wood and glass. He called for natural housing. If you build a house upon the desert, let the house know the desert and the desert know the house. That was the word, and he pronounced it from unassailable faith in his vision, and embodied it in nearly 800 structures from here to Tokyo.

But as with the Ishmaelite, it often seemed as if every man's hand was against him. Alexander Woollcott said, "If I were suffered to apply the word genius to only one living American, I would have to save it up for Frank Lloyd Wright." But regarding a proposed memorial in Venice, Ernest Hemingway commented, "Better a fire in Venice than a building by Frank Lloyd Wright." Awards, citations, and honorary degrees came to him from all over the world, but before he received the medal of the American Institute of Architects, opponents said, "The qualifications of Mr. Wright always have been, and still are, open to serious question." Said honest, arrogant Mr. Wright, "Gentlemen you are withering on the vine."

Hartford had met Mr. Wright momentarily. In 1950, a group was formed to build a theater he had designed in West Hartford. Naturally, it was a different kind of theater, and the architect came here to discuss it. It was never built. Unromantically the project foundered not because of architectural novelty, but in a prosaic fight over zoning.

With the passage of time, Mr. Wright won his artistic argument. Like everything else, the victory only galled him. His genius, his pronouncements have come to be widely accepted and admired, and the ranch-type house is everywhere. He said shortly before his death, "I am nervous for fear I may now be with the current. It has turned and I am afraid of going downstream when, all my life, I have been going upstream."

That was Fate's mean trick on the great heretic—acceptance. For Frank Lloyd Wright it was more stimulating to be in the thick of the battle. He doubtless departed this life with new plans for the Pearly Gates under his arm.

Communists' New Look

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 14, 1959

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Los Angeles Examiner of Saturday, April 4, 1959:

COMMUNISTS' NEW LOOK

By exposing an intense drive of militant communism to make southern California the headquarters of the worldwide conspiracy against democracy directed from Moscow, the House Committee on Un-American Activities has rendered the Nation a great service.

In its latest report made public this week, the committee meticulously pinpointed the Communist personalities and organizations which are operating here under a refurbished strategy.

Representative DONALD L. JACKSON, who with Represenatative CLYDE DOYLE represents the southland on the committee, said that of the 20,000 professional hardcore Communists in the United States, 5,000 are active in this area.

Our tremendous increase of major industry, with emphasis on defense science; our strong labor organizations, the spreading influence of our entertainment, cultural and social entities, have made this concentration of Communists a logical maneuver, says Representative JACKSON.

Masquerading as liberals, the local phalanx of Marxist-Leninism now aspires to infiltrate community and fraternal organizations, churches and nationality groups, the committee reports.

This subtle new strategy of revolution is all the more dangerous because it has completely beguiled into complacence many people who should know better, and whose own loyalty is not in question.

Thus we have proposals in Congress to do away entirely with the Un-American Activities Committee, among whose backers is Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT of Los Angeles; there are measures before the Legislature, supported by naive churchmen and educators, to outlaw the loyalty oath.

And there is growing attitude that some regrettable decisions by the U.S. Supreme Court in favor of accused subversives and Communists, have by some magic dissipated the machinations of professional traitors.

This last report of the committee, with its detailed disclosure of the entire conspiracy, completely dispels this atmosphere of artless confidence and reveals the real menance beyond.

Loyal Americans are greatly indebted to the committee.

They should regard the report as a warning siren calling all to be on keen alert.

More McClellans Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 14, 1959

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the Paragould Daily Press, of Paragould, Greene County, Ark., published, on April 7 of this year, a most thoughtful editorial based on a survey of local sentiment regarding aims of certain labor union officials to defeat Arkansas' senior Senator, the Honorable JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, because of his work as chairman of the Select Committee To Investigate Improper Activities in Labor-Management Relations.

Paragould has a well-balanced economy, based on agriculture and industry. Thus, the sentiment expressed in this editorial reflects both the views of our agricultural citizenship and our working men and women in the factories of the State of Arkansas.

It is evident that the intent expressed by certain labor leaders under fire by the Senate committee to extract a multi-million-dollar war chest to defeat Senator MCCLELLAN does not meet with the favor nor the wishes of the Arkansas men and women who belong to union organizations. Indeed, the editorial correctly finds.

"It is our guess that this newest threat from the labor front will only tend to weld these people more solidly behind him."

Members will find the entire editorial interesting:

MORE MCCLELLANS NEEDED

Newspaper columns carried a rather interesting story the other day about a so-called, multi-million-dollar "war chest" being raised by certain labor racketeering elements for the purpose of going all out in a fight to defeat Arkansas' Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN in the event he seeks reelection next year. Senator MCCLELLAN said that he had heard of the campaign and wasn't surprised.

Senator MCCLELLAN has been in the news for a couple of years now as chairman of the committee investigating various phases of the labor front and it was greatly through his personal efforts that the public's eyes were opened to the corruption in labor caused by such characters as Jimmy Hoffa and Dave Beck of the Teamsters Union.

While we are not always in agreement with the Senator from Arkansas, we think that his work as chairman of the Senate rackets committee has been nothing less than a

masterpiece and we, for one feel that our Congress could use a few more like him.

JOHN MCCLELLAN has proved not only through his conduct during the rackets hearings but through his attitude toward this "war chest," that he is not the least bit afraid of the labor hoodlums. The good, solid-thinking people of Arkansas are well familiar with his record in the Senate and it is our guess that this newest threat from the labor front will only tend to weld these people more solidly behind him.

We say "bravo" for JOHN MCCLELLAN and repeat, Uncle Sam could use a few more like him, a few more men in Congress who won't tuck tail and run every time the labor hoods crack their whip.

Radiation Hazard Act of 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 14, 1959

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, on April 10, 1959, I introduced a bill, H.R. 6265, to provide for the vesting of primary responsibility for the protection of the public health and safety from radiation hazards in the Public Health Service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes.

I believe that this bill deals with a most important and crucial public health hazard, the danger of ionizing radiation. The principal sources of ionizing radiation which have been created or developed by man include X-ray machines, nuclear reactors and their radioisotopic byproducts, high-energy particle accelerators, a number of concentrated forms of naturally occurring radioactive materials, and the fallout constituents of nuclear weapons. Among these sources, only nuclear reactors, their fuels, their radioisotopic byproducts, and their radioactive wastes have been placed under substantial regulation from the standpoint of their influence on health and safety.

In the absence of a comprehensive program through which the health hazards of all sources of ionizing radiation may be brought under supervision, there is an important weakness in the Nation's efforts to control radiation safely.

X-ray machines are now used extensively in industry as well as in the health professions. Radioisotopes are finding application in a rapidly increasing number of industrial plants, university laboratories, hospitals, and agricultural research centers. And nuclear reactors are being planned and constructed at an accelerating pace. Few areas of human activity remain where sources of ionizing radiation do not find some practical application.

A comprehensive program for the control of radiation hazards includes many elements; two are particularly worthy of attention: (a) The formulation of sound radiation protection standards and (b) the enforcement of public health regulations based upon these standards.

One of the important problems with which the Congress must deal is the extent to which the regulatory and enforcement functions of a radiation control program must be discharged by the Federal Government and to what extent they may be discharged effectively by State and governmental agencies.

Briefly stated, the bill H.R. 6265 would do the following. It declares it to be the policy of this Government that primary responsibility for the protection of the public health from radiation hazards shall be vested in the Public Health Service and in State and local health authorities. It instructs the Surgeon General to develop, in consultation with Federal, State, and local agencies exercising responsibilities in connection with the control of radiation hazards, uniform standards of radiation protection. It authorizes the Surgeon General to conduct research, studies, investigations, and training programs with respect to the control of radiation hazards both directly and through grants-in-aid. It establishes a National Advisory Council on Radiation Hazard Control, to be appointed by the President and to consist of 15 members, including the Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service, the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Director of the National Science Foundation. And finally, it requires the Surgeon General to submit to the Congress not later than February 28, 1960, a comprehensive program for the control of radiation hazards emanating from all manmade sources. This program will be developed by the Surgeon General after consultation with Federal, State, and local agencies exercising responsibilities in connection with the control of radiation hazards.

Mr. Speaker, the bill H.R. 6265 was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and it is my hope as chairman of its Subcommittee on Health and Safety that action on this important legislation can still be taken during the first session of this Congress.

All Created Equal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 14, 1959

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include an editorial which recently appeared in the Waltham-Newton (Mass.) Tribune:

ALL CREATED EQUAL

It shouldn't be necessary, but if there is no other way then Congress ought to give attention to a bill by Representative GLENN CUNNINGHAM, Nebraska Republican, dealing with the now controversial issue of equal time on the air for political candidates.

The Federal Communications Commission threw a wrench into the matter when it ruled candidates are even entitled to equal time on news programs.

This means that if a news commentator on TV flashes a 20-second shot of a candidate for mayor, every other candidate can demand similar exposure.

This doesn't leave a program editor much room for judgment as to who and what constitute news. And if there should happen to be 10 or more candidates for a job, what happens to other news?

CUNNINGHAM's bill simply would exempt regular news programs, not initiated by candidates, from the equal time provision of the law.

"Running Wild"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER THORNBERRY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 14, 1959

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, on April 4 the citizens of the city of Austin, my home, elected as a member of its city council a young and distinguished businessman of Austin, Mr. Edgar Perry III.

Mr. Perry is a member of one of the finest families of Austin. He is the grandson of Commodore Edgar Perry, who is one of the outstanding citizens of our State and Nation and one who has contributed so much to the growth and progress of Austin.

On April 1 this splendid young man delivered to the Civitan Club of Austin a speech on the problems of juvenile delinquency, which in itself justifies the confidence which the people of Austin have shown in him. He is a dedicated young man and all of us who are citizens of Austin are fortunate to have his services.

The speech is as follows:

SPEECH DELIVERED BY EDGAR PERRY III, AUSTIN, TO CIVITAN CLUB ON WEDNESDAY, APRIL 1, 1959

A dear friend of mine—and one of the many who keeps reminding me that I am no professional politician—tells me every day to "Run scared! Run scared!"

The topic of my remarks today is "Running Wild." But let me assure you, this is not a report to you on how well Edgar Perry is running for the city council. It's about the children in our city who have serious problems.

One of the most critical issues of our times has become: What to do about our children to protect them from bad influences? Austin is a dream city to me and I would not want to trade hometowns with anybody else on earth. I wish, therefore, that some of the things I am going to say to you today were not true. But as a candidate for your city council, I feel that I must talk frankly to you about all the problems that concern us, as citizens of Austin.

The professional people who work with boys and girls will tell you about case after case of Austin children whose only activity seems to be wandering aimlessly about. Many of these children are neglected, unsupervised, unloved, and unwanted.

The ministers, teachers, social workers, juvenile judges and others who have had to come face to face with some of these children, will tell you that it is no surprise to them that such conditions lead eventually to sadness and tragedy.

In recent years, while serving as a trustee for the Baptist Children's Home at Round Rock, I have learned through personal experience that there is no greater joy or challenge for any adult than to be able to dedicate oneself to working in some capacity with children. For every child who has been fortunate enough to benefit from an institution such as we have at Round Rock, there are literally hundreds of children in Austin who are deprived of the necessities of life. They are spiritually and emotionally insecure. If they are deprived for too long a time, they are likely to become depraved to the point of delinquency.

Austin has always been generous and humanitarian toward its young people. Let me assure you that the right things are already being done for some of these children. But I want to emphasize that more could and should be done for the neglected and dependent children who live among us. They are our neighbors.

Col. Homer Garrison tells us that juvenile delinquents—many of whom have records of family and community neglect during their early childhood—now commit half of all the major crimes in Texas. Most of these crimes occur in the cities.

If a farm boy is committed to the Gatesville State Training School today, this usually happens after he has moved to the city and has found the conditions and temptations for getting into trouble.

Our Austin newspaper reported this week that the Gatesville School, with a normal capacity for 810 delinquent boys, now has more than 1,200 boys, with the population rising every day.

Last year, Travis County sent 75 boys and girls to the State training schools for delinquents, representing 3.9 percent of the total number committed by juvenile courts throughout the State. Our juvenile courts committed 3.9 percent while our county's share of the total scholastic-age population of the State last year was only 1.9 percent.

Austin children are no worse than are the boys and girls in the other large Texas cities. Almost any magazine or newspaper will tell you that the juvenile problem is citywide, statewide, and nationwide.

I would like to have the honor of representing all the children of our city on the city council, regardless of the child's color or race or family background. The first plank in my platform compels me to ask of you and of every other citizen: What can your city council do to free Austin from the excessive waste of lives and of property which results from our wayward children and youth?

I do not imply that the city council should tell parents how to rear their children. May God bless any parent who does the job right and spends some time at it. What I am saying is that juvenile crime and child neglect—to the extent that it occurs today in our city—is one of the most serious responsibilities which must be faced by your city council. The city council can take the leadership in solving this problem, with the cooperation of all of the civic-minded citizens of Austin.

Let us build on to what we already have and put greater emphasis on all the fine things now being done in behalf of Austin children and youth.

A few months ago, 1,700 Austin men organized into a splendid new organization known as the Austin Youth Council. We have already learned from this group of volunteers that individual citizens of Austin are still willing to give their time and money to help the boy or girl who needs a friend, or who just needs a second chance.

Let us hope that the resources to do the job are, in the main, already available—we need citywide organization. To effectively stamp out child neglect and juvenile delinquency in our city, we will need more like 170,000 volunteers working at the job in much the same way that 1,700 business and professional men have begun working through the Austin Youth Council.

Robert Kneebone, of the Texas Youth Council, said in a recent speech in our city that we must try to bring our entire society back into the habit of neighborliness.

How many of you have heard of a family who has moved completely out of a neighborhood in order to get their kids away from somebody else's kids? This has happened in Austin.

How many of you have heard of a family whose children must walk several blocks out of their way each day in order to go around a place where idlers and gangs of young hoodlums congregate for the purpose of waylaying children who are desperately trying to go straight? This is happening today in Austin.

How many of you have heard of the hundreds of school-age children, living all around us here in Austin, who are not in our schools? Some of these, after having rebelled and finally being expelled, now hang around in places where they can harrass, tempt, or make pickups on children who are still in school.

Now you may ask, what does all this have to do with the city council? I can answer the question better after you have given me the opportunity of serving you on the council, but let's mention a few obvious things:

When a child quits school and begins to run wild, without parental control, the city streets and the city playgrounds have the responsibility for the child, whether we wish it that way or not. Eventually the juvenile courts take over if the child gets into trouble with the police.

Bill Anderson, county probation officer, has said delinquency in Austin falls considerably every summer when the playgrounds and swimming pools open—and the children have something they can do that they want to do. It is up to the city to provide year-round activities for all Austin children.

The city police and the city crime prevention bureau must spend a great deal of their time watching and questioning and corraling the children who loiter along the streets. Lives and property must be protected, especially during the night when most crimes are committed.

It is the city recreation department which tries to keep the attention of the idle boy or girl in order to keep kids off the streets and out of trouble.

It is the city hospital which must patch the wounds from the juvenile gang fights and feuds. Just desperate kids they are—old before their lives have ever really begun, lost in a morass of ignorance, poverty, disease, and spiritual need. With nothing to do, they molest and corrupt other children, who in turn need protection lest they become victims of delinquency.

It is the city maintenance crews which must replace the street lights which are damaged by BB pellets. It is the city fire department which must be constantly on guard against arson.

I am merely trying to stress the fact that the city government does have a very large stake in juvenile crime prevention.

My goal and obligation is to do everything a city council member can do to make Austin the example for the entire State and Nation. We can do it only if we make a citywide attack on juvenile delinquency, with an emphasis on removing its causes. I propose that the city council give intensive study and support toward the goal of making our city neighborly toward all children and vitally interested in all children. Austin must be a city in which all parents will want to live, without feeling the terror of what might happen to their child.

I am not talking about a big police crackdown, nor am I talking now about a 10 o'clock curfew, after which the kids will be swept indoors and off the streets. I am saying only that the parents in Austin—all of us—need to begin by studying this problem more intensively than it has ever been studied in the past. We must rely on the experts now working in the field. Let us not be checkmated, however, and suffer paralysis through analysis. Immediate action is needed. If elected to your city council, I would welcome the opportunity to discuss the juvenile problem at length with people like Police Chief Bob Miles and Joe Perry, of the crime prevention bureau.

I plan to ask them: "Bob and Joe, Austin appreciates and likes what you men are doing for the youth of our city, but surely there is something you need that would enable you to do this job better. What is it?" The same inquiry could be directed toward the recreation department and other city departments. Then, on a cooperative basis, the entire city could be mobilized. Austin has been widely known as the Friendly City—now let's make it the friendliest city. With your help, I would like to see Austin gain the top rank among cities who believe in caring for their own. Anything we do for our children will pay rich dividends in the form of a better city tomorrow.

In closing, may I say that this has been a discussion of only one part of my platform. Since the effects of juvenile delinquency and crime can inflict damage upon every family, directly or indirectly, I believe you will agree that this problem is your problem, too.

Mr. Louis Smith, of Wilkes-Barre, Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of Saturday, April 4, 1959:

LOUIS SMITH TESTIMONIAL

The decision to honor Louis Smith, executive director of the Jewish Community Center, at the annual United Jewish Appeal dinner tomorrow evening will add immeasurably to the occasion, for Mr. Smith aptly has been described as "Mr. UJA" because of the role he has played in the annual campaign, to say nothing of his service to the Jewish Center and its predecessor, the YM, and YWHA, for 34 years.

A former resident of Pittston and an outstanding basketball player in younger days, Mr. Smith has filled his post at the Jewish Center with distinction. His interest in young people has been reflected in the success of the extensive program which has included social and cultural as well as physical activities.

The adult program at the Jewish Community Center has enhanced Mr. Smith's reputation for service and resourcefulness, thus winning for him the plaudits of young and old.

His interest in the United Jewish Appeal, cognizance of which is being taken at Sunday's gathering, is a chapter in itself. He has given unsparingly of his time and talents to this worthy cause, contributing substantially to the success of the undertaking through his example as well as directly by his actual labors.

A grateful community, in saluting him on this occasion, publicly acknowledges a debt for service beyond that call of duty.

Statement Upon Introduction of Legislation Proposing Constitutional Amendment To Assure the States Exclusive Control Over the Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 14, 1959

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, in a bill which I am introducing today, I am proposing an amendment to the Constitution which shall be valid upon ratification by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States. This amendment reads:

Administrative control of any public school, public educational institution, or public educational system operated by any State or by any political or other subdivision thereof, shall be vested exclusively in such State and subdivision and nothing contained in this Constitution shall be construed to deny to the residents thereof the right to determine for themselves the manner in which any such school, institution, or system is administered by such State and subdivision.

The distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] previously has introduced similar legislation.

Mr. Speaker, when the Supreme Court in its 1954 desegregation decision decreed that the separate but equal principle in providing public education was unconstitutional, there was set in motion pressure which has caused turmoil in the South and in other sections of this country.

Since this unprecedented decision was handed down, we have seen radical elements flourish, schools destroyed by explosive, Federal troops with bayonets invading a campus, and public school buildings shut down. Today, nearly 5 years later, the issue is more irreconcilable than ever. The problem remains, and it is time a solution is found.

In my estimation, the solution can be approached only when a sound constitutional foundation is laid. This is what the amendment which I propose seeks to provide.

For some time, I have insisted that education is and ought to be under exclusive control of State and local authorities. There should be no room under our Constitution for the Federal Government to usurp this authority, and that is what happened in the 1954 integration decree.

History warns us of the usurpation of powers by the judiciary. George Washington in his Farewell Address stated:

Let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed.

In 1956, a special committee of outstanding jurists appointed by the Governor of Florida made a thorough study of public-school education in the light of the Supreme Court decisions. The committee pointed out that the assumption of power to change the meaning of the Constitution such as evidenced by the Supreme Court's integration decrees is an abuse of public trust and a tyrannical usurpation of power. The committee pointed out:

The Constitution of the United States may be amended only in the manner provided in that Constitution. In the course of history since the adoption of the Constitution the people have 21 times found it expedient to amend the Constitution, and when that unanimity of public opinion which justifies a change in the Constitution has developed among the people they have found no difficulty in effecting the changes they found desirable.

In my estimation, Mr. Speaker, the time has come and the people are ready for a constitutional amendment to assure each State the right to determine how it will conduct its public-school system.

David Lawrence, noted and respected syndicated columnist and publisher, recently in his column pointed to what seems to me to be the growing unworkability of integration in the schools. He indicates that the issue may reach the status of prohibition and its repeal, where the collateral effects of the controversy made it clear that each State should have the right to control its own liquor traffic. Mr. Lawrence concludes:

So with respect to school integration—as already revealed in the big cities of the North, including voteless Washington—the emergence of emotional issues having little to do with the merits of education or equality of status of individuals may finally decide the controversy in the next decade. It could bring a wave of feeling that local option—the right of each State to handle its own educational problems—is again the answer to a question of sociology as raised by the Supreme Court.

These emotional side-effects, which are already splitting this Nation, should not be allowed to grow. Let us take the problem out of the hands of a judicial oligarchy and place it back in the hands of the people concerned. The people can and will solve this problem to their own satisfaction if given the opportunity. An amendment to the Constitution, such as I propose, would, I sincerely believe, give them that opportunity.

A Welcome Letter From a Constituent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DAVID M. HALL
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 14, 1959

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, with the volume of mail received by each of the Members of this body it is unusual that an item be included therein from a constituent which is neither critical nor contains a request. After having received a letter that contains neither criticism nor petition, I beg leave to extend my remarks and include extraneous matter in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The letter follows:

ASHEVILLE, N.C.,
February 18, 1959.

Hon. DAVID HALL.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I need no pamphlets, I wish to ask no favors, seek no intercessions, nor have I any complaints, neither do I ask your support of any particular legislation.

I voted for you in the confidence that you were a good Democrat, a western Carolina mountaineer, a gentleman, and an able legislator. I just wanted you to know I am still secure in this confidence and wish you every success. We've never met, Congressman, but didn't think you'd mind a word of encouragement from home.

Warmly,

JOE BLY.

Association of the U.S. Army Asks Congress To Place "Floor" of 900,000 on Army Strength During Next 2 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 14, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter of transmittal from Maj. Gen. A. J. Drexel Biddle, president of the council of trustees of the Association of the U.S. Army, dated March 23, 1959, and a press release that the association issued on March 20, 1959:

ASSOCIATION OF THE U.S. ARMY,
Washington, D.C., March 23, 1959.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DAN: I want you to know of the action taken by the Association of the U.S. Army at its last meeting and am accordingly sending you the accompanying memorandum.

Warmest good wishes.

Sincerely,

A. J. DREXEL BIDDLE,
President.

AUSA ASKS CONGRESS TO PLACE "FLOOR" OF 900,000 ON ARMY STRENGTH DURING NEXT 2 YEARS

The council of trustees of the Association of the U.S. Army today called on Congress to enact legislation placing a floor of not less than 900,000 on the strength of the active Army during the next 2 fiscal years.

Maj. Gen. A. J. Drexel Biddle, president of the association, stated that it was the considered opinion of the council that the prospects of peaceful settlement of the Berlin situation and other points of friction with the Soviet Union would be enhanced "if the world was put on notice that the United States did not intend further to reduce its capability to deter nonnuclear aggression by Communist forces anywhere."

Pointing out that the strength of the Active Army has been reduced by more than 600,000 in the past 6 years, General Biddle said that the association believes that Congress should say in effect "this far and no further" by placing a floor of 900,000 on Army strength.

Present Army strength is below 900,000 and is expected to be 870,000 on June 30, the end of the present fiscal year. The administration's budget for the next fiscal year calls for maintenance of the Army at the 870,000 figure.

"Such legislation as we have called for will not only hearten our allies and serve to inform the Communists that we are determined to resist all types of aggression; it will also bring stability to the Army and make it possible for it to perform with greater effi-

ciency and much more economy," General Biddle said.

Constant changes in Army strength is most wasteful of taxpayers' money, he said. "The opening and closing of Army posts, the constant changes in programs involved in rotating troops overseas and back, and fluctuating calls on draft boards for manpower—all make for inefficiency and waste. If the Army could be assured that its strength would not go below 900,000 during the next 2 years it could make commitments and plans that would be in the public interest and serve the national security."

General Biddle noted that the Army's Chief of Staff had testified before congressional committees that he was gravely concerned about the reduction of Active Army strength and had proposed a strength of 925,000 to the administration during the preparation of the 1960 budget.

"The seriousness of the reduction is made manifest by the elimination of one division from the Army's four-division Strategic Army Corps, a force which is as vital to the deterrence of limited Communist aggression as the Strategic Air Command is to the deterrence of nuclear war," General Biddle said.

At its last annual meeting the Association of the U.S. Army adopted a resolution calling for an Active Army strength of 1 million officers and men. "We still believe that 1 million is a desirable and necessary strength," General Biddle said today. "The action of the council of trustees in asking Congress to enact legislation placing a floor of 900,000 on Active Army strength is designed to stop the continual downward trend in Army strength. We'll continue to advocate and work for the million-man figure," he said.

General Biddle said that "floors" on military strength were not unprecedented. Congress, he said, had by legislation placed a floor on the strength of the Marine Corps, and only last year placed a floor on the strength of the National Guard and Army Reserve.

Capt. John M. Davis—A Splendid Kentuckian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE SILER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 14, 1959

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, on the 4th of March 1959, there occurred in the Canal Zone the death of Capt. John M. Davis, a native son of Whitley County, Ky., who was born in my home city of Williamsburg.

Captain Davis served in the Spanish-American War, and later, in 1907, went to the Isthmus of Panama and became a police officer in the Canal Zone. That service he continued for nearly 40 years, having retired in 1945 when he was district commander at Balboa. Following his retirement, he and his wife continued to make their residence in the zone. He is survived by his wife, three daughters, and a son.

This splendid Kentuckian served his country during a long period, with unabated patriotism and constancy, and rendered highly effective service. During construction days of the Panama Canal, more than 80 percent of arrests for criminal offenses in the Canal Zone were sustained by convictions in the courts. Men like Captain Davis were responsible for policing the zone effectively and thereby were maintained conditions of safety for the accomplishment of the great task of building the canal. Throughout the history of the canal enterprise, the Canal Zone police department has functioned with marked efficiency.

Touching the death of Captain Davis and his career, I include as a part of these remarks, under leave granted, the following recent news story and editorial concerning Captain Davis, which appeared in the Star and Herald of the city of Panama, on March 6 and March 7, respectively:

[From the Panama Star and Herald, Mar. 6, 1959]

CAPT. J. M. DAVIS DIES; SERVICES NEXT MONDAY

Members of the Canal Zone police will act as pallbearers at the funeral services to be held Monday morning at 10 o'clock at Corozal Cemetery for Capt. John M. Davis, former Commander of the Balboa Police District, who died at Gorgas Hospital Wednesday night at the age of 76.

The graveside services will be conducted by the Rev. W. M. Alderton, of the Gamboa Union Church. Military honors will be accorded by members of U.S. Armed Forces stationed in the Canal Zone.

Captain Davis was born in Williamsburg, Ky., and served with the U.S. Army during the Spanish-American War. He came to the Isthmus during the construction days and joined the Canal Zone police in 1907.

During his many years with the police force, Captain Davis served in Pedro Miguel, Gatun, Cristobal, and Balboa with the major part of his service spent on the Atlantic side. At the time of his retirement in 1945, he was district commander of Balboa.

Since his retirement, he and his wife have been making their home in Gamboa.

Captain Davis was active in civic and fraternal affairs in the Canal Zone both before and after his retirement. He was a member of the Spanish-American War Veterans and served on the Goethals Memorial Committee.

In addition to his wife, he is survived by his son Ralph, who lives in Diablo Heights; and three daughters, Mrs. Myra Walson, of Diablo Heights; Mrs. Norma Short, of Quarry Heights, and Mrs. Margaret Dubois, of Philadelphia.

[From the Panama Star and Herald, Mar. 7, 1959]

WE ALSO MOURN CAPTAIN DAVIS

Perhaps only oldtimes on this Isthmus can look back over the lifework of Captain John M. Davis, former Commander of the Balboa Police Department, who died at Gorgas Hospital Wednesday at the age of 76.

The fact that this veteran police officer is to be buried with military honors points up his service with the U.S. Armed Forces and lends added luster to his service for his country.

And what a service. Captain Davis, a Kentuckian by birth, served with the U.S. Army during the Spanish-American War.

Like many another CZP officer he joined the Canal Zone police in the early construction days of the Panama Canal—his service dated from 1907. He served, as we recall, as station commander in Gatun, later was promoted to the strategic Atlantic port of Cristobal. On his retirement in 1945, he had reached the exalted post of district commander at Balboa.

The foregoing is assuredly an epic of police history in the Canal Zone:

Personally, Captain Davis scored high with the Isthmian press. That was before the news game in the Canal Zone became largely a matter of official "handouts" as it is today.

This system simplifies news gathering to a certain extent. But this oldtimer who covered the "Gold Coast" for many years for the Star & Herald, maintains that half of the nerve of news gathering is "getting the story" from a reliable source with all the ramifications of a good story.

Covering the scene of the accident, crime or unusual event helps a lot. That was the way we oldtimers of the press got our news.

It is worthy of comment that we were never called up on the carpet for writing exaggerated stories. There's nothing like it, boys and girls, especially when your blood has a tincture of printer's ink.

Those were indeed the good old days and many the fine stories we reporters gleaned from Captain Davis.

Our condolence to the Canal Zone Police and family survivors of Captain Davis. He was a great soldier and a great "cop." He was also kind and understanding in his handling of police cases. His memory must always stay green at this so-strategic point in the Western Hemisphere.

Next Mining Rush May Be in Oceans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. OLIVER
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, the never-ending search for mineral resources has led to the opening of a fascinating new frontier. Drilling for off-shore oil is only the beginning of a vast new mining bonanza that is waiting to be developed on the ocean floor. It has been scientifically established that not only petroleum but also gold, uranium, and manganese can be found in our oceans and under the ocean floor.

Recent evidence that Iraq is apparently under Communist domination has caused much consternation that Western Europe's supply of Middle East oil might be permanently destroyed. In that event, new sources of petroleum must be developed. Oceanographers can help provide an answer to this dilemma if enough funds are invested to insure the development of a comprehensive program of basic oceanic research.

The following article, taken from the New Bedford, Mass., Standard-Times, outlines the possibilities for future exploration of oceanic mineral resources:

SEA BATTLE 1958: KEY TO SURVIVAL, XI—NEXT MINING RUSH MAY BE IN OCEANS

(Whether it be for war or peace, the oceans of the world probably hold the secret of humanity's future. The nation that unlocks those mysteries first will direct the future course of mankind. One of the world's outstanding ocean-study centers is the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution. There and at other marine-science research centers in the East, the Standard-Times conducted a 2-month study to determine who is ahead. These stories tell the results of that research.)

(By Everett S. Allen)

When land sources of oil and important minerals and metals peter out, undersea

mines and oil wells may preserve western civilization's highly touted standard of living by providing new supplies of these 20th century necessities. How long before this may happen? Referring to petroleum supplies ashore, a physicist in New York, aged 40, predicted: "I may see the exhaustion of land oil supplies myself. My granddaughter certainly will have to face the problem of cutting down on automotive horsepower, finding an oil substitute, or even changing her mode of living entirely."

Most of the world's nations are acutely conscious of this rapidly approaching problem. Marine geologists on both sides of the Iron Curtain are trying to find out what the ocean, or the sea bottom, might be able to contribute by way of a solution.

SWIFT UNDERSEA RIVERS

Under the oceans lie mountain ranges as high as the Rockies, valleys thousands of feet deep, vast plains hundreds of miles wide, and ocean-bed rivers, some of them 200 miles wide and flowing at speeds occasionally up to 75 miles an hour.

In war or peace, these rivers in the sea, known as turbidity currents—moving multiton avalanches of silt and debris down the sea bottom's slopes—may be of critical importance to humanity.

In peace, they may reveal to submarine geologists the course taken by erosion from the continents since the beginning of time, and thus aid in locating seabed deposits of oil or valuable minerals, manganese, and uranium among them.

In war, it is possible that an offshore atomic blast might trigger a turbidity current—roughly likened to a snowslide down the face of a mountain—that would spread radioactive debris throughout an entire ocean basin.

CABLES SNAPPED

Here's an example of how these currents function:

Dr. Bruce C. Heezen, of Columbia University recalled, "on November 18, 1929, a severe earthquake shook the Grand Banks in the Atlantic area south of Newfoundland, an area which has a greater concentration of submarine cables than any other in the world. The cables broke on a wholesale scale, and the breaks naturally were attributed at the time to the quake, itself.

"But a study of the timetable of the breaks disclosed a remarkable fact * * * for more than 13 hours after the earthquake, cables farther and farther to the south of the epicenter went on breaking, one by one, in regular succession. Each break was downslope from the one before, and the last took place in the deep ocean basin 800 miles from the epicenter.

"It seems quite clear this series of events must indicate a submarine flow; the quake set in motion a gigantic avalanche of sediment on the steep continental slope which broke the cables, one after another, as it rushed downslope and flowed onto the abyssal plain."

BOTTOM EXAMINED

The Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution ketch *Atlantis* took two cores from the bottom of the Puerto Rican Trench, the deepest place in the Atlantic Ocean. The deposit here included limey shell of shallow-water organisms and fragments of limey marine plants that require sunlight for life. This material, transported from the shore to the deepest part of the ocean, was striking proof that currents must flow over the sea floor.

Starting between Iceland and Greenland and running to a point south of Newfoundland is a mid-ocean canyon, 2 to 4 miles wide and 25 to 100 fathoms deep, very possibly cut by periodic turbidity currents. Dr. Heezen believes all such submarine canyons were cut by these sea-bed rivers.

The turbidity curents offer clues to several major questions in which oceanographers are interested. For one thing, they indicate a means by which organic material is transported from the continental coast to feed fish and other organisms in the deep sea.

For another, these curents suggest how organic sediments may accumulate in sea basins and eventually become petroleum. Much of the petroleum of the world is found in ancient sands that once were part of the sea floor. Turbidity currents, therefore, may indicate where to look for undersea oil deposits; this concept has, in fact, been applied successfully in exploration of the coastal oil fields of southern California.

GOLD IN SEA WATER

The study of the sea floor, like most oceanography, is carried on in the interest of pure science, but as with many other basic studies, is not without its commercial, economic, military, and political implications.

Traces of many elements, including gold, can be found in sea water, and a lot of persons have had dreams of getting rich therefrom; to date, all of them have been, in the words of an oceanographer, "at least one decimal point wrong." Most of these elements are very much diluted in water and would require huge amounts of power to extract them.

As an example of what can be done, however, one major American chemical company has several plants extracting magnesium from sea water on a practical basis.

Mining the sea bottom for materials concentrated in the sediment is another possibility. The Blake Plateau, 400 fathoms deep and 80 miles off the North Carolina coast, is coated with manganese, valuable in the production of steel.

It is not as high in quality as that found ashore, laid down in ancient ocean basins of another age, but most manganese deposits are not located in the United States and it could get scarce in wartime. If so, it might stimulate submarine manganese mining; the material on Blake Plateau is in chunks, like coal, ranging from baseball size to flat discs, 6 inches in diameter. Scientists think it might be recovered with some sort of potato-picker arrangement dragged along through the mud, or perhaps it could be pumped up.

URANIUM FOUND, TOO

Scientifically, the big puzzle is: How did the manganese get there, and is it coming out of the water or the mud?

Many materials are concentrated in the ocean mud, mostly calcium in some form. Matter constantly is falling down through the ocean to the bottom like a weak snowstorm.

Uranium, highly valuable in this atomic age, is one of many substances found in much higher percentage in the ocean bottom than in the water, itself. Again, the ocean mud is not as good a source of uranium as the mines ashore, but many of these shore mines are petering out, and if this material gets scare enough, it will be practical to try submarine mining.

Among many other authorities, Prof. H. Schumacher, mineralogist of West Germany's Bonn University, believes the day of poorer minerals in all parts of the world is approaching. He has pointed out that as soon as the pitchblende deposits are exhausted, new sources of uranium, and many other essentials, will be sought eagerly.

NEW INTEREST SPURRED

The sea obviously is the basic source of petroleum, although the steps from mud to crude oil deposits are essentially unknown. Ocean petroleum sources already are assuming new interest with the Russian domination of Syria, in which are located most of the Middle Eastern oil pipelines.

Oceanographers do not yet know the maximum depth of water in which an oil well can be drilled; 100 feet is about the present maximum (the actual hole can be 18,000 feet or more) and that hasn't greatly increased the area that can be tapped, although Texas' oil-producing region is about half on land, half under water. But if men can drill oil wells beyond the 100-fathom curve, the sky's the limit. The Persian Gulf looks like the next important location of underwater wells, but until land supplies are all tapped—or pinched off by Iron Curtain politics—marine wells are not economical, but only experiments.

One cannot be sure, either, whether the deep ocean contains petroleum, but Dr. Robert Menzies of Columbia University, said, "We have discovered astonishing facts with regard to conservation of carbon in great depths of sea. In the Columbian Abyssal Plain, 200 miles from land, we recovered bottom cores showing layers of tree leaves and twigs well below typical deep-sea deposits 2,000 fathoms down, and extending over hundreds of miles. A staggering amount of carbon is entombed in this area, much of this material, once on the ocean bottom, was covered up in a day or less—thousands of years ago—by bottom sediment. The oxygen was thus excluded and the material preserved as a layer of sediment.

"IDEAL SOURCE FOR OIL"

"We consider such material is ideal source material for petroleum. Many of us are of the opinion much of our petroleum was formed from material like this in the past—in deep water, not necessarily in shallow water."

Also in New York, a physicist concerned with oceanography suggested drilling techniques would be perfected in the next 10 to 30 years so that it would be practical to do oil work 100 miles offshore, if desirable.

If Russia intends to control the supply of Middle Eastern oil on which Western Europe depends in either peace or war—and evidently she does—the time may be close at hand when America's principal allies will go to sea looking for petroleum.

Where the Farm Subsidies Go

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1959

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Chicago Daily Tribune of Saturday, April 11, 1959:

WHERE THE FARM SUBSIDIES GO

The Government's already troublesome farm surplus problem has taken a new twist with the discovery of a million dollar grain shortage in a Florence, Ill., elevator where the Commodity Credit Corporation stores grain. One of the two brothers who own the warehouse has been charged with converting part of the missing grain to his own use.

This episode only reemphasizes the absurdity of the farm subsidy lobby's claim that subsidies are essential to protect the small farmer. It is not the small farmer who winds up with the benefits. Department of Agriculture figures have shown repeatedly that the bulk of payments go to big corporate or private farms, and in amounts often exceeding $100,000. These big farmers make a business of producing grain for

sale to the Government at its support price, and the Government has piled up surplus stocks worth nearly $9 billion.

According to Senator WILLIAMS, of Delaware, an astute spotter of phony spending programs, "the high rigid support program is little more than a Government guarantee on the operations of corporate type farming, and actually encourages and underwrites absentee ownership to the detriment of the small farmer."

Since the Government is unable to dispose of its surplus, it must store it at an annual cost of $1 billion, and the people who benefit from this unintentional windfall are the owners of gigantic wheat bins.

It is worth noting that the two brothers in Florence, seeking a temporary trusteeship under bankruptcy laws, listed assets of $4 million and liabilities, including the missing grain, of $2.5 million.

Any small farmer who thinks he is benefiting from subsidies might well contemplate these juicy figures and ask himself, "How am I doing"?

Pouring Oil on the Fire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 14, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, New England was one of the first areas to suffer from the modern problem of chronic unemployment.

A number of its communities, in spite of persistent appeals for Federal assistance, are still in the economic doldrums.

We have a great human resource in the skills and the character of our people. These qualities were developed to compensate for our lack of natural resources. New England industries have been placed under a competitive disadvantage because they have had to pay higher prices for the fuels, and particularly oil, that has had to be brought in from distant States.

To survive, it has been necessary for us to import heavy residual oil from Venezuela and Canada.

The lobbying interests in other regions of the country, completely ignoring our predicament, are proceeding to cut off our lifeline, and force New England to subsidize the domestic coal, rail, and oil industries, as the final straw that could break our backs.

We in New England are slow to anger, but we will not tolerate this economic compulsion that threatens the very basis of our livelihood.

Speaking for our rising wrath and our determination not to be imposed upon to our loss is the following cogent editorial titled "Ganging Up on New England," which appeared in the March 31 edition of the Boston Herald. Under unanimous consent, I insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

GANGING UP ON NEW ENGLAND

They had a field day on New England in the Senate the other day. The Senators from the soft coal States joined the Senators from the oil States and the Senators from the shale States to hail the move to cut New England's residual oil imports.

It seems that in using this cheap imported oil, New England hurts the coal industry, the rail industry, the domestic oil industry and the development of shale oil deposits. So the coal States, the oil States, and the shale States (Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming) are lined up against us for one reason or another.

To be sure, the coal States want us to use coal, and the oil States want us to use domestic oil, and the shale States want us to be forced to pay enough for fuel to make the development of shale economically possible.

The concern of these States for New England was minimal. We are, it seems, expected to exist mainly as a compulsory customer.

It is hard to see this sort of thing going on in Congress without a sense of outrage. We have imported the heavy residual oil for power and large scale heating (nondomestic) because it is cheap and can be transported here cheaply by sea. In spite of constant attempts by oil and coal States to cut us off, our economy here has become heavily dependent on residual. Recently announced compulsory quotas will cut down our supply just enough to force up the cost of our fuel. In fact this is exactly the intent of the quotas, to compel New England (and other import areas) to subsidize the domestic oil industry. The reason given is national security, but the quotas apply also to Canadian oil, which would be just as available in wartime as domestic oil. In fact, Venezuelan oil is within the hemispheric defense line.

Now Senator BYRD of West Virginia (not to be confused with the veteran Virginian BYRD) would not only have us in New England give up our cheap fuel, but would force us into a large-scale conversion of our oil burners at a large cost. This so as to revive the lagging West Virginia soft coal industry and the coal-carrying railroads.

Both the West Virginian Senator and Senator LONG, of Louisiana, speaking for oil, admitted that their concern was with unemployment, though the security excuse got a nod now and then. It was clear that New England was expected to be a kind of involuntary employment provider for West Virginias and Louisianians.

The Senate speeches revealed the oil import quotas for what they are—a selfish regionalism to serve some States at the expense of others.

New England's congressional delegation will have to make common cause with other import States to fight for a free economy.

Private Investment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 14, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the New Orleans States-Item:

PRIVATE INVESTMENT

Support being accorded Representative HALE BOGGS' bill to encourage private investment overseas should draw smiles of approval from two sources:

1. Those people abroad who are sensitive over receiving outright aid from the U.S. Government.

2. Americans at home who would like to see a more modest price tag placed on our foreign assistance program.

The bill, presented by Boggs on the opening day of Congress, offers various tax incentives to stimulate investment of private U.S. capital abroad.

Resounding approval of the proposal comes from the international section of the New York Board of Trade.

In supporting the measure, the New York group also criticized recent Supreme Court decisions which permit the States to impose tax burdens on interstate and foreign commerce.

From the State Department recently came a recommendation that U.S. income tax reforms be effected to give companies greater freedom in their foreign finance operations.

The legislation and the support in principle it seems to be receiving are welcome on more than one score.

Our ranging foreign aid program, though effective in improving the lot of less prosperous peoples, is obviously not the best way of getting that job done.

Private U.S. capital working abroad would be the more respectable and efficient means of extending a helping hand overseas.

And it would be a means whereby a minimum burden would be borne by either end of the exchange.

Unions Made Whipping Boys for Sins of Modern Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 14, 1959

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the RECORD excerpts from a very fine article written by Father William J. Smith, S.J., director of St. Peter's Institute of Industrial Relations.

The article, "Labor's Wrongs and Rights," appeared in the Commonweal magazine, and while Father Smith's view need no elaboration, I do want to bring to the attention of my colleagues that Father Smith concludes that "no one has the right to assume the only place you will find corruption in American life is in the labor movement. The unions should not be made the whipping boy for all the sins and weaknesses that run all through modern society."

It is my hope that my colleagues will find the views expressed by Father Smith as thought provoking as I did upon reading them.

The following is excerpted from the Commonweal article:

LABOR'S WRONGS AND RIGHTS

(By Father William J. Smith, S.J., director, St. Peter's Institute of Industrial Relations)

That corruption has wormed its slimy way into some sections of the labor movement is a fact. Yet the parade of unsavory witnesses before the Kilieg lights, with snatches of testimony widely publicized, has highlighted this phase of the subjest out of all proportion to the whole.

The sordid features of the picture should neither be minimized nor concealed. They exist. But to present this caricature as the image of organized labor is a distortion of the fact.

Unions and corruption are not synonymous terms, and to attempt to identify the misdeeds of the minority with the good deeds of the majority is to do violence to justice.

No one class of our citizens has a monopoly on evil, a copyright on corruption, or the exclusive rights to the ill effects which have fallen upon the human race because of original sin. And to draw the conclusion from the findings of the McCellan committee investigation that the entire labor movement is tainted is simply a distortion of the law of logic. To infer further that the labor unions, and they alone, symbolize sin in American life is simply a surrender of reason.

Obviously, the public today has a right to scrutinize and evaluate the activities of the organized labor movement in America. There should not be, however, one standard of judgment for labor and another for individuals and groups who represent the various segments which comprise the whole of American society. The trade-union movement is not something isolated, unrelated to the rest of American life, standing alone in solitary segregation. It is part of an organic cultural whole.

A second fact about the labor movement which seems to cause concern to the public revolves around what antiunion critics call the monopoly power of labor. "The unions have become too strong, too powerful," is a common complaint. "They are a threat to the common good. They should be cut down to size."

The trade unions did not originate the capitalistic economic system. They have been compelled to fit into and to follow the pattern of bargaining which they found in the marketplace. The giant union is, consequently, the direct and natural reaction to the giant corporation.

At the present time we have 68 such commercial and financial institutions, each of whose corporate assets run from $1 billion at the lowest rung of the ladder to $20 billion at the top. The economic, social and political power of these, and other lesser giants, is all too evident. It seems just naive to talk about "cutting the unions down to size" while saying not a word about the accumulated power of the big unions' counterparts in industry.

In a democracy such as we have in this country and within the framework of an economic system that has happily but haphazardly evolved from an original false premise to something resembling an ordered industrial life, trade union organizations are entitled to exercise economic, political and social power. The measuring rod is not what management may think is "good for labor," but the common good as it is reflected in the integrity and ability of labor's leaders and the legitimate strength derived from the social activities of its organized membership.

When and if the power possessed by labor unions is used to the detriment of the public welfare, whether it be in a large scale operation or in a thousand small ways or circumstances on the local level, it is clearly both the right and the duty of public authority to enforce corrective legislation.

It would be a grave injustice, however, to attempt to restrict the political action of labor unions simply because labor's critics entertain an opposite political philosophy. It would be an equal injustice to attempt to restrict the economic power of labor unions simply to protect and expand a preusurped power held by the affiliates of organized management.

Nor need one (to qualify as pro-American) accept the National Association of Manufacturers' philosophy of individualism or the doctrinaire, antiquated economic theories of an "automatic economic system" still nurtured by some economists associated with the National Chamber of Commerce.

Labor unions must have power—economic, social and political power—if they are to carry out the social responsibilities that the very form of modern society places upon them. If the critics of the trade unions were to say "the craven, the immoral, the corrupt individual official must be rooted out of the American labor movement," no one could reasonably disagree with them. Power, any degree of power, in the hands of irresponsible and unscrupulous possessors of it, is certainly a danger and a threat.

Nor can it be questioned that some union officials have at times indulged in an arbitrary use of possessed power. No excuse or defense should be made for the labor tyrant whether he carries a union card or cracks the whip over unorganized workers in a sweat shop. That is one thing. But to talk in terms of denying to organized workers their rightful exercise of economic, social and political power is something else.

And no one has the right to assume the only place you will find corruption in American life is in the labor movement. The unions should not be made the whipping boy for all the sins and weaknesses that run all through modern society.

Brother, Can You Spare a Billion?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 14, 1959

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune of April 11, 1959:

BROTHER, CAN YOU SPARE A BILLION?

Mr. Walter Reuther and Mr. George Meany, of the AFL–CIO, staged their much touted indignation meeting in Washington Wednesday over unemployment. It was no ragged horde that they led into town. A substantial cross-section of the union brass was on hand to orate about the iniquity of Mr. Eisenhower's playing golf. The rank and file came by special train or chartered bus, the ladies in new flowered hats and the gentlemen in pressed business suits. Before getting indignant, most of the visitors took a sightseeing tour.

About 100 of the contingent on the special train from Toledo got sick. The turkey they ate is suspected, a dish which, even in deteriorated condition, does not seem consistent with the pangs of hunger. Empty stomachs rarely are afflicted with food poisoning.

The complaints largely centered on whether the Government's statistics were correct. The unioneers chose to believe that somebody was padding the figures showing that unemployment was tapering off. Secretary of Labor Mitchell, a glutton for punishment, frequently pushed around at union conventions, turned up and promised to eat his hat if unemployment were not down by October to about 3 million.

This demonstration was originally billed by Reuther as a "march" on Washington. The description evokes memories of Coxey's Army walking on cardboard innersoles to the capital in 1894 to push the cause of fiat money, and of the West Coast "industrial armies" that headed east to protest unemployment that same spring. Fry's "army" from Los Angeles and Kelly's from San Francisco didn't come by chartered train, eating turkey dinners. They stole trains and tried to run them themselves.

This lawless activity at least suggested an element of desperation, but there was none of that in Reuther's political show, which picked up such coattail riders as Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, haranguing about Mr. Eisenhower being the captive of hard-faced men. Mr. Reuther got in the stock observation that national policy is still being dictated by former Secretary of the Treasury George Humphrey, a Bourbon, according to Mr. Reuther, who shoots quail, a bird rather smaller than a turkey.

While there were some tales of hardship, they were mitigated by the Federal extension of unemployment compensation to 39 weeks, and, if there were real suffering, it might be imagined that Mr. Reuther and Mr. Meany might have done more to alleviate it by making hardship allotments from the union treasury rather than chartering special trains.

But it must be suspected that that was not their purpose. What they were trying to do was cause political embarrassment to the Republican administration, remind numerous Democratic Congressmen of their debts to union politicking, and advance the course of the welfare state by urging unlimited Federal spending for anything and everything in sight. Indeed, Mr. Meany put this dogma into so many words, with lavish outlays in his prospectus for schools, hospitals, homes, airports, and roads.

The old depression touch of a dime for a cup of coffee has yielded to the organized demand for billions from the taxpayers for all sorts of boondoggles, with none of the union statesmen caring a whit for the consequences of inflationary spending brought on by a long siege of just this sort of thing.

These gentlemen have not the slightest capacity to relate cause and effect. Their own wage demands have contributed as much as anything to loss of jobs, and the Federal spending policies they invariably recommend are not incidental causes in producing economic malaise.

Their idea that the Government can cure anything is realizable only if we all want to embrace bankruptcy and socialism. Evidently that is what these men have in mind.

Greater Wilkes-Barre Chamber of Commerce Supports Flood-Douglas Area Redevelopment Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 14, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted on March 20, 1959, by the Greater Wilkes-Barre Chamber of Commerce:

Whereas the Chamber of Commerce of the United States through its official publication entitled, "Congressional Action," volume 3, No. 11, dated March 6, 1959, and in a special report dated February 9, 1959, has taken the position in opposition to the enaction of S. 268, S. 722, and S. 1064 and H.R. 3505 providing for special financial assistance (loan and/or grants) from the Federal Government to areas of persistent and substantial unemployment in an effort to attract industries to these areas so as to reduce unemployment, which bills are now pending in the Congress of the United States; and

Whereas the Greater Wilkes-Barre area has been classified as one of the areas of persistent and substantial unemployment which these bills are designed to aid; and

Whereas the Greater Wilkes-Barre Chamber of Commerce in an effort to help the people of this area to help themselves has consistently fostered industrial develop-

ment in the area of Greater Wilkes-Barre, Luzerne County, Pa., both through its own efforts and by assistance of the Greater Wilkes-Barre Industrial Fund, Inc., and Committee of 100, Inc., both of which corporations are chartered for the purpose of encouraging industrial development in the aforesaid area and which have been active in this field and have spent time, effort, and moneys in the effort to attract industry in order to reduce the persistent and substantial unemployment in this area; and

Whereas it is the policy of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania as expressed through the General Assembly of the Commonwealth in the passage of the Pennsylvania Industrial Development Assistance Act (act of May 31, 1956, act No. 635) to give assistance in developing and fostering new industry in depressed areas of the Commonwealth; and

Whereas the Greater Wilkes-Barre Chamber of Commerce and the Greater Wilkes-Barre Industrial Fund, Inc., and Committee of One Hundred, Inc., have cooperated with the Pennsylvania Industrial Development Authority and are continuing to cooperate with the aforesaid authority in bringing new industries to this area; and

Whereas it is the considered judgment of the Greater Wilkes-Barre Chamber of Commerce that the position of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States in its opposition to S. 268, S. 722, and S. 1064, and H.R. 3505, is not well taken or in the best interests of the people of the Greater Wilkes-Barre area and other areas of the United States which suffer from the same problem; and

Whereas it is the considered judgment of the Greater Wilkes-Barre Chamber of Commerce that whenever any area of this Nation suffers economically, the well-being of the entire Nation is seriously affected: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Greater Wilkes-Barre Chamber of Commerce as follows:

1. That the position of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce is inconsistent with the position of the Greater Wilkes-Barre Chamber of Commerce in regard to the above-mentioned bills viz, S. 268, S. 722, and S. 1064, and H.R. 3505.

2. The Greater Wilkes-Barre Chamber of Commerce in reaffirmation to the position which it has consistently taken with regard to industrial development supports the sponsors of the aforesaid proposed legislation and requests the Congress of the United States to enact said bills into law.

The above resolution was unanimously approved at a regularly stated meeting of the board of directors of the Greater Wilkes-Barre Chamber of Commerce on Friday, March 20, 1959.

_____, *President.*

_____, *Secretary.*

Dated March 20, 1959.

Keep Newscasts for News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1959

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, due to abuses surrounding the equal time requirements now in effect through the Federal Communications Commission ruling, I believe we should take note of H.R. 5389 introduced by Representative GLENN CUNNINGHAM, of Nebraska, to alleviate this situation. Radio and television stations are now required to offer equal time to all candidates for the same office whenever one of the candidates makes news. This, to me, would seem to hamper the effectiveness of swift and accurate news reporting, and for this reason I believe the bill introduced by Representative CUNNINGHAM merits our support.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that an editorial which appeared in a recent issue of the Chicago American be included at this point in the RECORD. The text of the editorial follows:

KEEP NEWSCASTS FOR NEWS

Television executives must be looking fondly on Nebraska's Republican Representative CUNNINGHAM. He introduced a bill this week that would get them off an embarrassing hook by amending the Federal Communications Act.

CUNNINGHAM'S measure would exempt regular news broadcasts from the equal time requirement for political candidates. The bill recognizes an elementary fact of life: A man in an important public office almost automatically makes more news than one who isn't in office.

The bill does not leave it up to station executives to decide which candidates are or are not worthy of appearing on TV, for the equal time provision would stay in effect for political broadcasts.

The measure would, however, relieve the distress suffered by TV executives here last month, when they discovered that under the law they had to grant equal time on newscasts to Lar Daly.

Since the primaries, in which he trailed Mayor Daley by roughly 11 to 1, Daly has been very sportsmanlike about equal time. He assured city officials this week that they could go ahead and have a St. Patrick's Day parade televised, even if it does show the mayor marching.

Anyway, we hope CUNNINGHAM'S bill is passed. TV devotes enough time to situation comedy now, without having to include it in news broadcasts.

Chamber of Commerce Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1959

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the current week is known as Chamber of Commerce Week. Evidence that there's nothing new under the sun keeps turning up in the most unlikely places. From far off Mesopotamia comes proof that the local chamber of commerce—that symbol of jet-age enterprise—actually had its counterpart in the ancient city of Mari some 6,000 years ago.

If archeologists who plied their trade amid those ruins have read their cuneiform tablets correctly, the administrative palace of the Kingdom of Mari boasted both a foreign office and a board of trade, and from all accounts, business was really booming. In his book, "The Bible as History," Warner Keller tells us, "More than 100 officials were involved in dealing with the incoming and outgoing messages, which amounted to thousands of tablets."

Babylon had its chambers of commerce, too, apparently within the shadow of the Tower of Babel and the fabulous Hanging Gardens. During the Middle Ages, fairs and merchant guilds were the predominent businessmen's organizations. The predecessor of the modern chamber of commerce was started during the reign of the French King, Henry, with the establishment of the Superior Chambers of Commerce of France. About that time, too, the merchants of Marseilles formed an independent voluntary group to represent the commercial interests of their port. This early local was closely akin to that country's present day chambers of commerce, voluntary organizations having quasi-public functions. Today these groups have charge of stock and produce exchanges, issue export certificates, and even help manage the port cities. They also differ from their American counterparts in that their membership is smaller, ranging from 9 to 21.

Switzerland has two distinct types—those that follow the French concept and function under state auspices, and independent groups similar to our own. The German chambers, like those in France, are pretty much official institutions. On the other hand, in Britain they are, like our own, entirely voluntary organizations.

And speaking of differences, our own chambers of commerce really evolved from three somewhat different types of business groups, each fulfilling a particular need created by a particular time and place. There were the trading organizations, whose members met for the sole purpose of trading with one another, These were sometimes known as boards of trade, a name that still survives in some areas, particularly small towns. Then there were the protective organizations—businessmen who banded together against high taxes and discriminatory regulations. And finally, in the newer sections of the country, town boosters organized to seek new industries and good roads that would draw tourist travel and help the community grow.

Regardless of these differences, the common goal of all three types of business groups was progress. But in a country marked by rapid growth and change as ours has been, what today may pass as progress can become, almost overnight, somewhat of a mixed blessing. For example, as the horse-and-buggy days slipped further into history, the big move to the new population centers brought new problems. But the oldtimers saw no personal profit from becoming bigger cities, and they often voted down needed public improvement programs. Nevertheless the growth of America's cities was as inevitable as the industrial revolution, and so chambers of commerce became the vehicles by which civic-minded people could be mobilized "to build bigger communities by making them better."

The stock market crash brought a somewhat different problem, though. As land values went down, so did the municipality's ability to service their

overextended bond capacity. Faced with high municipal taxes, the businessmen took a new look at their organization, and belatedly they became tax conscious. Today the role of guardian of the taxpayer's pocketbook is an established function of the chamber of commerce.

Until 1912, the chamber of commerce movement had little or no cohesiveness. Then President Taft urged a group of businessmen to form what later became the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. Now there are 32 State and regional chambers, but the backbone of the movement still remains the local unit. And these days its business is not all business, either. The local chamber of commerce provides the leadership for all kinds of community activities—a project for the handicaped, the building of a playground, a fund drive to send city kids to camp.

As a matter of fact, projects aimed at helping youngsters, rate high among chamber of commerce-sponsored activities. But then this preoccupation with the problems of America's children is nothing new in chamber of commerce history. The records show that the Ohio Chamber of Commerce—the oldest in the country—was responsible for the enactment of the first child labor law in the Nation.

Three Hundred and Fiftieth Anniversary of Dutch Landing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 14, 1959

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, on March 14, 1959, the second annual banquet of the Holland Society of New York, Potomac branch, was held at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington, D.C. This banquet marked the opening of the festivities commemorating the 350th anniversary of the landing of the Dutch at New Amsterdam.

I am particularly pleased to bring this significant occasion to the attention of my colleagues, as I am a life-long member of the Holland Society as was my father before me.

Messages were received at the banquet by numerous prominent persons, including His Excellency J. H. van Roijen, Netherlands Ambassador to the United States, whose greeting read as follows:

Congratulations to the Potomac Branch of the Holland Society on initiating the 350th anniversary of the landing of our people on your shores and the commemoration of this year of history.

President Eisenhower wired greetings, as follows:

It is a pleasure to send greetings to the members and guests of the Potomac Branch of the Holland Society of New York gathered on the occasion of the 350th anniversary of the Dutch explorations by Henry Hudson. From the earliest days, the growth and spirit of our country have been strengthened by citizens of Dutch descent. The Holland Society helps to preserve an important quality of American culture. I am delighted to add my best wishes for a fine evening.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

I should like to touch briefly on some of the historical highlights in connection with the settling of the Dutch on what is now known as Manhattan. For instance, Netherlands' Prince Bernhard said, on May 19, 1958:

The Netherlands and the United States can pride themselves on very old cultural relations. In 1638 Holland provided your country with its first schoolmaster, Adam Roelants. An early President of the United States, John Quincy Adams, opened a long line of American students seeking knowledge at Dutch universities, when at the age of 13 he registered as a student at the University of Leyden.

You who are friends of my country and whose ancestors in many cases came from there, have set yourselves the task of advancing the friendship and cultural relations between our two countries.

There was a tablet in the court of the recently demolished Produce Exchange near the Customs House in downtown New York that marked the location of the first school in New Amsterdam, taught by Adam Roelandsen. It was also the first school of which there is any record in America.

Another first: In 1648, when the northernmost limits of the town extended no further than Wall Street, Gov. Pieter Stuyvesant laid the basic foundations of New York's and the Nation's volunteer fire-fighting system when he appointed four fire wardens.

A medical first in America: When the 17th century began, doctors cured much more by personality than by their remedies and practices. As a consequence, this era witnessed the discoveries of Antony van Leeuwenhoek, who built the microscope and was the first to describe the corpuscular formation of the blood, and those arising from Christian Huyghens' epochal studies in the field of optics. Dutch colonial America was the scene of several probable "firsts," notably the first coroner's inquest—1658—and establishment of the first hospital—1659.

The three Presidents: Three Presidents of the United States have been of direct descent in the male line from settlers of New Netherland well in advance of 1675. At least as many more occupants of the White House have been in part of such ancient stock through marriage. These three Presidents were also Governors of the State of New York. The first of the trio was Martin Van Buren, the second was Theodore Roosevelt—a very active member of the Holland Society—and the third was Franklin Delano Roosevelt, my father.

Our flag: The *Andria Doria*, bearing a copy of the Declaration of Independence of July 4, 1776, and her commission from the Continental Congress, signed by John Hancock, with copies in blank, signed by the same, for the equipment of privateers, and with a 13-striped flag flying at her masthead, sailed into the roadstead of St. Eustatius on the 16th of November 1776. She dropped anchor before Orangetown and in front of Fort Orange. The commander of the fort, Abraham Ravenle, on seeing the character of the vessel, and recognizing the flag of the American Congress, was in a quandary.

What should he do? Should he salute it with the full number of "honor shots" which were usually accorded to men-of-war of a recognized nation and thus officially recognize sovereignty of the United States of America? He was ordered by Governor De Graeff to return the salute with two guns less, as if the *Andria Doria* were a merchantman. Upon the commander's return to the fort, the Dutch garrison belched forth a salute of 11 guns. Following this event were serious repercussions. Governor De Graeff was subsequently recalled to Holland. The English protested in no uncertain terms to the Netherlands Government and accused it of violating its neutrality in recognizing an enemy.

EVACUATION DAY, NOVEMBER 25, 1783

Their discovery is a feat even more difficult than that performed by Symon's great-great-grandson, Sgt. John van Arsdale, who, after fighting against the British in the War of the American Revolution and being captured, imprisoned, and nearly starved to death by them, on evacuation day at New York, November 25, 1783, climbed the tall greased flagpole at the battery, tore down the British flag, and fastened the American flag there. The British had evacuated the city at noon, leaving their flag flying, after secretly greasing the pole. American military orders for the day were that the American flag should be raised upon the pole when General Washington appeared at the battery. At the vital moment the order could not be executed; the humiliation was intense; no one was able to climb the pole—until a young man in the crowd of spectators volunteered. He was John van Arsdale, who, having been a sailor in his father's ship, climbed the pole, tore down the flag, and substituted Old Glory. Upon descending, he received an ovation and a gift of money, to which General Washington contributed. (Hoppin, "The Washington Ancestry," vol. III, p. 164.)

Many fortunes have been made in New York City real estate since the Indians traded Manhattan to Peter Minuit for trinkets worth $24.

Today's value of all land and buildings, less tax-exempt holdings, on Manhattan Island is far in excess of $10 billion. The Dutch certainly got a bargain for their beads.

Founding Father of Vero Beach: Waldo Sexton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 14, 1959

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on November 5, 1958, the citizens of Vero Beach, Fla., celebrated Waldo Sexton Day, honoring one of its outstanding citizens with a special day of observance, proclaiming to all their pride and devotion and thanks to Waldo Sexton for his many contributions to Indian River County and Vero Beach.

Miss Elena K. Mead, who writes for the Vero Beach Press-Journal, tells the story of Waldo Sexton in an article entitled "Vero Beach's Mr. Section" from the Orlando Sentinel-Florida magazine of November 2, 1958, which I would like to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Her article vividly expresses why Vero Beach loves Waldo Sexton and why they call him one of the founding fathers. His contributions to the area are many and it has been my pleasure to know the Sexton family and, in particular, his fine sons, Ralph and Randy, their wives, and his daughter Barbara, and her husband John Tripson.

Miss Mead's excellent article on Waldo Sexton—the man who made Vero Beach and Indian River County a more interesting place to live—follows:

MAN OF THE WEEK: VERO BEACH'S MR. SECTION

(By Elena K. Mead)

The plow salesman is coming into his own. Next Wednesday, Indian River County is paying tribute to a man who came to Florida 44 years ago to sell farm implements and stayed to become one of her most enthusiastic developers.

He's Indiana-born Waldo E. Sexton who was sent to Florida in 1914 by the Spaulding Tilling Machine Co., Cleveland, Ohio, to demonstrate a heavy plow that Sexton says was "away ahead of its time." It failed to sell in Florida because nothing could move it in this sandy soil. Horses, mules, even oxen proved inadequate.

But the plow served its purpose. It brought Waldo Sexton to Florida, and next Wednesday bankers, citrus men, society women, and ranchers will rub elbows at a celebration, beginning at 2 p.m. and lasting until midnight, honoring the man who has helped to gild this section of the upper gold coast.

Best known for his famous Driftwood Inn on the beach here, resplendent with hand-carved furniture, wrought iron grill work and objects d'art from all parts of the world (as well as one of the world's largest collection of bells—Sexton long has had an enviable record in the fields of citrus and cattle raising as well as land development.

He aided in the organization of the Indian River Citrus League and served as its first president: Organized and underwrote the Indian River Fair Association. For 5 consecutive years he took first prize with his Marsh seedless grapefruit at the Tampa State Fair.

He had the first Florida orange analyzed. "I wanted to find out why Indian River citrus fruit was better than any other." California data was being used in Florida.

A Dr. Stuckey at the University of Kentucky gave him the answer with an analysis that is still used in the agricultural department at the University of Florida in Gainesville.

In the horticultural line, he developed three new avocados which were named Sexton, Indian River, and Vero Beach by the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

He is credited locally for having started the first dairy. His son-in-law, John Tripson, now operates it, with daily delivery covering all of Indian River and most of St. Lucie Counties.

His interest in beef cattle led him to try to breed and protect the native Florida guinea cow, a tiny animal producing a great deal of milk on a minimum of feed and said to have been brought to this country by the adventuresome Spaniards.

In recalling his coming to Florida, Sexton likes to tell the story of his discovery of the Sunshine State.

"I fell in love with Florida the first day. And I think I set some kind of a record. I had $500 in my pocket, and with it I made a downpayment on 120 acres of land, 100 feet of oceanfront, and a business lot. As the years went on, I never thought of putting money any place else. Some of the boys bought stocks and bonds, but I couldn't think of anything I'd rather have than more of Florida."

As a result, today, he owns some of the country's best citrus and pastureland as well as valuable downtown and beach property.

After the failure of the plow, Sexton went to work for the Indian River Farms Co., developers of the Vero Beach area, traveling all over the East and mid-East, giving lectures to groups of landseekers, marshaling them into excursions, bringing them to Florida where they were turned over to the late Senator A. W. (Tony) Young for the full treatment, Sexton taking the next train back north to look for more prospects.

"Sometimes it would be 3 weeks that I would never sleep in a bed," he says.

When he started farming on his own 3 years later he showed his organizational ability by setting up the Indian River Fruit & Vegetable Co., selling citrus trees for the Oklawaha Nurseries.

Of the 10,000 trees he set the first year he had only 1 percent loss.

Graduated from the school of agriculture, Purdue University, Sexton lays claim to a green thumb and today says "One of my greatest accomplishments has been tickling nature and making it respond."

His second organizational job was setting up the Indian River Products Co., a grove maintenance outfit, in January 1920, which he still serves as president.

He was great on organizational work in his new-found land. Just couldn't help it grow fast enough. At one time he was president of 17 corporations dealing with dairy, citrus, and vegetables.

Of the 17, 12 are still in operation and he is president of 9 of them. They include (besides the Indian River Products Co.) the Oslo Citrus Growers Association, a co-op packinghouse; Oslo Hammock Corp., owning 200 acres of the world's best Indian River citrus and 300 acres of undeveloped land; Oslo Packing Co., a holding company that owns property in the beach area; Sexton Groves, which controls 80 acres of excellent citrus and 80 acres of improved pastureland; Vero Beach Realty Co., Inc. (He's the oldest living realtor in the country from years of operation, having opened his office in 1914.)

Also, the Royal Park Service Co., owned jointly by Sexton, his cousin, Walter S. Buckingham, and a college classmate, John W. E. Wheeler; the Vero Beach Dairy, Inc., a family corporation owning historic Tiger Hammock and the land on which his ocean grill restaurant is located; Kenmore Groves, Inc., owners of 40 acres of producing groves.

Still in operation but not headed by Sexton are the McKee Sexton Land Co. and the Royal Park Co. During the depression years, Sexton was one of 75 men who formed the Florida Production Credit Association to make crop loans to farmers.

Sexton was nearly 50 years old before he started dabbling in the extraordinary. Luck shoved him into a new field—the attraction business.

Charles McKee, the man who had headed the Spaulding Tilling Machine Co., had a cousin named Arthur McKee, an orchid fancier, who chose to spend his honeymoon in Florida.

He was advised to look Sexton up and did. While on a little sightseeing trip in a Model A Ford, over roads that scarcely deserved the name, Sexton managed to upset the car, spilling bride and bridegroom.

They decided to stay a few days to get their nerves settled, with the result that McKee became interested in the area and established the Jungle Gardens, a dream of Sexton's and now one of Florida's major tourist attractions.

That was in 1932.

A couple of years ago, Sexton built a "mountain," a pile of shell topped by a shaft on which he printed the five flags that have flown over Florida.

PIRATE GOLD

Luck touched him again. A Fort Lauderdale developer saw the needle, became interested in the property adjacent to it, and leased the land for 99 years for a residential apartment development.

Many people do not take time to get acquainted with this mountain of a man, who is sometimes referred to as the Hemingway of architecture. Underneath what seems a brusque nature is a deep sense of humor, combined with a little boy's curiosity and a love of the romantic.

Asked why the lightning had struck the Ocean Grill Restaurant some six times, he confided, "there is really pirate gold buried beneath the building."

His wide-eyed grandchildren listen intently to his tales of fairies and leprechauns which he can discuss as convincingly as he can talk about the price of citrus with a fellow grove owner.

Now, supposedly retired, he has turned his cattle interests over to his older son, Ralph, and the groves to the youngest of his four children, Randy.

His daughter, Barbara (Mrs. John Tripson) and her husband operate the dairy and another daughter, Jacquelin (Mrs. Jack Daley) is married to an Episcopal rector and lives in California.

He is proud of his 13 grandchildren; and of "Elsabeth, the only wife I've ever had."

In his retirement, he is building a Ponce de Leon garden with the central figure being chiseled out by an itinerant wood carver named Al Quintana. He is also finishing up what he calls his Turf Club, west of the city, which he expects to operate as a "pizza pie palace for poor people."

As can be imagined, his friends are legion—among the colored as well as white. To the Negro people he is known as Mr. Secton and any of them seem to deem it an honor to work for him.

And so next Wednesday the folk of Indian River County are going all out to give a colorful celebration, a parade, a free barbecue, and a street dance for a colorful man who has made Vero Beach and Indian River County a more interesting place in which to live.

A Point of View

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial which appeared in Social Action in Review, February-March 1959 issue. This publication is printed under the auspices of the Commission on Social Action of Reform Judaism:

A POINT OF VIEW: POAU DEFLECTS FROM STATED GOALS TO ANTI-CATHOLIC POLICIES, PRACTICES

The time has come for some candid words to be said about the Protestant and Other Americans United for Separation of Church and State (POAU). The very title of the organization is unfortunate. While it is true that Protestants are intensely opposed to

public funds for parochial schools, or to the appointment of an Ambassador to the Vatican, the truth is that this passion for church-state separation does not usually extend to public education. By and large, Protestants are no less involved than Catholics in pressing religious practices upon the public schools.

But, beyond the question of the name of the organization is a much more serious problem: that POAU seems to have been deflected from its intended purposes into a position of obsessive anti-Catholicism. The only issues which seem to evoke vigorous action from the POAU are those which are directed against so-called Catholic power.

Disturbing evidence of this tendency, which frequently edges across the borders of good taste and tolerance, has been the questionnaire which POAU has designed to elicit the views of Catholic (and only Catholic) candidates for high public office. If such a questionnaire is needed, it should be directed to all candidates. If such religious discrimination were directed against Jews, every Jewish organization would have filled the air with angry protests. They and all other groups dedicated to fair play should repudiate the unconscionable suggestion that a religious test should be established for American public officials.

Despite the obvious progress which the American people have made since the dark anti-Catholicism of the Al Smith campaign, it would be foolish to pretend that anti-Catholic bigotry is a thing of the past. Anti-Catholicism, it has been said, is the antiSemitism of the intellectual. One must confess, in all honesty, that anti-Catholic remarks and fears are not unknown in Jewish circles, even in circles which denounce bigotry and discrimination. There is significance in the fact that the problem of anti-Catholic prejudice does not appear to challenge the interest of Jewish groups as actively as does prejudice against Jews, Negroes, Puerto Ricians, Mexicans.

There are many positions which Catholic groups take with which Jewish groups are in sharp disagreements. When this is the case, we disagree vigorously and fight for what we believe in the market-place of ideas. But this does not give us the license—nor does it give one to the POAU—to inject into public controversy the evils of baiting and religious rabble rousing. The time has come for the POAU to pause and consider where it is and where it is going.

A. V.

Five Out of Six Medical Societies Favor Social-Security Coverage for Doctors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 14, 1959

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, recently my attention was drawn to an article appearing in Medical Economics which shows that in statewide polls that have been conducted to date, doctors in five medical societies have come out in support of including physicians in the Federal social-security program. And in a sixth, inclusion was opposed by a narrow margin.

Becauce this is a matter which, I believe, has been given serious thought by my colleagues, I am therefore offering it for their perusal:

WHAT THE STATEWIDE SOCIAL SECURITY POLLS ARE SHOWING

(By Robert L. Brenner)

"Do you favor including physicians in the Federal social-security program?"

That's the question six major medical societies have asked their members in recent months. And the scoreboard so far is the best indicator yet of whether you and your colleagues will eventually get social security coverage. Here's why:

Leaders in Congress have hinted they won't extent social security coverage to self-employed medical men unless the A.M.A. asks them to. And the A.M.A. has indicated it won't take this step unless a majority of delegates from its constituent societies say they want social security.

At last June's meeting, the association voted down two State delegations' request for a nationwide poll of doctors. Said the A.M.A. House of Delegates: "Any such poll should be taken on a State-by-State basis and the results transmitted to the delegates."

So to keep abreast of developments, you've got to watch what happens next in the constituent societies. And make no mistake about it. Things are happening.

So far, Ohio, Maine, the District of Columbia, Connecticut, New York, and Georgia have completed polls that are expected to influence the A.M.A.'s final decision. The results: A big majority of doctors in 5 of the 6 societies seem to want coverage; it has been narrowly voted down in the sixth.

You can't base a solid prediction on just six polls, of course. But they do give the most up-to-date indication of how the wind is blowing. Here's more detail on the results of each:

Ohio: In favor of social security coverage by about 3 to 2.

Ohio's poll, taken last October, was preceded by heavy publicity in the State and local medical journals. As a result, the vote was heavy; 6,832 of the society's 8,900-odd members responded. The outcome: 4,095 in favor, 2,737 opposed.

Maine: In favor of social security coverage by nearly 2 to 1.

Maine's doctors voted heavily, too. Of the society's 840 members, 607 sent in ballots. The tally: 389 in favor, 212 against, 6 no opinion.

District of Columbia: In favor of social security coverage by about 3 to 1.

The vote in this society was 550 in favor, 192 against. In addition, many of the doctors wrote explanations of why they voted as they did. Typical reason for a "yes" vote: "I have always bitterly opposed 'something for nothing.' But since we have to help pay for social security, we should receive its benefits."

Typical reason for a "no" vote: "I'm holding out for Congress to pass legislation that lets me put aside some of my income in a tax-free pension fund. In other words, I want to buy my own social security."

Connecticut: In favor of social security coverage by more than 2½ to 1.

Connecticut's delegation was one of the two that asked the A.M.A. last June to take a nationwide poll. By then, the State society's members had already voted for social security, 1,391 to 504.

New York: A majority in favor of social security coverage.

New York's was the other delegation that asked the A.M.A. for a poll of all the country's doctors. The exact results of its own statewide poll have never been released. But the State's delegates have standing instructions to vote for social security if it comes to an A.M.A. vote.

Georgia: Opposed to social security coverage by a slim margin.

Fewer than half the society's members responded to its recent poll, and one society official calls the results entirely insignificant. Nevertheless, Georgia's A.M.A. delegates have nothing to go on but that vote: 539 against, 496 for.

Statewide polls are now under way or planned in Pennsylvania, Maryland, Michigan, and Delaware. Other States are expected to follow in coming months.

The Big Depletion Argument

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM STEED
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 14, 1959

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, the percentage depletion provision of the income-tax law is a subject of frequent discussion. But many are not familiar in detail with the reasons for this provision and with its history and operation. Mr. E. C. Seymour, senior vice president of the Magnolia Petroleum Co., gave a succinct summary of his experience and viewpoint in this field in the January-February 1959 issue of Magnolia News. His article, "The Big Depletion Argument," emphasizes the relation between the depletion provision and future oil resource development in the United States ample for the national security:

THE BIG DEPLETION ARGUMENT

(By E. C. Seymour, senior vice president, Magnolia Petroleum Co.)

Tucked into the maze of the United States' income-tax law are 73 words that most likely will trigger a hot congressional fight in 1959.

The expected attempt to erase or change those words carries not only vital significance for Magnolia and the rest of the oil industry but for every citizen.

Taken together the 73 words are called by most people the "depletion allowance." The oil industry prefers "percentage depletion" or "depletion deduction." A scattering of political figures from outside oil-producing States have termed it a "tax loophole."

What is this 33-year-old provision and why, at this late date, is it about to step into the national spotlight for cheers or boos?

Avoiding the technical language used in the law, the provision permits taxpayers—in figuring their gross income—to deduct 27½ percent of the revenue they get from producing oil and gas. The amount of the deduction cannot, however, be more than 50 percent of the net income from the property.

Note that the deduction does not apply to pipelining, refining, or marketing income—only to oil and gas wells. Note also that it applies to any taxpayer, whether company or individual.

Suppose a company owned three oil wells on one lease, and the total income from the oil amounted to $20,000 a year. It could claim a deduction from its income of 27½ percent, or $5,500.

But before claiming it, the company must also figure what 50 percent of the net operating profit would be. It spent $6,000 to get the oil out of the ground, so its net operating profit was only $14,000; 50 percent of that would be $7,000. The company can then take its depletion deduction since the amount in dollars is less than 50 percent of its net operating profit on the property. (However, contrary to general belief, no depletion deduction could be claimed if the lease had an operating loss.)

In practice, this limit pares the depletion deduction substantially below 27½ per-

cent and complications of following the law make this simplified example rare. But basically that is how the allowance works.

UNDER ATTACK

In 1959 Congress is expected to hear proposals for changing or doing away with the depletion deduction; various Members have expressed opposition, and the Director of the Budget has spoken of it as a possible way of raising money to help meet the big deficit in the Federal budget.

Also, there has been criticism from individuals and some newspapers. They say, for example, the allowance is a special privilege, that the oil industry makes too much money anyhow, that maybe such provision is needed but 27½ percent is too high.

Answers to these criticisms come from not only people in the industry but many outside it.

In 1951 President Truman appointed a Presidential Commission to investigate the state of the Nation's natural resources, and to recommend national policies that would strengthen the country's economy and military security.

PALEY COMMISSION

A year later the Commission—informally named after its Chairman, William S. Paley—returned its report to the President. Among other things, it dealt with the depletion rate.

"The present structure of minerals taxes includes strong and desirable incentives to explore for, develop and produce minerals of importance to the Nation's growth and security * * * the device of percentage depletion is a powerful inducement to capital to enter the relatively risky business of searching for mineral deposits of uncertain location, quality and extent."

The Paley Commission thus underlined the basic principle upon which the provision was built: that it would help keep the Nation supplied with oil. The Nation must have oil for peacetime commerce, and it must have it for national defense.

And to get it people must drill for it.

From the beginning, Congress recognized that getting people to drill for oil or invest in such drilling involves an almost foolhardy willingness to take enormous risks—unparalleled in such degree by any other enterprise.

A good deal has been said about these risks, but a thoughtful review gives more than surface significance to them.

Currently, one wildcat well—a well drilled in unproven territory—produces oil and gas out of every nine drilled. But only 1 out of 49 finds a pool of a million barrels or more; by most estimates it takes this size discovery to earn a profit.

The odds against locating a field of 50 million barrels or more are about 1,149 to 1.

Suppose that the income tax law did not take this into account. The oilman drills nine wildcat wells and eight are dry. The ninth is a producer (the odds are against it being profitable, but let's assume that it is). Every barrel of oil or gas he takes from his ninth well depletes his capital, which is simply the oil or gas he has discovered but not produced. He is transforming his capital into income.

The law isn't greatly bothered about this, except to the extent of wanting the oilman to have enough incentive to start out looking for more oil in spite of his eight failures.

There are plenty of places where capital can be invested that will yield a surer return than in drilling. Congress knew this. It made tentative attempts to provide producers more incentives to find oil during the period from 1918 to 1926, a time when there was real worry that the Nation would not have enough oil to keep up with its growth.

MORE DRILLING, MORE OIL

Passage of the depletion provision in its final form, in 1926, was followed by a succession of discoveries that today has brought the Nation's domestic oil and gas reserves to the highest level in history.

Thus, the basic idea has been to keep capital flowing into the hunt for oil in spite of the enormous risks involved. The strongest critics of the provision do not dispute its success in doing this.

But what about 1959? Aren't conditions different now?

President Albert L. Nickerson, of Socony Mobil Oil Co., said recently that Mobil economists predict a 40 percent increase in demand for petroleum in the next 10 years. American Petroleum Institute figures indicate that, at today's demand levels, the big reserves we have will still last only about 11 years. A great deal more oil is going to have to come from somewhere.

And oil is getting harder to find in the United States with wells more expensive and deeper. This is a hard fact, even with the depletion deduction. What is needed, according to supporters of the provision, is less talk about cuts in the deduction and more thought now about a future increase. Foreign crude may be plentiful, but the Nation cannot afford to let domestic supplies wither as odds against finding oil and gas get higher and higher. The risks of such a policy are even more than those of drilling itself.

OIL AND SECURITY

Magnolia, the oil industry in general, and non-industry supporters of the present depletion rate insist that the Nation's security depends heavily on ample oil supplies which the provision helps provide, and are willing to do battle against specific criticisms.

Is the deduction a tax loophole?

The pro-depletion forces say the provision is no more a loophole than the provision for special treatment of long-term capital gains, or giving married men more deductions than bachelors. Both recognize special reasons for adapting the tax law to realities if fairness and the national interest require it.

The argument that oil companies' profits are too high already is met with the statement that their profits are not as high as in other industries.

Statistics gathered by the First National City Bank of New York show that oil companies' earnings, after taxes, averaged 9.5 percent of invested capital versus 10.6 percent for all other manufacturing companies. This was from 1926 to 1956 inclusive, the first 30 years of the depletion provision. The Chase National Bank studied earnings of the 30 largest oil companies from 1938 to 1953, inclusive, and found their average rate of return was 10.9 percent. Average for all manufacturing in that period was 12.6 percent.

Critics say that U.S. companies should not be permitted to use the depletion deduction on income derived from foreign production.

Those companies who have foreign production point out they pay income tax on such production as with their U.S. wells, that if the purpose of the provision is to keep the Nation supplied with oil then the country should not ignore the fact that foreign crude is likely to be even more important as bigger demand develops. It's needed there as in the United States if oil for the future is to be located.

Some opponents accept the idea of the depletion deduction but argue that 27½ percent is too much. Reduce it, they urge.

But history shows that the original Senate and House that adopted the provision came up with recommendations of 25 percent and 30 percent—fairly close figuring. The 27½ percent figure was a compromise between the two.

Those for the provision point out that (1) the 27½ percent figure has worked well in providing incentive for investment, (2) it is not too high in view of the industry's profit record.

There isn't any doubt that the U.S. Treasury could use any money received by either cutting or abolishing the deduction. How much it would be is subject to argument.

HIGHER PRICES POSSIBLE

If depletion goes, some other incentive for attracting capital to drilling must be found or shortage of supplies will develop. Higher prices for petroleum products offer the only other alternative in sight. This is not a threat but recognition of the economic facts of life. If more oil is to be found for Magnolia and its customers, the hunt must be paid for, and if capital is permitted to shrink as oil is depleted, more capital must be found.

That capital must come from users of oil. How much would the increase be? If applied to gasoline alone, need for revenue would force up the cost from 2 to 5 cents a gallon according to the best estimates, with 4 cents being most often mentioned. Spread the cost over other products, and it would be less—but consumers would pay for it.

ISSUE VITAL

This, then, is the substance of the big depletion argument, scheduled for congressional review once again as it has been off and on for 30 years. The attack is going to be stronger this year, and more will be riding on the outcome.

Says E. C. Seymour, Magnolia's senior vice president, who has surveyed the operations of the depletion provision for many years:

"A reduction or abolition of the depletion provision would have the most serious consequences for Magnolia. We are engaged in pulling out from under a serious recession. We are fighting high costs, and have had to shrink our payrolls in certain lines in order to get more competitive, and to meet those high costs. In addition, we are looking for oil under increasingly adverse conditions.

"Some people in and out of the U.S. Government seem to think the oil industry is overly prosperous, and that the depletion provision, therefore, is not needed. We dispute both the belief and the conclusion they draw from it. Neither is factual or reasonable. The real point at issue is this: Will there be enough oil here and overseas to take care of the Nation's needs? The opponents of percentage depletion seem willing to gamble on the matter. But Magnolians and most other Americans are not."

Miss Patsy Riley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1959

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, each year the American Legion, Department of Arkansas, holds an oratorical contest for students of high school age and awards prizes to those who win. One of the requirements is that the oration must be upon a patriotic subject; another requirement is that it must be original with the young student.

Miss Patsy Riley, a junior in the Springdale High School in the district which I am honored to represent, won the prize for the first district of the American Legion. Patsy is a lovely young lady who is a credit not only to her family, her school, her community, and her State, but to the Nation. She put a lot of work and spirit into the

oration which I insert as a part of my remarks:

THE CONSTITUTION: TEMPLE OF LIBERTY

Ladies and gentlemen, I wish to discuss the Constitution of the United States of America. As a legal document it establishes a successful system of government. Its precision and brevity are admirable. As a frame of government, it has stood the test of time, war, and depression.

The portion of the Constitution which I wish to discuss is the very heart of it. This is the liberty on which it was founded; the liberty on which it now and always will stand.

Why was the Constitution formed? Who were its framers?

In a nutshell, the purpose for which the Constitution was formed was for the perpetuation of American liberty by uniting the States in one, strong union.

The Constitution was formed by the Framing Fathers, these men were of wide knowledge and public experience, men of wealth and prestige. These men varied in age from the oldest member attending, Benjamin Franklin, who was 81, to Dayton, the youngest who was 26. Never before nor since had such a group of remarkable men met under one roof. Age was of no importance, these men were there for the purpose of uniting the Nation they loved. They had seen the light of liberty slowly dimming as the States quarreled and threatened to disband. They saw that to keep it from completely dying, some action must be taken to make a strong government. A government that could offer unity and security to all.

There were many problems facing this group of men. They were involved in their own State politics. The larger States wanted the most power, while the smaller States refused to be pawns of the larger ones. They disagreed on almost every proposal, but they all yearned for freedom. It seemed that everything was lost.

At this crisis, Benjamin Franklin suggested that they look to the Almighty Father for guidance. What their hearts had yearned for, their minds now discovered. They now had a way to make American liberty secure forever.

Next to the Bible, the Constitution is the greatest document ever to be written. Just as the Bible offers solace and security to the soul, the Constitution offers security and liberty to the American people.

The Founding Fathers had faith in God. This faith is proclaimed by the inscription on each coin made in the United States. The inscription, "In God We Trust."

The basic foundation for the Constitution was framed when the United States of America was formed with these bold lines:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

With these words, the War for Independence was begun.

I'm sure that most of us know the story of how these patriots fought and died for liberty. Many writers have tried to explain this desire for freedom that has caused men to give their lives for it. This feeling can't be put on paper, it must come from within.

Many people did die in the War for Independence, but their love for freedom was undying. This desire was kept alive. It was ignited until it became a flame burning in the very hearts and souls of every freedom-loving man, woman, and child. This is why the War for Independence was won. How could the mother country continue to fight against something that refused to die?

The Constitution was drafted to guarantee the people that this liberty that they fought for would never die. Every word of the Constitution institutes this liberty.

Let us examine the Preamble:

"We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution of the United States of America."

Let's take this step by step:

"We the people of the United States in order to form a more perfect union." Why? To make our liberties secure. For how long? As long as humanity wanders through the wilderness of time. For whom? For every man, woman, and child under the American flag.

"Establish justice." What is justice but the guardian of our liberty? Justice comes from the Almighty God himself, for he said, "I, the Lord thy God, am a just God."

"Insure domestic tranquillity." The great Charter insured equality of the States; domestic order and peace, both of the States, and of the people.

"Provide for the common defense." The States were now united. They were now capable of defending themselves.

"Promote the general welfare." This promotion is shown in innumerable ways, such as the establishment of a postal system, a uniform coinage, defense forces, a uniform currency, and of course by the unification of the States which is shown in nearly every paragraph of the Constitution.

And finally, the Preamble declares that the Constitution is established to "secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity." We are the posterity of the men who fought and died for our liberty. We too can be worthy of this posterity if we pledge our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor to the perpetuation of our American liberty.

In summation of the Preamble, it declares that our forefathers fought for unity, justice, tranquillity, safety, welfare, and liberty. Our forefathers ordained this Constitution for freemen; we shall also sustain it for freemen.

People all over the world have felt this same instinct to be free. They have escaped a Stalin, a Mussolini, a Hitler. They have come to America seeking a refuge from the tyrannies of a dictatorship, of a communistic form of government.

As they enter New York Harbor they see our Great Lady stretching forth her hand, offering to them her home. The inscription by Emma Lazarus says to them: "Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free; the wretched refuse of your teeming shore; send these, the homeless, tempest-tossed, to me: I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

Freedom and liberty are the lights shining in the souls and hearts of everyone.

Man can suspend his mighty bridges, erect his impressive skyscrapers, fuse the hydrogen atoms, and send his puny satellites into space, but he can never dim this light burning in the souls of the American citizen.

Every American can study the framework of the Constitution and say with pride, "This was made for me. When danger threatens my life or liberty I can take safe refuge in the Constitution. Into that fortress neither President nor Congress nor armies nor mobs can enter and take away my life or liberty."

Since the birth of Christ, 14 powerful nations have risen and fallen, democratic nations among them. We in America believe that democracy is the world's dream for government. If so, why did these nations fall? As the original ones who fought for democracy died, the principles on which it was founded also died. The generations following had no written guarantee of their democracy or of their basic freedoms to posterity.

The eyes of the world are upon the United States. We have that written pledge of personal liberty, equality, felicity. That aged document lies in the Library of Congress, sealed in an airtight glass case that all may see. Though its pages are yellowed with age, and the ink is slowly fading away, the words once written there remain embedded in our hearts. They gave us our liberty, our Nation, our flag, and our way of life.

Yes, the eyes of the world are upon us, but have we ourselves forgotten to look at our own heritage? If we are neglectful of our heritage and our Government, we, too, might join the ranks of fallen nations.

We must remember that "the price of liberty is eternal vigilance."

We hold the key to civilization's future.

Ladies and gentlemen, are we being neglectful of our heritage? Are we putting an end to our "Temple of Liberty"? If our Constitution dies, so dies the hope of the world.

I close with the words of President Cleveland:

"This Constitution comes to us sealed with the test of almost two centuries. It has been found sufficient in the past, and it will be found sufficient in all the years to come, if American people are true to their sacred trust. Years will pass and millions yet unborn will inquire concerning our stewardship and the safety of the Constitution. God grant they may find it unimpaired."

Fact Sheet Compiled by Textile Workers Union of America on Textile Unemployment, April 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the most current figures on textile unemployment just issued by the research department of the Textile Workers Union of America:

TEXTILE WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA FACT SHEET ON TEXTILE UNEMPLOYMENT, APRIL 1959

Unemployment in the textile industry is about the highest for all manufacturing industries except apparel. In January 1959 the U.S. Census Bureau reported 10.3 percent of the textile labor force as unemployed as compared with 7.3 percent for the entire nonfarm wage and salary worker population.

While the unemployment rate for all manufacturing industries declined from January 1958 to January 1959 by 1 percentage point, from 8.9 to 7.9 percent, the unemployment rate for the textile industry dropped only one-half of 1 percentage point, from 10.8 to 10.3 percent. Most of this drop was caused by people leaving the industry as the number of production workers employed in the industry actually declined from 861,000 to 855,000 during this period.

There has been a net decline of 403,000 production jobs from February 1951 to February 1959, as employment fell from 1,263,000 to 860,000.

Increases in production are not translated into higher employment as productivity is increasing at a phenomenally high rate. Yards produced per man-hour in 1947 were 7.8; in 1951, 9; in 1956, 10.6; in 1957, 11.6; and in the first 9 months of 1958, 12.2. As output has not kept pace with the annual rate of increase in productivity of 4 to 5 percent, employment has continued to shrink.

The decline in jobs has been felt in all sections of the country in which substantial numbers of textile workers are employed. While New England and the Middle Atlantic States have suffered the greatest declines, the South has also had a considerable drop in employment (table I).

Large groups of unemployed textile workers have been stranded in communities all along the eastern seaboard. These communities have made abortive efforts to improve their lot by attracting new industry. But in no case has the new employment significantly improved conditions within these areas. Textile workers have been scrapped by the thousands. Men and women with years of service have remained unemployed, with many of them involuntarily being retired or supported by families.

The chronic state of unemployment has meant economic distress for many areas (table II).

TABLE I.—*Employment in the textile mill products industry, by State, February 1951 and January 1959*

[Thousands]

Region and State	Employment (wage and salary workers)		Change, February 1951 to January 1959	
	February 1951	January 1959	Number	Percent
United States [1]	1,365.0	946.0	−419.0	−30.7
New England	286.1	122.0	−164.1	−57.4
Maine	27.5	14.2	−13.3	−48.4
New Hampshire	21.1	12.7	−8.4	−39.8
Vermont	5.2	1.2	−4.0	−76.9
Massachusetts	125.0	49.8	−75.2	−60.2
Connecticut	41.6	14.8	−26.8	−64.4
Rhode Island	65.7	29.3	−36.4	−55.4
Middle Atlantic	307.2	167.9	−139.3	−45.4
New York	96.1	[2] 56.8	−39.3	−40.9
New Jersey	65.8	31.7	−34.1	−51.8
Pennsylvania	141.7	76.9	−64.8	−45.7
Delaware	3.6	2.5	−1.1	−30.6
South	669.9	573.8	−96.1	−14.4
West Virginia	2.9	1.9	−1.0	−34.5
Maryland	11.6	5.8	−5.8	−50.0
Virginia	42.7	35.2	−7.5	−17.6
North Carolina	244.2	217.0	−27.2	−11.1
South Carolina	139.8	127.6	−12.2	−8.7
Georgia	114.8	98.2	−16.6	−14.5
Alabama	55.5	42.2	−13.3	−24.0
Mississippi	6.0	4.5	−1.5	−25.0
Tennessee	39.9	30.9	−9.0	−22.6
Arkansas	2.3	1.9	−.4	−17.4
Texas	10.2	7.0	−3.2	−31.4
Midwest	32.2	20.8	−11.4	−35.4
Illinois	13.5	[3] 9.9	−3.6	−26.7
Minnesota	4.9	2.3	−2.6	−53.1
Wisconsin	[3] 10.1	[2] [3] 5.2	−4.9	−48.5
Missouri	3.7	[3] 3.4	−.3	−8.1
Far West: California	8.2	5.6	−2.6	−31.7

[1] Data include States not shown separately.
[2] December 1958.
[3] Production worker employment.

TABLE II.—*Textile areas of substantial labor surplus,[1] January 1959*

NEW ENGLAND

	Percent
Maine:	
Biddeford-Sanford [2] (January 1959)	21.2
Lewiston-Auburn (February 1959)	11.3
Portland [3] (January 1959)	9.8
Vermont:	
Burlington (June 1958)	6.8
Connecticut:	
Danielson [2] (January 1959)	12.3
Norwich (January 1959)	11.9
Thompsonville (January 1959)	11.4
Rhode Island:	
Providence [2] [3] (December 1958)	10.0
Newport [2] (September 1958)	6.2

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE II.—Continued

NEW ENGLAND—continued

	Percent
Massachusetts:	
Brockton [3] (January 1959)	8.5
Fall River [2] [3] (January 1959)	11.3
Fitchburg (January 1959)	8.3
Lawrence [2] [3] (January 1959)	9.5
Lowell [2] [3] (January 1959)	11.5
New Bedford [3] (January 1959)	12.9
North Adams [2] (January 1959)	14.9
Plymouth (January 1959)	13.9
Southbridge-Webster (January 1959)	11.3
Springfield-Holyoke [3] (January 1959)	8.6
Taunton (January 1959)	8.7
Ware (January 1959)	9.2
Worcester (January 1959)	9.6

MIDDLE ATLANTIC

New York:	
Amsterdam (July 1958)	18.0
Auburn (September 1958)	15.0
Gloversville (August 1958)	13.7
Utica-Rome [3] (November 1958)	9.0
New Jersey:	
Paterson [3] (January 1959)	9.1
Phillipsburg (November 1958)	6.9
Pennsylvania:	
Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton [3] (January 1959)	10.1
Berwick-Bloomsburg [2] (November 1958)	12.5
Lewistown [3] (November 1958)	11.4
Reading [3] (January 1959)	7.8
Scranton [2] [3] (January 1959)	16.8
Sunbury-Shamokin-Mount Carmel [3] (September 1958)	10.3
Wilkes-Barre-Hazelton [2] [3] (January 1959)	18.0
Williamsport (July 1958)	12.9
York (January 1959)	8.7

SOUTH

Maryland:	
Cumberland [2] (August 1958)	13.2
Virginia:	
Radford-Pulaski [2] (December 1958)	7.7
Roanoke [3] (January 1959)	10.2
West Virginia:	
Martinsburg (October 1958)	6.3
Parkersburg (December 1958)	8.4
North Carolina:	
Asheville [2] [3] (January 1959)	8.3
Durham [2] [3] (January 1959)	7.4
Fayetteville [2] (January 1959)	14.0
Hendersonville (January 1959)	11.9
Kinston (January 1959)	8.7
Lumberton (January 1959)	12.1
Mount Airy [2] (January 1959)	10.9
Raleigh (January 1959)	6.9
Rockingham-Hamlet (January 1959)	21.4
Rocky Mount [2] (January 1959)	10.0

SOUTH

Rutherfordton-Forest City [2] (January 1959)	11
Shelby-Kings Mountain [2] (January 1959)	9
Waynesville [2] (January 1959)	6.2
Tennessee:	
Bristol - Johnson City - Kingsport (September 1958)	6.7
Chattanooga [3] (January 1959)	7.3
Knoxville [2] [3] (January 1959)	8.1
Memphis (January 1959)	6.7
Murphreesboro (April 1958)	11.2
Shelbyville (October 1958)	8.7
Georgia:	
Toccoa (September 1958)	6.9
Mississippi:	
Greenville (August 1958)	8.1
Alabama:	
Alexander City (August 1598)	11.5
Anniston (December 1958)	8.6
Florence-Sheffield (December 1958)	10.5
Gadsden (December 1958)	7.2
Jasper (December 1958)	10.8
Talladega (December 1958)	9.9

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE II.—Continued

WEST

	Percent
Oregon:	
Pendleton (November 1958)	8.2

[1] 6 percent or more of labor force unemployed; figures in parentheses are latest available unemployment rates.
[2] Would be eligible for assistance under Douglas bill as of January 1959.
[3] Major area.

Source: U.S. Bureau of Employment Security.

An Appraisal of the St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in a few short weeks, the St. Lawrence Seaway will be formally dedicated. Heads of state of a great many nations will be on hand for this historic event, and many of the nations of the world will join in wishing us success in this greatest of all engineering ventures.

Before we get too deeply embroiled in the ceremonies, the glitter, and the glamour, it is well for us to take a good look at the seaway under the cold, hard light of facts. In the April 1959, issue of the Michigan State University magazine, an article by Dr. John L. Hazard, entitled "The Seaway: An Appraisal," gives us just such a look.

I would very much recommend this article to my colleagues in the House, since it is an excellent analysis of the problems to be faced and the decisions to be made in the months and years ahead in relation to the seaway:

THE SEAWAY: AN APPRAISAL

(By Dr. John L. Hazard)

Much of the glitter of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway has been scratched away in recent months by waterway experts who have gathered at Michigan State.

Recognizing the seaway as perhaps one of the most crucial—if not controversial—subjects of the decade, Michigan State University has sponsored wide-ranging programs aimed at assessing the water route's possible contribution to the heartland of America.

As soon as the ice clears on the Great Lakes this month the seaway will actually open. The formal dedication will be made in late June by Queen Elizabeth and, possibly, President Eisenhower.

The fact that the British monarch is coming to dedicate the waterway, which runs 2,216 miles from salt water to Duluth, is taken by some as an indication of an inferior U.S. position.

MOST OF HEARTLAND IN UNITED STATES

But while the seaway is primarily a Canadian project through the St. Lawrence River, most of the mid-continent, Great Lakes portion is under U.S. development.

"This heartland region," says Frank W. Suggitt, head of the Michigan State University resource development department, "comprises the five East North Central States (Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Michigan) and the Province of Ontario.

"It constitutes the only intercontinental land mass in the world which is served by two major waterways which link it to the sea and to the commerce of the world. The

St. Lawrence and Great Lakes Waterway and the Ohio and Mississippi River system serve this vast heartland."

Professor Suggitt explains that the region contains only 8 percent of the combined land area of the United States and Canada, but has 25 percent of the water area in the two countries—without counting the surface area of the Great Lakes.

The main portion of the traffic to come on the seaway, says Bradley D. Nash, Deputy Under Secretary of Commerce, will be bulk commodities such as iron ore, coal, chemicals, limestone, grain, forest products, and petroleum.

"Within the next few years," Nash said at a transportation meeting in Kellogg Center, "all the work in the connecting channels of the Great Lakes will be completed. This will bring about greater shipping capacity in the vessels using the seaway. Large ocean vessels can, after the completion of the channel work, reach the lakes with full cargoes."

SHALLOW WATERS RESTRICT VESSELS

While oceangoing shipping has been able to get through to the lakes for many years it has, until this year, been restricted by shallow waters, 14 feet being the maximum draft. The ultimate aim is to have a seaway with a minimum depth of 27 feet.

With larger locks and channels throughout the system the future of the mid-America area—in which Michigan State University is practically at the center—can be influenced by the waterway. But the question brought out in campus discussions is whether the seaway actually will contribute directly to the economic and political strength of the heartland, and at least indirectly to Michigan State and its alumni.

Part of the answer came out during a vital Canadian-American seminar held at State in February. It was at this meeting that a Wisconsin booster of the seaway project claimed the Great Lakes will become a new Mediterranean.

The booster from Wisconsin is Harry C. Brockel, Milwaukee's port director. Brockel says international trade over the waterway will bring 40 of the world's great shipping companies to the lakes, plus badly needed raw materials.

But he claims that the decision of the United States to join Canada in the development came partly by the belated realization of our steel industry that the Mesabi Range iron ores had a determinable end and that new raw materials are available in Canada.

As a mainspring in the project, Canada began pushing the seaway in earnest in 1951, although that country had turned down the earlier chances for a joint venture with the United States. It is suggested that Canada's dependence on world trade forces it to begin hustling.

CANADA DEPENDS ON EXPORTS

"A full 20 percent of Canada's gross national product comes from export, compared to only 4 percent in the United States," explains Gerald A. Newman, Canadian consul general at Chicago.

The consul also attended the Canadian-United States meeting on campus. Prof. John L. Hazard, Michigan State University department of marketing and transportation administration, was chairman of the joint seminar.

Dr. Hazard, who has been an economic consultant for the St. Lawrence Seaway Corporation, asserts that the water route strikes into an advanced industrial economy and poses a new series of material options, a new spectrum of market opportunities, and equally a whole new set of political issues to the midcontinent.

One problem is competition with well-developed eastern ports. Although a map will show that by water Detroit is closer to London than New York is, the East has the know-how and contacts in foreign shipping that takes most of the business to the coast.

"Seaports have invested several times more money in port development than has been invested in the Great Lakes area," Professor Hazard says. "Market restrictions have come into being."

"The seaway will benefits most those who prepare for it," he warns. The best way for the lakes region to do this, he adds, is to collect its divided political and social efforts.

"One of the biggest faults is that many are waiting to see what bonanzas the seaway will offer them," Dr. Hazard says. "The general apathy that might throttle the realization of seaway commerce might also hinder the successful deevlopment of the seaway, not only through weakness of mid-America as a unit but as a result of failure to withstand pressure from other sections of the country."

"The seaway itself does nothing," he continues. "It is something to be used as a tool. It is a capital investment to be bought and paid for by this heartland region."

BUSINESS KNOW-HOW LACKING

To the lack of development and failure to acquaint the world with the Great Lakes, add the failure to train men well versed in the import-export business. The last was often mentioned when port and shipping authorities met at Kellogg Center to discuss the impact of the seaway during the Michigan State University Farmer's Week.

One participant claimed that too many ill-founded projections had been made on the effect of the seaway. He is Ralph McCrea, vice president of a Muskegon dock and market firm.

"We're going to have a wonderful tool to work with," McCrea says, "but those who look for a flow of gold coming upstream are in for a surprise. On the basis of general cargo and merchandise freight we have a long way to go before we can utilize the waterway."

Port terminals and facilities are as vital as shipping, he explains, but these facilities are still lacking in most places.

That fact, coupled with failure so far to develop foreign trade independently of the east coast, will hamper the heartland, McCrea says.

"Somebody is going to have to be vigorous," he asserts. "We're always letting someone in New York or Philadelphia do the work."

Past experience gives some indication of who has been vigorous. In the American section of the seaway opened last July here is what happened:

Canadian-registry ships dominated the traffic with a total of 3,911 passages. U.S. ships numbered only 593. West Germany sent through 306 vessels; Norway, 151, Britain, 111; Sweden, 74; Denmark, 36; France, 16.

Another point developed in discussions at Michigan State University is the key position the State of Michigan holds if its facilities are developed sufficiently.

Of Michigan's 83 counties, 62 are within 40 miles of the waterway. The State has a coastline of 3,125 miles.

"We have to let businessmen around the world know that Michigan has a longer coastline than any other State," declares Paul Herbert, director of research for the Michigan Department of Economic Development.

Herbert explained at a Michigan State University-sponsored seaway meeting that a great need exists to develop manufacturers for export, especially because of the new European Common Market which probably will lure American businesses to build branch plants abroad. This could mean less production at home for exports.

GREAT VALUE SEEN IN COOPERATION

One heartening aspect of the seaway venture is the cooperation that has come about between Canada and the United States. It extends from high administrative levels to the physical carrying out of the project.

A representative area of cooperation is in charting of the waterway. Gilbert E. Ropes, 1934, of the Corps of Engineers, is one of the men engaged in this work.

The alumnus says the mutual labor of Canada and the United States in charting and other projects is saving money for both countries.

Concurrent efforts have been developed to such a degree that charts based on new soundings of the extensive waterway will probably be available for the 1960 navigation system.

International cooperation may prove to be the ultimate great value of the seaway, Professor Hazard says.

"We have a tenuous union with the seaway", he asserts. "We had to be pulled into it. But one hope is that we now will become politically and socially united.

"The first step is making joint use of larger resources of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system. This includes the first step toward political recognition of growing economic integration between Canada and the United States."

It is lack of unity which Dr. Hazard believes to be the most serious shortcoming of the Heartland, for without a strong sense of regionalism the larger potentials of the seaway might slip from mid-America's grasp.

Doctoring the Dollar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following letter to the editor of the New York Herald Tribune, written by Eugene Bashore of Scarsdale, N.Y., will be of interest to our colleagues. It appeared in the Herald Tribune of March 29, 1959:

DOCTORING THE DOLLAR

To the New York Herald Tribune:

In your March 20 editorial "Shares in America," you say, "By buying savings bonds, he (the citizen) is making sure that the dollar will remain sound to support the growth of the United States." That, in terms of financial literacy, is a mistruth.

Whatever reasons there may be for buying savings bonds, assuring the soundness of the dollar is not one of them. Citizens who have owned at one time as much as $49 billion of savings bonds know they have not been a good investment for the very reason that the soundness of the dollar has not been and is not being maintained. And the willingness of citizens to buy savings bonds hasn't had anything to do with it.

From 1789 to 1930, a period of 142 years, the Government lived within its income in 96 years and overspent in 46 years. Deficits resulting from the War of 1812, the depression of 1840–43, the Civil War, the panic of 1893, the panic of 1907 and World War I were followed by periods of surplus which largely restored fiscal order. Deficit financing was not a way of life.

From 1930 to 1946 we had a string of 16 deficits and in the 13 years since World War II we have had 8 more deficit years—24 deficit years out of 29.

It is true that deficit spending was not made possible by the willingness of citizens to buy savings bonds, or other Treasury obligations, except to an extent during

actual war under compulsion of patriotism. It has been possible in recent years because the Treasury has avoided the test of the market place, by selling since 1947 $32 billion of Treasury obligations to Federal, State and local Government accounts. But those accounts are now dry, or nearly so. Woe is willing on woe, and Government finances are in a mess.

EUGENE BASHORE.

Architect Wright—As Much a National Monument as the Structures He Built

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 23, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Wisconsin lost one of its most famous, colorful, and controversial native sons—and the world lost a renowned architect—when Frank Lloyd Wright died at Phoenix, Ariz., April 9. As an individualist living in an age of conformity, he did more than any one man to change the face of American architecture with his revolt against traditional designs. Many of his architectural designs, condemned at the time as impractical or worse, have since become an accepted part of the American scene. His famed "prairie houses," which drew heavy criticism when he designed them prior to World War I, were the forerunners of today's tremendously popular ranch-style homes.

Wisconsin has produced many individualists like, for instance, Senator Robert M. LaFollette, Sr., and Architect Wright's close friend, William T. Evjue, crusading editor of the Madison, Wis., Capital Times. Their contributions to progress cannot be measured.

The world is poorer with the passing of Architect Wright, but richer because of what he did and what he stood for during his lifetime. His buildings are a monument to the spirit of the man.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD an editorial from the April 9 Capital Times. It summarizes, as well as words can, the achievements of Frank Lloyd Wright, an extraordinarily gifted individual and architect:

FRANK LLOYD WRIGHT: THE IDEAS HE LEAVES IN HISTORY

Wisconsin's most famous son and the towering genius of modern architecture is gone. The sad news has come from the West that Frank Lloyd Wright, almost on the eve of his return to his beloved hills of Wisconsin and with but a few weeks before his 90th birthday, failed to survive surgery for an ailment that seized him suddenly.

For 70 years the ideas of Frank Lloyd Wright have been battering down the accepted principles of architecture. Through the storms of the years he has refused to yield from those principles.

When he died last night he was recognized around the world as the greatest of all figures in his field.

The world accepted his genius in architecture before his death. There is no longer any question that he and he alone set the direction of modern architecture. His work is known and admired in every country of the world. Dozens of honors have been conferred upon him by foreign governments and by the arts and science groups at home.

To understand his preeminence in the work he followed one had to know the power of the personality from which the genius flowed.

Mr. Wright, like Bob LaFollette, Wisconsin's other famed son, was a powerful personality that stood by itself without reliance on others. Like LaFollette, he preferred to think his own thoughts rather than accept them from others.

He dared to push out ahead, to question, to challenge, and to come to new and radical conclusions, not only in his work but in his philosophical concepts of the world and the life about him.

Inevitably, also like LaFollette, he was the storm center of thundering controversy, the object of bitter vilification.

Men like this are not concerned only with their own lives. They are philosophically concerned with the lives of those around them. They believe passionately in the right of the individual to full expression and full development.

To Mr. Wright nothing was more precious than freedom; nothing more hateful than the government or the social customs that bound the freedom of expression and movement which he considered necessary to the development of human dignity.

Nothing could be more ridiculous than the spectacle of his detractors who would call this great individualist a Communist. He could no more be bound by the discipline and dogma of communism than he could be bound by the social mores of the country clubs.

He lived and fought his momentous battles in the world of ideas. Here is where he was the militant. He never ducked a battle and never gave quarter. But he despised the stupidity of war and physical violence.

His memory will be enshrined, of course, for centuries in the monuments of steel and stone his genius has created in this and in other countries. But time's hand will ultimately destroy these.

It is in the world of ideas where his enduring monument will be found. His thought is part of the stream of human life and nothing but complete annihilation can remove it. Men will move to its majestic cadence always, as it has to the ideas of other great thinkers and doers.

There is nothing that can destroy an idea that has the power of truth and beauty. Frank Lloyd Wright gave the world some of those ideas and he lived his own life in the faith that only in leaving endurable ideas can man give the world a lasting heritage.

Poison in Your Water—No. 56

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the Observer Dispatch of Utica, N.Y., on October 31, 1958, entitled "Two Firms Pay Large Sums for Pollution":

TWO FIRMS PAY LARGE SUMS FOR POLLUTION

Settlements totaling $882 were paid during August for conservation law violations in central New York, according to report of Commissioner Sharon J. Mauhs.

The two largest penalties for the month were for pollution of streams causing fish kills.

A Madison County firm, the Cooperative GLF Exchange Inc., of Canastota, paid $500 for allowing ammonia to be discharged in Canastota Creek.

The New York State Electric and Gas Corp., Liberty, paid $1,000 for pollution of Mongaup River.

Other settlements listed were:

Floyd H. Miller, Salisbury Center, paid $12.50 for fishing without license.

Jack C. Weaver, Harrisville, RD, paid $27.50 for hunting without license.

Claude C. Jones, Nelson, paid $100 for possessing deer illegally.

Andrew J. Bruno, Earlville, RD 1, and Harold D. Kingsbury, Earlville, RD 1, $15 each for trespassing.

John D. Cavallo, Canastota, RD, $17.50 for taking fish with aid of explosives.

Paul J. Sugar, Munnsville, and Kenneth J. Morgan, Lebanon, $12.50 each, hunting, no license.

Douglas H. Jones, West Branch, $17.50 for taking pheasant during closed season.

Lawrence Christianson, Harts Hill, Whitesboro, and Joseph S. Rogowski, Aiken Avenue, Whitesboro, $17.50 each for having loaded gun in car.

Ronald Jones, Williamstown, $100, for possessing deer illegally.

James Konstanty, Worcester, $17.50 for fishing without license.

Mr. Summerfield's Space Age Philosophy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 14, 1959

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, time was when it took 4 days for regular mail to reach me here from the State of Washington. For 6 years, as a matter of fact, I learned that I could count on this as an immutable rule of thumb.

It was kind of comforting, even, to know I could depend on this, one of the few unchanging constants in an age of bewildering flux.

Alas, no more. Mr. Summerfield, caught up with the spirit of the times, could not leave well enough alone. He persuaded the President and a somewhat reluctant Congress to give him more money through increased postal rates to finance a wholesale modernization program of the postal service. He promised us a new, efficient postal system, in keeping with the moods and needs of the mid-twentieth century.

The new look has arrived, quietly, unheralded.

It now takes 7 days for the mail to reach my office.

I long hesitated to admit, even to myself, that my old familiar 4-day rule had been replaced by a brand spanking new 7-day model. But indisputable proof confronted me last Friday, April 10, when the postman delivered a letter to the office at 1 p.m.

I looked at the postmark. The letter had been posted exactly 7 days earlier,

at 1 p.m. April 3, from a small town in the State of Washington.

I felt sad, Mr. Speaker, when the truth was forced upon me. Even this had changed and was no more.

But in the midst of my sorrow, there came the gleam of a comforting thought. Maybe, I said to myself, Mr. Summerfield is wiser than us all. Maybe he alone realizes that in the midst of the noise, and complexity and speed of the space age, we need to be reminded that time is eternal, that life will go on, and that we must preserve some of the old values of cumbersomeness, inefficiency and delay.

The Discredited Philosophy of Fair Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 23, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial that pointedly and accurately portrays this legislation as allegedly protection for the few at the cost of the many, the "jerrybuilt" Federal fair trade law:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 18, 1959]

THE DISCREDITED PHILOSOPHY

Despite the lessons of recent history, price fixers are busy again trying to shore up the jerrybuilt Federal fair trade law. Not least among the lessons they have failed to learn is the fact that a large measure of the growth and popularity of the discount houses can be attributed to the fair trade laws.

Another fact they have failed to learn in their long battles in Congress, the State legislatures and the courts, is that people are realizing more and more that price fixing—no matter what it is named—is not in the public interest. Some 17 State supreme courts have declared State fair trade laws unconstitutional.

Perhaps it is not strange, then, that some of the present measures under consideration by the House Commerce Committee have an air of desperation about them. The McGuire Act—now on the books—permits a manufacturer to set retail prices in a State or Territory by the mere act of signing up one retailer to agree to the set price. But even this false nod in the direction of honoring contracts goes by the board in one of the present bills before the committee. All that would be necessary under that bill would be for the manufacturer to set retail prices without agreement of any retailer whatsoever.

Yet, if State courts objected to the fair trade laws even when they permitted price fixing under the guise of contract, what will the State courts think of a law—if Congress enacts it—that is an out-and-out grant to manufacturers to fix retail prices at will all over the country?

It is no wonder that the Federal Trade Commission and the Justice Department are opposed to fair trade laws. Indeed, FTC Chairman John Gwynne had this to say to the committee:

"The fixing of retail prices is inconsistent with the American system of free competitive enterprise and is contrary to public policy expressed by Congress in the antitrust laws since 1890."

There isn't much question that fair trade goes in the opposite direction from the principles of the antitrust laws. Fair trade, as a principle, prevents the customer from shopping around for the best price he can get—and the customers' right to shop around is basic to our free competitive enterprise system. And fair trade permits the manufacturer to assert a dead hand control over the sales of goods that are no longer his.

Granted that a man who makes a thing has a right to charge for it what the marketplace will give and thus set his own price. But if the Government told him that he had to charge a specific price, and sell his goods for no more and for no less, the manufacturer would be the first to object. Yet, in seeking to control the price the retailer can ask for his goods, manufacturers are asking the same power to fix prices.

No man, we think, ought to have control over goods he has sold to someone else. The retailer who has paid out his money for the goods ought to have the right to sell them for any price the market will support—or even to give them away.

Instead of trying to find ways to strengthen fair trade laws that would protect a few to the cost of a great many, it strikes us that Congress ought to look to repeal of the McGuire Act and thus free competition altogether from the dismal and discredited philosophy of fair trade.

Jobs Past 60

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 14, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an interesting article from a recent issue of the National Tribune, the Stars and Stripes:

JOBS PAST 60

The Labor Department reports that the jobless market for idle workers is bad, worse than last year. The report cites statistics and expresses the hope of employers that employment may improve in the next few months.

We hope that their prediction comes true because there are too many unemployed right now in this great industrial country of ours.

But in joining in this hope for increased employment throughout the Nation we think of one thing. If employment does increase who will benefit by such an increase? Naturally the younger group of the presently unemployed. That seems reasonable and we cannot blame the industrialists for employing those from whom they may expect a good many years of work.

What becomes, however, of the older group? We might as well face the fact that once past 60 years of age and jobless, the chances of finding work are practically nil.

Just one more reason why the administration and Congress should give serious thought to the passage of H.R. 1181 which would give these unemployables who have served their country in time of war something to live on in their declining days.

The passage of H.R. 1181 would give some of the older veterans who are still struggling to hold on to jobs a chance to settle back and give the younger folk a chance to fill jobs for which we must admit, as a rule, they are more capable, physically, at least, to fill.

In our race for profits in industry more and more there has developed the thought that the oldsters must be cast off and their places taken by younger and stronger men and women—not necessarily more capable—but in the eyes of industry better risks than the older folks who have built up these industries.

It is a sad state of affairs but one which we face in these days of competition. What better way could be found than to take care of the men who have passed the age of employability as gaged by our industrial system—the men who protected that system when it was threatened by strong enemies—than to grant them the benefits provided by H.R. 1181.

Such action would care for two necessities—the need of our older group and the opportunity for our younger men and women to replace them and continue to advance the progress of our country.

Poison in Your Water—No. 58

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Record-Searchlight, of Redding, Calif., on January 9, 1959, entitled "A Serious Kill: Pollution Threatens Salmon":

A SERIOUS KILL: POLLUTION THREATENS SALMON

Heavy rains have kicked loose a pollution flow into the Sacramento River that threatens the king salmon population.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife officials from Coleman fish hatchery first spotted dead fish yesterday when they removed their fish traps at Keswick. All fish in the traps—411 king salmon and 11 steelhead—were dead. These were adult fish.

State department of fish and game officials then checked the river from Keswick to the Highway 99 bridge and found young king salmon (fry) dead and dying along the river edge.

Yesterday afternoon fish and game men planted three cans of fry salmon obtained from Coleman hatchery at three separate points along the river from 1 mile below Keswick to 4 miles below. Fourteen hours later, the fish in the can 1 mile below Keswick were all dead, 90 percent of those in a can 3 miles below Keswick were dead, and all were alive in the can 4 miles below.

Water samples were obtained from various points along the river and are being sent to the Central Valley water pollution board for analysis.

The State Department of Health is also working with fish and game taking samples of the water.

"This is a serious fish kill," said James Stokes, regional manager for the State Fish and Game Department, "and a blow to salmon fishing and reproduction in the Sacramento."

This morning, Stokes said, no fish were in the fish traps at Keswick, although prior to yesterday they were entering the traps in constant flow.

Stokes said the pollution was caused by a combination of a heavy flow from the Spring Creek drainage and a low stage of flow in the Sacramento.

Swollen Spring and Slick Rock Creeks and heavy rains along the delta have washed deposits of copper and zinc into the Sacramento, poisoning the fish, Stokes said.

The Mountain Copper Co. put into operation last month a purifying system which flows out of its underground workings and filters the copper from the water before releasing it into the river.

But, Stokes said, the buildup of copper deposits along the drainage and delta system before the new facility went into operation is probably now washing into the river.

Stokes said that his department has recommended that an increase in water releases from Shasta Lake into the river be made. He said that studies have been made which show that a heavier flow in the river will ease the pollution problem.

Adam Smith Updated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 17, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, an excellent and most timely editorial appeared in the New Republic magazine of March 16, 1959, and I commend it to the attention of our colleagues. It follows:

ADAM SMITH UPDATED

Certainly the President's muddled exhortations and his advisers' platitudes on the sound dollar do no credit to the honorable tradition of conservative economic thought. There must be more to Adam Smith, circa 1959, than obsessive longing for balanced budgets. In a February editorial, Fortune presents a much more intelligent statement—one susceptible to close liberal evaluation. Its editorial opens with an attack on J. K. Galbraith for missing the "* * * basic libertarian point that while the market in general enlarges the field of human choice, Government action, however necessary, is by definition coercive." Fortune temperately does not propose to eject Government from society's affairs. But, "* * * granted that Government today will play an important part in our lives through monetary and fiscal policy, as well as because of the overriding needs of defense, still there are many places where the functions of Government could be cut down, given some hard thought and half the ingenuity that modern liberals now give to enlarging the prerogatives of the State."

Just where can the reductions be made? "The privately financed toll road is a better bet than the Washington financed superhighway. Private power can do all that is promised by new TVA's." It is a harmful fiction that "* * * as a society grows richer it generates," or can generate, its own built-in social security."

Does government action necessarily coerce? Do private markets necessarily liberate? In some of its necessary functions, every government employs compulsion. Tax payments partially, and compulsory military service nearly completely, limit the freedom of the law abiding, and police and prisons impede the lawless. But this is scarcely the end of the matter. A case-by-case consideration of what modern democratic governments do tells a more complex story. A category in themselves are the varied measures designed to shelter the unfortunate. Widows, dependent children, handicapped veterans, and the aged, none of them participants in the economic fray, depend for decent existence on government support. Of course, no retired citizen, widow, or veteran is compelled to accept his government's bounty. But would he or she be freer without it?

A second category of government activity enlarges economic choice by diminishing economic insecurity: unemployment compensation does not coddle its recipients; it enables them to move more readily from one job to another and to risk more easily geographic and occupational change. As the case of the migratory farm laborer suggests, workers who must depend unaided upon their own resources enjoy precious little freedom. It is unnecessary to endorse the wisdom of our present agricultural policies to place the parity price program in the same general class. The point of these policies is the opportunity they offer farmers to choose less desperately between farming and other occupations. To stigmatize these programs as coercive is to ignore the opportunities to contract out of them and the essentially coercive face which unprotected competition presented to American agriculture before 1933 and the first AAA.

Put briefly, real freedom of choice implies the existence of genuine alternative. Properly conceived, the range of government policies which promote economic stability (a third category to be considered), simultaneously encourage individual security and individual choice. The fiscal and monetary policies to which Fortune is little more than resigned imperatively demand strengthening and resolute use. Tax cuts and public works could and should have limited the recession which still harasses an economy that has 4.8 million unemployed.

An increasingly important fourth type of government intervention attempts to fill the gaps left by private enterprise. For does not experience demonstrate that private enterprisers have little interest in building the schools, hospitals, inexpensive housing, parks and concert halls which go far in defining the quality of a society? Yet such minimum urban amenities are precisely those which promote intelligent choice. Education widens individual comprehension of alternatives and encourages accurate discrimination among them. In what sense, then can it be said that State action which enlightens its citizens, prepares them for wide choice, and infrequently competes with private authority, is coercive?

These categories and examples far from exhaust the topic of Government's proper role and impact. But they are enough to imply that only when modern democratic Government acts uncreatively is its primary role coercive. Much more frequently, it measurably serves the object of Fortune's desire, the widening of individual choice.

Fortune's claim that "the market in general enhances the field of human choice" exposes a characteristic conservative nostalgia. No doubt, in the 19th century there was much truth in the view that competition was for the most part free. Enterprise was relatively small and opportunities comparatively unlimited. Although the success stories fail to compute the human costs of the failures, a hundred years ago the bold, the imaginative, and the ruthless could build their lives in expectations of riches. Many a man's strong hands molded his own fate. Or so, in retrospect, it now appears. Fortunately, talent and industry still enjoy rewards in our society. But the conditions under which these rewards may be grasped are drastically different. In particular, the character of the private market has changed so radically that in many parts of the economy private governments, of varying benevolence, control the lives of employees, subordinates, suppliers and customers. This is one of the effects of the existence of great industrial empires like General Motors, General Electric, Du Pont, United States Steel, and their peers. If the markets which they control widen the field of human choice it is equally accurate to maintain that employment in a Government bureaucracy does as much. Increasingly, the structure of business enterprise puts the small business unit under the domination of the large one. In Government work, small subcontractors exist at the discretion of large prime contractors. In ordinary production, small suppliers survive so long as their large customers decide against continued integration of their productive facilities. Real choice thus becomes largely a prerogative of large enterprise. Insofar as the tendency has been checked and the small man permitted to thrive in the interstices of national markets, it is because of "coercive" Government which, at its most alert, prevents the big from growing bigger by merging with their own kind, discriminating in each other's favor, and eliminating the small. In the reality of the private markets which surround us, it is very hard indeed to see much substance in the vision of freedom which Fortune conjures up.

Only at their peril will liberals ignore the potential dangers of Government as coercive agent. But liberals separate themselves from conservatives by their perception that in an economy in which giant corporations jostle each other only Government can succor the trampled, create a breathing space for the economic pygmies, insure a decent supply of basic cultural amenities, keep the economy stable, and moderate the exercise of private coercion.

Red Envoy Expelled in Argentine Rioting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 14, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news article which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of Tuesday, April 7, 1959:

RED ENVOY EXPELLED IN ARGENTINE RIOTING

BUENOS AIRES, April 7.—The Argentine Government today linked Soviet bloc diplomats with the bloody labor riot in Buenos Aires last week and said at least one envoy had been ordered expelled.

A Government statement said similar action is being considered against "other members of the diplomatic corps from countries behind the Iron Curtain." The expelled diplomat was not named.

Argentina is the second Latin American nation to act against Soviet bloc diplomats within a week. Mexico expelled two members of the Soviet Embassy last week, accusing them of giving money and support to an illegal railway strike.

The Argentine Government has blamed the Communists for last Friday's rioting, in which 57 workers and policemen were injured.

The newspaper Correo de La Tarde named three members of the Soviet bloc diplomatic colony and accused them of promoting labor unrest.

Those named were Soviet Ambassador Mikhail Alexevich Kastylev; Dr. Victor Dimitriu, Rumanian Chargé d'Affaires; and Mrs. Vera Lestova Zalka, wife of the Hungarian Ambassador.

Informants said the Government of neighboring Uruguay is considering taking stern measures against the Soviet Embassy, which has a larger staff than in any other South American country.

Friday's rioting erupted when workers gathered in the heart of the capital to protest the labor policies of the Frondizi government. They included workers from unions dominated by Communists or followers of former Dictator Juan D. Perón.

Rioters threw up barricades in the street, burned and overturned automobiles, and attacked streetcars and stores before police halted the disorders.

Eliminate Income Tax and Government Business Operation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 23, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following testimony of Willis E. Stone before our Federal relations committee of the Texas House of Representatives, in relation to income tax and getting the Government out of the conduct of business. To anyone concerned with these two matters, this presentation will be most interesting and informative:

TESTIMONY OF WILLIS E. STONE BEFORE THE FEDERAL RELATIONS COMMITTEE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, TEXAS LEGISLATURE, AUSTIN, TEX., FOR PRESENTATION, APRIL 6, 1959

Thank you, Mr. Chairman and the members of the house Federal relations committee of the Texas Legislature. I deeply appreciate the opportunity to appear before you for the purpose of discussing some well documented views on Federal taxing and spending, and the proposed solution to this problem which is pending before you as Texas House Concurrent Resolution 6.

To establish my identity, I am Willis E. Stone, chairman of the National Committee for Economic Freedom and president of the American Progress Foundation. My address is 6413 Franklin Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif. I am also identified with several other organizations which are attempting to bring better understanding of the American Constitution to the American people.

As an industrial engineer I have long been concerned, as every good citizen should be, with the apparent fact that taxes are too low. This is evident because taxes have but one valid function, that of paying the costs of government, but taxes have failed to achieve this purpose by an average $12 billion per year at the national level alone during these past 20 years, thus adding more than $240 billion to the national debt.

This national insolvency is rubbing off on the States, and more and more we hear of the deep financial troubles of the several States. Unfortunately Texas is not immune from this problem—no State is. The problem has affected our people to such a degree that open tax revolts are flaring with increasing frequency in various areas. The one most newsworthy at the moment is the so-called Ritzville tax revolt in the State of Washington.

These tax protests give fair warning to the administrators of public affairs that taxes are too high to be borne willingly by our people. This comes at a time when legislative bodies are looking more diligently than ever before for new tax sources to provide for the wants of the many agencies of Government which seem to sprout on all sides.

To the administrator, at least, taxes are too low. To the taxpayer, taxes are too high. The basic question uniting both sides of this puzzle involves the possibility that the cost of Government is too high. An investigation of this possibility reveals some startling facts.

In seeking areas where sizable reduction in the cost of the Federal Government can be achieved, I have been amazed at the quantity of Federal corporate activities which exist without any pretense of constitutional authority, and the enormous quantity of tax dollars they directly and indirectly absorb each year to pay their losses and hidden costs.

That the members of this committee may appreciate the quantity of Federal agencies involved in some corporate activity directly competitive with private taxpaying enterprises, a copy of fact sheet No. 1 has been attached to your copy of this transcript. It lists more than 700 Federal agencies so involved.

Since the publication of this list, a series of case histories, each dealing with one specific agency has been initiated. Thus far 27 releases have been issued. The cumulative losses identified from the budget records in the first 27 releases aggregate more than $24 billion. To your copy of this transcript a sample issue of these releases has been attached. This sample deals with the Virgin Islands Corporation.

With this information as the starting point an extended study of the manner and extent in which tax funds have been spent in recent years can provide an idea of the potential benefits available to all of us as such expenditures are abated.

Under the label of "foreign aid" the American taxpayers, who have never known military defeat, have been compelled to pay more treasure into the coffers of foreign powers than all the vanquished people in history have been required to pay to their conquerors.

On the domestic scene more than 700 Federal corporate activities have been established without constitutional authority. They absorb directly and indirectly more than half the total Federal revenue to pay their losses and hidden costs. They have taken over 40 percent of the land area and 20 percent of the industrial capacity of the Nation, riding the backs of the American people as interest free, dividend free, rent free, cost free, and tax free princes of privilege, competing with every American, be he producer or consumer.

To get some idea of the gigantic scale of the conquest of State and private lands, permit me to refer to page 221 of the U.S. Government Organization Manual, 1958–59, which asserts that the Interior Department alone has "custody of 750 million acres of land." This is an area equal to 32.3 percent of the total land and water area of the United States and all its territories and possessions.

Page 254 of the 1958–59 Organization Manual stipulates that the Forest Service "administers approximately 188 million acres." This is an area equal to 8.1 percent of the total land and water area of the United States and all its territories and possessions.

These two agencies alone have, according to these official statements, taken over an area greater than the combined area of 25 European countries (list on request).

To control this rapidly growing problem of Federal conquest of our States and our people, an amendment to the Constitution has been designed to repair the damage done and prevent its recurrence. It is a proposal which is pending before you as Texas House Concurrent Resolution 6. An identical resolution has been formally approved by the State of Wyoming. It is pending before the Congress as House Joint Resolution 23, and is widely known as the Proposed 23d amendment

The two major companion provisions in this proposal are:

"SECTION 1. The Government of the United States shall not engage in any business, professional, commercial, financial, or industrial enterprise except as specified in the Constitution.

"SEC. 4. The 16th article of amendments to the Constitution of the United States shall stand repealed and thereafter Congress shall not levy taxes on personal incomes, estates, and/or gifts."

This amendment would stop the political gift of our tax dollars to foreign socialistic and communistic governments, leaving individuals to do this on a voluntary basis if they wish. This business of foreign grants and credits annually amounts to about $5 billion.

This amendment would cause the Federal corporate activities to be sold back to the American people from whom they were taken. It is estimated the land, buildings, and facilities, even under forced sale, would bring better than $65 billion, all of which should be applied to the national debt, particularly as series E and F bonds would probably be employed to buy those properties.

This estimate of the recovery value of these properties is very low, as is evidenced by the history of the sale of the Inland Waterways Corp.'s barge lines and the federally owned synthetic rubber plants. May I illustrate by quoting from the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission. The Commission's report to Congress, dated January 1956, page 5, recited the fact that the total book value of the plants sold amounted to $127,617,000. They had produced an accumulated deficit during the period of Government operation of $134,693,000, for a total investment of $262,310,000.

The same report, same page, cites the fact that these facilities were sold back to taxpaying private enterprise at a total price of $284,848,000 which is $22,538,000 over the total cost of the Government excursion into rubber production. As private enterprises they have been paying substantial taxes, Federal, State, and local.

An extensive program of selling Federal corporate activities back to the American people on this scale would rapidly eliminate the national debt, particularly as we learn from the Federal Real and Personal Property Inventory Report of June 30, 1957, by the Committee on Government Operations (p. 13) that the grand total of the acquisition cost of such property held by Government exceeds $250 billion.

But let's assume that the properties and facilities affected by the amendment will not bring their book value plus more than 100 percent such as in the rubber plant disposal program. Let's assume that they will not even return their book value or acquisition value. Assuming that they will only yield $65 billion, the disposal would produce the following results in such a year as 1959, based upon the information contained in the 1960 budget.

First, we would not be required to provide taxes to pay interest on the $65 billion of national debt paid off. At a 3 percent interest rate this means a savings of $1,950 million per year.

To amortize this $65 billion over a 40-year period costs another $1,625 million per year which would not be required from the taxpayers.

A study of the Federal budget during the past 10 years indicates that the losses accumulated by the Federal corporate activities, even though they operate interest free, dividend free, rent free, cost free and tax free, have exceeded $10 billion each year, and in 1959 the welfare spending splurge shoved these losses well above the $19 billion mark.

It is estimated that more than 40 percent of the 2½ million Federal employees drawing pay from the general fund are exclusively employed in providing services to the Federal corporations without cost to those corporate activities. An average $4,300 per year for these employees means a cost to the taxpayers of $4,300 million per year.

Selling the Federal corporate activities back to the American people would cause those employees to become more profitably employed by the expanded private enterprise system, stopping this payroll as a cost of Government, and also eliminating the goods, services and facilities they now consume which is estimated at 3 times payroll, or $12,900 million per year based on the 1959 estimate.

These five items of potential savings add up thus:

	Millions of dollars
Goods, services and facilities that can be saved	$12,900
Payroll that can be saved	4,300
Losses which can be eliminated (1959 estimate)	19,000
Interest that can be saved	1,950
Amortization charges saved	1,625
Total	39,775
Plus savings from terminating foreign aid	5,000
Potential saving (1959 level)	44,775
Compared to individual income taxes collected 1959	36,900
Leaving a surplus of	7,875
Accommodating repeal of estate and gift taxes 1959	1,393
Making a net surplus of	6,482

By repealing individual income, estate and gift taxes at the same time the Federal corporate activities are sold back to the American people.

But this is by no means the end of the statistical facts relating to this question. When $37 billion are added to the take home pay of the American people simply because it is not deducted from the pay envelope, it will produce the greatest period of economic expansion in history. This money being spent for the things people want will enormously increase the revenue of the Federal Government from corporation taxes, excise taxes, imposts and the many miscellaneous taxes currently levied.

A 20 percent increase in the volume of business from the present taxpaying business community would increase the corporate and excise yield by $5,100 million at the 1959 level.

As 20 percent of the industrial capacity now owned by Government would be back on the tax rolls, this would mean an increase in tax receipts from these sources in such a year as 1959 of $3,825 milion.

Add these two items to the surplus cited above and the total of the new tax sources and the surplus amounts to $15,407 million.

This would absorb the deficit of the 1959 fiscal year of $12,900 million and leave a net surplus which can be applied to the national debt of $2,507 million.

Although this outlines the potential benefits to apply to both Government and people from applying the "Proposed 23d Amendment" in such a year as 1959, there is a decided uniformity in the results of tabulations from year to year regardless of the changes in the factors involved.

Nor are the elements described above all the benefits to be expected. There is the matter of collecting the income tax which would no longer be involved. This amounts to more than $200 million per year. It is estimated that the printing of the tax forms and all the auxiliary items related to the income tax collections costs more than $100 million per year, and the cost of the postage to handle the flood of parcels, booklets and letters connected to tax collections adds about $40 million per year to the deficit of the Post Office Department. In these items another $340 million can be saved, and help pay off the national debt or reduce taxes in other areas.

Strangely, by applying the terms of this amendment miraculous changes will be produced in the local and State taxing problems.

Your difficulties are great because the tax drain before you ever reach the citizens of Texas has become unbearable. Your difficulties arise because the taxes you must devise are an added burden upon already exhausted people. By putting an end to the Marxist income tax program, the take-home pay of the people of Texas and every other State will be about 20 percent greater than at present without adding a single penny to the rate of pay or to the costs of production. The people of Texas would no longer be exhausted before they faced the problem of local and State taxes.

Then, too, there will be a vast increase in the volume of taxable property. I am not certain about the percentage of Texas which has been taken over by the Federal agencies without constitutional authority for doing so, but I do know about my own State of California where the Federal Government owns about 48 percent of the State. Selling back the property held without constitutional authority will put about 40 percent more property on the tax rolls to share the burden with the present taxpayers, so that even if the cost of State government is increased, the share each taxpaying unit will be required to pay will be lessened. This will be spectacularly true in such a State as Nevada where the Federal Government owns and occupies 87 percent of the land area.

Come to think of it, how can a State be considered as a sovereign State when the jurisdiction of the State government extends to only 13 percent of the area of the State?

In each State, and in each city, and to each person, the situation differs, but in every instance, without exception, the transfer of these vast political empires back to the American people, to be restored to the constitutional protection which the Founding Fathers originally intended for our individual enterprise system, means an infinite variety of benefactions beyond the power of human imagination—just as the Constitution itself held advantages for us far beyond the dream of those who gave it life.

The proposed 23d amendment pending before you as Texas House Concurrent Resolution 6 can achieve these amazing things, not because it adds something new to the Constitution or takes anything from it, but only because it will give the Constitution as originally established new force and effect. Instead of grinding the people down under an inhuman load of individual income taxes, those taxes, and the need for them, would be abolished.

Instead of the Federal Government operating at an annual average deficit of $12 billion per year, as it has during the last 20 years, we can balance the budget, amply maintain all essential and constitutionally authorized functions of Government, and pay off the national debt at a rapid rate.

Instead of the violent conflict between Government and people regarding which shall own and operate the enterprises created by the people, we will have a Government devoted to protecting our lives and property.

Instead of the Federal Government being the greatest pauper in history, it will be returned to a solvent position and regain the affection of the American people—and the affection of the citizen is the greatest asset any government can possess.

This all adds up to the simple equation that when we stop political competition with the private enterprises of taxpayers the tax problem will very largely be solved.

At the same time, the sovereignty of the States will be restored, just as the Constitution intended.

It will restore international justice, confidence, and honor.

It will reestablish the American theme of "equal justice under law," with Government back at its rightful job of governing and regulating, protecting our lives and property.

It will constitute a great rebirth of liberty, making us free, in fact, when we are brave enough to face the issue and do the job.

Even the strife between management and labor will vanish when labor regains the full reward of toil by eliminating the withholding tax, putting a greater net increase in the pay envelope of the American people than any politician or any labor leader ever dared to think about.

These factors are sound in every way, heavily supported with evidence from official records. It staggers the imagination that so many benefactions to Government and people can arise from the restoration of economic justice and fiscal balance, yet our history and tradition verify these facts.

Reorganization of the 109th Field Artillery of the Pennsylvania National Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Record of Thursday, April 2, 1959:

REORGANIZATION OF GUARD

Today the Record is publishing a summary of the plan for a complete reorganization of the Pennsylvania Army National Guard. The far-reaching changes include a provision for two artillery battalions for Wilkes-Barre instead of one. For this and other reasons detailed in a news article, a significant new chapter is being written in what we know today as the 109th Field Artillery. As its new milestone is reached, we cite some of the historical background of an organization of which Wilkes-Barre and the surrounding area can be justly proud.

The 109th was first organized in 1775 and has 23 battle streamers in addition to the Presidential Citation and the Luxembourg Croix de Guerre.

The 9th Pennsylvania Infantry, as it was known from 1873 to 1916, included companies as follows: Six in Wilkes-Barre, A, B, D, E, F, and K; three in Pittston, C, H, and M; one in Hazleton, G; one in Plymouth, I; one in Nanticoke, L.

In 1916 it was reorganized as the 3d Pennsylvania FA Regiment for border service and became the 109th Field Artillery Regiment for World War I in 1917. After World War I it was organized with the Regiment Headquarters and 2d Battalion in Wilkes-Barre, and Batteries A, B, and C in Nanticoke, Pittston, and Plymouth. About 1930 the Pittston battery was disbanded and Battery B was established at Tunkhannock.

This organization remained until 1942 when, with the triangular reorganization, the 109th FA lost Regimental Headquarters Bat-

tery to the Tank Destroyer Battalion and the 1st Battalion to the 193d FA Regiment, both outside the division. In 1946 upon reorganization the 109th FA Battalion was kept in the Wilkes-Barre Armory as it is now, but there was also the 967th FA Battalion, with batteries as follows: Headquarters, Wilkes-Barre; A, Wilkes-Barre; B, Nanticoke; C, Plymouth; Service, Danville (reorganized in Nanticoke in 1950).

This battalion was, of course, outside the division. It was called to duty in 1951 and was not thereafter reorganized.

After the return of most of the personnel in 1952, the 109th FA Battalion was again reorganized in the Wilkes-Barre Armory. Tank Company of the 109th Infantry was organized in Nanticoke in 1954. Company D of the 109th Infantry was organized in Plymouth, also in 1954.

In 1946 or 1947 Cannon Company of the 109th Infantry was organized in Pittston and since 1953 has been the 109th Infantry Heavy Mortar Company.

Statement of Hon. Melvin Price, of Illinois, in Support of Federal Unemployment Compensation Standards Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith my statement to the House Committee on Ways and Means in support of legislation to estabilsh Federal unemployment compensation standards:

STATEMENT OF HON. MELVIN PRICE, OF ILLINOIS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, TO THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS IN SUPPORT OF FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION STANDARDS LEGISLATION

Mr. Chairman, I congratulate this committee for scheduling hearings on the critical issue of improved Federal standards for unemployment compensation and I am deeply grateful for the courtesy of the committee and of the chairman for allowing me to state the reasons I believe the committee should report a bill establishing such improved standards.

The bill I have introduced, H.R. 3580, like others before you, would strengthen the already existing Federal Standards Act under which the unemployment compensation laws of every State now operate. It would increase the number of workers eligible for unemployment insurance benefits, and in addition it would provide improved benefits for a maximum of 39 weeks in all of our States. These higher benefits would be payable so that a worker thrown out of a job by no fault of his own could draw weekly payments of at least two-thirds of his ordinary salary or wages, or one-half of the average of salaries and wages in his State, whichever is smaller.

Mr. Chairman, this expert committee is intimately familiar with the details of such legislative proposals and with the taxing programs that would be required to finance them. I believe that in the technical and tax fields my bill is sound, but I would like to discuss the general principles involved.

What is the origin of our unemployment compensation systems in our various States? Why, they came into existence by Federal action. A bill was passed by Congress, in the depths of the great depression nearly a quarter of a century ago, establishing a Federal tax upon employers to finance unemployment benefits. But the bill also contained a provision that if the States would set up their own systems, meeting certain standards laid down in the Federal law, most of the tax receipts would be remitted to the States for operating their systems.

And what has been the history of the systems? An enormous variety has come into existence, over and above the standards required by law, by which some States pay much more and some States much less than each other and than the average. There are differences in the eligibility rules, in the length of time for benefits, of the size of benefits, in the tax rates that employers now must pay to finance the systems that have been recognized as socially desirable.

This has had two very bad results. In the first place, there is a quite natural tendency in the State legislatures not to make swift and major improvements in their local systems that may lay a burden on business that does not exist in neighboring States. The members of this committee are practical, knowledgeable, well informed. You know the force of a witness' argument, before a State legislative committee, urging that taxes and social welfare programs be kept at a level that enables the State to remain competitive.

In the second place, this system has prevented the Federal law from working as it was supposed to work. What are the reasons for unemployment compensation? They are both humanitarian and economic. The theory is that benefits for a worker thrown out of his job will ease the shock and loss until he is able to find a new job; this is for the benefit of the worker and his family. But the further theory is that payment of benefits will maintain the worker's purchasing power, at a reduced minimum, so that the economy does not suffer a total loss in periods of severe recession. The economic reasons for jobless compensation benefits are as imperative as the humanitarian reasons.

I think it can be considered as proved that under the existing law, neither the humanitarian nor the economic objectives are being wholly met.

The statisticians report that during the recent recession, the loss in wages and salaries resulting from the unemployment of nearly 6 million was not compensated for in any adequate way. Perhaps 40 percent of the jobless never became eligible for any unemployment benefits at all, either because they were not covered under the general terms of the State laws or under the specific exemptions. And out of the total, not more than 30 percent of the wage loss was recovered through benefits.

I urge this committee to consider very seriously whether the time is not past for the breaking of new ground, for a giant stride forward that would cure the deficiencies which all of us can see have developed across the past quarter of a century.

Unemployment compensation, Mr. Chairman, seems to me one of the wisest programs of our modern age. Our economy is a marvelously efficient enterprise, but it is subject to the shifts and changes that are a part of the price of freedom. Jobless benefits, financed through an orderly system set forth by law, offer the most effective protection against individual suffering and the most effective cushion against shocks to our national health.

When we deal with the subject of improved Federal standards, let us recognize that we are doing nothing unprecedented. We got our system in the first place by the setting up of Federal standards, and I think it fair to say that without these standards we would not today have unemployment benefit programs in all of our States. What we are confronted with is the question of whether it is not necessary now to modernize the standards, to remove as between the States competition in low tax rates and low benefits, to cure weaknesses that the passage of time has revealed in the law as it was first written.

I am well aware that the President has thrown his weight, at least negatively, against the bill and the program for which I speak today. I can merely say that I consider this attitude extremely shortsighted—an example of a deplorable tendency in the White House to confuse the letter of States rights with the spirit that infuses our entire system of government. There is no genuine issue of States rights involved here, but merely a broader question of how we can wisely use information now available to us to strengthen a program that is very much in the interest of the country, a bulwark of our free enterprice system and a proper protection of our people.

This committee is well aware that common report has it that the Secretary of Labor was prepared to support a new Federal standards program until he was overruled by others in the White House. It is well aware that the first chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, Dr. Arthur Burns, believes that a swift improvement and expansion of our jobless compensation law is the greatest contribution we could make to maintaining a sound economy.

I respectfully suggest that this session of the Congress should take account of the passage of time since the unemployment compensation laws were written, should face the realities of the need for an improved system, should recognize its own opportunity to initiate a tremendous forward step. On this subject, I believe that bold thinking and bold action would meet with an overwhelming favorable public response.

Prayer of Rabbi Joseph Rudavsky, Guest Chaplain of Massachusetts Senate, on March 24, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 14, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the prayer of Rabbi Joseph Rudavsky, of Lawrence, at the opening session of the Massachusetts Senate on March 24, 1959, who was the guest of Senator William X. Wall, of Lawrence, Mass.:

The following prayer was offered by Rabbi Joseph Rudavsky, of Lawrence:

Today is Purim, festival of joy, gladness dedicated to the proposition that the Hamans of all ages—men, merchants of prejudice, purveyors of hatred—may yet learn the truth "that to bigotry there can be no sanction." Purim, festival of religious equality, commemorating the right of worship. The privilege to stand stalwart, consistent with one's faith and belief.

On Purim we pray to thee, O God, creator of all, to implant in humanity the qualities of love and understanding, of courage and wisdom, of patience and humility. As we are grateful to Thee for people of prophetic stamp, so do we pray to Thee, for our leaders, who serve to inculcate these ideals in the people.

O God of our fathers, bless us and shield our leaders with wisdom and fortitude, that

they may lead the people in righteousness. Enable our legislators to make of our land, a land of justice and goodness for all. Help them to organize our life for a better day. Strengthen their hands and bless them with consecrated hearts to serve our people with devotion and dedication, that our land, the land of the brave, may ever be the home of the free, its beacon shining, a guiding light to those yet struggling in darkness and oppression, yearning for the light. May their inspiration ever be peace, and their lodestar ever be justice for all mankind. Amen.

Secretary Benson's Speech in Dallas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Secretary Benson's speech in Dallas before the 50th annual convention of Texas Cotton Ginners' Association, April 7, 1959:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE EZRA TAFT BENSON AT 50TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF TEXAS COTTON GINNERS' ASSOCIATION, DALLAS, TEX., APRIL 7, 1959

I am delighted to join you in this 50th annual convention of the Texas Cotton Ginners' Association. This, I understand, is the largest meeting of its kind anywhere in the United States. It is both a signal honor and a challenging responsibility to have the opportunity to meet with so many representatives of the entire cotton industry.

And, may I add, your Texas welcome leaves nothing to be desired. There is an old saying, "The glory of the house is hospitality." Hospitality is also one of the glories of the people of this great State.

But I did not come here simply to sing the praises of Texas. My mission is to talk frankly with you about agriculture in general and cotton in particular.

The facts indicate that 1958 was a year of substantial improvement for most U.S. farmers.

The per capita income of our farm people, from all sources, rose 10½ percent to $1,068. This was a new high. It was 9 percent above the previous record of $983 in 1951—a war year.

The fact is that the per capita income of our farm people had a more favorable relationship to the income of nonfarm people last year than it did in 1952—the year before this administration took office.

Farm operators' realized net income rose to $13.1 billion in 1958. This was the highest in 5 years. The gain over 1957 was $2.2 billion, or 20 percent.

Prices received for farm products averaged 6 percent above 1957 and were the highest since 1953.

The value of farm assets, the proportion of farms owned by their operators, and the standard of living of farm families were all higher in 1958 than ever before.

The total assets of U.S. agriculture at the beginning of this year reached $200 billion. Farmers' net equities, after all debts, were $177.4 billion. This was a gain in equities of about $11 billion over a year earlier, and a gain of $134 billion since 1940.

This is not to say, however, that agriculture's major difficulties have all been solved. Far from it. We still have surpluses of some crops. The cost-price squeeze is still pinching our farm people. We still have many underemployed, low-income farm families. A few crops are still under programs which are outmoded, too costly, discriminatory and harmful to agriculture as a whole. The President's message of January 29 clearly showed the need for prompt action in this regard.

Now, what about cotton? Here, too, the situation is not all that we would like—but assuredly it is better by far than it was a couple of years ago. You will recall that the cotton carryover in mid-1956 was at a tremendous record high of 14.5 million bales.

Since then, largely through the vast subsidized export program, supplemented by acreage reductions, the carryover has been reduced by 40 percent. It stood at about 8.7 million bales as of August 1958. It will be at about that same level next August. Although still burdensome, this is the smallest carryover since 1953–54.

Domestic consumption of cotton is picking up beyond previous estimates. Business conditions are generally good, and that favorable fact is being reflected in increased mill use of cotton. If the current rate of consumption is maintained, we will use about 8.5 million bales here at home this marketing year. That would be a substantial gain over last year and the year before.

I wish I could say the same for exports. At present, it looks as though about 3 million bales will be exported this year. Thus, total disappearance will be about the same as the 1958 production.

Now, I don't want to get into a second guessing contest with anyone. But I do object strongly to the mistaken notion that the Department of Agriculture has been, or is, dragging its feet on the cotton export program.

Let's look at the facts. Since the beginning of the 1956–57 marketing year, and through this marketing year, our cotton exports will total about 16.5 million bales. This is an average of over 5 million bales a year. I recall quite clearly that in testimony and debate at the time the export legislation was discussed, 4.5 to 5 million bales was then regarded as a "fair historical share of the world market" for U.S. cotton. Of course, this estimated share is not a static figure. It may vary up or down from one time to another.

I want to say with all the earnestness at my command that I will continue to seek a fair share for American cotton, whatever that share may be.

During the 1956–57 marketing year we exported 7.6 million bales of cotton, the highest since 1933.

In 1957–58 we exported 5.7 million bales. The total of more than 13 million bales in the 2 years was an outstanding record of successful, competitive exports—far above the expectations of many cotton men.

Cotton exports could not be expected to continue at these high levels. Foreign stocks, which had been low, were built up to high levels. This is one reason why our exports during the current marketing year have fallen off. But the record shows that our export programs have been effective. They have moved a lot of cotton in the interests of the American cotton grower and in line with the expressed wish of the Congress.

I do not believe, however, that the cotton export program is a permanent solution. We must seek markets on a sound competitive basis through normal market channels.

We must not lose sight of the fact that we have moved this cotton under the subsidy program at a substantial cost to U.S. taxpayers. It will continue to be expensive to do this.

The export subsidy rate which we have announced for the beginning of the next marketing year will be about $40 per bale exported. To this cost must be added that of the difference between the purchase price for choice A cotton and the resale price for unrestricted use. After taking into consideration the administrative expenses, this phase of our subsidy operations will result in a cost of about $20 per bale. This means that on the choice A cotton which is exported the subsidy will cost taxpayers $60 a bale.

No matter how you figure it, this adjustment to meet competitive world prices will be costly. Why? Because of the long continued use of unsound programs.

Textile activity both at home and abroad is picking up. This upsurge should reach substantial proportions in the coming marketing year.

The new cotton law, with which you are all familiar, should help producers and the entire cotton industry. It is designed to provide more freedom to plant, to market, to compete, and to make decisions.

A total of about 69,000 farm operators have elected the choice B upland cotton program for their farms for 1959. Allotments for these farms are thereby increased from a total of 2.5 million acres to 3.6 million acres.

I imagine one of the questions uppermost in your minds is how the Department is going to operate its purchase and sale of choice A cotton. Although we have not yet announced all of the details, we are currently planning to operate somewhat along the same lines as the loan program. Purchases and sales will be made through local people.

This would mean that qualified persons or firms—ginners, banks, cotton buyers, cotton merchants, cotton cooperatives, or warehousemen—would be permitted to enter into agreements with the Government and act as agencies for the purchase of choice A cotton from local producers. An approved purchasing agency could be approved as a sales agency to sell choice A cotton locally.

I must stress that this is not final. Many details still have to be settled. But I assure you that we adhere firmly to the principle of making maximum use of private trade channels. That has been our philosophy from the beginning. We hold to it strongly.

Another question you want answered is, When are we going to start? We expect to have the purchase program out in time to take care of your early crop areas. The sales program details may take a little longer, but they will be ready before the August 1 beginning of the new crop year. Sales of cotton under the provisions of the new program cannot begin until then.

It is my belief that the Agricultural Act of 1958 as it applies to cotton can help this great industry move toward expanded markets at home and abroad.

On the other hand, it is by no means a complete solution to our cotton problems. Over the past 20 or 25 years the cotton industry has become involved in a complex—almost bewildering—situation which is by no means easy to unscramble.

My complaint about the old cotton program is simply this: Over the years it was loaded down with so many conflicting gadgets that it became wholly unworkable.

The price-support mechanism was frozen at a production-incentive but market-destroying level. Markets were handed to synthetics on a silver platter. We have spent 6 years trying to thaw out the system, and the job isn't finished yet.

In addition, over the years special fringe benefits, such as the ⅞ Middling provision, were provided, which had the effect through 1954 of making the actual support level even higher than the unrealistic 90 percent of parity.

On the other hand, a number of special provisions, plus the technological revolution, made acreage controls almost ridiculously ineffective.

All this added up to a classic example of trying to have your cake and eat it too.

It just can't be done—not for cotton or any other commodity.

The effects of such contradictory policies are even more evident in the case of wheat. Despite the control programs, we now have by far the greatest wheat surplus in all history.

By July 1960 the carryover of wheat will be about 1½ billion bushels—enough to supply our normal domestic requirements 2½ years. We will have $3½ billion tied up in wheat alone.

We have spread the Wheat Belt all over America. Wheat acreage has increased in areas of high cost, while acres have been cut back in areas where production is most efficient. This doesn't make sense.

Not only have surpluses of a few crops piled up, the cost of the price-support program is staggering—indefensible.

Our total investment in price-supported commodities is now $9 billion. It will probably exceed $10 billion by the end of the next fiscal year.

It is estimated that during the next fiscal year we will spend more than $1 billion—$1 billion—just for storage, transportation, and interest on these Government-held surpluses.

It is apparently impossible for a Secretary of Agriculture to deal effectively with the present critical problems of agriculture always on the basis of just necessity or just economics—he must sometimes face up to the politics.

There is nothing disgraceful in the word politics or in the word "politician." Politics is the art of government and good politics makes for good government. The very foundation of this Government was a document divinely inspired that was drafted and adroitly handled by politically educated men to become an instrument for freedom. What we must strive for in the political factor of the formula is to have political action governed by the economic facts. And this is where the failures have occurred.

I think it must be admitted that in the past there has been an overemphasis on political approaches to farm problems which are basically economic.

Agriculture must not be sacrificed on the political auction block. Agriculture is neither Republican nor Democrat. It is American.

Let us be candid. Both major parties share responsibility for the situation in which we now find ourselves. But more important is the responsibility for getting to the solution. Congress has our recommendations. It is my sincere hope that the action so urgently needed will be taken without further delay.

No one has more concern than I about the cost of these farm programs. This Secretary of Agriculture has been administering, and is still required to administer, within the straitjacket of outmoded laws, the most costly, irrational, hodgepodge program ever patched together. It is the result of 25 years of political attempts to solve economic problems, seemingly with an assiduous determination to pretend that economics does not exist.

Do you think that as a farmer, the son of a farmer, yes, the grandson of a farmer, and as a former county agent, and now as a spokesman for farmers, I enjoy for 1 minute the distinction of administering the third largest item in the Federal budget? Of course not.

But be assured, I would not hesitate to defend this program if it were serving the best interests of our farm families and the people of the Nation. The truth of the matter is that these stupendous surpluses and heavy costs are not only sapping the vitals of free agriculture, they are also a threat to the solvency of this Nation.

The Secretary of Agriculture is subject to many pressures and crossfires. Opposition to change—to sound economic solutions to economic problems—has been almost unbelievable. My opponents can't agree on a constructive solution of the farm dilemma. Really, the only general agreement among my opponents is this:

"Let's saddle Benson with all of the ills of agriculture, and especially with the cost of the mess we helped cook up for him."

With smoke screens of distortions and half-truths, those who would dodge responsibility for obvious failures seek to obliterate the facts. But a rising crest of informed and aroused public opinion is beginning to penetrate the fog of confusion.

One of the largest national farm magazines recently invited farmers to tell Congress what to do about price-support programs.

In replying to that poll, 55 percent voted for "no supports, no controls, no floors, free market prices; get the Government clear out."

This is a significant increase over the 50 percent who in a similar poll a year ago favored getting the Government out of farming.

Another 15 percent favored emergency supports only "to prevent disaster from a huge crop or sudden loss of markets; floors set at, say 50 percent of parity, or 75 percent of the average 3-year market price and no production controls."

Another 8 percent wanted adjustment supports "such as 90 percent of the average 3-year market price, permitting gradual adjustment to normal markets and moderate production control when necessary to ease adjustments."

Only 22 percent wanted more Government price help. This breaks down into 14 percent who favor a return to supports at 90 percent of parity or more and 8 percent who asked for production payments.

This nationwide poll showed that 8 out of 10 of the farmers want greater freedom and less Government in farming. In the South the figures are 81 percent for more freedom in farming as against 19 percent for more Government in farming.

Yes; the voice of the American farmer calls in louder and louder tones for more freedom to act, and less Government interference.

If this is what farmers want what are we waiting for—what is Congress waiting for? I repeat, we've made our recommendations. Why don't they act?

In January, the President again asked the Congress to make forthright changes in our farm price supports. He urged that price supports no longer be related to a standard 45 years old, but to a percentage of the average market price during the immediately preceding years.

If the Congress still prefers to keep existing parity standards, the President urged that the Secretary be given discretion to establish the support level for all commodities in accordance with guidelines fixed by law. This is now permitted for all of the 250 commercially produced commodities except the 16 for which supports are mandatory.

Either of these changes would be constructive. Under either course, the surplus could be reduced, the cost cut, production controls relaxed, and markets developed. Our farm people could make more of their own decisions. The Government could resume its proper function of promoting farm research, expanding and developing markets, protecting soil and water resources, improving farm credit, and so on. We would help stabilize markets, not price ourselves out of them.

Congress recognized the need for farm program revision last year by passing the Agricultural Act of 1958. This act made some limited changes in the program for corn, cotton, and rice. Now we need prompt and effective action in behalf of producers of the other three basic crops, wheat, tobacco, and peanuts.

The American people want and deserve a program that makes sense. The poll I referred to is one further evidence that most of our farmers want it, too.

Our old costly farm programs are not only harmful to agriculture, they also contribute to unbalancing the budget—and this adds to the threat of inflation. That is of utmost concern to every citizen. No nation can go on indefinitely living beyond its income and cheapening the value of its currency.

I am intensely concerned about this. The course of inflation is subtle. Its ends are destructive. It mounts quietly, almost unseen in the short-term view, but it is utterly devastating over time.

The President has called for tight reins on Government spending, and for a balanced budget. He has called upon all of us, as citizens for self-discipline in our economic actions, both as individuals and as groups. Government alone cannot win the battle against inflation. To win it—and we must win it—will require the united efforts of the American people—business, labor, banking, agriculture, and all economic groups.

Our expanding Federal Government has boosted the average family's tax bill from $120 to $1,600 a year. How much further can we go in this direction?

Many pressures are now being exerted to add more billions to Federal spending in the coming fiscal year, and beyond—billions that can bring on further deficits and inflation.

Contrary to what some people would have us believe, the Federal Treasury is not a bottomless grab bag which never needs to be conserved or replenished. To act as though there is no limit to what the Treasury can spend is an open road to the destruction of private enterprise, and its replacement by a socialistic economy.

We must have a tax policy which is not confiscatory and a budget policy which prevents inflation. The Nation must have sound farm programs—just as it must have sound banking and finance—and sound wage and price policies.

In the interests of the whole Nation, we need less Government in farming. Quit trying to fix prices unrealistically from which flow the twin evils of production for Government warehouses and Government control of farmers. Emphasize markets, increased efficiency, and competitive selling. Eliminate Government's stranglehold on agriculture.

This is the solution to the farm dilemma.

We have made limited progress. We are on the right track. If we can push ahead soundly and keep the train from being derailed by those who put their faith in panaceas and quack remedies, agriculture in general and cotton in particular will regain lost markets, expand old markets, develop new markets.

Cotton is gaining in domestic use for clothing, about holding its own in household uses, falling far behind in outlets for industrial purposes. From 1947 to 1957 the domestic use of cotton for clothing increased 44 percent. But industrial use of cotton dropped 40 percent.

Always we come back to the essential point—markets depend on quality, price, and promotion.

Cotton ginners are a vital link in the chain of progress. I know that you have long had an important part in promoting quality improvement and in helping cotton on its way to the mills at minimum costs. Many of you have accepted the responsibility for taking cotton samples and shipping them to classing offices. Some of you are spokesmen for farmers, unhappy because grades are below expectations.

I urge you also to take an active interest in accurate price quotations. We must all strive to make further improvements in quality and market efficiency.

I hope ginners will be well represented at the universal standards conference to be held in Washington next month.

Some of you have seen the experimental "flight-bar" roller gin developed at our Mesilla Park Laboratory. In tests, it has turned out nearly 20 pounds of extra-long staple lint cotton per inch of roller per hour, an eightfold increase over the average commercial roller gin. Its capacity for relatively shorter staple upland cotton is 13 pounds, a sixfold increase over the average commercial roller gin.

Many mills are now using the machinery designed by our engineers to open, blend, and clean cotton. This year some 4 billion yards of new fabric will be given finishes that make cotton garments and household goods soil and crease resistant, with the wash-and-wear qualities demanded by today's homemaker. These finishes were developed with the aid of our chemists.

A year ago an industry-USDA study group recommended a pilot spinning facility be set up as part of the marketing research program for cotton. This plant is now being established at Clemson, S.C.

These many efforts are the starting point for knowledge on which a whole new technology can be based, a technology that will mean more efficient machinery in the gin as well as new cultural practices and processing techniques of benefit to the entire cotton industry.

All this is heartening, encouraging, stimulating.

I am not impressed with gloomy prophecies and defeatist talk about the future of cotton and agriculture as a whole. The future can be exciting, profitable, satisfying, progressive, a good time to live and work and raise a family.

What is called for is a joint undertaking to which our wholehearted cooperation is dedicated. I challenge you of the entire cotton industry to give us your cooperation and I pledge that you shall have ours.

I am dedicated to doing what is economically sound, fair, and right to help improve the position of farmers in our economy. I shall continue to pursue that goal of a more prosperous, expanding, and free agriculture.

With God's help, and the understanding and cooperation of groups such as this, whose futures are so closely allied with farmers', we shall reach that goal.

Remarks by Gov. G. Mennen Williams Before Cleveland Bar Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the RECORD, excerpts from remarks by the Honorable G. Mennen Williams, Governor of Michigan, before the Cleveland Bar Association, in Cleveland, Ohio, on April 7, 1959:

EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS BY HON. G. MENNEN WILLIAMS, GOVERNOR OF MICHIGAN, CLEVELAND BAR ASSOCIATION, APRIL 7, 1959

Just a couple of weeks ago, I was talking on the phone to a neighboring Governor.

After we had exchanged the usual greetings, he remarked, in a tone of voice filled with warm and friendly solicitude, that he was sorry to hear that Michigan was in such tough shape.

Quite naturally, I thanked him for his generous concern, but it wasn't easy to restrain myself from making some observations about his State on the basis of figures which had come across my desk.

His State's deficit is considerably larger than mine, he's trying to raise almost half again more taxes this year than I am, his State had more than twice as many areas of serious unemployment at the turn of the year than my State had, and his State debt was almost $30 per capita higher than mine.

Yet he was sincerely extending his sympathy to me because the stories he had been reading made it seem like Michigan was a barren economic wasteland. Incidentally, it wasn't Mike DiSalle I was talking to—although I do enjoy talking to your great Governor.

My wife, who is touring the Orient as an observer for the World Health Organization, says that the American periodicals received over there have painted such a grim picture of Michigan that she half expects her tips to be returned.

So I've come to respect, even to marvel a little at the power of the printed word, even when its wrong, as it certainly is in the case of the exaggerated announcements about the imminent demise of Michigan's economy and government.

Michigan has problems—of course we have. So does every other State in the Union. But let me assure you that we're not cashing in our chips yet. I'm not a ghost. And the gleeful obituaries of Michigan written by some editorial writers around the country are considerably premature.

For example, so far this year there have been announcements totaling more than $600 million in new industrial installations or expansions in Michigan. Three-fifths of a billion dollars in private capital investments already scheduled this year hardly sounds like a State that's on its last legs. And last year, Michigan ranked fourth among the States in industrial construction, according to data published nationally last month in the Engineering News-Record publication.

Business Week reported last month that Michigan was one of only eight States that could boast of $1 billion in personal income per month in 1958, which hardly can be the death throes of a dying economy.

Incidentally, one of those eight States is your own great State of Ohio, and I'm glad that we're together right up there among the leaders.

And as for our being a welfare State—there are 33 States with higher per capita costs for welfare than Michigan's. And there are 30 States which have higher State and local taxes in relation to income than we have, according to a study released by the census bureau earlier this year.

This bit of chamber of commerce talk is just to correct any queasy feeling you might have that your neighbor Michigan is slowly sinking into the Great Lakes and is about to go under with a last gurgle.

And those of you who want to come to Michigan for a vacation will find that the accomodations are still the very best, the scenery is superb, and the fishing is the greatest—so do come over and visit us—anytime.

But in spite of our assets, we in Michigan, the same as you in Ohio, have some real economic problems. These economic problems are largely part and parcel of the economic problems of the Nation as a whole, and it is to this point that I shall address the remainder of my remarks.

It is obvious that there are grave dislocations in our National economy when we have critical unemployment at a time of rising production. It is equally apparent that we have immense public and private needs which are not being taken care of at the present level of economic activity.

Did you know, to take just one example, that 14 percent of American families had family incomes in 1957 of less than $2,000 a year, according to a report by the Department of Commerce.

We can take care of this economic need, and other needs, by creating a bigger economic pie. The way to discharge the economic responsibilities which lie upon our collective shoulders, is to make our economy grow consistently at a faster rate than it has over the past half-dozen years.

We need an economy which does more than just keep pace with the needs of our booming population. We need an economy big enough to wipe out the backlog of needs, raise our standard of living, and help the free world to greater security and prosperity—all at the same time.

Take education as one of many examples of why we need a bigger economy, and need it right now. Conservative estimates of today's classroom shortages place it at about 140,000 classrooms. Other estimates range up to 300,000 classrooms. At $30,000 a classroom, a low estimate for many parts of the country, these 140,000 classrooms would cost more than $4 billion. If we took the larger shortage estimate of 300,000 classrooms, the needed expenditure would be up to $9 billion.

And remember this is just the backlog. It doesn't even touch the new needs coming up, to say nothing of the necessity of more adequate teachers' salaries. Our needs in the field of higher education, of course, are enormous. Enrollments in higher education are expected to double in the next 10 to 15 years.

The critical shortage isn't going to go away by pretending it doesn't exist, nor will it be resolved out of an economy which over the last half-dozen years has not fulfilled its growth potential.

The reason I mention education first is because it is the seed of American growth and the root of American opportunities. As long ago as 1916, Prof. Alfred North Whitehead said:

"In the conditions of modern life the rule is absolute; the race which does not value trained intelligence is doomed. Not all your heroism, nor all your social charm, nor all your wit, nor all your victories on land or at sea, can move the finger of fate.

"Today we maintain ourselves. Tomorrow, science will have moved forward yet one more step, and there will be no appeal from the judgment which will be pronounced on the uneducated."

It would be grim irony indeed if history were to say that Russia took that advice but America did not—on the specious grounds that we were unable to build an economy big enough to afford it.

What is true in education is true in many other areas of our national life. Since 1950, our population has been showing an average net daily increase of 7,600 persons, or some 2,800,000 a year. By 1975, we are going to have a population of some 225 million in America.

In the book "The Exploding Metropolis," the editors of Fortune magazine say this about American urban housing today—and just think as I read this what the impact of that population growth is going to be in housing alone if we don't roll up our sleeves and lick our housing problems.

The editors of Fortune reported this: "Today some 17 million Americans live in dwellings that are beyond rehabilitation—decayed, dirty, rat-infested, without decent heat or light or plumbing."

Surely, we're not going to stand by and let that kind of thing continue in this great Nation.

Take the social security needs of our aged citizens. Today there are some 14 million

people over 65 years of age in the United States. There will be 21 million by 1975, and 27 million by the turn of the century.

Are we going to continue to make deprivation, loneliness, and uselessness the things our senior citizens look forward to? Or are we going to attack their social security needs realistically, and provide the economic sufficiency and the social environment to make the last years of their lives happy, enjoyable, and useful?

In national defense, the Rockefeller report says we should be spending $5 billion a year more on our Military Establishment. In foreign economic aid, particularly to help the people of the underdeveloped countries to live in dignity and increasing prosperity, we should be spending an additional $3 billion a year, according to experts in this field.

We need a higher level of consistent economic growth simply to do what needs to be done in education, in slum clearance and urban renewal, in programs for our aged, in military defense, in economic aid, and in a great number of other areas of our economic life, areas like power development, hospital building, support for basic research in physical sciences and in medicine, and so on.

Are we able to do this? Is the task so formidable that it is beyond our national capacity?

Well, if there is any one thing clear in our economic history, it's that we've proven time and time again that we really don't know what prodigious things the American economy is capable of until we try.

Many of you will remember as clearly as I do one of the dramatic examples of this. In 1942, President Roosevelt called for the production of 45,000 combat planes and 6 million tons of shipping. In 1941, by comparison, only 1 million tons of shipping had been produced. Some cynics scoffed, but the American people went to work. We turned out 48,000 planes that year and 8 million tons of shipping.

In the late 1930's our gross national product was about $90 billion. Some economists thought we might be able to increase this to $140 billion under the demands of war. But we actually achieved a gross national product of $211 billion by 1944.

And with that immense resurgence of the American economy, we rescued our Allies from defeat, smashed Hitler, forced Japan to surrender, and kept right on going, and growing, until by 1948, after absorbing 12 million members of our Armed Forces back into our civilian economy, we had a gross national product of $259 billion. And unemployment during that reconversion never exceeded 2.5 million workers.

In other words, when the need was clear and our national policy was to fill that need, we grew nearly three times over in a decade. It is my contention that the need for economic growth is equally clear today, and it is my contention that America is equally able to meet a peacetime challenge.

Can we afford the present investments needed to spur our growth without "spending ourselves into bankruptcy," as the accusation is sometimes phrased?

Well, in 1953, Federal expenditures were 20.7 percent of the gross national product, and now they are 17 percent. The proportion of the gross national product used for defense expenditures fell from 14 percent in 1953 to slightly over 10 percent last year.

And we certainly weren't on the brink of economic collapse in 1953 when we were doing proportionately more in Federal expenditures than we are today.

We have at hand three immense resources to achieve the growth we need. These are our unused industrial capacity, our idle manpower, and the undeveloped talents of those young people who are deprived of an education to the limit of their ability for economic reasons, or because of discrimination.

As proof of this latter point, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Arthur S. Flemming, had scholarship requests totaling $62 million on hand in January when he began to put into effect the National Defense Education Act passed last year. He had expected scholarship requests to total $31 million.

The real economic waste in America is not in governmental spending. It's in the waste of manpower through enforced unemployment, and the waste of human talent through failure to provide the fullest possible educational opportunities for everyone.

Are there dangers in promoting rapid economic growth? Are there attendant problems? Of course there are. But I for one have every confidence in the world that our free enterprise system, and our democratic form of Government, can minimize the dangers, and surmount the problems, if we really apply ourselves to the challenge.

We are being told by some voices that inflation will run rampant if we do not restrict our public outlays. But the facts about our national experience with inflation make this proposition worth a much closer examination.

In a recent speech in Congress, the able and experienced Representative CHESTER BOWLES of Connecticut pointed out that since 1948 the average annual increase in wholesale prices has been 1.3 percent and for consumer prices 1.8 percent. Over the past 60 years, the average annual increase in both wholesale and consumer prices together has been 2.5 percent. Congressman BOWLES drily observes that such an increase is hardly of "panic size."

A very large proportion of the actual increases resulted from war. Moreover, the opinion is now growing that perhaps as much as 85 percent of the price increases in recent years lies in administered prices, which, the record shows, tend to rise more rapidly in periods of recession than in periods of growth.

In recent weeks, Dr. Woodlief Thomas, chief economist for the Federal Reserve Board; and Professor Saulnier, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, and others, have conceded that administered prices have been a major element in postwar price increases.

Dr. Gardiner Means, one of the authorities on administered prices, estimated that as much as 85 percent of our price increases were in this administered price sector of the economy.

Not for a moment am I denying that we must be on guard against inflation. Not for a moment am I saying that we should ignore the danger of inflation in our calculations of how rapidly we can expand our economy.

But the fact is that we have less reason to fear inflation than we have to fear the losses due to unemployment, inadequate schools, a depressed agriculture, and the like.

Otherwise, America is in danger of presenting to the world the ridiculous spectacle of a nation afraid to expand because of a false scare that a roaring inflation is the penalty for rapid growth.

Inflation is only one of the problems. It gains us little if our economy grows in a fashion which merely makes the rich richer and the poor poorer. It gains us little if we have prodigious production simultaneously with critically high unemployment, or surplus food and fiber along with a depression on our farms.

The kind of free enterprise system I want is a free enterprise system which really works to give every able and willing citizen a decent job, decent housing, the best education for his children, recreational opportunities for himself and his family, that provides him the wherewithal to have the medical care he needs when he needs it, and which gives him an old age worth looking forward to. And does this without the ugly stain of discrimination for race, religion, color, or national origin.

That's the kind of example I want America to show the world. That's the kind of example we need to move the world away from the lures of communism.

So we not only need growth which does not founder on the shoals of inflation, we need growth which is so worked out that the stated national policy of this country—clearly expressed in the Full Employment Act of 1948—is fully realized.

What then is holding us back? What is preventing the sinew, and nerve, and courage of America from accepting the challenge, rolling up its collective sleeve and going to work? Why do we stand around, almost in a stupor of inaction, while millions of Americans are out of work at a time of rapidly rising production, while food surpluses pile up and farmers go broke, while our cities decay, our children are squeezed into inadequate schools, our teachers are underpaid? Why are we not increasing those services which only Government can provide—at least enough to keep up with our rising population.

Have the American people lost their will to act, or has our leadership not sounded the call to action, as it should to America in midcentury.

The answer, I think, is clear. We need to revive the can-do spirit of the American people. We need to rouse this Nation to the challenge to do great things in the spirit which created our Nation in the first place, and has carried us onward to our manifest destiny for greatness ever since.

When we have a national attitude that squarely faces the facts about our needs, and firmly resolves to meet them, we will have taken a big step toward achieving the economic growth which will make it possible for us to do what needs to be done.

Then we must use the tools of fiscal, budgetary, and monetary policies to increase investment opportunities in America, and at the same time to make sure that the new wealth created is fairly distributed through the economy in a manner to sustain and increase both buying power and savings for further investment.

We've got to have the cooperation of management, and labor, and educators, and leaders of all kinds, to set forth our goals and to work together to achieve them.

We've got to go all out in our support for research because much of the new growth we need will come from research laboratories in the form of new inventions and new products to create whole new business enterprises not now even dreamed of.

The call to action in midcentury America is the call to growth. The schools we need are needed now, not 20 years from now. The slums to be cleared need clearing now, not a generation hence. The aged who need help need it now. The jobless worker needs work tomorrow, not 5 or 10 years from now.

The need to help the emerging peoples of the world to stand upright in freedom, dignity, and economic opportunity is a need which faces us now; tomorrow will be too late.

Let's be done with voices of little faith who doubt America's capacity to do what we have to do. This I believe is the call midcentury America wants to hear.

The Imminent Fair Trade Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 23, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by

the New York Times (Monday, April 13, 1959) that calls a spade a spade. It is time now for consumers to be heard. Nor will this bill help the retailer as it alleges to do.

The editorial follows:

THE FAIR TRADE BILL

The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House of Representatives is scheduled soon to vote on a radical piece of legislation whose enactment into law would do damage to the interests of every consumer as well as to basic principles of our society. This is the Harris bill, now being pushed by advocates of so-called "fair trade" legislation to repair the defeats they have suffered in the courts and legislatures of 19 States and Alaska. Put most simply, the bill would make it a Federal offense for any retailer to sell a product for a price below that set by its manufacturer, provided only that the product has for some time been part of a "shipment in commerce." Thus the sanction and threat of Federal Government power would be put behind uncontrolled private price decisions imposed upon all further sellers and buyers of such a product.

This effort to outlaw price competition is obviously subversive of the free competition which is basic to our way of life. The proponents of this measure would do well to ponder the likely future consequences of their success should they win. They should not be surprised if one such consequence were the demand for Federal control over manufacturers' prices. The recent chagrin of domestic oil interests which have seen their success in winning compulsory Federal control over oil imports open the door to Government control over prices of oil and oil products teaches an instructive lesson in this regard.

From the consumer's point of view passage of this bill holds a threat of higher prices and further intensifying inflationary trends. The magnitude of this threat is clearly indicated by a Department of Justice survey conducted in 1956. That survey found that in eight "non-fair-trade" cities consumers could save 27 percent in buying some 77 items at the lowest prices prevailing in those cities as against the prices for the same goods charged where they had to be sold at their "fair trade" prices.

From the point of view of public policy, the Harris bill is clearly obnoxious both in principle and in terms of its probable impact upon our economy. It is to be hoped that the House committee will decisively vote it down.

Poison in Your Water—No. 57

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the Seattle, Wash., Times on January 6, 1959, entitled "Objective Is To Save Green Lake":

OBJECTIVE IS TO SAVE GREEN LAKE

Seattle citizens were shocked last month by the announcement that Green Lake might become permanently impaired for use by swimmers and for other recreational purposes.

It was foreseen that the diversion of storm water into the lake from the freeway might complete the contamination process which kept Green Lake bathing beaches closed during most of last summer.

Later, Mayor Clinton made the more reassuring statement that the lake need not be utilized as a reservoir for rainwater runoff from the freeway if there were danger of more contamination from that source.

Various proposals for swimming have been offered since. One was to develop beachside swimming pools on the lake shore.

Another was to restore the east end of the lake, at least, by a device for recirculating the lake water and purifying it by a system of chlorination.

Studies of this problem have been continued at city hall and by the park department. It will be the subject of discussion at one or more meetings of citizens' groups, one of which is scheduled to be held this evening.

As we see it, the public is not so much concerned with the kind of measures to be taken by the city to safeguard Green Lake from continued contamination, from whatever source.

What the public is concerned about—and deeply concerned—is that a satisfactory plan be evolved that will preserve Green Lake as a permanent, natural recreational asset.

U.S. Postwar Financial Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1959

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the utter fallacy, fraud, and humbug of foreign aid is apparent to the taxpayers at the grassroots. Unless Congress curtails considerably this fallacious program, the American people might rise up and revolt at the ballot box against this unworkable, ridiculous program.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the following article by Prof. J. Fred Rippy of the University of South Carolina:

U.S. POSTWAR FINANCIAL AID—GLOBAL AND HEMISPHERIC

(By J. Fred Rippy)

Our national debt will soon reach $290 billion. The time has come to scrutinize most carefully the enormous sums which our Government has spent abroad since the triumph and tragedy of the 1940's.

The triumph alone cost our taxpayers $341 billion by the end of fiscal year 1945. The ultimate cost in veterans' pensions and other benefits cannot be predicted with accuracy; but most probably these will have amounted to double the $341 billion by the end of this century.

POSTWAR TRAGEDY

After the war new aggressors immediately took the place of the conquered aggressors. This is the tragedy that followed on the heels of triumph.

The precise foreign-aid figures for fiscal year 1959 are not yet known. The year still has some months to run and statisticians in the Office of Business Economics at the Department of Commerce will need several months more to assemble the data. However, with the exception of a few relatively minor sums aggregating no more than a billion or so (incuding our Government's portion of the loans made by the World Bank), the figures for the fiscal years 1946 through 1958 are available to all who will take the time and trouble to search for them.

WHERE TO FIND THE FACTS

The most complete statistics are published quarterly by the Office of Business Economics under the title "Foreign Grants and Credits by the U.S. Government." The latest issue covers the postwar period through June 30, 1958. Most of our national officials are probably familiar with this publication; the majority of the American people are unaware of its existence. The few comparatively alert citizens concentrate their attention on the annual appropriation acts entitled "Mutual Security Appropriations," and thus overlook many other appropriations made with the same objective. These latter amount to approximately half of the total in some instances.

FAULTY MOTIVES AND MEANS

With the aims of safeguarding the security of our Nation, of responding to presumed moral obligations, and of sustaining national prosperity by stimulating exports and developing foreign sources of raw-material supplies for our factories as we are presumed to exhaust our own—a hodgepodge of motives which, together with the means used to achieve them may prove to be self-defeating—the U.S. Government spent and lent during the period July 1, 1945–June 30, 1958, a grand total of $73,808,794,000, omitting the aforementioned billion or more.

The major part of this incomplete total consisted of grants amounting to $57,274,691,000; the remainder—$16,534,103,000—represents long-term loans at low interest. Some of these loans, for example those made in local currencies under authorization of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act amounting to $321,063,000, may turn out to be soft loans which never will be repaid or serviced in full. Others represent bargain sales of surplus property on long-term credit which involved large losses at the time the sales were made. Under this last category the total was no less than $1,497,557,000. The remainder of the loans may perhaps be serviced and ultimately repaid, provided both general war and global economic crises can be avoided.

FORCED AID

In studying the announced aims of our postwar financial aid, it is necessary to point out that Government determination and enforcement of our moral obligations to alien peoples violates a basic principle of our historic political system by curtailing our personal liberty. Since many of the main proponents of this morality are clergymen, there is also involved our fundamental national principle of the separation of church and state.

The economic assumption that our national prosperity is fostered by stimulating exports by means of gifts and cheap loans provided by taxpayers is false for two main reasons: (1) the dollars sent abroad may return, but they will return to only a minority of the people from whom they were taken, and (2) the profits will amount not to the whole of the gifts and loans, but to only 15 or 20 percent of the whole—unless it is also assumed that labor, raw materials, and management cost nothing. No more absurd propaganda was ever palmed off on the American people with so little popular protest.

CENSORED AID

It is a fact that an enormous portion of the grants were made to unidentified countries. For one reason or another, the allotment to individual countries is concealed from the general public. This portion of the gifts amounts to more than $23 billion (nearly $21 billion for military aid), and represents more than 40 percent of the total. Certainly, some of it may fail to achieve its purpose. A fairly complete list of the items

included in this tremendous sum is as follows:

Europe in general	$13,336,971,000
European Payments Union	238,084,000
Asia, the Pacific area, Africa	7,359,751,000
Latin America	479,009,000
United Nations and affiliates	718,191,000
Migration and refugees	307,755,000
Unspecified	541,288,000
Total	23,001,049,000

The figures for the United Nations and its affiliates include the postwar total expended through the UNRRA, but exclude the contribution of the United States to the loans made and administered by the World Bank. Owing to lack of details about the distribution of this huge sum among presumed beneficiaries, the statistics presented hereinafter are incomplete, in some instances most incomplete.

GARGANTUAN GRANTS

There has been much official talk in Washington, D.C., and elsewhere in our country about the desirability of reducing expenditures for foreign financial aid grants and increasing those for loans. But through fiscal year 1958, at least, Government action has contradicted words in most cases.

For the year 1958 itself, grants amounted to almost 77 percent of the total aid; the average for the preceding fiscal years was approximately 79 percent of the total.

"SOFT" LOANS

Although it seemed likely that expansion of loans would reduce the percentage of grants in future years (barring widespread military conflict or major economic crises), the total of "soft" loans probably will increase as loans from the new Development Fund are added to those made in local currencies derived from sales of surplus farm products. (It should be noted that part of these surplus farm products are the result of price rises which have put the products beyond the household family budgets of many of our people.) Such loans, and probably some others, might eventually become the equivalent of grants. They might also prove still more disappointing in good results achieved.

Do the American people remember the war and reconstruction debts of 1915–20, and the investments made during the following decade in the bonds of foreign countries? It seems this experience ought not be forgotten.

THE LION'S SHARE

The lion's share of our largesse during the 1945–58 period went to Western and Southern Europe. Certainly, it may have helped to give some of the peoples of this region the fortitude to defy the Communists. But the final result is still in doubt; even, it is in the lap of the gods.

Excluding concealed distributions made among the several countries, the following list reveals the largest recipients of our largesse:

Great Britain	$8,878,292,000
France	6,876,899,000
West Germany	5,206,039,000
Italy	3,240,427,000
Greece	1,906,943,000
Dutch Netherlands	1,352,772,000
Austria	1,139,414,000
Yugoslavia	860,173,000
Belgium-Luxembourg	822,491,000
Scandinavia	794,861,000
Spain	471,988,000
Portugal	90,593,000

Europe's portion, including sums expended in Iceland, Ireland, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary and also including concealed distributions, was in excess of 60 percent of the global total of $74 billion.

However, Europe's share was rapidly diminishing during fiscal years 1957–58, when it was only 30 percent of the aggregate spent and lent by the United States. Of this percentage, the major part was classified as military assistance, although technical and economic aid amounted to a bulky part in several cases, and, except in a few instances—notably England and Poland—all, or nearly all was in the category of grants. It is interesting to note the following list of countries and sums received in technical and economic aid during fiscal years 1957–58:

Great Britain	$300,309,000
Spain	243,903,000
Italy	172,498,000
Greece	89,380,000
France	74,257,000
Yugoslavia	68,060,000
Austria	45,701,000
Portugal	28,320,000
Poland	20,191,000
Hungary	10,573,000

These statistics for Europe include expenditures by the U.S. Government on such European dependencies as still existed at the end of the period under review. Funds provided for this purpose during fiscal years 1946–58 amounted to some $64.5 million; the major part of the total was devoted to European possessions in the Americas and Africa. The British West Indian Federation was especially favored. Of the European colonies in the Asiatic and Pacific areas, Hong Kong received priority treatment.

AID TO FAR EAST

Among independent nations outside of Europe, the stressed areas were Japan, Taiwan (Formosa), Korea, and the three countries of Indochina (Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam):

Japan	$3,313,980,000
Taiwan	2,654,987,000
Korea	2,185,659,000
Indochina	1,216,285,000

Again, these huge sums are exclusive of military assistance. Japan, of course, cannot be classified as an economically retarded nation. It is a war-devastated country badly in need of emergency aid and presumably significant in the global defense strategy of the United States. The latter is largely true of Australia and New Zealand, which received a combined total of $46,486,000, consisting mainly of cheap loans.

Among the politically independent undeveloped nations of the world, those of the vast teeming continent of Asia were given huge sums of financial aid by our Government during 1946–58. The total for the Philippine Republic, a sector of the Pacific area which might also be described as a part of Eastern Asia, was $987,720,000. Sentimental attachments to the Philippines were of as much if not more weight than considerations of national security. The 12 nations of the Middle East were recipients of $1,608,018,000. But India, Pakistan, Indonesia and Thailand were the major Far Eastern recipients:

India	$618,791,000
Pakistan	423,607,000
Indonesia	314,344,000
Thailand	129,780,000

The eight nations of the Near East, including Egypt, were the recipients of a combined total of $1,119,319,000. Israel and Iran (Persia) were the most favored of this group. Israel's portion was $512,699,000 and Iran, where some of the expenditures were scandalous, received $365,957,000. Egypt (together with Syria, recently seized by Colonel Nasser) was the recipient of $96,612,000. The large sum expended by the United States in Turkey—$853,984,000—might be added to the total spent in the Near East.

It must be repeated and emphasized that none of these figures cited in relation to Asia takes into account the billions distributed among unidentified individual countries mainly for military materials and services, some of which are use wastefully and imprudently.

MORE AID TO AFRICA?

Assistance by the U.S. Government to the independent and autonomous nations of Africa during this post World War II period was comparatively small. But it seems likely to expand rapidly. Including the Union of South Africa (which can hardly be considered as an economically retarded country) the total was only $447,908,000, excluding military aid and which in a few cases is large. Recipients of the major shares were:

Union of South Africa	$150,316,000
Libya	61,880,000
Rhodesia-Nyassaland	60,697,000
Morocco	51,520,000
Liberia	41,074,000
Ethiopia	28,449,000

SOME PARTISAN ANGLES

Most of the financial aid given to the Union of South Africa and to Rhodesia-Nyassaland consisted of cheap loans. Liberia was favored largely by virtue of tradition1 attachments and politically partisan motives (winning the Negro vote here at home), and these same partisan motives may have had some influence in the case of Ethiopia and that of some others. (In Israel too, racial and partisan motives were an influence.)

Nowadays, new nations are rapidly being set up and recognized in Africa with little attention being paid to the realism of their economic viability. This is being done mainly by the votes of those member states of the United Nations whose representatives have no intention of paying the piper for their foolishness. It seems they are confident that American taxpayers will foot the bills for the new African nationalism.

LARGESSE TO LATINS

Latin America's share of our largesse during the years 1947–58 was $2,878,809,000, including $452,756,000—for military supplies and services. The source for these statistics is the Office of Business Statistics in the Department of Commerce. Grants to Latin American countries were much smaller than low-cost loans. The main presumptive beneficiaries were:

Brazil	$814,068,000
Mexico	414,424,000
Chile	197,648,000
Guatemala	70,497,000
Ecuador	51,004,000
Haiti	48,144,000
Colombia	161,092,000
Peru	155,198,000
Bolivia	147,504,000
Cuba	41,542,000
Costa Rica	38,411,000
Panama	25,291,000

These totals for Latin American nations exclude not only military assistance and indirect aid through our contributions to the United Nations and its affiliates, but also considerable sums contributed through the Organization of American States and its subsidiaries as well as several millions in contributions by the U.S. Government to the budgets of the Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences (in Costa Rica), and to the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory in Panama.

These figures show that Latin America, with some 6.2 percent of the world's population, was the recipient of approximately 5 percent of the grand total of official expenditures by the United States in foreign countries during the period following World

War II. In fact, during fiscal years 1956–58, Latin America's share was almost 7 percent.

LATIN NOSTALGIA

Yet, it seems, Latin America has been growing more and more unfriendly to the United States during this period. The causes of this unfriendliness may be traced to false accusations made against us by Communists and their dupes and fellow travelers, to widespread dissatisfaction with our commercial and investment policies, to severe disagreements concerning the proper role of government in production and distribution, to homegrown and foreign inspired false allegations that the United States is favorable to dictatorships and despots, and to a feeling of neglect arising from the fact that our economic and military strategy seems to have shifted away from the Western Hemisphere.

Then, too, there is nostalgia in Latin America for the good old days of the New Deal good-neighbor policy, during which a favorable response was accorded to virtually every request made to us by Latin Americans, and the administration in Washington, D.C., uttered no complaints at all against the expansion of Latin American political governments into national economies.

SPENDERS UNLIMITED

It is safe to say that the vast foreign economic aid program of our country has proved again the truth of the old adage that friendship cannot be bought. Neither can prodigality produce thrift and savings.

We in the United States are a Nation of only 175 million people. Never was so much aid expected from so few and exacted from them by their own Government.

The question for Americans now is, "Have we lost the spunk and stamina of our tax-rebellious ancestors, or will we soon exhibit these good qualities and demand a strict accounting from our own governmental spenders unlimited?"

Our demand for strict accounting should not only concern foreign aid but also all other extravagant Government outlays. To talk of balancing our national budget by means of another rise in postal rates and an increase in taxes on petroleum products is both absurd and irritating. Our national budget cannot be balanced without cutting appropriations for foreign aid and for other outlays, and without exerting strictest economy in government bureaucratic administration. Petroleum taxes and postal rates are already too high, and postal services have been growing less and less efficient.

THE FATE OF OUR COUNTRY

There is only one sound way to try to pay off our debts. We must save money and cut expenses. If we do not banish spenders unlimited from the seats of Government, can we escape the fatality of the tragedy that has followed the triumph of the 1940's? There is no role which the historian adjures more than that of a prophet. Yet this historian cannot ignore his feeling that the fate of our Nation will be finally decided within the next few years. Either we shall triumph over tragedy or it will overtake us, largely as a result of our own financial folly.

Poison in Your Water—No. 59

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the Gazette of Berkeley, Calif., on January 17, 1959, entitled "The Outdoors," by Jim McCormick:

[From Berkeley (Calif.) Gazette, Jan. 17, 1959]

THE OUTDOORS—ANOTHER POLLUTION KILL

(By Jim McCormick)

A little over a year ago, a pollution discharge in San Francisco Bay killed thousands upon thousands of striped bass and other fish.

It was a sickening sight with the sportsmen and conservationists in this area up in arms over the needless damage.

The kill of a year ago was mild compared to the savage blow dealt to our salmon and steelhead spawning fish on the Upper Sacramento River a week ago.

Seepage from copper mines in the Spring Creek area above Keswick Lake was carried by recent storms into the river drainage area above Keswick Dam, just below Shasta Dam.

The copper sulfate poisoning provided a lethal dose with 453 adult spawning salmon and steelhead counted alone in the Keswick Dam fish traps, which are used to collect fish for artificial spawning at the Coleman fish hatchery.

Investigation revealed a serious fish kill along an extensive stretch of the river which is reported to have killed thousands of adult salmon and steelhead and decimated millions of recently hatched fish.

The department in an attempt to determine the extent of the amount of pollutant placed three cans of small salmon from 1 to 4 miles below the Keswick Dam. The pollutant was so strong that several hours later the fish in the cans were killed.

According to the Shasta Cascade Wonderland Association, it is estimated that an excess of 15 million fish were lost in the tragedy, including adults, fry and eggs.

The tragedy of the situation is that California has been waging a losing battle to save the valuable salmon fishery.

This year Mother Nature lent a helping hand by placing a greater number of salmon on the limited spawning beds than in the last 4 or 5 years. Then a source of pollution that should have been corrected years ago breaks loose and does irreparable damage to a fishery that is already in serious jeopardy.

"Hablo Español—Un Poco"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 16, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, in the course of my various visits to Latin America in the past 2 years, I have regretted very much that I could not speak Spanish. I intend to learn Spanish. I have the books, the records, and the motivation, but I have not found the time yet.

In Springfield, Oreg., sixth graders are learning Spanish, thanks to Principal Charles E. Smith, of the Mill Street Elementary School. Experimental classes are being watched with a great deal of interest by Superintendent Harold Beall. It is possible that from this experiment a second language will be added to the elementary school curriculum, something which many educators here and in other countries think makes a good deal of sense in terms of the language learning abilities of children at relatively tender ages.

Under a previous consent, I am inserting the article about this class which appeared in the Springfield News, February 12, 1959:

Drop in at Mill Street School almost any day and you will hear the soft, musical sounds of conversation in Spanish—and the speakers will be sixth graders.

Principal Charles Smith is teaching an experimental class in conversational Spanish to 16 sixth graders, the top reading group of the sixth grade, and from the eyes of a casual observer it appears that the youngsters (and leader) are having a lot of fun, as well as learning new skills.

Smith explains that on the basis of the experience thus far there appear to be a number of advantages:

1. The children supplement their social studies familiarization with customs of a foreign country.

2. Taking of the top readers from the sixth grade for the Spanish class gives the regular sixth grade teacher more time to work on specialized reading problems with the remainder of the class.

3. A challenge is provided superior students.

Supt. Harold Beall is watching the experimental class with a great deal of interest. He points out that this is actual research, a part of the overall program in District 19 curriculum studies aimed at improvement of the material provided in all the schools. He said the curriculum study is based on a desire to improve instead of accepting that which has been done for years. It is entirely possible that from the Mill Street School class will come the addition of a second language to the elementary school curriculum.

The first lessons in the Mill Street class were prepared by Smith on a fluid duplicator, because there just were no books on elementary Spanish available when the course was mapped out. Now the school has a set of books "just like first and second grade readers" which Smith says is the first set of books he has ever seen for elementary grade Spanish.

The first lesson told of the meeting of John (Juan) Dunbar with a Mexican friend, Pablo, while on a trip to Mexico. The lesson was based on their greetings, their inquiry about each other's health and their farewells.

An opaque projector forms an important part of the Spanish study, as words and pictures from the one set of elementary Spanish books plus other material are projected on a screen for class discussion.

When a News reporter visited the class, one of the pupils was inquiring about the Spanish custom of having an inverted question mark at the beginning of each written question. One child wanted to know "Do Spanish kids have trouble with those marks?" Smith explained that it is perfectly natural to the Spanish children to have an inverted question mark at the start of each sentence. He said the young Spaniards probably ask "How do American children know it is a question if there is no mark at the beginning?"

During the class period, a picture of a donkey was shown on the screen, and the children identified various parts—las orejas, ears; los ojos, eyes; la cola, the tail, etc. Smith then told a child "Cuente usted por diez hasta ciento," and the child arose and counted to 100 by tens. There were a number of other exercises, for instance "El globo es redono," the moon is round. And there were such admonitions as "remember, the adjective always follows the noun it modifies."

After an interesting hour, the News staffer was ready to say "Hablo Espanol—un poco," meaning "I speak Spanish—a little."

Members of the class include: Jimmy Fleck, Jeff Jenkins, Tom Sawyer, Joyce Remington, Denny Taylor, Beverly Elving, Carol Smith, Lucia Hart, Kathy Whala, Jimmy Corbett, Gary Auxier, Mark Swinehart, Dale Sebring, Jeff Wright, David Nelson, and Judy Hazel.

Prohibiting Payment of Annuities and Retired Pay to Officers and Employees of the United States in Cases Involving National Security

SPEECH
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 14, 1959

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4601) to amend the act of September 1, 1954, in order to limit to cases involving the national security the prohibition on payment of annuities and retired pay to officers and employees of the United States, to clarify the application and operation of such act, and for other purposes.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I think the distinguished chairman of our committee has clearly explained the purposes of this legislation. This bill comes before this Committee with the unanimous approval of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Let me say, too, that it comes to you after long consideration and deliberation.

Our chairman has well said that about all there is to this legislation is that we went a little further than we intended to in the original legislation. It deals primarily with the question of national security and loyalty, and not so much with other subject matters that have been brought into this discussion today.

Briefly stated, this legislation is desirable to eliminate injustices resulting from denial of retirement benefits, under present law, to many individuals—and widows of some—for relatively minor offenses which do not involve questions of loyalty or the national security. At the same time, enactment of this legislation will clarify and strengthen the very desirable bar, intended to be provided by existing law, against payment of Federal retirement benefits to individuals who have committed offenses—or who have failed or refused to act when in duty bound—in loyalty or security matters.

To accomplish this twofold purpose, the bill completely rewrites Public Law 769, 83d Congress. That law was enacted for the primary purpose of prohibiting Federal retirement benefits for individuals guilty of wrongful acts or omissions in matters affecting the national security. The law was enacted in response to strong and widespread public demand. This demand arose because of the then pending payment of a civil service retirement annuity to an individual about to be released from a Federal penitentiary after serving a penal term for perjury before a Federal grand jury in a proceeding directly involving the national security. The entire country was deeply disturbed and indignant at the prospect that a Federal annuity could be paid in any such case.

I should say that the individual in question has not yet applied for the retirement benefits; but if he should apply, there will surely be a question as to whether he can collect. He has left the country, and I do not believe that any Member of this body would want to pay retirement benefits to an individual who decides to reside in a foreign country.

Although this was the primary purpose of the law, during the consideration of the legislation a number of additional offenses were written into the provision barring annuities. Many of these additional offenses in no manner relate to the national security. It appears clear at this time that the denial of annuities in these additional cases was above and beyond the primary purpose of Public Law 769 and should be stricken from the law in equity and good conscience.

It cannot be too strongly emphasized that H.R. 4601 continues, clarifies, and strengthens the original purpose of Public Law 769, that is, to bar Federal annuities and retired pay in cases of offenses against the national security. The decision of the Court of Claims in Steinberg against the United States declared section 2 of Public Law 769 unconstitutional in a matter relating to the invoking of the fifth amendment before a grand jury investigating a nonsecurity matter. Unless the security provisions of the law are strengthened, similar judicial decisions well might be handed down in the future declaring the entire present law unconstitutional.

H.R. 4601 removes the inequitable provisions of Public Law 769 by restoring all annuity rights in nonsecurity cases. The restoration is retroactive and will take effect as though Public Law 769 never had been enacted. Anyone who has received a refund of contributions to an annuity or retirement system will have to redeposit the refund to obtain restoration of benefits. In this connection, it is to be noted that many of the annuities which will be restored were denied for comparatively minor offenses. In many cases, no penalty was applied due to mitigating circumstances such as restitution, good records, and so forth. In a number of instances, the offenders were reemployed and rendered long and faithful public service, only to be denied annuities when they reached retirement age.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. Why, if pleading the fifth amendment is not an offense in itself, is one kind of pleading of the fifth amendment invoked to have your retirement benefits canceled? On the record I would like to say if one is unconstitutional or one method of pleading the fifth amendment provides an unconstitutional result as to retirement benefits under this act, I think the second, although we like it less, will likewise result in an unconstitutional decision if it is sustained.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. FOLEY. I would like to associate myself with the conclusion reached by the gentleman from Pennsylvania and say that if it is unconstitutional for one purpose, it is unconstitutional for all purposes and that there cannot be a line drawn, and whatever may be our personal feelings in the matter if the matter is a constitutional right, it is a constitutional right, in my humble judgment, for all purposes.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I would like to observe first of all that the question of what is or what is not constitutional seems in these latter days to be whatever the decision of a majority of the nine men across the street happens to be. Now, Mr. Chairman, does not the question amount to this—not whether there is a right to invoke the fifth amendment, but whether there is a right, a constitutional right to hold a job under an oath of loyalty to the Constitution and in the Federal Government and then refuse to give an accouting of one's performance of that job with respect to matters that involve national security and that involve loyalty to this Government and to the very oath that was taken. Is not the real issue whether or not we are going to make a constitutional right out of a Federal job without reference to willingness to testify as to the most basic responsibility of all, namely, that of loyalty to the Government and to the very oath that is taken?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I think the gentleman has stated the proposition correctly.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. Would you explain to me—because that does bring up a question—if a citizen of the United States exercises his constitutional right, by what right or authority then does this Congress put a penalty on it?

Mr. JOHANSEN. I would point out, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, that the loss of the job would certainly be a penalty and the loss of the perquisites and privileges of the job, of which this pension is one, is, let us concede for all practical purposes, a penalty; but the question is whether the right to that job and to these perquisites is a constitutional right that is completely inviolate whether or not a person violates national security or refuses to answer questions related to his own performance in that office.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DOYLE. I had not prepared to make any remarks in connection with this bill, for which I will gladly vote. But I think perhaps the subject of pleading the fifth amendment by a witness comes before the House Committee on

Un-American Activities more than any other committee of this House. Therefore, in view of the discussion about it, now in process, I might contribute a thought or so which might be helpful, and for the problem. In the first place, may I say, that the Supreme Court of the United States time and again has held that the pleading of the fifth amendment, by a witness before a congressional committee, does not even infer guilt or wrongdoing. It does not even infer guilt and is definitely not an admission of guilt; not of any kind or sort of guilt of criminal activity.

Mr. REES of Kansas. This legislation does not affect that.

Mr. DOYLE. But I wish to associate myself with the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] and the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FOLEY] on the question they have raised, as to the constitutionality of the bill provisions in the fifth amendment. Of course, I am strongly in support of the bill. I hope this method of trying to strengthen our national security proves practical and legal. I compliment the committee upon its work on the problem. But, I think we ought to be dead sure that this bill, as it passes this House, is fully considered by the other body and possibly in conferences, as to this particular point being discussed. I doubt very much if by this congressional legislation we can overcome many, many decisions of our Supreme Court which has so many times defined that the plea of self incrimination, known as the fifth amendment, is a basic constitutional right.

May I say this, and I say it with all due respect to the members of the committee: that I am one Member of this Congress who recognizes, that even though I may not like some of the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, the Supreme Court of the United States is the Supreme Court of the United States, under the U.S. Constitution. It interprets the law as we pass the laws of the land. We may not like it. Some of their decisions may prove inconvenient, and personally inconsistent with our individual opinion, but, nevertheless, under our constitutional form of government, the judicial department of our Government is represented by the Supreme Court of the United States. As a member of the California bar for over 30 years, and of the bar of the Supreme Court for many years, I wish to affirm my position again. It is, that the Supreme Court, as our highest Court, deserves the dignified expression of faith and confidence of this Congress and of every citizen of the United States. If it does not have this, the Commies and their fellow travelers will proclaim with loud glee and hilarity and their unpatriotic propaganda and their subversive activity, that our form of representative constitutional government has not worked well. We can honestly criticize a decision, but I do not conceive of it being strengthening to the endurableness of our constitutional government to condemn the Court itself. To do so, makes for weakness of our fortress against Soviet communism.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I would like to associate myself with a view expressed relative to the U.S. Supreme Court—and as long as it remains the Supreme Court and a truly judicial body, I have the utmost respect for it—some 90 years ago by Abraham Lincoln in his first inaugural address, when he said that if the decision of the Supreme Court in a specific case must thereafter become the irrevocable law of the land, then we will have ceased to be our own rulers in this country.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CORBETT. I am not an attorney and certainly not a constitutional attorney, but I believe that those who feel this law may be unconstitutional because of the provisions which relate to the invoking of the fifth amendment are losing sight of the basic fact.

This is not a penalty provision in the true sense of the word. No one is, or will be, deprived of any of his own money. Under the terms of this bill he gets his money back, but because he has refused to testify when he has a duty to do so, by reason of his official position with the Government, the U.S. Government has a right to withhold from him any special benefits which accrue to him in this event. I submit, therefore, that what we are trying to do is to prevent an employee getting special benefits from the taxpayers when he has failed to keep his contract with the U.S. Government.

In this connection, I believe that these statements of public policy, set forth by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, are significant:

Adverse and hostile policies, attitudes, and other actions of certain foreign nations in the world today imperil the existence of the United States of America as a sovereign Nation. Proof exists at every hand that one of the primary objectives of the Communist enemy is the infiltration of the Government of the United States with hostile influences in order to undermine and overthrow the Government. It is beyond the bounds of right and reason that an individual, whose acts or omissions are calculated to impede the national defense, safety, and security or to give aid and comfort or secure any advantage to foreign hostile forces and influences, should derive any Federal benefit in the form of annuity or retired pay based on his service as a Government officer or employee. This committee cannot emphasize too strongly that inaction and disregard on the part of the Congress of the United States or of any other organ of the Government with respect to any such situation constitutes dereliction of duty of the most serious nature.

It is apparent to this committee that a significant principle with respect to the nature of the benefits at issue has not been given the proper weight in the consideration of existing law. This principle is to the effect that an individual who assumes public office or employment accepts all of the obligations (explicit and implicit) of such office or employment as well as the emoluments thereof. When an individual enters the service of the United States, he imposes upon himself an extraordinary—even a unique—commitment of complete and unswerving loyalty to government and to country. This obligation of loyalty is preemptive of any and all rights and benefits accruing from public office or employment. Fulfillment of such obligation of loyalty at all times is an absolute condition precedent to the granting, vesting, and receipt of any right, benefit, or remedy arising out of the office or employment in the past, present, or future.

Breach of this obligation or high trust by an individual guilty of an act or omission which impairs the national security abrogates from the beginning any obligation of the United States to pay benefits based on the service of such individual. All claims for such benefits must stand or fall along with those of the individual whose conduct is at issue. In the case of such breach of trust, it is entirely fitting and proper to deny such benefits and at the same time make appropriate return of contributions made by the individual concerned. These benefits are, in part, in the nature of gratuities because of Government contributions toward such benefits. In effect, the payment of any such benefits to any such individual would be shocking to the public conscience and morals and repugnant to the high principles on which our Government is founded. This was made abundantly evident, during the consideration of the bill that became Public Law 769, 83d Congress.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. That brings up a remarkable question. Does Alger Hiss have a right to get his money back, with interest, from the Government, and has he asked for it?

Mr. CORBETT. The answer is that he has not received his money and he has not asked for it, but he is entitled to it.

Mr. FULTON. And is he entitled to interest on his money?

Mr. CORBETT. Certainly, as provided by the Retirement Act.

Mr. FULTON. Why did not the Solicitor General of the United States in the Steinberg case develop this on all aspects of the constitutional question? Why did he not appeal from the Court of Claims decision to the U.S. Supreme Court to clarify this question before recommending this legislation? Why did he not do it? Will somebody answer me on that?

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. CORBETT. The answer is that everybody agreed that there should be a change in the law to clarify and strengthen it and that further appeal would be undesirable, particularly since he was going to recommend this particular change in the law.

Mr. FULTON. I believe it was an error on the part of the Solicitor General not to have settled this question in advance before recommending legislation. This question of constitutionality should be settled; and all the gentleman from Maryland, the gentleman from California, and I are doing is simply trying to check out on all phases of this matter of constitutionality. Under the rules of the Supreme Court if a matter is unconstitutional in one phase the entire act falls. If they hold it is unconstitutional to put a penalty on a person for exer-

cising his rights under a section of the Constitution of the United States we should not try to do what amounts to just that. I for one cannot see how a constitutional exercise of the right to plead the fifth amendment which the Supreme Court says is not even an inference of guilt gives Congress the right to assess a penalty against anyone exercising his constitutional rights.

Mr. CORBETT. It is not assessed on that ground, but because he has violated his obligation as an employee of the United States of America in refusing to give information which it is his duty to give because of accepting that employment.

Mr. FOLEY. In connection with the position taken by my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] I would like to quote this language from the Supreme Court cited in the Steinberg case. The Supreme Court has held in the case of Slochower against the Board of Education:

> The privilege against self-incrimination would be reduced to a hollow mockery if its exercise could be taken as equivalent to a confession of guilt. The privilege serves to protect the innocent who otherwise might be ensnared by ambiguous circumstances.

My question, I may say to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], is this: As a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee and one who is in favor of the adoption of H.R. 4601, it is my understanding that the purpose is to eliminate this unfair provision referring to crimes not involving national security and not involving loyalty. It is also my understanding that it is the purpose of the amendment, H.R. 4601, to eliminate that provision pertaining to the exercise of the constitutional right, in other words, exercising the guarantee provided by the fifth amendment. My opinion is based upon the fact that the original act, section 2, specifically authorized the forfeiture of benefits where the refusal to answer was on the ground of self-incrimination. H.R. 4601 eliminates that provision.

It seems to me that it was the intent of the committee when they reported out H.R. 4601 to eliminate all reference to the exercise of constitutional rights as forming the basis for the imposition of any penalty or sanction.

My question arises because of the fact that in the report of the committee on page 7 of the statement is made:

> Section 2(a) of the amendment prohibits annuities or retired pay to persons refusing on ground of self-incrimination.

I concur in the opinion stated by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] that the Court of Claims is correct in holding that for the exercise of a constitutional right, regardless of what that right may be, the Congress cannot impose any loss of any benefit, cannot impose any penalty or sanction. This is true not only in the case of crimes or misdemeanors, but in all other cases, and Congress cannot except from this fixed principle cases involving the serious charges of loyalty and security. Therefore I join with the gentleman from Pennsylvania in the conclusion that if this bill in any respect in loyalty or security matters seeks to impose sanctions or penalties upon the exercise of the constitutional guarantee under the fifth amendment that it will be struck down by the Supreme Court as unconstitutional.

Mr. REES of Kansas. As a member of the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service, and one of the most diligent members of that committee, I believe the gentleman supports this legislation?

Mr. FOLEY. Yes; I am in favor of the bill; but my questions are prompted by the language in the report. The purpose of the amendment, as I understand it, is to eliminate the original provision which called for the forfeiture of benefits upon the exercise of the constitutional right. I have been somewhat at a loss to understand why that has not been categorically and positively set forth in the report, to prevent any conclusion from being drawn that the purpose of the bill is not to do away with the original provisions providing for a sanction or penalty upon the invocation of the fifth amendment protection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The bill sets out the policy as carefully and clearly as can be done.

Mr. FOLEY. That is my understanding. It is the report that has misled me.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Briefly. I think the gentleman supports this legislation?

Mr. FULTON. I am supporting it but it brings these questions up. We do not want to have the legislation declared unconstitutional merely because of the lack of congressional intent in the language we are setting out here. I believe our purpose is to make sure that we are not going beyond constitutional limits. This brings up a precedent, and I think the veterans' organizations of the country should take cognizance of this fact.

This brings up a precedent, as I say. Every action we take here is going to be cited as a precedent later. I am a former veteran and that brings to mind this: When somebody is convicted by a court-martial and discharged from the service, he loses his rank, his pay, his retirement, and his GI education rights, whether it is on the security of the country, loyalty or on a small little thing that sometimes would not even be a misdemeanor in a State. So, we are here in the U.S. Congress in one instance depriving a serviceman and his widow dependent, also his children, of support when it involves only a misdemeanor.

I hope that the veterans' organizations will look into this because there has been a lot of injustice done to many of our veterans in this country when they have been deprived of their retirement right, their disability right, their citizenship rights, yes, and their widow's and their children's support rights, and also they have lost their GI education rights that would simply make them better U.S. citizens. How can we say we are not doing that?

I strongly favor and recommend that the Congress and the Committee on Armed Services particularly take up the situation because there has been a tremendous injustice in many cases.

Mr. CORBETT. I do want to say to both the gentleman from Maryland and the gentleman from Pennsylvania that we appreciate the fact that their concern for the welfare of this legislation has prompted their remarks. But I do think this needs to be added: The full intent of the committee and those counseling on this bill was to bring here a measure that would provide, first, that no one who is guilty of subversion or disloyalty may secure additional gratuities or benefits from the people of the United States and, second, that employees, former employees, and their families not be deprived of their benefits because of comparatively minor offenses. That has been the intent, and I submit, as both the gentlemen pointed out, that this bill represents the best possible means to obtain these objectives. If a constitutional question exists, the ultimate decision will have to be with the courts of the United States. Further discussion on this matter here would seem to serve no purpose.

Mr. FOLEY. You have reference to a conviction for these offenses by a court of law rather than the exercise of a constitutional right, being the basis or the ground for forfeiture of the benefits, is that correct?

I repeat my question. Your views were premised on this basis, that the person involved has been convicted by a court of law of the charges against him and that the forfeiture of his benefit depends upon that act rather than upon the exercise of a constitutional right; is that correct, sir?

Mr. CORBETT. It is the failure to act on the part of the employee who is in duty bound to act in keeping with his contract made when he took office. It does not result in a penalty or punishment in the form of forfeiture of the benefit. It results in a justified refusal by the Government to give him a benefit because he has failed to act in accordance with the rules laid down which he accepted when he took office.

Mr. FOLEY. On the ground other than the protection of the fifth amendment invocation; is that correct, sir?

Mr. CORBETT. Any refusal or failure to act when it is his duty to act, whatever it might be, in violation of the contract between him and the Government of the United States seems to be due and adequate cause.

Mr. FOLEY. Which failure would include the invocation of the fifth amendment protection.

Mr. CORBETT. If the fifth amendment is being utilized as a shield for him to refuse to do his duty—and even possibly to aid and abet the weakening or destruction of the Constitution—certainly, then, the invocation of it itself is a violation of his contract of employment.

Mr. FOLEY. If it is on that basis, I disagree with you on the ground it would be unconstitutional.

Mr. FULTON. How can the invocation of a constitutional right guaranteed under the Constitution be a breach of his oath under the statutes that this Congress has passed for his protection? I do not understand that.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I gather from this discussion that we have had that

no one who has spoken is opposing this legislation as it is written. We are glad to have this discussion and to have these matters pointed out. But let us remember that this matter of denial of retirement benefits deals only with the question of national security. I do not believe that the questions raised should delay approval of this legislation.

Again, it should be noted that this legislation was reported unanimously by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee and will carry out what is believed to be the recognized public policy.

In my judgment, this legislation should be passed by the House and enacted into law.

Junkyards at Gettysburg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about the desecration of Gettysburg battlefield by hotdog stands and beer parlors. And much more will be said until such time as the National Park Service is given not just the authorization but the money to purchase the despoiling "inholdings" in our national park at Gettysburg. The West Shore Times is an excellent weekly newspaper in my district and I would like to call the attention of the Members to the following editorial from its issue of April 2, 1959:

SECOND BATTLE OF GETTYSBURG

Those familiar with the nearby Gettysburg battlefield area cannot but help observe what an overwhelming victory commercialization and land abuse appears to be scoring in that section so historically important to our Nation's history and political development.

The subject is now timely because of the struggle that U.S. Representative JAMES M. QUIGLEY, Camp Hill, is waging toward saving the appropriation in Congress for the U.S. Park Service to acquire additional battlefields land there and elsewhere.

Terming the struggle "the second Battle of Gettysburg," the Camp Hill Congressman points out that now is the opportune time for the Park Service to expend the proposed $1.25 million for acquiring land that figured in the area battle and that at Manassas, Va.

Besides the Gettysburg Battle 100th anniversary in 1961 is rapidly approaching, there also is the important factor involved that some of the land proposed for Government acquisition soon will be sold at public auction by the Adams County commissioners.

QUIGLEY—and he has logic on his side—contends this is the time to act if this land area, particularly that owned by the county government, is not to pass to commercialization forever and never to become a part of the Gettysburg National Park.

Lost also would be the opportunity of future generations to view areas where their Nation's historic events occurred sans hotdogs, motel, and souvenir-promotional signs.

The Congressman pointed out to his colleagues how one area important to the North during the decisive area battle is now occupied by an auto graveyard. That's a rather kind word for an auto junkyard.

While we generally would view with alarm the idea of Government acquiring more land and thus removing it from production, commercially and taxwise, we do think that there is merit in the Park Service's case at issue.

Not only do we hope that Congressman QUIGLEY is successful in gaining his objective but we hope you will write him and tell him what your feelings are in the matter.

Historian author, Bruce Catton, Harrisburg's citizen-soldier, Edward J. Stackpole, and S. K. Stevens, State Historical and Museum Commission executive director, are among those who have voiced their support of QUIGLEY's stand.

Authorizing Appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration

SPEECH
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 14, 1959

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (S. 1096) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction and equipment, and for other purposes.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I believe the Congress should know that the field of space and science is one place where partisanship so far has not had a very great effect. As a member of the previous House Select Committee on Space and Astronautics that worked last year—I see some of the members of that committee sitting here today—it was a pleasure to work under the leadership of my good friend the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. JOHN MCCORMACK, majority leader, and likewise under the leadership of my good friend the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. JOSEPH MARTIN, who at that time was minority leader.

We at all times had unanimous decisions and unanimous committee reports. We at all times, every Member of us, put the country and the interests of science and progress above everything else, and put partisan pride so far down the line that it played no part in our decisions. As a matter of fact, when the bills on space have passed this House, they have passed unanimously. The same has happened in the other body. Then when points of disagreement had been ironed out in the conference committee the reports again were unanimous, and the acceptance of those conference reports by both the House and the Senate was unanimous.

We on the new Science and Astronautics Committee of the House are coming to you today to ask for a further authorization of appropriations in the amount of $48,354,000. If you will look at it closely you will find that it is not new money we are asking, because it was all asked for last year. Last year it was felt that the agency personnel were not quite ready with the program and at that time could not use it efficiently. The only amount of really new money is that caused by the Federal Salary Increase Act of 1958. To meet the requirements of that act this National Astronautics and Space Agency requires $3,354,000 of this total sum requested.

As has been pointed out to you in the excellent statement of the chairman, Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana, in addition, for research and development, we are asking $20,750,000; for construction and equipment, $24,250,000, a total of $48,354,000.

This legislation was reported out of our committee unanimously; that is, both sides of the committee, consisting of 25 members—15 Democrats and 10 Republicans—have agreed that this is in the interest of the United States and is necessary for efficient and economical administration and progress. This particular amount has been included in the President's budget and has also been approved by the Director of the Budget, so that it has been carefully screened on the budgetary level as well.

I would like to speak about the gains there are to be from this space program. Those gains are not all theoretical ones; they are gains that are practical and within our own view at this time. For example, Dr. Reichelderfer, Director of the U.S. Weather Bureau, has stated that with an adequate system of weather prediction we would be able to predict far in advance storms, hurricanes, tornadoes, rainfall, floods, droughts, and so forth. This would be good for our cities, agriculture, and good at sea as well, also good for our communications that are now interfered with because of magnetic storms. Dr. Reichelderfer estimates the total savings there could be under such an adequate program of weather forecasting for the United States yearly in the sum of $4 billion. I emphasize that he estimates there would be that amount of savings to the United States alone. As a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs it would likewise help us in our foreign aid programs because we would not always be having these disasters coming up abroad with emergency needs.

It has been pointed out, and I would like to emphasize, that we in America are ahead with our ICBM program. This is my considered judgment as a serious hardworking student of this subject, and is no casual opinion. We in the United States are going ahead on a broad basis, not only in the size of the vehicle but in the size of the engine, also in the guidance and control developments. Our programs in these fields are much more intricate and developed than the Russians, or any of our U.S. allies. Of course, the Russians had big artillery, they have always had mass forces. So it was very logical for them to end up with a tremendous kind of an instrument or space vehicles that would go off with a tremendous bang and a lot of push but not be very well controlled. That is just about what has happened.

The United States has developed a more sophisticated control. We are trying to get the right combination of weight, size, acceleration, and velocity, and combine them with good control. Our overall programs that have been worked out by the Department of Defense, under the supervision and direction of our competent Secretary of Defense, Neil McElroy, and particularly with the help of Roy Johnson of the Advanced Research Projects Agency, Dr. York and Admiral Hayward, have been well done. We people of the country should not throw up our hands when we find the Russians with bigger vehicles and a bigger bang than we have at this time. The question is, Do they have control? The answer is, they cannot control them as well as we in the United States do. As a matter of fact, on the Atlantic missile range between Canaveral and Ascension Island, we have been able to have shots that have a target capability circle of probable error that is surprisingly efficient. This means in a circle laid out of 2, 5, or 6 miles in diameter, 50 percent of the shots will land as a probability within that target area. Russia to this date on her long-range ICBM land missile range has had no such shot of the length and CEP, we in the United States have had from Cape Canaveral to Ascension Island. I say that without fear of contradiction.

Also, their missile range is not long enough to give them a landfall at the ranges we now have and are operating on efficiently between Cape Canaveral and Ascension Island. At that equivalent range they would have missile reentry off the Kamchatka Peninsula in the Pacific Ocean. We should not be too disturbed about what Russia currently is doing on her ICBM range, because we are quickly in the United States making our present generation of big vehicles obsolete. They are fast becoming as obsolete as our early airplanes. Our U.S. advances are developing at such a tremendous rate in many fields. We should, therefore, not project the current rate of production of the present generation of U.S. missiles, ICBM or IRBM, into the future of 1962, but we should emphasize research and development and construction of facilities for this research and development, which this bill now does.

So I urge every Member in the House to vote not only for the space program generally, on scientific research but, second, for our security, and third for weather benefits and the gain of $4 billion that might be possible through advanced weather predictions, and last, for this reason, that we in the United States are advancing tremendously on communications satellites. We already have been the only country in the world that has had a communications satellite where we have received voice from a satellite operation. It is a tremendous breakthrough to have done that. We can look ahead and see where they have already recommended that we go into a program of two space satellites that will carry further all the telegraph communications for our Western Hemisphere. The cost of these satellites will be from $100 million to $200 million, and they could be built within 18 months to 2 years. They would have 4 channels of radio and each one of those channels could send 500 digits or items a second. On these communication satellites it would mean the reception or sending of 2,000 digits, words, or signals per second from each of these two satellites. Now the remarkable thing about it is that those satellites would have the power to jam all sorts of radio and radiotelephone or TV communications and possibly radar communications in the area where they are operating. I would not be able to give you the specific area they would cover at the time, but with this jamming capacity, it really puts into further 1,000 percent operation our strategic air force that might be stopped by an enemy radar system. We would have the power to jam opposing radar, television, radio, not only on land where they might be operating tanks or communications, but in the upper atmosphere. In addition the United States would have the power by narrow bands or channeling communications, which would be by line of sight, to give its own message from the satellites wherever we want around the world, and that could not be jammed except within the little circumference or line of sight on the narrow band that was sending it out. You can see what a tremendous possibility that is for the defense of this country.

The General Electric Co., of Philadelphia, has already made a recommendation that we proceed immediately with the development of these two space satellites, and I recommend we should, too.

In conclusion, might I encourage the American people about space. Space is a new place, but it is not a strange place. The scientists and the astronomers have been working on space for generations. The field of space is the one place in the world where all the nations have been cooperating. Russia, the countries behind the Iron Curtain, except Communist China, all the free world countries, practically unanimously, have been working on the International Geophysical Year that ended on December 31, 1958. Likewise, on the scientific level, there is still cooperation, and many of our current U.S. programs in some respects are part of the International Geophysical Year.

Many of the scientists before our committee have stated that they could not say that Russia and her satellites had not cooperated with the United States and the free world scientists on exchanging information during the International Geophysical Year, and they could not say that there was complaint about Russian cooperation on the work that we had done together. Now, that could be a new light in the world, a new era, if such cooperation could be expanded and continued. It may be that the solvent of science and education will help settle many of the ideological differences that we have in the world today.

If we can find areas such as science and space where we can work together I believe there is hope for the future of the world and possibly the freedom we all hope for and progress will come not too long after.

I recommend the passage of the legislation.

Views of the Bureau of the Budget on Bills To Amend the Federal Trade Commission Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 14, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am inserting into the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from the Bureau of the Budget to the Honorable OREN HARRIS, which reads as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C. April 13, 1959.

Hon. OREN HARRIS,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your letter of January 30, 1959, requesting the views of the Bureau of the Budget on H.R. 768, a bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended, so as to equalize rights in the distribution of identified merchandise; your letter of February 5, 1959, requesting views on H.R. 1253, a bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended, so as to equalize rights in the distribution of merchandise identified by a trademark, brand, or trade name; and your letter of February 9, 1959, reqesting views on H.R. 2463, a bill to define and restrain certain unfair methods of distribution and to confirm and define the rights of producers and resellers in the distribution of goods idenitfied by distinguishing brands, names, or trademarks, and for other purposes.

All interested Federal agencies, including the Council of Economic Advisers, the Departments of Justice, Commerce, Agriculture, and State, and the Federal Trade Commission, recommend against the legislation. Among the major reasons given by these agencies are that resale price maintenance is inconsistent with our free-enterprise economy; that the legislation would substitute Federal mandate for State or local discretion; that the bills would increase the cost of living for American consumers; that they would not benefit small businesses, but might, in fact, handicap them; and that there are grave doubts concerning the constitutionality of the legislation.

The Bureau of the Budget is in full agreement with the views of these agencies and strongly recommends against enactment of this legislation.

Sincerely yours,

PHILLIP S. HUGHES,
Assistant Director for Legislative Reference.

Prohibiting Payment of Annuities and Retired Pay to Officers and Employees of the United States in Cases Involving National Security

SPEECH
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 14, 1959

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4601) to amend the act of September 1, 1954, in order to limit to cases involving the national security the prohibition on payment of annuities and retired pay to officers and employees of the United States, to clarify the application and operation of such act, and for other purposes.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Chairman and the ranking member of the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service, whether this legislation is based in any respect on the legal premise that there are different ways of exercising rights under the fifth amendment of the Constitution? For example, are there any different ways of exercising the right of a citizen to plead the fifth amendment in a criminal proceeding?

Mr. REES of Kansas. The answer is "No."

Mr. FULTON. What does the Chairman of the Committee say about that?

Mr. MURRAY. The answer is "No."

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, then I believe that if the law is applied equally in the matter of exercise or invocation of the fifth amendment, if this act were unconstitutional in one situation of such invocation or plea, it would have to be of necessity unconstitutional as to this particular provision in the next instance when the fifth amendment is pleaded, regardless of what the reason is, or the degree of the offense whether security or loyalty charge, felony or misdemeanor. I believe that that particular section of the legislation will be unconstitutional and therefore we should give it further study by the proper committee on the conference. We in Congress have the obligation of making the intent of the Congress clear, and must neither transgress constitutional limitations nor make laws that require different exercise of the same rights under any section or amendment of the U.S. Constitution.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Business in the 83th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CARL HAYDEN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], a good neighbor of Arizona, delivered an address to the Western Highway Institute convention in Phoenix, Ariz., on April 6, which is recommended reading for anyone who wants information as to the march of population and industry in the great Southwest.

In it is an accurate summary of what the Congress has done to develop a highway system which has for its objective the movement of persons and things from where they are to where they are needed at less cost and in less time. He also has illustrated what needs to be done in furtherance of this purpose.

There is a nationwide demand for water, and there is no one better qualified than the Senator from New Mexico to state, as he did in his address, the progress which has been made toward meeting this imperative demand.

All the Senator from New Mexico said in Phoenix was informative, and to make his remarks available to a wider audience I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUSINESS IN THE 86TH CONGRESS

Your program committee gave me an easy topic for this noontime talk: "Business in the 86th Congress"—easy because it admits of many different treatments. I might confine my talk solely to the way the 86th Congress is likely to conduct its own business, the interferences that may come from extraneous issues, and the delays in enacting legislation that may result. Or I might discuss what business can expect from the 86th Congress—what laws we will pass with reference to income taxes, life insurance, trucking, water development, atomic energy, and allied subjects. Finally, in view of the great number of investigations already underway or about to be authorized, my theme might well be "Who Gets the Business, Why, and Where."

Naturally I will have a little trouble restraining myself on my favorite theme. Rather steadily these past few months, I have been talking and writing about the atom, its place in the home, its role in industry, its effect upon our laws and our lawyers, and the general problem of fallout; and today I could try to tune you in on what I regard as one of the most fascinating subjects now before the people of the earth.

Perhaps I might better start with a few words about what the 86th Congress has been doing these first 3 months, particularly as its actions relate to business.

Of first importance is the passage of the Hawaiian statehood bill, the addition of a 50th star to the flag. Today we are in the State which gave the 48th star to the flag and for 47 years held the distinction of being the last State admitted to the Union. For nearly half a century, when a new Representative of Arizona came into the Congress, he took the bottom of each committee list because committee assignments go by seniority and if seniority is equal, then by the order in which the States were admitted to the Union. Many times I've heard your Arizona people remark how they went to the absolute foot of the totem pole. Now come Alaska and Hawaii to move Arizona and New Mexico up a couple of notches, and we join with you in pleasure at our new prominence.

The Senate has passed a housing bill which provides $2.7 billion; has extended the Draft Act for 4 years in the pattern that the President requested; has passed an airport bill providing $465 million over a 4-year period; has added $48 million to the funds available to the new Space Agency to advance Project Mercury—the man in space—and to develop and test a new rocket engine. And finally, because it relates directly to business, it has passed a depressed area bill involving $390 million. Democrats thought the sum a minimum. Most Republicans thought it too large. One party's meat is the other party's poison. We learned that again when we extended some special unemployment compensation benefits, which we did in the final closing hours before the Easter recess.

Here in Arizona, I surely should mention the fact that the Senate Committee on Finance has been busy with hearings on a new proposal to change the basis for the taxation of life insurance companies. That deserves mention in Arizona because in 1950 there were two life insurance companies domiciled in New Mexico and three in Arizona. Today there are still 2 in New Mexico and 81 in Arizona. This State chartered more new life insurance companies than any State in the Union except Texas and if you add the State of Texas, Arizona and Texas started about as many new life insurance companies as all the rest of the Nation put together. I don't know what makes life insurance suddenly so attractive for Arizona and Texas companies, but perhaps an examination of the tax-free income possibilities could supply you with an answer.

The Senate has authorized the Joint Economic Committee to make an economic inventory of the United States. There is a background for that. The Senate Finance Committee on which I serve has made a long study on the financial condition of the United States, has filled 1,606 pages of printed testimony with theories, explanations and comment on what has been going on in our financial world. You and I will not need 1,600 pages to understand it. We know that if we deposited $100 in a bank 2 years ago, never wrote a check against it, just allowed it to lie in the bank, subject to the erosion of the dollar now going on, that $100 is worth $93 today. Inflation did that. And when there is that much inflation in the United States, whether creeping or galloping, interest rates will go up, true values will go down, businessmen will be affected, and people will want to see what Congress can learn about inflation as it sweeps across the land.

So that's a part of what the 86th Congress has been doing so far this year that might be of direct interest to business.

But my mail would indicate that businessmen are not concerned alone with taxes, inflation and unemployment. Through all the rather dull pattern of these inquiries there is woven in like a red thread the question of Berlin.

"What's going on?" they want to know. "Is Khrushchev bluffing? What will happen in May? If my children go to Europe this summer, will they be caught in a nuclear disaster? If war starts, how long will it last?"

If you find someone with exact answers to all these questions, send him to the missing persons section of the State Department; we have needed him a long time. But exact answers may not be required. What the Russians do may be influenced by what the free world does. Maybe I can give you one man's opinion.

A united front by the United States and her allies is essential if we are to deal successfully with the recurring world crises.

More important is unity among U.S. leaders, and the stand taken by the country's leaders must be understood and supported by the people. Businessmen like you must make a serious effort to be and remain informed on the problems facing your Nation's Government.

The U.S. position on Berlin is united. Democrats and Republicans alike are in agreement with the sentiments expressed on the floor of the Senate last month by Senator FULBRIGHT, new chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Senator FULBRIGHT listed three points on which there is complete unity in this country:

The United States will make no separate deals with the Soviet Union.

It will not be driven or enticed from Berlin or West Germany.

It will not accept, even tacitly, any propositions designed to formalize the subjugation of the once-free satellite peoples.

Berlin is the world's most important symbol of freedom. Because of this, more than because of its value as a city, it must be protected. It is an island of freedom in a sea of communism, and it must remain free.

Once the Russians understand that, and respect it, then there may be points that can be negotiated.

This is one audience that may be interested more than most others in the Berlin crisis, because here we have a problem that revolves around the highway—the highway which connects the island of West Berlin to the Bonn Government which in turn is tied to the rest of Western Europe. Remember that the United States, France, and Britain have their own zones and spheres of influence in Western Germany, and they are attempting to keep open their lines to Berlin. Over the highway which connects West Berlin with Bonn, roll constant thousands of trucks supplying the city. It was the blocking of the highway which precipitated the first Berlin crisis in 1948. Now the East Germans are threatening once again to cut off the highway which is the lifeline of the new city.

We need to keep constantly in mind the fact that it is not distances but distinctions which cause a fair share of this trouble. The end of World War I saw the establishment of the Polish corridor through Germany. It was a narrow strip of land, but it had high significance. After World War I, I talked with a distinguished statesman of a European nation. I asked him why that little strip of land disturbed him so. His reply was that the Polish corridor was not wide, but it was wide enough to bar forever the guarantee of peace for Europe as long as it existed.

Now again another little strip of land, the little highway that leads into West Berlin from West Germany, may embrace scant acreage, but may be sufficient to promise that a Berlin crisis or something similar to it, can fret us constantly as long as you live and as long as our children may live. It is a tiny highway but it could be the path over which we could travel to world war III.

Maybe I am a pessimist, but I do not look for any quick and easy relief from the tensions that now grip the world. Today it is Berlin; yesterday it was Lebanon, and the day before that it was Quemoy. Last week it was Korea; tomorrow, God knows. Wherever the force of worldwide communism can reach, even into the sacred temples of Tibet, the drive will be on. You and I and our children must be prepared to adjust our lives to it, to stand firm against it, and as Senator FULBRIGHT has suggested, to "chip away relentlessly at the encrusted Communist mixture of dogma, braggadocio, and fear that contributes so much to keeping world peace in a recurring state of serious jeopardy."

World tension, then, is part of the task of the 86th Congress and part of the responsibility the Congress feels toward business. Our world, which was once so large that it defied man's imagination, is now so small that we live neighbor to all creation. Instead of going around the world in 80 days—an unbelievable feat in the time of Jules Verne—we can travel by jet around the world in 80 hours. A missile or spaceship with a man aboard will soon be making the circuit in 80 minutes. Photon propulsion may sail us from Venus to Mars, and nuclear retrorockets may guarantee safe landing on the farthest planet. I'm no pessimist on space travel.

But the world is being shrunk by means other than jets and missiles and communications. One of the biggest problems which we will have to face in the future will be the shrinking of the world's available living space by a population growth which has properly been termed an explosion.

For Old Mother Earth is in the midst of her greatest baby boom. The United Nations population commission now estimates that in 16 years the earth will contain a billion people more than it does today. It believes that the rate of population increase during the second half of the present century will be twice that of the first half. In numbers, the U.N. predicts by the year 1976 a world population of 3,830 million; by the year 2000, a population of 6,280 million. And there is reason to believe that the U.N. forecasts are conservative.

The population explosion creates new pressures and new problems.

It is creating an irrepressible demand for elbow room, for more space, for new land for overcrowded nations. It is creating the same types of pressures which have historically led to the world's great wars.

The problems are magnified by the fact that the greatest population increase is coming in the lesser developed countries—brought about by a spectacular decline in death rates coupled with little change in traditionally high birth rates. The population is growing so fast in countries like China and India that they are unable to develop their economies. They are hard-pressed to maintain even their present low standards of living. Naturally they are looking around at other countries, rich industrial countries with high standards of living. Their leaders are coveting their neighbor's riches.

China by 1975 will have a population of more than 900 million, according to U.N. estimates—more than a quarter of the total world population, nearly 4 times the population of the United States. China's population by 1975 will be more than twice the combined population of the United States and Russia. China is regarded as a satellite of Russia, but by 1975 the satellite, three times as big as its Communist brother, may become the star.

China today has too many people to realize her economic or military potential. But she is apparently bent on converting her weakness into strength by revolutionary economic methods. She is outcommunizing Russia. By the tightest of controls she is directing her masses into productive channels, trying to avoid the dissipation of scarce capital which would result if these masses were allowed to live on more than a bare subsistence level. She is transforming her excess people into economic betterment by vast schemes of public construction.

If China's population and economic growth continue at their present rates, she obviously will soon become the strongest contender for world leadership. Such a mass of humans, equipped with modern arms and disciplined by a dictatorship, would prove difficult to contain if it were bent on conquest at any cost.

John King Fairbank, professor of history at Harvard, in his book, "The United States and China," says: "As the earth shrinks and the peoples proliferate, we will soon be living on the same planet with a billion Chinese. We have something to think about."

So you can see to what crises the world's population explosion might lead. These are the types of world problems which must be reckoned with by every individual.

But the baby boom has meaning at home. The population of the United States today is 176 million, but by 1967—only a few years away—it is expected to reach 250 million.

Where will these new people be going? Where will they live? And how?

Every time God skims the milk of civilization, He pours the cream over the western side of the bowl. As a region the West, particularly the Far West and those southwestern areas that we refer to fondly as the Spanish borderlands, are growing faster than the rest of the country. Take a look at some figures:

The Bureau of the Census reports that between 1950 and 1958, population in the 11 Western States increased 27.6 percent, while growth for the United States as a whole was 15 percent. Nevada led the national parade with a growth of 66.7 percent. Florida had 60.3 percent, and Delaware and Maryland were in the first 10; but for the West, Arizona had 52.1 percent, California 35.4 percent, Colorado 29.1 percent, Utah 25.5 percent, and New Mexico 23.6 percent. Texas, I am happy to report, ran a little behind New Mexico. Washington and Oregon were just above the national average.

As with the States, so with the cities. Los Angeles has been adding population at the rate of 16,000 per month, adding every year about the equivalent of a city the size of Des Moines, Iowa, or Hartford, Conn., or—to stick with the West—of Spokane, Tucson, El Paso, or Albuquerque.

This stupendous growth is amazing arithmetically, but brings problems that seem to increase in geometric proportion. In Los Angeles alone enough dwelling units were built between 1946 and 1956 to house the combined populations of Philadelphia and Boston, or if you would rather keep your thoughts farther west, enough new houses to take care of the combined populations of Houston, Dallas, Denver, and St. Louis.

Naturally the 86th Congress has to keep looking at population growth and try to determine the problems posed to business and all segments of our economy by this growth. It needs to ask and answer what must be done to meet them.

First of all in your interests are roads. We live in an area of magnificent distances, and when we turn to the trail, it's a long, long trail that winds from Seattle to San Diego or from the Columbia River to the Rio Grande. Through the years we have been learning that if the road job is to be done, the Federal Government must be a partner to the State, the county and even to the city.

That is due not alone to our distances but to the share of land publicly owned within the borders of each of the 11 Western States.

Federal and Indian land ownership in Arizona account for 69 percent of its total land area. The Federal Government owns 44.6 percent, or 32,414,635 acres, of the State's total area of 72,688,200 acres. In addition there are 19,344,971 acres of Indian land. None of this acreage is on the tax roll. If Uncle Sam did not help to build roads in Arizona, the task with modern transportation standards would be impossible.

In Nevada, the total area is 70,264,960 acres. The Federal Government owns 61,644,005 acres, or approximately 87.7 percent of the total land area. In addition to this, there are 1,149,700 acres of Indian lands not on the tax roll.

In comparison to these Western States, New York has a total land area of 30,684,160 acres. The total Federal land area is 258,519 acres, or 0.8 percent. Iowa, for instance, has a total area of 35,868,800 with the total Federal holding of 122,244, or a 0.3 percent Federal acreage.

Fortunately, the problem was recognized long ago and a man who helped develop—if he did not invent—modern policy is still Arizona's senior U.S. Senator, CARL HAYDEN. This is to be no historical survey: suffice to say that the original Shackleford proposal recognized the need to apportion Federal aid to highways on the threefold basis of population, area, and mileage of post roads. Such a bill was enacted in 1916, providing a total of $75 million for the next 5 years. That sum, of course, was utterly inadequate and more money was pumped in.

The act itself was amended first to include a larger percentage for areas of unappropriated public lands in the public land States and then by Senator HAYDEN to consider as well untaxed Indian lands. That raised the Federal participation in Arizona from a 50–50 basis to a 72–28 basis, and it helped New Mexico and other States as well.

That was primary Federal aid. In the Hayden-Cartwright Act of 1934, aid to secondary roads was specifically earmarked. More recently we have moved into the more publicized Interstate Highway program where Senator GORE prepared a liberal bill and reported it from the Senate Public Works Committee of which the senior Senator from my State, DENNIS CHAVEZ, is chairman. So the West continues its interest in roads and its reliance on the Federal Government for a large share of funds to do the needed work.

I am sure that you have already heard—or will hear from succeeding speakers—all you want to know about roads, but it seems appropriate to suggest that the rising tide of population plus the factor of more rapid growth in the Western States may make all our present plans and standards inadequate.

We have learned that lesson in our American cities. In 1850 only 15 percent of our population lived in our metropolitan areas; but 65 percent lived there by 1950, and that

is where most of our future growth will take place. I have mentioned what it meant to housing in Los Angeles, but there isn't a city in the fast-growing West that will not feel the pinch in its transportation problems.

Who knows what road system you will need through and around your cities? Will you be forced to cut off from traffic the heart of your cities? Or can you plan now to make them usable?

Fort Worth has a plan. It now has a population of about half a million, but expects to double that by 1970. What to do? Someone had an idea.

The Fort Worth plan would set aside 15 city blocks for central shopping and install there stores, shops, banks, restaurants, and theaters. There wouldn't be a single car or truck on the surface of that area. Giant parking garages would be developed at lower levels and moving stairways would bring shoppers to the surface. The idea seems to be to keep cars and trucks out so that people may come in.

Have you an idea for your metropolis? Last week a Texas multimillionaire who had just made a big investment in the future of Albuquerque predicted that that city's present population of around 200,000 would reach 2 million by the year 1970.

Can you imagine a population of that order of magnitude in my home town? Can you dream up a plan to serve downtown Albuquerque in that day and generation? Can you foresee the strain on such narrow streets as Copper, Gold, Silver, and Lead, whose very names remind us of our almost-forgotten mining history? I say it will be a problem to convert the traffic lanes of the old cowtown to the freeways of a metropolitan are of even a half million people, and it can only be done with the help of the Federal Government. We simply cannot find money fast enough to match the growth that we know is ahead. The task of finding it is upon the 86th and succeeding Congresses.

And the school problem is like unto that, where the Government owns large tracts of land but moves in huge numbers of people whose families include children of school age, the problem is now greater than the community can bear. Hence the Congress responded to the situation by passing in 1951 Public Law 815 to provide assistance in construction of facilities in these areas and Public Law 874 to pay part of the operating expenses—laws which have been extended from time to time and are now effective until 1962.

Between 1951 and 1958 under Public Law 815, 24 school districts in New Mexico received $26,720,587. In all, 98 building projects were finished containing 986 classrooms for 27,608 children. During the same years, Arizona received $21,886,553. Nationwide for this fiscal year $50 million is to be spent for school construction and $150 million for maintenance and operation of schools in impacted areas under these laws—and there is still need for vast additional sums for Federal aid to education. Senators and Representatives must try to do this badly needed job in the 86th Congress. But that fight is always a tough one. What will we do when the tidal wave of population finally reaches us?

Schools, roads, and then houses. In Los Angeles County alone building permits issued have exceeded a billion dollars a year since 1950. But the new homes create a long list of necessities—shopping centers, office buildings, drive-in banks, doctors' offices, golf courses and other recreational facilities. The trucking business is bound to be good with all the materials that the new cities will require.

Congress keeps on responding: a highway act for roads, aid to education to provide and maintain schools, housing and home finance for new residences, airport assistance so we can travel and land at jet age speeds, and Hill-Burton money to build hospitals when we become ill. No field of expanded endeavor seems able to keep with the pace unless it has aid from the Central Government.

Most of the new projects require water—as do our new habits of living. Recently an eastern newspaper carried a picture of a southwestern residence development with a swimming pool behind every home. That's a new demand for water and it is growing fast. Air conditioning is another claimant. That is why the Interior and Insular Affairs Committees of Congress have before them so many bills which include domestic water supplies, such as the Arkansas-Fryingpan project of Colorado. Water may be the most difficult to supply of all the new needs of the growing West.

So you might be interested to know that about 10 days ago, the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs reported out Senate Resolution 48 which contemplates an exhaustive study of water conditions throughout the United States. We did not concern ourselves with any shortage of water that there might be in the Colorado River and thus bother with a problem that is tied into the lawsuit of *Arizona* v. *California* or in any way involves the claims of the lower basin States against the upper basin States in the Colorado River. We know that under present circumstances there is not enough water in the Colorado River to supply all the people who want to use it, but we also know the problem 20 years from now is to be even more formidable.

Does the 86th Congress merely fold its hands and express its regrets? Not at all. There are several rays of sunshine—and we intend to pursue them all.

First, there is the intriguing promise of atomic energy. We raise water to high temperatures when it is used as a coolant in creating electric current from uranium. We need to raise sea water to high temperatures if it is to be made free of salt. Somewhere, somehow we may learn to coordinate the two processes and obtain an abundant supply of both products.

Second, there is the general program of desalinization of salty and brackish waters, and I was happy to be the author of the bill under which the construction of five large plants can now move ahead. The first site is soon to be selected, and there a plant to remove salt from sea water will be built. It offers much to the West. It could remove from many cities the ceiling on population which limited water supplies now threaten to impose. It could in time assure expanding—almost exploding—Los Angeles an unlimited and eternal supply of good water from the Pacific Ocean. Such a realization might remove California from the more active candidates for water from the Colorado River, could then assure a pleasing outcome of the suit between Arizona and California, and as a final byproduct, let Arizona, California, and Nevada tell the upper Colorado River Basin States that the days of fighting over the water of that river might someday be at an end.

Third, there is the possibility of weather control through the seeding of clouds. Congressman CRAIG HOSMER has been a leader in the current program to establish a cloud-seeding project that might add a million acre-feet of water to the Colorado River, and thereby relieve the shortage in the flow of the river below the estimates upon which the Colorado River compact was based.

Considerable quantities of water are still available in the West to meet its needs for several years to come. However, there may be a rearrangement of priorities now assigned to water use.

Edward A. Ackerman, a scientist and water authority attached to the Carnegie Institution in Washington, in January delivered a paper to a symposium on cloud modification and water resources. In it, he wrote:

"Past western irrigation development usually was undertaken in the absence of other seriously competing demands for water * * * there are signs that this situation is changing."

Mr. Ackerman concludes that there are population and industrial demands upon the West's water supply which may reduce the priority of development of water for irrigation. Domestic and industrial uses may become first and second priorities, and irrigation may be third.

However, the 86th Congress again must move ahead with weather control, with money for the desalinization plants, including one for the arid region of the Southwest, with funds for the Atomic Energy Commission which has already had a "feeler" from California on a possible test plant to combine salinity control with electric power, with approval of projects like the San Luis Dam which ultimately might add substantially to the water supply of southern California cities. This is truly the subject of my talk, "Business and the 86th Congress," because business is dependent for its development and continued growth on the availability of funds and programs that mean new homes, schools, roads, hospitals, airports and an adequate supply of water.

As a closing word, may I suggest that the ability of Congress to meet and solve these problems may be somewhat dependent on business itself. Many groups associate themselves with political endeavor. Business, in my experience, has remained a little aloof. Do you think you should? Do you deeply care who goes to Washington? Do you get pleasure or pain when you see and visit with the man you have helped send to the Senate or the House?

Businessmen can worry less about the tasks of the 86th and succeeding Congress, when—if I may steal a business slogan from my greeting card friend Joyce Hall—"When you care enough to send the very best."

Two Hundredth Anniversay of the Death of George Frederick Handel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, German contribution to modern civilization has been great, and innumerable Germans have added immensely to what is commonly called Western civilization. Germans have been particularly outstanding in the sciences, but no less distinguished have they been in the arts, especially in music. And Handel is one of the giants in the world of music.

George Frederick Handel, who died exactly 200 years ago at the ripe age of 74, was the son of a barber-surgeon in Halle, Lower Saxony, who by his unusual talents and through ceaseless industry gained immortal renown as a composer. At the age of 20 he produced his first opera, "Almira," one of a series of great operas culminating in the "Messiah" and "Israel in Egypt" which together have

long placed him among the foremost of great composers of his time. Even today he is considered one of the greatest composers of all time.

The celebration of the 200th anniversary of Handel's death evokes many memories, and recalls historic events in Germany history, but we can hardly forget the importance of current international events connected with Germany. Indeed, the Berlin situation, the even larger issue of German unification, and the matter of strengthening the Western democracies in their fight against Soviet totalitarianism, are issues that the West cannot hope to solve without the wholehearted cooperation of the German people. On this 200th anniversary of Handel's death let us preserve the freedom of West Berlin in a manner demonstrated by President Truman in 1948–49, let us work for a united, free, and democratic Germany, and let us work for closer cooperation among all freedom-loving peoples of Western democracies.

Steps Toward World Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN A. CARROLL

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject "Steps Toward World Order," delivered by the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] before the University of Virginia Law School, at Charlottesville, Va., on March 12, 1959.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STEPS TOWARD WORLD ORDER

(Speech by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY before the University of Virginia Law School, Charlottesville, Va., March 12, 1959)

In these dark times when crisis is piled upon crisis, it is easy to lose heart, to give up hope. The Berlin crisis is bristling with complex and knotty problems. It is perhaps the most serious situation we have faced since V–J Day. The Formosan crisis has quieted down, but has not disappeared. And there is always a crisis of one kind or another in the turbulent Middle East.

With every crisis there are dangers and risks. But there are also opportunities and responsibilities. I have not lost hope for a more enduring peace, and I believe the American people have not lost hope. We must keep hope alive. Genuine hope. Not hope based upon wishful thinking, but tempered with a realistic understanding of the world we live in.

A few months ago I was in Moscow and Berlin. It was an unforgettable experience. I have a firsthand knowledge of some of the vexing problems we face. But I have not surrendered the gift of hope which gives men the courage to press on, the vision to see beyond the encircling gloom a better world.

Genuine hope does not permit us to escape the present into some utopian future of our dreams. Genuine hope helps us to come to grips with the present in the name of the future and out of respect for the values of the past. Evil triumphs when good men fail to act.

Tonight I want to talk about some steps we can take toward greater peace and order in the world. I say steps, plural, not one giant step. This may disappoint some of you, but I am convinced that new institutions and laws are not achieved in one giant step. Great preparation and even suffering precedes the birth of new forms, new ways of doing things. History teaches not to expect drastic changes overnight.

The pace of history does not discourage me. If the goal is clear and if we take genuine steps in the right direction, I am confident that our efforts will be rewarded.

The many-faceted challenge of communism today demands bold action to meet the economic, political, and military threat of the Soviet Union and Red China. Only bold steps will be equal to the challenge of the "revolution of rising expectations" in Asia and Africa. Timidity is the counsel of despair.

THE HUNDRED YEARS OF PEACE: 1815–1914

Before I suggest some specific steps toward greater world order, I would like to say a word about a remarkable period of modern history, a period which may hold some lessons for us today. I refer to the century spanned by the end of the War of 1812 to the outbreak of World War I, which some historians have referred to as "the hundred years of peace." More accurately, it was a century when there were no general wars and a considerable degree of world order prevailed. The balance of power among the European states made a measure of stability possible. No single European power could aspire to world domination. Great Britain, with its firm control of the seas, acted as a check on the ambitions of any of the European landpowers.

England was neither strong enough, nor did she aspire to dominate the European continent. She acted as a balance wheel. Through this delicate balance stability was maintained for an entire century.

On the economic side, this century of peace was a great period of industrial development in many parts of the world. International trade was stimulated by the acceptance of the gold standard. And the London capital market provided the funds through which large portions of the world, including these United States, were developed.

The principles of Anglo-Saxon law and political institutions, based upon the concept of public responsibility, spread to the far corners of the earth. Everywhere people were beginning to learn, at least theoretically, the meaning of the democratic principle of government by the consent of the governed.

During this remarkable century wars were limited both geographically and in their political objectives. In this country we had a tragic Civil War. But there was no general war. And no tyrant rose to conquer the world or even any large portion of it.

World War I shattered the hundred years of peace and economic development, and destroyed the fragile and elementary forms of world order created in the 19th century. This order was never really reestablished in the long weekend between Versailles and Pearl Harbor.

What can we learn from this century of peace? Is it too different from our present century to teach us anything? Our times are different, in some ways vastly different. Yet, I believe there are three very important things we can learn from the 100 years of peace:

1. Power must be exercised with responsibility.

2. Peace is possible.

3. Peace must be planned.

First, power must be exercised with responsibility. The key to the 100 years of stability was the responsible exercise of British power. Britain held the balance in Europe and through her navy throughout the world. She carried her power with restraint and with a sense of moral responsibility. She did not seek to enslave or to make the world over in her image. I am not suggesting that her Britannic Majesty was a paragon of virtue, but I am suggesting that Great Britain exercised her decisive power with wisdom and restraint.

The mantle of world leadership which Britain wore in the 19th century has in this century fallen upon our shoulders. The key to peace and order in our century, insofar as we have control over the situation, is the wise and responsible exercise of U.S. power. I am not suggesting for a moment a new imperialism, and American century, but rather a recognition that we should have a sense of responsibility commensurate with our wealth and power. This responsibility, in our interdependent world, must be widely shared, through instruments such as the United Nations, NATO, and other multilateral arrangements in the political, economic, and military spheres.

The destiny of Western civilization and the peace of the world may well depend upon Americas' ability to use her wealth and power not only to defend herself, but to create a world of greater peace and justice for all men.

Second, we must believe that peace is possible. If we believe that peace is not possible, we would be among the most miserable of men. Although we are today challenged by a powerful, committed, and relentless foe and the specter of nuclear destruction hangs menacingly over our heads, I still believe we can avoid war and that peace is possible. I have worked and I will continue to work on this belief.

Third, peace must be planned, worked for, sacrificed for. Peace is not an accident, a gift from the gods or a happenstance. Peace is a difficult goal, an elusive goal. Peace must be waged. We must work for peace even as we keep up our defensive shield. Waging peace is no substitute for an adequate defense posture. Nor is an adequate defense posture a substitute for waging peace. The world of 1959 does not confer upon us the luxury of choosing between waging peace and maintaining our defensive strength. We must do both, and we must do each task with as much imagination, creativity and wisdom as we can muster.

THREE STEPS WE CAN TAKE NOW

There is no magic key—no easy way—to world order, no master plan that will assure us of peace in our time. Perhaps I should amend this statement by saying there is no master plan which lies within the realm of the politically possible. Bismarck once said that "politics is the art of the possible." He was right, although there is room for disagreement on what is in fact possible. You will recall that in one of the Federalist Papers, the writer (I believe it was Madison) said that if all men were angels, then we would not need the checks and balances which the Founding Fathers regarded as essential to sound government. But since men are men and not angels, said Madison, we need the checks and balances which prevent one interest or one branch of government from taking over.

Given a world of imperfect men and nations, I maintain there is no master plan that will end conflicts of interest and erase all hostility. Nevertheless, there are steps, important steps we can take which will move us along on the path to a more secure and peaceful world. These steps will help to accomplish in this century the stability and order which was achieved in the 19th century.

Some of the greatest opportunities lie in the economic realm, especially in the areas of international trade and economic development. We need present-day counterparts to the gold standard which facilitated trade and the London capital market which provided development funds in many areas throughout the world. The International Monetary Fund and GATT (the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs) are in a real sense the counterpart to the gold standard. The International Bank for Reconstruction (World Bank), the point 4 program, the Columbo plan, and other similar instruments are the counterpart to the London Capital Market.

In the military sphere NATO and other free world alliances are the counterpart to the balance achieved by British naval power.

I merely mention the economic and military aspects in passing.

I thought I would like to confine my remarks to the political sphere. In the political sphere we can take three positive steps:

1. Work for effective arms control with inspection.

2. Strengthen the United Nations and world law.

3. Make fuller use of the World Court.

1. Work for effective arms control with inspection: Peace and a more stable world order can scarcely be attained if nations are constantly developing postures of hostility toward each other. Demands by one great power that another great power surrender some valuable position, loud and repeated threats of annihilation if demands are not met, all backed up by a feverish race to concoct new weapons and amass them in ever growing stockpiles—these developments do not create an atmosphere conducive to a more just and peaceful international order.

This is why steps toward disarmament now are so important to mankind's hopes for peace. We must act, even if only a small step is possible. The failure to act is to act negatively.

For years the United States and its allies planned and worked for disarmament with grandiose plans which covered the whole range of military defense and that envisaged comprehensive machinery of administration and control. We learned gradually the futility of this approach. We lowered our sights to more realistic goals, and we have now arrived at a point where we are seeking to conclude a first-stage or a partial disarmament agreement. Complete disarmament all at one stroke need not and cannot be obtained. What we should have, and must have, is a limited agreement, that will help deflect the world from its present hazardous course. Once course has been changed, there will be ample time and opportunity to pursue the larger goals toward which we aspire.

The conclusion of an agreement to suspend nuclear weapons tests with inspection, or to install an inspection system to prevent surprise attack in some region of the world would be a small, first-step agreement of great value for initiating a new trend in world affairs. Either one of these agreements would slow down or perhaps even halt the forward momentum of the arms race. Once the fever of competition has been lowered, sanity and reason can then operate more freely in our quest for peace with justice.

Within the past year progress has been made toward conclusion of a first-stage agreement. Negotiations for a ban on nuclear weapons tests have advanced to an extent scarcely hoped for this time a year ago.

Last summer the Soviet Union suddenly accepted our Government's invitation to hold a technical conference on devising methods of inspection in order to guarantee fulfillment of any international agreement for suspending nuclear weapons tests. This conference of scientific experts from the Communist bloc and the prinicipal Western Powers was convened at Geneva. By the end of last August it issued conclusions concurred in by both sides. This was an unprecedented step in the history of postwar disarmament negotiations. For the first time Soviet and Western representatives had seen eye to eye, and had agreed on the technicial details of an international arms control and inspection system.

It is necessary to recognize what these Geneva conclusions were and were not. They were not in themselves an agreement to suspend nuclear weapons tests. They were, however, an aid, a spur, and a necessary basis for any such future agreement.

Last spring immediately after concluding a very intensive series of nuclear tests, which shot a large barrage of radioactive debris into the atmosphere encircling the globe, the U.S.S.R. announced to the world that she was unilaterally suspending nuclear weapons tests. She further announced that she would continue such a suspension provided the United States and Great Britain, the other two nuclear powers, would do the same. This was a clever maneuver, but it was not clever enough.

The primary aim of this unilateral and conditional suspension was to impress world opinion. To a degree it succeeded. But the more perceptive people around the world knew that the Soviet plan would have resulted in a suspension of tests without effective inspection. Such a suspension would have been worse than no suspension at all, because there would have been no guarantee that one side was not cheating. Under such conditions, fear, suspicion, and tension would have increased and not abated.

The United States wisely pressed ahead with its endeavor to obtain an internationally agreed termination of testing, backed up and safeguarded by an effective inspection system.

Immediately after the close of the Geneva Conference of experts, the United States invited the Soviet Union to a political conference. The purpose of the second conference was to work out a test ban which would utilize the technical and scientific foundation reached at Geneva. The United States said she would suspend her tests for 1 year provided the Soviet Union would do the same. This would allow time for the political conference to hammer out an agreement.

The conclusions of the Geneva Conference of experts confined themselves strictly to scientific matters of a politically nonsensitive nature. They indicated the number of inspection stations and the kinds of inspection instruments and procedures that should be adopted for an effective control system, but they did not go into such controversial matters as to where the inspection stations should be located, who should man them, or what powers the control administration should exercise. These were questions to be thrashed out at the political conference.

The Geneva political conference on suspending nuclear weapons tests has now been at work for about 4 months. When Mr. George Kennan testified before the Senate Subcommittee on Disarmament early this month, he stressed that one of the main obstacles in the way of an arms understanding with the U.S.S.R. is its philosophy and tradition of secrecy. This has been one of the main stumbling blocks on the road to any reliable arms control agreement in the post war period, and it is one of the main obstacles to success in the current Geneva negotiations.

To be reliable, arms control inspection must be genuinely international. National self-inspection is not genuine inspection, and self-inspection is essentially what the Soviet Union has been insisting upon at Geneva. Control stations under the Geneva experts plan would be located in each participating country to check on its activities. But the Soviet has been saying, "These control stations must be manned by nationals of the country wherein they are located." Communist Russians would be checking up on Communist Russians, according to this plan, and it is not difficult to see that Americans will not stake their security, or survival, on such paper promises.

The United States and Britain, in contrast, have taken the position that stations should be manned by outside nationalities, so that the resulting surveillance is truly international, mutual and reciprocal. These opposing views on inspection are responsible for the deadlock at the present moment. This is a point on which the Soviet Union must make a substantial concession if there is to be an effective and dependable inspection network.

Another crucial point of issue in the negotiations is the amount of authority that should be vested in the countries administering the control commission. The Soviet Union insists that there should be unanimity among the major powers on the control authority to make major decisions. In other words, the Soviet negotiators want a veto over the control authority. The American and British position, however, is that at least certain important decisions on the functioning of the control mechanism should not be subject to a one-nation veto, but should be reached by a majority vote.

If, for example, the inspection stations recorded an event that might be an underground nuclear test it would be necessary to send inspectors immediately to the location to investigate. "On the spot" inspection of this type is very vital to the effective functioning of the entire control system, otherwise the purpose of inspection could be frustrated and a violator of the agreement might readily escape the consequences of his violation.

The United States says, "This kind of decision cannot be blocked by a veto." The Soviet Union says, "This kind of decision must be subject to a veto, or it is a violation of sovereign rights."

Soviet intransigence is again responsible for the deadlock on this point. Unless the Moscow government modifies this position, it will be impossible to have an effective and dependable inspection system.

The issue of international inspection in the Geneva disarmament negotiations highlights one of the most significant potential contributions of disarmament to the cause of peace and harmony in the world today. If I had to single out any one factor as the main barrier to peace in the world today, I would point my finger at the Iron Curtain, or in other words the barrier of secrecy and isolation which the Soviet Union has erected between its own people and the outside world.

International inspection for suspension of nuclear weapons tests would pierce this barrier in an unprecedented way. The political effect of getting an international authority into the silent and secret land of the Soviets would be inestimable.

I am dedicated to national security. I believe our defenses should be strong in order to back up our international negotiations and commitments. We arm to parley, we develop strength in order to negotiate as well as to deter attack, limited or general.

We must arm and at the same time strive to turn back the tide of fear that is engendered by the mounting arms race. We must make a start somewhere in tearing down the veils of secrecy that breed mistrust and suspicion between the Communist and free worlds. An agreement to end nuclear weapons tests, backed up by an effectively functioning inspection system within the participating nations, would be a significant

step in the direction of world peace and order.

2. Strengthen the United Nations. The United Nations is a continuing conference of over 80 sovereign states. It is a limited instrument. But it is a valuable instrument. The United Nations can be used, abused, or ignored by its member states, and it would not be difficult to cite examples of these three attitudes toward it.

I believe the U.N. can be strengthened through a fuller use of its peacemaking and peacekeeping facilities. The member states can make a contribution to greater world order by participating in the long-range economic and humanitarian activities of the U.N. which help to weave the fabric of peace and understanding. I refer to the Children's Fund, the World Health Organization, UNESCO, the U.N. technical assistance program, FAO, and other essentially nonpolitical activities carried on under the aegis of the world organization.

I favor the fullest possible cooperation of our Government with other nations in the great problem of assisting economically the less developed areas of the world.

In the peace keeping or political sphere, I believe the present U.N. is capable of serving the cause of peace when the nations really want to use it. But there is no way we can force the nations to utilize the U.N. Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt once said: "The United Nations is not a cure-all. It is only capable of effective action when its members have a will to make it work."

In spite of the Soviet bloc's frequent use of the veto in the Security Council and other obstructive tactics, the U.N. has a solid record of achievement even in the political sphere. Through the U.N., aggression was thrown back in Korea. Through the U.N., Soviet troops were forced to withdraw from Iran. Through the U.N., fighting was stopped in Greece, Indonesia, and the Middle East.

This suggests one possible immediate area where we can strengthen the United Nations. I refer to the U.N. emergency police force now deployed in the Gaza strip between the United Arab Republic and Israel. This force has limited functions and no one pretends it is powerful enough to hold back a full-scale attack by either side. But it is a beginning, perhaps a symbol of a greater international force which one day may be used to bring stability in trouble areas.

It is difficult to foresee the time when a U.N. force could deal with a situation such as the present Berlin crisis in which the two superpowers are so deeply involved. This could not take place short of a radical change in the nation-state system in which states would have already surrendered their military establishments, the ultimate symbol of their sovereignty.

But, even if a U.N. police force is not capable of dealing with the major security problems in the world today, it is quite possible that a mobile force dispatched to minor trouble spots would be capable of putting out "brush fires" before they blazed into a global conflagration. This would be eminently worth the relatively small investment.

I believe we should also explore the possibility of creating international rules and machinery for the regulation of outer space. In this area the U.N. can also make a contribution.

I have no illusions. I know the U.N. can work effectively on any major security question such as arms control, or regulating outer space only when the Soviet Union is willing to go along with the majority position. And we have no means of forcing the Communist bloc to give in to the majority. But we can try, and in trying we can lay bare the intention of any nation which obstructs the plans of those nations which are genuinely working for greater order and peace. Even if the U.N. serves primarily as a mirror of our divided world, it is performing a valuable function. For without a clear picture of the world situation, we cannot act with political insight or moral wisdom.

3. We should make full use of the International Court of Justice.

One of the most disappointing aspects of the work of the United Nations has been the International Court of Justice. This Court, established as a forum whereby international disputes would be resolved by law, has had all too little opportunity to fulfill this function. In the 13 years since it was established, the International Court of Justice has in fact decided only 10 cases. I repeat, 10 cases in 13 years.

By any standard, this is somewhat less than an impressive record of accomplishment. Here is a court made up of 15 judges who are each paid $20,000 a year, and yet it has decided less than one case a year.

To me this is indeed tragic. For in this day and age the rule of law in international affairs should be looked upon as one of the main ways of peacefully settling disputes between nations.

The sorry record of the Court is due in large measure to the U.S. refusal to give it full backing and support. The damage was done, I regret to say, by the U.S. Senate when in 1946 it added to the so-called Morse resolution, Senate Resolution 196, which declared our acceptance of the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, six words "as determined by the United States."

In 1945, the United Nations Charter was approved. Chapter XIV of the charter provided for establishment of the International Court of Justice to replace the Permanent Court of International Justice. Under article 93 all members of the United Nations are ipso facto parties to the statute of the International Court of Justice. However, no member nation is bound by compulsory jurisdiction of the Court without a specific declaration accepting such jurisdiction.

Less than half of the 81 member nations of the United Nations have by declaration accepted compulsory jurisdiction of the Court in specified areas of international law stated in the statute of the Court. It is of interest to note that none of the Communist nations in the United Nations—including the Soviet Union—have accepted compulsory jurisdiction of the Court.

Senate Resolution 196, which gave the consent of the Senate to the United States accepting compulsory jurisdiction of the Court, was introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], in November of 1945; it was cosponsored by 14 other Senators from both parties.

Hearings we held on Senate Resolution 196 in July of 1946 by a subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee. Not a single witness appeared before the subcommittee to oppose the resolution. Moreover, not a single letter or telegram was received in opposition to the resolution.

Against a backdrop of overwhelming public support, the subcommittee decided to report the resolution favorably to the full Foreign Relations Committee with only one minor amendment. On July 24, 1946, by a unanimous vote, the committee reported the resolution to the Senate for favorable action in exactly the form recommended by the subcommittee.

The resolution was considered by the Senate on August 1 and 2; it was approved August 2 by a vote of 62 to 2 and the Senate adjourned sine die some 2 hours later. During consideration of the resolution three amendments were adopted.

The most controversial amendment, offered by Senator Connally, added to paragraph (b) the words "as determined by the United States" to the language of the resolution which excluded from cases on which compulsory jurisdiction would be accepted "matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States." This amendment was adopted by a vote of 51 to 12.

Many observers at the time felt that this amendment, by reserving to the United States the right to decide whether or not a matter is essentially domestic, rather than having the Court make such determination, demonstrated a lack of confidence on our part in the competence and integrity of the new Court.

Mr. Dean Acheson, who was then Under Secretary of State, in testifying on this resolution expressed the argument against any such reserve clause as follows:

"The rule of law becomes effective to the extent that states agree to submit themselves to the decision of the Court in all cases involving questions of law. It cannot become effective if States may reserve this decision to themselves, regardless of the degree of good faith by which they govern their actions."

The effect of such reserve clauses has been to seriously limit the role of the International Court of Justice in settling international disputes. As I have stated, the Court has decided only 10 cases in 13 years.

I hasten to add that this sorry record is not due to any fault of the Court itself. The 15 judges are competent and qualified men. The Court is ready and willing to aid in the settlement of international disputes. The reason for the ineffectiveness of the Court lies principally in the various reservation clauses contained in the declarations of nations which have accepted the jurisdiction of the Court.

The United States, and in particular the U.S. Senate, cannot escape responsibility for the Court's ineffectiveness.

The distinguished lawyer, Charles S. Rhyne, past president of the American Bar Association, and presently chairman of the Committee on World Peace Through Law of the American Bar Association, in an address delivered only this past Tuesday, March 10, assessed the blame quite candidly when he said:

"I am therefore firmly convinced that one of the major causes for the empty courtroom of the United Nations Court is the Connally reservation which was created by the U.S. Senate, is maintained by the U.S. Senate, and can be removed by the U.S. Senate. * * * Every report I have seen by the many experts who have studied this situation agrees that the Connally reservation has emasculated the usefulness of the Court and rendered it impotent as an instrument for world peace. The cancerous effect of the Senate's action has spread as other nations have copied it; it has an ever-widening scope. The tremendous responsibility of the U.S. Senate for continuing through this reservation to stifle use of the United Nations Court is a most serious one when one considers the value of and need for any mechanism which can aid in preventing war under present world circumstances. The Connally reservation is unsound in principle and effect and should be eliminated."

This is a strong statement indeed. A statment of a highly respected and learned lawyer—a man not given to making reckless or rash statements. Mr. Rhyne is a sound and realistic student of international affairs, and his views cannot be casually dismissed. Mr. Rhyne's forceful address indicates a realization of the peril we face in view of the lethal weapons of mass destruction, and the absolute necessity, in the name of self-preservation, that we bolster the available means of settling disputes by law rather than force.

I believe that the time is long overdue for the Senate to remove this reserve clause in the Morse resolution. It is my intention to

offer in the near future a resolution to amend the Morse resolution by deleting from paragraph (b) the words "as determined by the United States."

In the absence of action by the Senate, I fear that the International Court of Justice will remain an ineffective instrument of world peace without authority to dispose of disputes between nations by way of peaceful judicial determination.

It is time that we in the U.S. Senate acted to remove the shackes which restrict the United Nations Court. I hope most earnestly that prompt consideration will be given to the resolution I intend to offer.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, I return to where I started. I said we must have hope, hope in certain specific small steps we can take in the direction of greater world order. I believe peace is possible, and I believe we must work for it in the small and undramatic ways—through painstaking arms control negotiations, in the day-by-day business of the United Nations, in all those daily acts of fidelity which help create a fabric of peace, justice, and understanding.

Foreign Languages and the National Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this past week Representative JOHN BRADEMAS of Indiana delivered an address at Valparaiso University entitled "Foreign Languages and the National Interest." The theme of this fine talk was that the lack in our country of adequate foreign language training is hindering our attempts to strengthen the free world and combat the tyrannical aspirations of Soviet communism.

I wish to commend Representative JOHN BRADEMAS for calling attention to what he aptly describes as our language gap. I concur completely with him in advocating greater emphasis on language training. This is a subject in which I have been very much interested.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations of the Committee on Government Operations, I have had the opportunity to study foreign language training programs; in particular those conducted by our Federal Government. Only last week I submitted from the Committee on Government Operations a report, Senate Report No. 153, as prepared by my subcommittee, entitled "The Federal Government's Foreign Language Training Programs." In the foreword to this report I stated:

It is time we give full recognition to the indisputable fact that foreign language training is indispensable to our military effort, to our overseas economic programs, and, without question, the key to our ability to win friends throughout the world. It is high time that we do something about it.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the thoughtful address of Representative JOHN BRADEMAS, to which I have referred, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND THE NATIONAL INTEREST

(Text of an address by Representative JOHN BRADEMAS, Third District, Indiana, at the annual spring meeting of the Indiana Foreign Language Teachers Association, Valparaiso University, Valparaiso, Ind., April 11, 1959)

Some years ago I spent several weeks in Mexico where for the first time I had the opportunity to try out my high school Spanish. At one stage of a conversation, I groped for a phrase to indicate that I was, for any one of a number of reasons, embarrassed. Not knowing the exact word, I reached for a cognate and confidently said to my Mexican friends, "Con toda franqueza, estoy embarazado." They shrieked with laughter and amazement.

For the non-Hispanists among you, "embarazado" in Spanish means "with child" and, I need hardly add, is an adjective confined to the feminine gender, i.e., "embarazada."

After an experience like that I require no persuasion of the importance of understanding foreign languages.

CITES INTEREST IN LANGUAGES

I am honored by the opportunity to speak today at the annual spring meeting of the Indiana Foreign Language Teachers Association. There are several reasons I feel at home with members of your organization. Because my father was born in Europe, early in life I became aware that there were languages other than English, although, to my later regret, I did not trouble to take advantage of the opportunity to learn his native tongue, Greek.

My own graduate studies in the modern political history of Spain could not have been completed had I not been able to use my knowledge of Spanish, somewhat improved from the visit to Mexico, to interview Spaniards who had themselves participated in the events I was seeking to analyze.

As your chairman has indicated, I have also been a college teacher and am therefore familiar with some of the problems you face.

It happens, moreover, that I serve on the General Education Subcommittee of the Education and Labor Committee in the House of Representatives and I am, therefore, directly concerned in my legislative duties with the field of education.

The vastly increased interest which Americans are now demonstrating in education at every level is, of course, a source of great encouragement to us all. It is with respect to one of the most significant areas in the field of education that I should like to speak today, the area of foreign languages.

The United States has in the postwar world assumed the awesome and troubling, but nonetheless indispensable, burden of leadership of the free world against the tyrannical aspirations of Soviet communism. We have undertaken programs of political, military, and economic cooperation with our friends and allies throughout the entire world. Yet we still pursue what I should describe as a semi-isolationist policy when it comes to learning the languages essential to communicating with our friends, understanding the uncommitted peoples of the world, and evaluating the challenges posed by our potential enemies.

THE LANGUAGE GAP

More than 3 million of our citizens are living and working abroad as members of the Armed Forces, the diplomatic corps, and various technical missions engaged in industry. Yet comparatively few of these Americans can speak any language but their own with fluency. It is a simple fact that we are woefully behind the times in learning foreign languages. And there can be little question that the interest of our country suffers, and suffers seriously, because of what, to paraphrase another more controversial aspect of our national security system, might be called our language gap.

U.S. DIPLOMATS LACK LANGUAGES

The problem of the language gap in America is particularly acute in the one spot where it should not be—our diplomatic corps. An Ambassador or consul in a foreign capital is perhaps an exception rather than the rule if he speaks the language of the country to which he is assigned. Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther declared a few weeks ago that, of the 8,000 men and women who recently passed the academic requirements for the Foreign Service Institute of the Department of State, only 300 had a language qualification beyond English. Our embassies and legations are forced to employ thousands of foreign nationals as translators and office staff largely because there aré no Americans qualified for these jobs.

I am glad to say that, thanks in part to the criticisms of James Reston, the distinguished correspondent of the New York Times, the Foreign Service Institute has in the last couple of years intensified its efforts to train more of our Foreign Service officers in foreign languages. But there is a long way to go before the United States does an effective job, even for those who are the official representatives of our Government abroad, of bridging this language gap.

"THE UGLY AMERICAN"

In "The Ugly American," that disturbing and challenging novel about Americans stationed abroad, Eugene Burdick and William J. Lederer provide a parable which dramatizes the link between foreign languages and the national interest. If the mythical Asian country of Sarkhan, the Russian Ambassador promises the natives thousands and thousands of tons of rice to stem a local famine. The rice arrives but it is American rice, on each bag of which Sarkhanese Communists have stealthily stenciled in Sarkhanese for each citizen to see and read for himself: "This rice is a gift from Russia."

The Americans take pictures of the distribution of the rice and the smiling faces of the now happy people. There is no comment from any of the Americans present. None of them can read or understand Sarkhanese, and they do not know what is happening.

It would not be difficult to spend the rest of my time here today citing factual, not fictional, examples of how our incompetence in languages has damaged our relations with foreign countries and, by so doing, has worked against the vital interests of the United States. Members of the Indiana Foreign Language Teachers Association, however, do not need to be persuaded of the significant relationship between foreign languages and the national interest.

I do think it would be profitable for us to examine briefly our deficiencies and then ask ourselves what to do about them.

The language gap of which I speak is in large part of our own making. Beginning with World War I, foreign language instruction was systematically discouraged in our public schools, with 22 States passing laws forbidding the teaching of German and other foreign languages. Some shortsighted persons would likewise today impair our national security by insisting that we should not provide for the teaching of Russian in our public schools.

Although advances in aviation and communication in the period between World Wars I and II brought foreign lands closer and closer, Americans have held to the be-

lief that the time spent studying languages could be more profitably employed in other academic endeavors. We are now tasting the fruits of this irresponsible attitude.

FEW U.S. HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS STUDY LANGUAGES

Today less than 15 percent of our total public high school students are studying a modern foreign language. Of these, only a handful are studying Russian, German, Portuguese, Italian or Chinese. None are learning such strategic world languages as Japanese, Arabic, Hindi, Malay, Bengali, or Ukrainian.

Even if we decided right now to expand substantially the language study opportunities for our young people, it would be impossible to find enough adequately trained teachers. Two years ago the supply of new high school language teachers was over 25 percent short of the demand, and I have no doubt that the current rise in interest in language education has made the shortage of competent teachers still more serious.

Today, partly because of the lack of qualified teachers, less than one half of our public schools are able to offer a course in any modern foreign language. A recent survey showed that only 24 percent of Indiana's schools offer instruction in a modern foreign language.

RUSSIANS EMPHASIZE LANGUAGE TRAINING

Our failings in this area are all the more tragic when they are compared with the achievements of our cold war adversary. On the primary and secondary school level, most Russian students begin language training in the fifth grade and continue language training for 6 years. Before completion of their high school studies they will have spent 660 hours learning another language.

Those Soviet students who go on to college are required to demonstrate foreign language competence in order to get into college and must take at least 2 years of languages while there. The Soviet Union has also developed extensive language training programs for diplomats and for technical people sent abroad with their foreign assistance programs.

U.S. Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas warned only last month of "the fierce competition from the Russians who have made language one of their great specialities."

"Telugu"—and I am quoting Justice Douglas—"is a language spoken by 33 million people in India. Yet we have not six people who can read a Telugu newspaper. When the Soviet delegate arrives, however, not only he but his staff are versed in Telugu. The Russian foreign language expert is not only the foreign service official but the Soviet technical expert as well. In medicine alone, Russia is turning out many more doctors than she can use at home. These doctors of hers are trained in Asian and African languages as well as in medicine. They are prepared to practice abroad and to spread the gospel of communism. What is true of the Russian doctor is also true of the Russian engineer, agricultural expert, and scientist."

LANGUAGE GAP COMMANDS CONCERN

That the language gap is beginning to command the concern of more and more persons in our country is evidenced by three random articles I have come upon in the last few days. The Laporte Herald-Argus, published just a few miles from where we now meet, said in an editorial last month that "the blithe insistence of Americans doing their stretches of time in distant lands on keeping aloof from the 'natives,' refusing to learn the language, appreciate the customs, or participate as citizens-for-a-time does us irreparable harm, and explains a good deal of the anti-American sentiment in many areas."

The current issue of Women's Day, a magazine sold in many supermarkets, contains a stimulating article entitled, "Why Can't Our Children Speak a Foreign Language?"

John R. Walsh, education writer for the Louisville Times, in a recent report, describes the sweeping plan of Catholic colleges, high schools, and elementary schools in the Louisville area to coordinate language teaching from top to bottom and to place strong emphasis on the elementary level.

PRAISES PROF. WILLIAM RILEY PARKER

I am sure then that there is growing recognition of the serious shortcoming of this country in the development of persons skilled in modern languages and of the fact that this weakness is prejudicial to the best interests of the United States. The next question is: What can we do about it?

The natural resource which can most quickly be utilized is the trained body of language teachers now engaged in teaching. Certainly no one would dispute the proposition that all teachers would benefit by an opportunity to increase their knowledge of the subjects they teach. In an excellent study for UNESCO, entitled "The National Interest and Foreign Languages," Prof. William Riley Parker of the University of Indiana, presently Chief of the Language Development Program in the U.S. Office of Education, cites the example of the language teacher who has only the minimum training required to teach languages and, as a result, has reached the limits of his knowledge after teaching a 2-year course. If we are to give our students competent and extensive training in languages, we must have teachers who know the languages as thoroughly as possible.

Let me pause to pay a word of tribute to Dr. Parker for the splendid work he is doing to remedy the lag in languages we are discussing. All of us in Indiana should be proud of his contributions, and I want to express the hope that all of you who have not already done so will read Dr. Parker's first-class analysis of foreign languages and the national interest.

HAILS NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT

I am very pleased to tell you of a significant effort now underway to attack the basic problem in language development in the United States: the shortage of good language teachers. The National Defense Education Act, passed by the 85th Congress, contains a number of provisions which are evidence of the awareness of Congress of our deplorable backwardness in this field. In fact, the only one of the 10 titles of the act which rode serenely through all the hearings and all the debates was the one dealing with languages.

The National Defense Education Act provides for the establishment of summer foreign language institutes where language teachers may take additional training in the languages they teach. Four institutes have already been set up for this summer at the Universities of Colorado, Maine, Michigan, and Louisiana State. Because we in Congress last month voted a supplemental appropriation of $75 million for the Defense Education Act, six more institutes will be established this summer. They will accommodate an additional 600 teachers. The institute program should, in its first year of operation, provide 8 weeks of training for 1,000 teachers.

The need for this kind of program and the enthusiastic response on the part of language teachers is demonstrated by the fact that the first institute established—at the University of Colorado—has received applications from every State in the Union at the rate, as of last month, of 100 per day.

For those of you interested in the foreign language institutes, and I hope that includes everyone here, I might say that the program provides a $75 weekly stipend for public school teachers, plus $15 a week for each dependent.

Parenthetically, let me mention a conversation I had in Washington a few days ago with Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, and Eugene Burdick both of whom told me of the tragic fact that the Army Language School at Monterey, Calif., a first-class center for the teaching of languages, is operating at less than half capacity.

URGES INCOME TAX DEDUCTION FOR LANGUAGE TEACHER TRAVEL

With the increasing emphasis on teaching students to speak, as well as to read and write foreign languages, I think it might be wise to encourage teachers to increase their knowledge of the spoken language. The best way to achieve this goal is to spend some time living in a foreign country.

I am sure that most of you would be happy indeed to travel abroad, but, as college teachers, you are inhibited by the lack of money. Because I am so deeply convinced of the value of such travel, I am considering the introduction of legislation to permit language teachers a partial income tax deduction for the expenses of trips designed to increase their knowledge of a foreign language.

CITES AREA CENTERS FOR RARE LANGUAGES

The summer institute program represents a very promising start in our efforts to provide this Nation with competent linguists, but it does little to increase the number of trained language teachers or to provide trained linguists, teachers, and teaching materials for the so-called exotic languages, those which are rarely taught in this country.

Our incompetence in the field of the exotic languages is demonstrated by a recent survey made by the American Council of Learned Societies which revealed that at least 50 languages—each of them spoken by more than 2 million people, 14 of them spoken by between 10 and 42 million—are not taught in any American college or university.

The National Defense Education Act does, however, provide a means for attacking our lack of proficiency in the exotic languages. The act provides for the establishment of language area centers for the development of facilities to teach these languages. Let me list the goals of the area center program:

(a) Intensive courses available frequently and at geographically distributed locations.

(b) The production of several complete sets of reliable and effective teaching materials.

(c) Adequate instruction in related area studies.

Some of these language area centers would use existing facilities at colleges and universities. Others would be developed from scratch. The centers would be financed through a system of matching grants. If we can put these centers into operation, we should be able to build up a pool of trained linguists who, in turn, would be available to train more students throughout the Nation. The development of suitable materials would provide insurance should we quickly need large numbers of trained personnel in any specific language.

You will be interested to know that the study conducted by the American Council of Learned Societies showed the languages most needed now by Americans are Arabic, Chinese, French, German, Hindustani, Italian, Japanese, Portuguese, Russian, and Spanish.

One or more area centers will be established for all of these languages except French, German, Italian, and Spanish, which are available at most colleges and universities.

NOTES STUDENT LOANS TO ENCOURAGE TEACHERS

The Defense Education Act also encourages the college student to consider a language-teaching career by providing writeoffs on

student loans, granted under the act, to students who subsequently teach in the public schools. The student is allowed to writeoff 10 percent of his loan for each year that he teaches up to a maximum of 5 years.

The important place given to languages in the National Defense Education Act is, I believe, a symbol of the growing realization among the citizens of the United States of the contribution to our country of your profession. The Indiana Foreign Language Teachers Association is to be congratulated for following the recommendation of the Modern Language Association that each State establish a group to include all teachers of foreign languages in the State. State educational officials will look to organizations like yours for advice and help in putting the foreign-language provisions of the Defense Education Act into practice.

PROPOSES NATIONAL LANGUAGE FOUNDATION

Indeed, I would urge that your organization and others like it consider seriously an effort to create an agency similar to the National Science Foundation for the purpose of marshaling support for the study of foreign languages and cultures. Just as the National Science Foundation is a source of strength for scientific endeavor in our country, so, too, a National Language Foundation could serve as a coordinating agency and rallying point to intensify interest in language education.

It will be 2 or 3 years before we can see evidence of real progress from some of the programs I have discussed. Meanwhile, all across the Nation parents, teachers, and school boards are displaying an awakened interest in language education. Students, housewives, and factory workers are arising with the sun to take Russian on early morning television programs. PTA groups are asking schools to teach Russian or Japanese to their first graders.

This new interest is a splendid example of the capacity of the American people to respond to a challenge. There is, however, a danger that these crash programs will collapse because of an inadequate foundation and the lack of a continuing planned program.

CALLS FOR LANGUAGE TRAINING FROM PRIMARY TO COLLEGE LEVEL

A good deal is said about the advantages of teaching the fundamentals of a foreign language to young children who have the ability to assimilate such knowledge without pain or embarrassment. I believe that we should do all we can to encourage the teaching of languages to children at the primary level, provided that at the same time we prepare advanced training for these students at the secondary and college level.

These primary programs should be carefully planned so that we do not disappoint both the students and their parents by starting on an exciting venture, only to be stopped by the dead end of inadequate preparation.

SUGGESTS FOREIGN-BORN AMERICANS TEACH LANGUAGES

I shall dare to make another suggestion.

There have been many cities and towns ready and willing to begin language instruction in the primary grades, but which were unable to find qualified teachers. This, in many cases, is not because we lack a significant number of competent linguists in this country, but rather because too few of these linguists meet State and local teaching certification requirements.

The suggestion I shall make is not a criticism of our certification requirements, but is rather a commonsense approach to the basic problem: How can we enable more Americans to learn foreign languages in the immediate future?

I would suggest that we make use of the many educated immigrants and foreign nationals now living in the United States who have complete command of their native tongue, who have the intelligence and background to teach these languages, but who may lack the necessary college credits to qualify as teachers.

It would seem quite possible tht evening or summer courses could adequately prepare these people to teach languages to primary students, especially since the language teacher could have the aid of the regular classroom teacher. Later these people could be replaced by regularly trained teachers, or, if they wished, could take the courses required by State laws to become fully qualified teachers.

In the meantime, they could be imparting their knowledge of the correct pronunciation, tone, and inflection of their native language to the receptive minds of young students. These students would then be able to take full advantage of advanced courses on the high-school and college level.

URGES IMMIGRANTS TO TEACH THEIR CHILDREN NATIVE TONGUE

Foreign-born Americans and foreign nationals living in our country are an invaluable resource whom we have too long neglected. In this connection, let me say that I believe it is a patriotic duty of American citizens of foreign birth to teach their children a second language. Immigrants should take pride in the fact that they can contribute in this significant way to the security and well-being of their adopted country.

PRAISES CULVER ACADEMY RUSSIAN PROGRAM

Let me take this opportunity to point out that here in Indiana there are many school systems which have already started to improve the teaching of foreign languages. Very near here, for example, the Culver Military Academy has only recently hired a highly qualified language scholar to teach Russian to its students.

Maj. Gen. Delmar T. Spivey, superintendent of the academy, told me that the course was instituted because, "aside from the questions related to communism, when a country is as large in land mass and as populous as Russia is, the impact of its culture on Western civilization will be so great that it is absolutely essential for our citizens to gain a better understanding of this culture."

General Spivey added that he had found it very difficult to find a person competent to teach the Russian courses. I might say that I am glad to see that Saint Mary's College, where I taught for a time, has just begun to offer courses in Russian.

SPEAKING IN STRANGE TONGUES

Russian is but one of the many languages in which this country is deficient. In a world that seems to change overnight—every night—those of us who believe deeply in democracy as the best political expression of the dignity of the individual must speak clearly to the peoples of the world, millions of whom are now for the first time moving to the stage of human history.

We must, if we are really to be understood by these peoples and to understand them, speak to them in their own language.

This is the fundamental reason we must bridge the language gap.

In the Acts of the Apostles we read of those who were speaking in strange tongues.

The future of free civilization will very largely depend on how well we in America can speak strange tongues and listen to them.

How well we speak and listen depends in turn on how well you, the members of the foreign language profession, teach our young people.

Yours is a high and noble calling and I am confident that you will respond with dedication to its challenges.

Extension of Medical Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. JAVITS. On April 5 the Honorable ERNEST GRUENING, U.S. Senator from Alaska, officiated at the dedication of a new library, auditorium, and lounge at the Albert Einstein College of Medicine of Yeshiva University in New York City.

The facilities dedicated were the D. Samuel Gottesman Library, the Mary and Karl Robbins Auditorium, and the Max L. and Sadie Friedman student-faculty lounge, constructed on the campus of the college of medicine. The units, embodying the most modern facilities for medical education, were a medical library with provisions for 200,000 volumes and periodicals; an auditorium seating 838, equipped for closed-circuit color television; and a student-faculty lounge, providing for informal get-togethers of students and faculty.

Speakers at the ceremony, in addition to Senator GRUENING, were Dr. Samuel Belkin, president of Yeshiva University, and former New York State Attorney General Nathaniel L. Goldstein, chairman of the board of overseers of the college of medicine.

Addressing the assemblage of leaders in industry, community affairs, and education, Dr. Belkin declared:

Let there be a friendly rivalry among scientists of different lands for new discoveries against cancer, heart disease, and other dread killers. Let the libraries of the great cities vie with one another on the size and quality of their book collections. Let the major universities of different nations compete in the scope and daring of their educational programs. Let nations be judged on the merits of their medical training and research rather than on the size of their warheads.

In a greater sense and larger measure, we are dedicating ourselves here to the spiritual and democratic concept of the infinite worth and sacredness of the human personality. Because human life is sacred, it is our moral duty to do everything in our power to preserve it.

General Goldstein, referring to the teamwork of scientists and businessmen who had helped create the college of medicine, said:

In the world competition for better health facilities, more educational opportunities, higher standards of scientific achievement, we need fear no nation in the world. A free-enterprise system that can give rise to institutions like the Albert Einstein College of Medicine is its own proof of essential soundness and creativity.

Medical advances in our golden age of science have paradoxically raised alarming new problems in health. With the increase in our population, particularly of the aged, health and disease problems have arisen which call for a far greater tempo in medical education and the numbers of medical researchers, teachers, and physicians.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address by the Senator

from Alaska be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF SENATOR ERNEST GRUENING, OF ALASKA, AT THE DEDICATION OF THE D. SAMUEL GOTTESMAN LIBRARY, MARY AND KARL ROBBINS AUDITORIUM, MAX L. AND SADIE FRIEDMAN STUDENT FACULTY LOUNGE AT THE ALBERT EINSTEIN COLLEGE OF MEDICINE OF YESHIVA UNIVERSITY, APRIL 5, 1959

It is a privilege to participate in any ceremony which further commemorates the name of Albert Einstein, though it is beyond the power of the living to enhance by words the fame of that great man. No posthumous tributes can add one cubit to his stature. He belongs to the ages. In the roster of immortals who have signally advanced the frontiers of knowledge, and whose contributions were milestones in the progress of mankind, only a very few in all recorded history may be deemed comparable: Archimedes, Copernicus, Galileo, Newton, Pasteur, Darwin. But Einstein was not only a great scientist, he was also a great humanitarian—a philanthropist in the generic sense of that word, a lover of his fellow man. He deeply sensed the philosophic import of his cosmic discoveries in physical science. He was keenly aware of their epochmaking impact.

So it is doubly significant and twice just that the college of medicine of Yeshiva University was named after him. For a college of medicine combines, as no other institution could, pure science, of a character which directly benefits both the individual and society, and extension of those benefits with a total disregard of barriers of race, creed, or country. What institution could be nobler in purpose?

I am happy to be here with you at the dedication of three important additions to this already great and prospectively greater and enduring institution—the library, auditorium, and a student and faculty lounge. It is a welcome assignment to bring you the greetings of the 49th State, and as a Member of the U.S. Senate, where Alaska is represented for the first time. Alaska's elevation from territorialism and the recent admission of Hawaii, which followed more or less naturally after Alaska had, so to speak, broken the ice, are important steps forward in the application of that most basic of American principles, the principle of government by consent of the governed.

The Senate is deeply concerned with the problems which this ceremony today signalizes—health, medical education, and research to promote that health. A Senate resolution of the 85th Congress adopted as recently as last August authorizing a complete study of all matters pertaining to international health, research, rehabilitation, and assistance programs, was based on the declared assumption that "mankind's efforts for the conquest of disease have become a matter of ever higher priority in the judgment of the American people and the Congress."

The first of a series of these studies, under the auspices of the Senate Committee on Government Operations of which I am a member, is about to appear and I have been reading the galley proofs thereof. One of the encouraging facts cited in this report is that expenditures for national medical research have risen from $88 million a decade ago to $330 million last year and that the Federal Government's participation in the same period has risen from 32 percent of that total to 56 percent; an increase by Uncle Sam from $28 million a decade ago to $184 million. There is no better test of the Government's interest in a project than its willingness to appropriate for such project. Here, as in other fields, actions speak louder than words. So the Federal Government's interest is tangible and demonstrable.

In addition, in this, the 86th Congress, another highly important joint resolution, known as the International Health and Medical Research Act of 1959 is slated, I hope, for early action. It is sponsored by Senator LISTER HILL, of Alabama, chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare—the committee whose jurisdiction includes both education and health.

Cosponsored by 58 Senators, of whom I am happy to be one, this measure is designed to establish the procedures which can mobilize the Nation's health resources so that our scientists can participate effectively in a cooperative effort with the scientists of other countries against the still unconquered diseases that afflict all mankind.

It is scarcely necessary to enumerate these diseases to this assemblage. In 1957 cancer killed one American every 2 minutes. If we project that figure into a rough approximation of its worldwide toll—although we do not have statistics available for the world population—we will discover approximately one cancer fatality every 10 seconds on this planet. Many of the fatalities occur in early adulthood. It is among the premature deaths, among the parents of the young, among the breadwinners, among those still in the prime of life, that are found the great personal tragedies.

Last year diseases of the heart and cardiovascular system accounted for approximately one-half of the total deaths from disease in the United States—some 800,000, and of these more than one-fifth had not reached the age of retirement.

Mental illness which now affects over 10 million Americans and appears to be on the increase, is a vast field only beginning to be explored.

Modern invention, the steadily accelerating tempo of contemporary life, ironically, bring new medical problems. Automobiles on the faster throughways increase the accident rate and require emergency antishock treatment and surgery which were not required in the horse and buggy age. Aviation medicine—to take care of the physiological concomitants of rarefied atmosphere, rapidly changing atmospheric pressures, and other implications of supersonic speeds into space—is upon us. This is a field closely linked with national security and the preservation of the freedom we enjoy.

Radiation from atomic fallout has brought new grave perils, new medical time-bombs, the full import and consequences of which we are not yet wholly aware, except that they present new challenges both to medicine and to statesmanship.

It is the objective of this legislation now before the Congress to sound a call for world cooperation in an organized onslaught against disease and ill health and the resolution has been given an appropriate short title, namely "Health for Peace Act." It asks for an appropriation of $50 million annually. Its passage by the Congress will serve notice to all peoples that the United States desires worldwide cooperation, not for war among nations, not for mutual destruction of our fellow human beings, but for an all-out war against the common enemy of man. Modern methods of communication and transportation render such cooperations more feasible. As the world has shrunk through the annihilation of distance and reduction of travel time, cooperative effort is not only facilitated but is rendered more obligatory through the rapid spread of infectious diseases which can span continents with a speed heretofore nonexistent.

It is an interesting fact that Senator LISTER HILL, who is responsible for so much good legislation dealing with health, such as the Hill-Burton Hospital Act, is the son of a noted American surgeon, Dr. Luther Hill, who was the first to perform a successful suture of the human heart. He had studied in London under the great Sir Joseph Lister, who introduced aseptic techniques into surgery, and had given his son the name of LISTER.

Likewise I want to bring you the greetings of Alaska, until a few days ago I could have said our youngest State, whose citizens will be keenly interested in this young medical school. At present only 118 physicians are licensed to practice in Alaska, an area one-fifth as large as the 48 States. Vast areas in that great domain lack adequate medical services. This unfortunate condition exists in all but 11 of our largest communities and in the immediate surroundings of certain hospitals established by the U.S. Public Health Service. These hospitals are designed to take care of our native population—"native" being an Alaskan word for people of aboriginal descent, that is, of Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut blood, but, by a curious reverse racial discrimination which we are trying to rectify, these agencies will not treat whites. Large Alaskan regions, the Yukon Basin, many areas both coastal and in the interior, are almost totally lacking in medical services, and many of their people live and die without benefit of therapy. Alaska's crucial needs are best illustrated by giving you these tragic facts:

We have in Alaska the highest recorded rate of eye, ear, nose, and throat infections and their complications, such as mastoiditis.

Although our incidence of tuberculosis has been greatly reduced in recent years from the shocking ratio of nine times what it was in the 48 States 10 years ago, it is still a great and smoldering danger.

Infant mortality is high in rural Alaska, mostly in children less than a year old, and this is largely due to nutritional and hygiene factors.

Dental disease in rural Alaska is extreme and exerts an inevitable adverse influence on general health. Some communities have never had dental care. Instead they have dental caries.

These conditions are the heritage of nearly a century of colonialism. We have liquidated that colonialism on paper, through statehood, but the economic and social consequences of those 92 years of neglect and discrimination remain to be disposed of. And here is a challenge for the forthcoming graduates of this and other medical schools, as well as for our State and Federal authorities.

I am not quite sure why I was so signally honored with the opportunity to dedicate these great new additions to the Einstein College of Medicine. Perhaps an explanation may be found in some personal references. Medicine has played an important part in my life. My father was a practicing physician in New York. He was an oculist and an aurist, probably the last man to practice both these specialties in Manhattan, where, prior to his death in 1914, these two important branches of medicine, as in other metropolitan areas, had come to be separately practiced. My father attained distinction in both, having been elected president of of two societies that, in his lifetime, dealt with each, the American Ophthalmological Society and the American Otological Society. Since his day otology has expanded its domain, laterally and vertically, has annexed the nose and throat, or perhaps better said, has formed a tripartite union with rhinology and laryngology. But in earlier days nose and throat were considered somewhat apart from eye and ear. Fortunately medical disciplines, unlike some labor unions, are not prone to jurisdictional disputes.

So I grew up in a medical atmosphere and, even as a boy, became familiar with the institutions that my father served: The New York Eye and Ear Infirmary, the Mount Sinai Hospital, and the German Hospital, later renamed the Lenox Hill Hospital, in which he successively passed through the various echelons and ultimately became the

consulting surgeon in his specialities in these hospitals. While still in school, I watched him perform a mastoid operation at Mount Sinai and remove a cataract at Eye and Ear. My father was once asked what the definition of a consulting surgeon was. In a humorous vein he replied wryly that a consulting surgeon was one who was called in at the last minute to share the blame.

The assumption was inevitable that, as the only son in the family, I would follow in father's footsteps, and I did study medicine and obtained my M.D. at Harvard Medical School. However fascinating the pursuit of medicine, a number of factors led me to the belief that I would be happier in attempting to diagnose and treat the ills of the body politic rather than the ailments of the bodies corporal. So I decided to give up medicine and entered newspaper work, starting as a cub reporter. It was a serious blow to my father. But he became reconciled, after I had become an editorial writer and he found that a number of my editorials were being reprinted in the Journal of the American Medical Association and hailed by its editor as welcome examples of seldom encountered correct comment on medical matters in the daily press of the day.

So my medical education proved of great value in journalism, as it did likewise later in Government. In fact, one of my collateral efforts, although I was on what was known as the editorial side of newspapers—as reporter, copy desk editor, rewrite man, editorial writer, city editor and managing editor—was to try to persuade the business office of the newspapers for which I worked to ban medical advertising.

In those days, the first and second decades of the century advertising of quack doctors and of patent medicines that were guaranteed to cure cancer, tuberculosis, venereal disease, "female troubles" and every known ailment, was carried almost universally in the daily press. The lucrative patent medicine business was exposed by Samuel Hopkins Adams, a great journalist, who died only a few months ago at the age of 88, in a memorable series of articles in Collier's weekly, labelled "The Great American Fraud," subsequently published in book form. The unholy collusion between newspapers and this fradulent medical advertising he subsequently unmasked in fiction form in a novel called "The Clarion," whose scene was laid in a New York up-State city where some widely publicised patent medicines were manufactured and indeed were one of that community's principal industries. "The Clarion," in the novel, was the name of a locally published daily trying to free itself from that industry's control.

Adam's crusading served to awaken the public conscience and to mobilize public sentiment by making clear that, through the publication of these fraudulent nostrums, newspaper publishers were accessories to the killing of innocent people. I found it helpful to get Samuel Hopkins Adams to come to Boston to address its chamber of commerce and to challenge these derelict publishers in their hometown. It was a bombshell, but it achieved the desired result.

But, before I turn from these personal recollections to the important and stimulating aspects of this occasion, I want to add that my medical education enabled me to help build and develop a school of tropical medicine in Puerto Rico, securing for it from the Federal Government substantial sums which I was dispensing as Administrator of an agency known as the Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration, and, later, to have the school of tropical medicine expanded into the School of Medicine of Puerto Rico.

While in Alaska, my medical education enabled me to work more effectively to create a full-time department of health and to make a start in combating tuberculosis and other endemic diseases there, after a virtually total neglect of public health by the Federal authorities whose responsibility this had been during the first three-quarters of a century of American rule in Alaska.

But, as I have pointed out, Alaska still lacks much that it needs in the way of medical care and health facilities. Within this month, one of my medical friends from Fairbanks was here in the East looking for practitioners for his clinic, and similar shortages exist elsewhere. We know that our medical schools are not graduating the number of physicians who are needed. I am confident that the Einstein College of Medicine will make a major contribution to alleviating that deficiency.

I will not burden you with statistics, but one that is striking is that the medical educational facilities in the United States with 80-odd medical schools have been insufficient to take care of half the applicants or anywhere near the need. The number of these applicants may be expected to increase and in relation to population growth and need the percentage of accepted students to diminish. Hence the great value and importance of the Einstein College of Medicine.

This college emphasizes as no other institution could the international character of science and particularly of medicine. Located in the most cosmopolitan metropolis on earth, with populations of ethnic groups often numerically greater than in the largest cities in the land of their origins, a magnet for the greatest talent, a receptiveness to that talent regardless of race or creed, it furnishes, in this land of freedom, the ideal center of hospitality for the scientists of lands less free.

Such was Abraham Jacobi, who, imprisoned in Germany for participating in the revolution of 1848, escaped and here in New York established the first pediatric clinic in America. Such was Albert Einstein and countless other physicians and scientists driven from their homeland by the obscurantism and racism of Hitler. Here were welcomed the refugees from Mussolini's Italy, from Franco's Spain. Here are welcome and will be welcomed whatever freedom-loving men and women have defected or will defect from the tyranny of Communist imperialism, or of any other police state.

In this age which has witnessed such a resurgence of nationalism, has seen the erection of barriers to travel and intercourse which a generation ago we believed had been forever outgrown, it is more than ever important to insist upon the international character of the profession of healing. In no arena of human endeavor have the men and women of so many nations contributed as they have to the advancement of medical science.

Hippocrates the Greek, father of medicine; Galen the Roman; Avicenna the Persian were among the pioneers in what was then the art of healing. We need but name a few of the luminaries whose work advanced medicine into a science to make clear beyond preadventure the international character of medicine.

Vesalius and Leeuwenhoek, from the Netherlands; Arrhenius the Scandinavian; Harvey, Jenner, Bright, and Lister, Englishmen; Pasteur, the Curis, Binet, Charcot, from France; Casal, the Spaniard; Helmholtz, Virchow, Graefe, Roentgen, Koch, Ehrlich, Germans; Mendel and Freud, from Austria; Banting, from Canada; Metchnikoff and Pavlov, from Russia; Noguchi and Takamine, from Japan—these are only a few of a glorious list before we come to the great contributions of our fellow Americans with Jonas Salk and his antipolio vaccine as the latest bright star in the international galaxy. I hesitate to venture into an enumeration of the other stars in the American medical firmament. That would constitute a major address all by itself.

This vast medical center which has arisen from a wasteland in six miraculously short years, the buildings we are today dedicating, were born of a rare teamwork of businessmen and scientists, idealists all, yet practical men and women. These farsighted and public spirited citizens were fired with the vision of a Jewish-sponsored medical school—the first in our Nation's history. It would, they knew, continue the age-old contributions of the Jewish people to the health and welfare of mankind. They helped build this city of training, research, and healing that surrounds us here. They gave freely of their thought, their time, and their money to achieve that great objective.

They hoped, and their hope will be generously fulfilled, to emphasize by this creation that we are well into the golden era of medicine, the rapidity of whose advances must be consonant with the urgency of this age. They want to accelerate the great progress made in recent years—to spare the deaths and personal tragedies that came to many stricken by illnesses for which a few short years later a cure was found. They were aware that in the last 10 years, due largely to the discovery of sulfa drugs and antibiotics, the death rate has declined almost 12 percent. This means that 1,700,000 Americans are alive today who but for medical research would be in their graves.

They knew that surgical techniques had advanced so far that the touch-me-nots of yesteryear now hopefully invite the newer skills of surgeon and anesthetist, which save lives that but a few years ago would have been doomed.

They had seen the passing or great diminution of the infectious diseases that a generation ago swept communities with epidemic virulence. They have seen the incidence and fatality of diphtheria, typhoid fever, scarlet fever, tuberculosis, penumonia, poliomyelitis, and much else, greatly diminished. They have seen life expectancy steadily increased. But they have also seen cancer and heart disease take their steady, perhaps increasing, toll. They have seen little headway made against crippling arthritis.

So they have deployed the laboratories, the classrooms, the operating rooms, the therapeutic apparatus, the most modern equipment in every sector, to wage a vigorous and unrelenting battle against sickness and premature death.

Adjacent are the thoroughly equipped facilities of the Abraham Jacobi and Nathan Van Etten Hospitals, and now the new D. Samuel Gottesman Library in which are housed some 200,000 volumes, in the expanding and multiplying subsciences together grouped under the all-inclusive title of medical books and publications—these recording the steady advance from conjecture and hypothesis to experiment, to trial and error, to proved experience, to near certainty—the cumulative experience of past and present, the prognosis for a still better future.

This great Mary and Karl Robbins Auditorium, visually linked to vital points in the medical center with its closed-circuit television, its modern equipment for auditory and visual communication, a center for the dissemination of information to medical and lay public alike on prevention and care of disease and on the maintenance of health.

This bright and cheerful lounge named for Max L. and Sadie Friedman, which will serve as a meeting ground for faculty and students and as a place for pleasurable relaxation and social contact.

I would like, in conclusion, if it were not deemed inappropriate, to paraphrase and adapt the immortal words of Abraham Lincoln:

We cannot dedicate these great gifts for the welfare of mankind. The Jewish people, in their unquenched idealism, in their

age-long martyrdom, in their unremitting devotion to freedom, in their unceasing quest for the higher and better life, have dedicated these facilities far beyond our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note nor long remember what is said here. But uncounted tens of thousands through the years to come will never forget what will be done here.

Inching Along Toward Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on March 30, during the recent Easter recess, it was my privilege to address the Dade County Bar Association in Miami, Fla. I spoke on the subject of the Berlin crisis and set forth my ideas on the course of action we should follow in order to protect free West Berlin and maintain the peace.

I ask unanimous consent that my address, entitled "Inching Along Toward Peace," be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INCHING ALONG TOWARD PEACE

(Address by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, before Dade County Bar Association, Miami, Fla., March 30, 1959)

We live in a time of continuous crisis. We have been numbed by screaming headlines about Suez, Germany, Baghdad, and Budapest. Now we are in the middle of the Berlin crisis. This is not just another international crisis. It is probably the most serious and fateful problem faced by the United States and the free world since the end of World War II.

We all know what is at stake in Berlin—the two things we value most—peace and freedom. A false move or a serious miscalculation could be the spark that would ignite a nuclear holocaust. If free West Berlin falls, it is not inconceivable that West Germany would eventually follow, and if West Germany falls, the nightmare of a new tyranny would sweep over all of Europe.

Berlin is the focal point in the mighty struggle between Communist tyranny and the free world. The situation is fraught with danger. But I believe that firmness, wisdom, and solidarity with our closest allies will give us the strength we need to meet the challenge posed by Mr. Khrushchev's thinly disguised ultimatum which falls due on May 27.

In my remarks about the seriousness of the Berlin crisis I would like to make a few general observations in the interests of understanding. I do not want to say or do anything that will make the job of the executive branch any more difficult than it now is. In fact, I seriously considered whether I should say anything at all in public on so delicate an issue. I hope my comments will help to clarify the situation in its deepest and broadest aspects.

A sound policy toward the Berlin crisis will require all the patience, understanding, and courage we can muster.

If the American people understand the depth of the crisis I believe they will be willing to pay the price to save West Berlin. We know that peace and freedom are indivisible and that both are at stake in Berlin. And if freedom is snuffed out in Berlin the cause of freedom and justice throughout the world will suffer.

The gravity of the Berlin crisis necessitates that we enter into face-to-face talks with Russian leaders.

In his address to the American people the President rightly insisted on both firmness and our willingness to negotiate—as many of us have been urging. I am gratified that he is now willing to go to the summit.

We must always be ready to undertake any honorable move that will further prospects of peace.

The test of our greatness and leadership is not to be found in the formalities of diplomacy, but, rather, in the sincerity of our purpose. With a large part of the world in the control of dictators, vital decisions will be made by heads of state. To suggest otherwise is to ignore the real facts of political life. Therefore, let us proceed to the summit conference fully prepared with purpose and program, and in unity with our allies. We must do our homework better than we have in the past, and know what we want and what we are going to propose.

The willingness to negotiate is only the beginning, not the end, of a responsible policy toward the German situation. Our major problem now is to develop a viable negotiating posture in concert with Britain, France, and West Germany. To enter into talks with the Russians, either at the foreign ministers' level or heads of state level, ill-prepared or disunited, is to invite humiliation and even disaster.

I want to emphasize to you today my belief that it would be excessively imprudent to hold the proposed summit conference without utilizing the unique facilities of the United Nations.

As we go into the coming summit conference, we need to invoke the moral authority of the purposes and principles embodied in the charter of the United Nations.

And, in my opinion, the best way to do it effectively is to hold the summit conference within the framework of the United Nations.

We can't be part-time members of the U.N. turning to it in desperation at the last moment only after we have bungled efforts to solve the world's problems alone. We can't take an off-again, on-again attitude toward the United Nations, if we want to help keep it an effective force for peace.

When we had a crisis in the Middle East and Russia proposed a summit conference, we insisted that any such conference be held through the United Nations.

Yet now, as we approach a summit conference which all agree is urgent, we seem to have regrettably turned our back on the U.N.—and our back upon our other allies we represent in the occupation of Berlin.

The presence of the Secretary-General at a summit conference would mean the symbolic representation of all the members of the United Nations who may object to four powers presuming to settle an issue which can mean peace or war for the entire world. Peace is the responsibility of all nations.

It is not only the conference itself which should be brought within the framework of the United Nations. There is also the brighter prospect through such a conference of bringing within the framework of the United Nations the administration of any eventual agreement of a safer regime for Berlin. Such a regime might well include a permanent U.N. presence for Berlin.

The United Nations Charter recognizes the role of normal diplomacy, and charges the nations to seek solutions to their problems in the first instance through peaceful means of their own choice.

Nevertheless, the presumption must be that in dealing with general problems which threaten international peace and security, international conferences should be conducted within the framework of the United Nations.

The United Nations offers many advantages for international conferences, whether involving few or many States.

One of the advantages of a conference within the framework of the U.N. is that such a conference has the moral backing of the charter, and would be directed toward objectives compatible with the purposes of the charter.

Our purpose, in any summit conference, would stand that test. It would be Soviet purposes that would become subjected to world scrutiny.

WHAT THE COMMUNISTS WANT

It seems to me that the Soviet Union wants three things in Europe and has created the Berlin crisis as a lever to gain them:

1. The Soviet Union wants the three Western Powers to get out of West Berlin. It ultimately wants the entire city to be under complete Communist control.

2. She wants to use the Berlin crisis to force the Western Powers to negotiate an all-German settlement favorable to the Soviet Union. She prefers a united Germany tied closely to the Communist bloc. She will settle immediately for two Germanies. In other words, the status quo with East Germany the Communist state under firm Soviet control and influence. The least acceptable alternative that the Soviet appears willing to consider is a neutralized and denuclearized Germany which she hopes eventually to swallow up, by one means or another.

3. The Soviet Union sees in the Berlin crisis an opportunity to split the Western alliance. We must never forget that the primary objective of Soviet policy in Europe is to weaken NATO and to divide the United States from her allies. We cannot permit any of these Soviet objectives to be fulfilled. It is inconceivable that we would retreat from West Berlin. To do so would be to forfeit world leadership and in fact to become a second-rate power. I am convinced that the Soviet Union prefers to gain its political objective in Europe without nuclear war, and I know that the United States and our allies want to avoid a nuclear Armageddon.

We should make every effort to avoid getting into a position where we would be required to use force first. I am sure our Government will do everything possible to avoid a provocative or hostile act. We should, however, make it crystal clear that we will not be forced out of Berlin, nor be denied access to or in any way accede to any effort to starve into submision the West Berlin population. It must be clearly understood by Moscow and East Germany that we are prepared to take any action necessary in support of these policies and commitments.

U.S. POLICY OF RESOLUTE FIRMNESS

Last November I stood in West Berin with its able and courageous mayor, Willy Brandt. I vowed then, and I vow today, to support a policy of firmness, to uphold the right of France, Britain, and the United States to maintain garrisons in West Berlin until a legitimate peace treaty is signed.

This is the position and policy of our Government. We can all be grateful that we do not stand alone. Britain, France, and the 12 other members of the NATO alliance stand with us. We will not surrender. We will not be pushed out.

What does standing firm mean? It does not mean holding fast inflexibility to old positions which have helped to produce the present unhappy stalemate. The real issue, said Walter Lippmann recently, is "whether to stand pat on positions that have become

untentable or to move to new positions from which the western allies can recover the political initiative." Standing firm means that we must match our firmness with imagination, courage, and a willingness to negotiate with the Soviet Union. It means firmness in our fundamental position and flexibility in our strategy and tactics. Standing firm and willingness to negotiate are not, as some people suggest, contradictory policies. They are two elements in any viable policy in the Berlin crisis. We must stand firm in order to negotiate effectively. And we must have solid bases for negotiation if we want to stand firm.

It is imperative that the best minds of our country—those persons qualified as experts on the problems of Central Europe and Germany as well as Soviet policies and tactics—be called upon at once for intensive consultation directed toward policy formulation.

In the weeks between now and May 27, we, in concert with our allies, must explore every possible honorable means that can ease this crisis and point in the direction of a just and equitable settlement.

It is not enough just to negotiate and talk. We must have clearly in mind the objectives we seek, and the means and ways of achieving those objectives without bargaining away the rights of others, or in any way weakening our own security.

I am gratified that our Government is at last taking anew the leadership in preparing for these important conferences.

Yet I would be less than candid if I did not warn the American not to expect quick and easy solutions out of the impending negotiations.

It must constantly be kept in mind that there are no short-time, short-run, immediate answers to these grave, perplexing, long-range problems. Negotiations will require persistent patience. They will require a willingness to endure almost unbelievable, tedious discussions of long duration.

But we must be perpared to negotiate and negotiate as long as there is the slightest prospect of relieving world tension and minimize the danger of war.

The hope of peace and understanding with the Soviet Union is not to be found in political deals.

We cannot leap over our problems and differences.

They must be slowly chipped away, through our contacts in the United Nations, our participations with the Soviet in the U.N. agencies, through our exchange programs, and what we hope will be gradual changes within the Soviet Union.

At best, we will inch along toward peace and understanding.

Let us hope and pray we have the emotional stability and maturity to persevere. And let us hope and pray that no attempts will be made to find quick solutions which will ultimately be regretted because of ill-considered actions or ill-advised consideration.

We know that our national security is not and should not be a partisan matter. But genuine bipartisanship in foreign policy does not mean that the loyal opposition silently acquiesces in all policies advanced by the administration.

The Berlin crisis is both a danger and an opportunity. It is a danger to world peace if we display signs of weakness, indecision, or appeasement. It is an opportunity if we recognize the sharpness of the crisis and proceed to explore every means of peaceful settlement, not only of the Berlin and German situation, but indeed the relationships between the United States, its allies, and the Soviet Union in all of Central Europe. Wise, prudent, and courageous statesmanship is needed now as never before. We must be prepared to follow the course that may be tedious, frustrating, and characterized by insults, threats, and abuses for months to come. The war of nerves has been intensified.

In this struggle, the victory will come to those who clearly understand the relationship between power and principle, maneuver, and objective. We cannot afford to be found wanting in any of these.

Make no mistake about it, a policy of firmness with negotiation is the only policy that will avoid surrender on the one side, and minimize the risks of war on the other.

COOPERATION WITH ALLIES AND RESTRAINT URGED

We must act in harmony with our allies, Britain, France, and West Germany. This means more than coordinating our pronouncements about standing firm. It means hammering out a unified policy and strategy to give us strength for bargaining, and to undergird our determination if negotiation should break down.

If we had worked a bit closer with our allies and had strengthened the consultative process within NATO during the past 5 years, perhaps we would be in a better position than we are today. But let bygones be bygones. If we ever needed the wisdom, strength, and counsel of trusted allies we need them now.

Yes, these are dangerous days and the situation is explosive. But these are also great and challenging days where spiritual and brain power may save us from the dangerous alternative of the use of firepower.

The alternative to war is peace, and it is in the pursuit of peace that we will find our greatness and fulfill our destiny.

Citation of Hon. J. Edgar Hoover as Humanitarian of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, a few days ago a great tribute was paid to Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, when he was cited as Humanitarian of the Year by the Variety Clubs International for his contribution in the fight against juvenile delinquency. This is certainly a well-deserved honor.

I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled, "FBI Chief Cited as Humanitarian," referring to this award published in the Washington Daily News of April 3, 1959, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWENTIETH WINNER—FBI CHIEF CITED AS HUMANITARIAN

FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover today was named Humanitarian of the Year by the Variety Clubs International for his tremendous and continuing contribution in the fight against juvenile delinquency.

The Variety Club, a worldwide organization of people in all branches of show business, named Mr. Hoover in Las Vegas today at the end of its annual 4-day convention.

Formal presentation of the award will be made here some time next month, the club said.

The members also took note of Mr. Hoover's monumental efforts in safeguarding the Nation against the insidiousness of communism.

Recognition of Mr. Hoover's work was made by a committee of 70 newspaper editors, 25 college presidents plus all living past recipients of the award.

Mr. Hoover is the 20th winner of the annual award. Previous winners include Dr. Konrad Adenauer, Henry Ford 2d, Herbert Hoover, Sister Kenny, Bernard Baruch, and Sir Winston Churchill.

"We feel the name of Mr. Hoover constitutes a valuable addition to the list of distinguished individuals from all branches of human endeavor who have received this award in previous years," Club Chief Barker George W. Eby said.

Deterrent Power?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in the Coos Bay World, entitled "Can Dead Man Taste Revenge?"

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAN DEAD MAN TASTE REVENGE?

Arguments over whether the United States still has sufficient deterrent power to keep the Soviet Union honest, and whether this condition will prevail in 1 year, 2 years, or 5 years, fill those who want only to live and work with cold horror.

In Washington, the annual debate over defense capabilities is at its height. The argument is more vigorous than ever before, which is perhaps a sign that our situation is more critical than ever before.

Last week's Life magazine did a study of two schools of thought on defense.

One school believes our best method of maintaining the deterrent effect on Soviet attack potential is to maintain an assortment of weapons—some missiles, some Strategic Air Command wings equipped with long-range jet bombers, some aircraft carriers for shorter attacks, some missile-equipped submarines.

The other school is chiefly filled with younger officers who believe America's salvation from defeat by the Communist bloc is reliance on the superhorror weapons of the missile-hydrogen bomb age: intercontinental ballistics missiles with thermonuclear warheads, and a lot of them.

The administration appears committed to the first school of thought. So be it. But, reading elsewhere, it seems this commitment does not extend so far as to actually provide the equipment with which to carry it out.

A big question, as argued by experts, is whether the Strategic Air Command will have adequate time to get its superbombers off the ground, aimed for the Soviet Union, after the Russians begin lobbing intercontinental ballistic missiles, with hydrogen warheads, toward U.S. targets.

Today, apparently, SAC does not have the ability. Warning time that Soviet missiles are on their way appears to be from 0 to 10 minutes, not really enough time to get sufficient planes in the air for an effective counter-attack. But it also appears that the Soviet does not have enough missiles at present to launch a successful attack on all U.S. retaliatory bases, assuming a 50 percent accuracy for their weapon, which can

kill everything in a 5 mile radius and cripple everything far beyond that area. Experts disagree as to when the Soviet will have the capability—1 year, 3 years, 5 years.

When the Soviet capability is there, then what?

Probably at that time, U.S. warning systems will provide as much as 20 minutes of SAC takeoff time, enabling the U.S. to retaliate to some extent. Probably this retaliation, under recent Pentagon theory, will be against population instead of against defenses. At least some of the SAC bombers, which are really obsolete already, would get through with their dirty hell bombs.

There is the horror.

In 20 minutes, we say, a hundred, 200 superhydrogen bombs will be exploding all over the United States, killing millions, destroying our defense potential, and spreading a deadly radioactive pall cross the length and breadth of the land.

In 20 minutes, we will be dead.

In that 20 minutes, we will launch a counterstroke—a weak one but at any rate a counterstroke—against those who have killed us. We will be dead when our stroke is delivered, but it will hurt him, perhaps kill him, after we have been dead for hours.

Can a dead man taste revenge?

That's carrying arguments about deterrents to the ultimate conclusion.

A deterrent is meant to deter, not to kill. The power of the deterrent through the years we had it was meant never to be used for actual delivery of massive retaliation. It was meant to frighten the Kremlin so that the Soviet would not initiate a war for fear of the sureness of our retaliation.

This is still the idea of the deterrent. This is the argument of the first school of thought—that Soviet knowledge that SAC can deliver some sort of retaliation against the Soviet heartland, even after the fatal messengers are winging our way from Russia, and we are all as good as dead, will keep the Soviet masters from pushing the red buttons marked "Omaha," "San Francisco," "New York City," and all the hundred or so other names representing population centers, missile installations, and Strategic Air Command bases.

Whether the deterrent deters this year, next year, 5 years hence, is open to debate. And it is being debated by experts.

But a deterrent, if continued, must surely some day lead to the retaliation phase.

One has only to be a human being and not an expert then to ask: Can a dead man taste revenge?

Taxation of Patronage Allocations of Cooperatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have just received a copy of a resolution dated March 28 adopted by the Union County Pomona Grange, La Grande, Oreg., relative to taxation of patronage allocations of cooperatives.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the Apendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas there is much pressure on Congress to enact tax legislation on cooperatives that would be unfair: Therefore be it

Resolved by Union County Pomona Grange this 28th day of March 1959, That we ask Congress to enact legislation establishing a single tax levy, consistent with other partnerships upon patronage refunds of farmer cooperatives by taxing them at face value in the hands of the member; be it further

Resolved, That Congress reject any attempts to fix any interest to be paid on such patronage refunds on the period of redemption thereof by such farmer cooperatives.

HENRY WEATHERSPOON,
Master.
LAURA E. BATES,
Secretary.

New Frontiers To Be Conquered by Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on any given night our television sets offer a variety of programs which recall the days of what is termed "the frontier." In introducing these programs, the announcers speak as though frontiers were a thing of the past. Although it is true we have expanded from coast to coast, America today faces new and thrilling frontiers. These frontiers are in all the fields of human endeavor.

Even if the pioneer no longer pulls up stakes and finds new lands to clear, there are still minds to clear by improving our knowledge. Today's pioneer fears raids by hostiles—hostile bacteria which must be fought with energy equal to that with which the settlers of days past defended their wagon trains. There are still great areas to be explored, if not on land, then in the fields of human relations, prevention of poverty and hunger and disease, and the continuing endeavor to provide a better life for all our people.

Just as the earlier pioneer went armed with ax and rifle, today's pioneer comes armed with education. Education and knowledge, provided by better schools, are the keynotes of our modern frontiers and the continuing work toward "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in Life magazine for April 6, 1959, under the heading "America's Durable Frontier."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA'S DURABLE FRONTIER

Man has ever had a compulsion to go west, to follow the sun. Whether he seeks the rainbow's end, a passage to India or the seven cities of gold hunted by the conquistadores, he has heeded the call of his blood, and gone. Out of his thrusting movement has come, not only America's discovery, but America's own odyssey, the winning of the West.

As time goes, this odyssey was only a moment of history and recent enough to be remembered by men yet living. Yet already it is becoming folklore, celebrated (and distorted) in the smoking guns of the horse operas now dominating 8 out of 10 top TV shows, as if today's Americans, bored with abundance and hungering after some drowned Atlantis, lost youth or more challenging day, find all these in glorifying a vanished frontier.

Is the frontier closed? Certainly the gloomers who think so have a case, just as did Thomas Malthus, whose deep pessimism (in the 18th century) about overpopulation was proved wrong by the frontier's own tremendous enlargement of man's food, wealth, and space. Perhaps the physical frontier is disappearing. But its conquest, a physical event of enormous grandeur, was more than that. It was also a state of mind—as much a cause of the conquest as its product—which has come to characterize the American and to set him apart, in his ideas, enthusiasms and dreams, from the third old lands of his multiple origins.

As soon as the indentured servants finished their terms in the tidewater they struck out for the freedom and the boundless land of the southern uplands, soon to be joined by the new tide of Scotch-Irish and Palatine Germans streaming down the Allegheny ridge from the Philadelphia gateway. Feeling crowded if anybody settled within 5 miles, they pushed on across the mountains, and the West was wherever their axes were making the latest clearing. Soon they sang:

"Me and my wife and my wife's pap
Walked all the way to the Cumberland Gap."

The 13 States had been able to make a union but it was these men who transformed it into a Nation. They first began to talk of national roads and demanded national improvements. Regionalism was submerged, as in Indiana and Illinois, where the upland southerners who settled there were quickly joined by restive Yankees pushing westward from Vermont and New York, and soon by the first tide of Germans, Irish, and, later, Swedes, and others. The new American could say (in John Latouche's great ballad) that he was quite a mixture, including: Greek and Turk and Czech and double Czech American.

Out of the medley came the strength of hybrid vigor, people who grew taller and stronger, like the Nation itself. Out of it came an Abraham Lincoln who could write that the Mississippi was intended to flow through one country, and (when the Vicksburg victory made that certain) rejoice: "The Father of Waters again goes unvexed to the sea." And out of it also came the state of mind, the boundless American optimism, the refusal to believe anything impossible, the conviction that all barriers are made to be conquered by the adventurous spirit of men.

As long as this spirit lives, the frontier will never die. Already some "Fifty-niners" are prodding into the Alaskan spaces. But even when all new land is gone, the pioneer spirit will continue to uphold what the new land offered: freedom, equality, justice, and the dignity of man. It can probe the frontiers of weather control, melting the icecaps, harnessing the energy of the oceans, creating new Americas by turning salt water fresh and reclaiming the deserts, penetrating the mysteries of inner matter and of outer space. A great frontier lies in breaking the last outposts of tyranny, not by conquest but by the irresistible power of unarmed truth (Pasternak's words) and free man's example.

Strengthening the Civil Defense Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the cold war, with the threat of a hot war always in the background, continues to emphasize the need for protective measures for our civilian population in the awful event of an attack.

To help provide such protection, dedicated and patriotic citizens are attempting to develop an effective civil defense program.

For the most part, the major responsibility for civil defense efforts has been left to the leaders in communities. We recall, of course, that at the last session the Congress enacted a very modest piece of legislation, Public Law 85–606, to help planning and programing of the overall civil defense establishment. We recognize, however, that the magnitude of the responsibility in this field continues to be tremendous.

Despite this, however, courageous leaders in communities throughout the country are making constructive efforts to move forward with an improved civil defense program.

Today I call particular attention to the civil defense program being set up in a seven-county area in Wisconsin. As a part of the overall planning, county and municipal governments and civil defense organizations will integrate their resources into the civil defense operational services for any emergency that may arise. These services include: attack warning, police protection, handling the movement of people from a threatened community, radiological defense, manpower mobilization, and a number of other such services.

To further illustrate the constructive work being undertaken by community leaders to provide a more effective civilian defense program, I ask unanimous consent that an article appearing in a recent issue of the Milwaukee Journal be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CIVIL DEFENSE SET UP IN SEVEN COUNTY AREA—REGIONAL DIRECTOR TO BE NAMED TO HEAD TEMPORARY SERVICE IN EMERGENCY

A regional civil defense director for the seven county metropolitan Milwaukee target area (MMTA) is to be named under a plan announced Thursday.

The plan also provides for the coordination of all civil defense activities of Milwaukee, Waukesha, Racine, Kenosha, Ozaukee, Washington and Walworth counties.

The director would supervise temporary functions for local governments made inoperable by war, nuclear bombing or natural disaster. He also would be the commander in chief in perfecting a regional civil defense setup and directing its emergency services.

MEET AT COURTHOUSE

The plan was discussed Thursday at a meeting of public and other officials at the courthouse, convened by the MMTA civil defense commission.

The director will be appointed by Maj. Gen. Ralph Olsen, State civil defense director. The functions, meanwhile, will be carried out by the cochairmen of the commission's planning and operating committee, George W. Carnachan, Milwaukee county civil defense coordinator, and Don Carleton, city of Milwaukee civil defense coordinator.

The county and municipal governments and civil defense organizations will integrate their resources into the civil defense operational services for any emergency that may occur or be declared by the Governor.

SERVICES ARE LISTED

These services will include attack warning and communications, command and control administration, police services, movement of people, welfare, transportation, engineering, radiological defense, home defense, fire fighting and rescue work, manpower mobilization, intelligence, medical and public health, information, continuity of government, training, and mortuary requirements.

The aim of the plan, it was explained by Carnachan, is to get people to safety, provide security, care for the sick and wounded, set up housing, feed and clothe refugees and reunite families.

He said there also was a need for laws to extend the powers of peace officers across municipal boundaries, to permit counties and cities to relocate the sites of government temporarily and to allow seizure and rationing of food, fuel, and clothing for the common good.

Organization of American States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Organization of American States, composed of 21 good neighbor countries in the Western Hemisphere, observed its 69th birthday on April 14.

As the Washington Daily News commented:

As befits one approaching three score and ten, it is confident, respected, and serene.

The OAS has brought about some fine programs for better health and social welfare in its member countries. And it has promoted a spirit of friendliness and a means of working together to look out for each other's interests and to provide a better life for all.

We of the United States of America wish to extend our best wishes to our Latin American neighbors and again say to them "mis mejores deseos y buena suerte," our best wishes and good luck, for continuing success in the years to come.

Mr. President, as part of paying my respects to the Organization of American States, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Washington Daily News for Monday, April 13, 1959, under the heading "Happy Birthday."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAPPY BIRTHDAY

Tomorrow the Organization of American States celebrates its 69th birthday. As befits one approaching three score and ten, it is confident, respected, and serene.

The OAS has had a great degree of success in keeping the borders of this hemisphere calm and inviolate. Its programs have promoted significant improvement in health and social welfare. But most important of all, it has led the 21 countries to view themselves as members of a single family where differences of opinion may occur but where the welfare and safety of all is the paramount interest.

With the creation of the Inter American Bank (the $1 billion draft charter was signed last week) there is evidence of continued vigor in the search to find the best means to solve the hemisphere's critical problems of economic health.

The OAS, where each member, large and small, is guaranteed protection when he is threatened, help when he is hurt, and at all times the dignity and respect commensurate with full and equal partnership, represents the best in the free world's human associations.

At 69, OAS is showing the vigor and intelligence of youthful prime, and we wish it the years of Methuselah which were, as we remember it, at least 900.

Emergency Unemployment Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP A. HART
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "No Help to Michigan," from the Detroit News of March 9, 1959.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO HELP TO MICHIGAN

The sudden decision of House Democratic leaders to press for further extension of emergency unemployment benefits has brought from the Eisenhower administration a disclosure that it, too, has been thinking along the same line.

It is not clear which decision to "do something for the unemployed" prompted the other. But it is abundantly clear that the motivation on both sides is political. Clear also, at least to us, is the fact this competition in political humanitarianism will help exceedingly few of those whom the lag in employment recovery has left jobless.

In Detroit and Michigan, particularly, the proposed extension of benefits will be a distinctly minor blessing. Of the 364,000 currently unemployed in Michigan, all but 30,000 have already exhausted their regular and extended benefits or will have done so by April 1, when the present program expires. Only the 20,000, and those present jobholders who hereafter become unemployed, would be eligible for the further extension proposed. Helpful as that might be, it would present a bleak prospect for the great majority who would get nothing.

A further objection to the proposal from the Michigan standpoint is that this new extension, like the last one, would be financed first by Federal loans but ultimately by a levy on State employers. Because the

Michigan provision for unemployment benefits is among the most liberal as to both term and amount, the levy on State employers would be correspondingly heavier than in other States. The best hope of Michigan's unemployed is not benefits but jobs. It will not help to attract payrolls to Michigan, if the effect of the proposed legislation is to widen still further the comparative costs of unemployment insurance as between here and other States.

What would best serve Michigan and Michigan's unemployed would be the plan urged by the AFL–CIO for a national 39-week benefit term applicable to all States, including those now granting as little as 16 weeks. We hope the administration may be persuaded to back this plan, which the southern-dominated leadership in Congress significantly finds unsuitable.

The Padre of the Americas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, Father Joseph F. Thorning yesterday delivered the opening prayer in the other body of Congress on the occasion of the celebration of Pan-American Day. It is fitting that the famed padre of the Americas should be accorded this great honor for the 15th consecutive year, for over the years he has worked unceasingly in behalf of the good neighbor policy, and to promote greater understanding and cooperation among the American Republics.

Many citizens interested in the good neighbor policy look upon Father Thorning's presence and prayer yesterday as a memorable anniversary of patriotic service to our country. Because of its significance and the wide interest in his work, I ask unanimous consent that a synopsis of the work accomplished by my friend, Father Thorning, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the synopsis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE REVEREND JOSEPH F. THORNING, PH. D., D.D.

Joseph F. Thorning is the son of a New England mother and a Viking father. The mother came from Springfield, Mass., while the father, hale and hearty at the age of 94, worked as a shipbuilder on the shores of Lake Michigan.

Born at Whitefish Bay, Wis., on April 25, 1896, Joseph Francis Thorning received his early education at Marquette Academy, Holy Cross College, and St. Louis University. While at St. Louis, he was invited to prepare a series of articles on international friendship for the national review, America.

This series led to his election as chairman of the Europe committee of the Catholic Association for International Peace. His first monograph, "National Security and International Peace," was published under the auspices of this association.

In 1931, Joseph F. Thorning, now ordained to the priesthood in the Jesuit order, was awarded a doctorate in sociology, economics, and political science by the Catholic University of America. His doctoral dissertation, "Religious Liberty in Transition," is still regarded as a classic on the subject, according to Carlton J. H. Hayes, onetime Seth Low professor of history in Columbia University and wartime Ambassador to Spain.

In late 1931, Dr. Thorning, now associate editor of the quarterly, Thought, was asked to serve as European correspondent of America and special correspondent of NCWC news service.

These assignments took Dr. Thorning to the United Kingdom, where he developed his interest in international studies under the direction of Sir Alfred Zimmern. Another of his friends at Oxford was Francis de Zulueta, regius professor of civil law. He also exchanged views with Father Martin C. d'Arcy, S.J., celebrated Thomistic scholar at the university.

Oxford University furnished a splendid headquarters for research and writing with the opportunity of making frequent excursions to European centers of learning. Among the universities which Dr. Thorning visited were the Sorbonne, the University of Salamanca, the University of Fribourg (Switzerland), Munich, Bonn, and Heidelberg. At Geneva Dr. Thorning was invited by officials of the National Broadcasting Co. to give a transatlantic address, a novelty at that time, on the so-called disarmament conference. In this period, Dr. Thorning also wrote articles and reviews for the Commonweal.

Returning to the United States, Dr. Thorning was appointed special lecturer on sociology and acting dean of the graduate school in Georgetown University by the Very Reverend W. Coleman Nevils, S.J., one of the most famous presidents of that institution.

It was at Georgetown that Dr. Thorning began his series of conferences with Father Edmund A. Walsh, regent of the school of foreign service. As a result, these two intellectuals were often described as the two leaders who, for 30 years, best understood the nature of the Soviet Union and the mentality of the Soviet hierarchy.

When Father Walsh was asked by the general of the Jesuits to prepare a volume on the cause and cure of Marxism, he entrusted the pivotal first chapter of the positive phase of this scholarly study to Dr. Thorning. In this chapter Joseph F. Thorning explained, in practical terms, the celebrated labor encyclical, "Forty Years After," by His Holiness, Pius XI.

While at Georgetown, Dr. Thorning formed his friendships with Ambassador J. H. Jefferson Caffrey (first career diplomat to hold the blue ribbon post at Paris, France); with Ambassador Walter J. Donnelly, who has had brilliant service in Colombia, Cuba, Brazil, Peru, Panama, Costa Rica, Venezuela, Austria, and Germany; and with the Honorable H. Freeman Matthews, now U.S. Ambassador to Austria.

In 1937, by appointment from His Excellency the Most Reverend Michael J. Curley, archbishop of Baltimore and Washington, Dr. Thorning became chairman of the department of social science in Mount St. Mary's College, Maryland, and professor of ethics and church history in Mount St. Mary's Major Seminary. At this post, he wrote the monograph on social reconstruction, "A Primer of Social Justice," with a preface by Archbishop Curley.

In May 1938, at Budapest, Hungary, it was reported in the New York Times that Dr. Thorning established a world record by broadcasting, over the facilities of the National Broadcasting Co., the story of the International Eucharistic Congress, in seven languages.

Then, as in 1937, he visited all the battlefields in the Spanish civil war, interviewing leaders on both sides. When he returned to the United States, Dr. Thorning was described by Archbishop Curley as one of the greatest authorities in the Nation on Spanish affairs.

Once more in Europe in the summer of 1939, the Maryland educator traveled throughout the Balkans. World War II broke out while Dr. Thorning was a guest of the bishop of Nice on the French Riviera. Upon his return to America, he predicted the fall of Adolf Hitler. Years previously, in a notable series of articles in "America," Dr. Thorning had furnished the first systematic, scientific exposé of Hitler and nazism (1931). Indeed, his piece on "Five Years of Hitlerism" had been featured by the religious news service of the National Conference of Christians and Jews in 1938. Dr. Thorning, in the early thirties, had also written the longest series ever to be published in "America" on the program of Soviet collectivism for the United States.

Upon the conclusion of the Spanish civil war in 1939, Dr. Thorning was awarded the rank of knight commander in the Order of Isabella the Catholic. His articles on Spain and about other European countries had been publicized from Bombay, India, to Brisbane, Australia. One result was that the Historical and Geographic Institute of Brazil, upon the death of Prof. Percy Alvin Martin, of Stanford University, unanimously elected Dr. Thorning as its one honorary fellow in the United States. At the same time, he was nominated as a director of the American Peace Society, associate editor of "World Affairs," and a fellow of the American Geographical Society.

Throughout the summer of 1941 Dr. Thorning served as director of the first inter-American seminar to South America, with headquarters at the University of San Marcos, Lima, Peru. The next year he established inter-American seminars at the National University of Mexico and the University of Havana, Cuba. One result was a unique distinction: Dr. Thorning was awarded the degree, doctor of divinity, honoris causa, by the Catholic University of Chile, a pontifical institution. It was the first award of this dignity to a North American. Simultaneously the Republic of Ecuador conferred its national decoration, the Order of Merit. This decoration was given at the hands of His Excellency Don Galo Plaza, then Ambassador and subsequently President of the Republic.

In February 1948 Dr. Thorning was a guest of the Venezuelan Republic for the inauguration of Don Rómulo Gallegos in Caracas. While in Venezeula on this visit, and on other occasions, he explored the archives of the National Academy of History.

In the summer of 1949 Dr. Thorning made the midshipman cruise to Europe, as a guest of the U.S. Secretary of the Navy, on the battleship U.S.S. *Missouri*, flagship of Task Force 61. In this capacity he was invited by Rear Adm. Allen E. Smith, commander of the task force, to preside as chairman at the daily 2-hour seminar on conditions in France, the United Kingdom, Belgium, the Netherlands, Italy, and the Iberian Peninsula.

In February 1950, as a guest of the Republic of Haiti, Dr. Thorning attended the International Exposition, celebrating the 200th anniversary of the founding of the Haitian capital, Port-au-Prince. Subsequently he was awarded the national decoration of the Republic, the Legion of Honor and Merit.

In 1951 Dr. Thorning was appointed to serve as an official member of two U.S. special diplomatic missions, the first for the inauguration of President Getulio Vargas in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, and the second for the inauguration of President Anastasio Somoza in Nicaragua.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-two was signalized by the publication of Dr. Thorning's

most recent book, the biography of Don Francisco de Miranda, precursor of South American freedom and independence. "Miranda: World Citizen" had a preface by Sumner Welles and the introduction by Galo Plaza, President of Ecuador. In his preface, Sumner Welles wrote as follows:

"I regard this biography of Francisco de Miranda by Dr. Joseph F. Thorning as an immensely valuable contribution to the cause of inter-American understanding."

Twice in 1952 the editors of the New York Times book review described "Miranda: World Citizen" as "one of the outstanding books of the year." This life of the fabulous Miranda, published by the University of Florida Press, is now in its second printing.

On June 19, 1950, at colorful ceremonies on Constitution Avenue, Washington, D.C., Dr. Thorning gave the invocation, dedicating the beautiful bronze figure of José Gervasio Artigas, champion of Uruguayan independence. This program, heard on the Voice of America, included speeches by Ambassador José Antonio Mora, now Secretary General of the Organization of American States, Dr. Alberto Lleras Camargo, now President of Colombia, Bogotá, Colombia, and the then U.S. Secretary of State Dean Acheson.

In 1953, Dr. Thorning was a guest in Europe of Congressman Thurmond Chatham of North Carolina, a distinguished member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives. Together they visited Spain.

In 1954, at the 10th Pan American Conference, Caracas, Venezuela, Dr. Thorning acted as special adviser to the chairman of the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on the American Republics, the Honorable BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, of Iowa.

In 1955, at the request of several leaders of both Parties in the U.S. Congress, Dr. Thorning made a survey of social and economic conditions in all the Republics of Central America: Panama, Costa Rica, Nicaragua, Honduras, El Salvador, and Guatemala. In the meantime, he had been awarded several more high National decorations: the Order of Francisco de Miranda (Venezuela); the National Order of the Southern Cross (Brazil); The Cross of Boyacá (Colombia); and the Order of Carlos Manuel de Céspedes (Cuba).

Upon the reestablishment of full diplomatic relations between the United States and Spain, the Spanish Government awarded to Dr. Thorning two of its most coveted decorations for his outstandingly brilliant leadership in the cause of friendship; The Grand Cross of the Order of Isabella the Catholic and the Grand Cross of the Order of Alfonso the Wise (Spain's highest award for cultural achievement).

In 1956, with White House approval, Dr. Thorning served as an official member of the U.S. delegation, headed by Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON, at the inauguration of the new President of Brazil, Juscelino Kubitschek.

Two months later, Dr. Thorning was invited by His Excellency, the Most Reverend Octavio A. Beras, Archbishop Coadjutor of Santo Domingo, to be a delegate and spokesman for North America at the closing session of the International Congress on Christian Culture for the Peace of the World.

In 1957 he was asked to lecture in the National War College on "The Role of Latin America in the Free World Coalition."

For 15 consecutive years, Dr. Thorning has been invited by the U.S. Congress to deliver the invocation to start Pan American Day in the Capitol. On these occasions, he has been hailed by U.S. Senators and Representatives as "a great American and a man of God." It was Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, who characterized Dr. Thorning with the title which has now become popular, "The Padre of the Americas." Few inter-American functions in Washington are complete without his presence.

Recognizing New Dictators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Recognizing New Dictators," written by Constantine Brown, and published in the Washington Evening Star of April 14, 1958.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECOGNIZING NEW DICTATORS—NEWSPAPER EDITORS' INVITATION TO CASTRO TO SPEAK IN WASHINGTON IS CRITICIZED

(By Constantine Brown)

Fidel Castro, self-appointed Prime Minister and supreme boss of Cuba, will be given the same treatment of unofficial courtesy which the State Department gave Soviet Deputy Premier Anastas Mikoyan.

Both have bloody hands—Mikoyan from tens of thousands of Hungarian freedom fighters; Castro from the blood of many innocent Cubans.

It is barely conceivable that, burdened by responsibility and anxious to maintain his position of power, Prime Minister Castro eventually may change and become "just another Caribbean dictator" and forget his leanings toward the political and social doctrines of Marx, Lenin, and Stalin.

Castro's predecessor, Fulgencio Batista, started his dictatorial career as a revolutionary whose heart was bleeding as much for the underprivileged masses as that of Castro. The signal for the revolution was given when President Machado ordered a cavalry regiment to ride over strawberry patches belonging to independent growers who were competing with the personal friends and supporters of the dictator. Then (in 1933) as now Moscow agents were roaming the islands and inciting people to arson and murder.

Washington recognized the new regime in Cuba at that time because the man who brought about the revolution, Cavalry Sergeant Fulgencio Batista, held no official position in the newly formed government. It was 7 years later, in 1940, that he became Cuba's President. Thus in recognizing the revolution which threw out the ruthless Machado-de Cespedes administrations, we did not depart officially from our policy of having no truck with dictators or military juntas.

The fact that Batista had no official role (although we knew he ran Cuba) enabled us to recognize the new regime without losing face. In those days the American Government was less prone to adopt the expediency policy in its foreign relations. It had just been decided to recognize the Communist Government in the Soviet Union because, it was said, the blood on the hands of its rulers had long ago dried up. But the men in the State Department and White House would not dream of clasping hands with rulers whose hands were still dripping with the blood of their victims who preceded them in office.

The tenets of morality of the administration in Washington and for that matter, judging by the invitation extended to Fidel Castro by the American Society of Newspaper Editors, also of the American people have changed in the last quarter century. Our Government has definitely adopted expediency as a policy in its dealings with foreign governments.

The old inflexible rule that you don't deal with murderers who become monarchs or presidents of republics is being abandoned. The yardstick for recognition is now expediency—and that is frequently misjudged by domeheads in the State Department who write policy papers. The most blatant example is that in Iraq last summer when we recognized the regime of the murdering gang of Gen. Abdul Karim Kassem within a very few days after the bodies of our loyal friends, King Faisal and his top advisers, had been thrown in a ditch. The explanation given by our policymakers was that Kassem might not become a tool of international communism and if we handled him properly might remain in the Baghdad pact.

The present developments in the Middle East show how pathetically wrong were those who urged quick recognition of the Iraqi regime. When we rushed with equal speed to recognize Fidel Castro, we merely followed the new pattern of expediency rather than political morality. At the present time the free and Communist worlds alike recognize that this is the modern trend. The actions of governments do not, however, always reflect the feelings of the people. It is for this reason that the invitation extended to Castro by the American Society of Newspaper Editors is regarded as more important than the recognition of the Cuban dictator by the American Government.

Newspaper editors do not have to adopt expediency in choosing the honored guests who will address them. They can afford to be highly selective. The fact that Castro may be news is no argument in favor of inviting him. These men who are the greatest force in molding American public opinion do not need to make sensational headlines at their yearly meeting.

The editors' reception of Fidel Castro will reverberate all over the seething, restless, and strife-ridden Southern Hemisphere where Khrushchev is now trying so hard to make hay.

The Berlin Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech entitled "The Berlin Crisis," given by the Honorable Adlai E. Stevenson on March 5, 1959, in Boston, Mass. He rightly insists that our greatness as a nation is being tested in Berlin. I also agree with him that the Democratic Party, as a responsible opposition, should help to give a sense of direction to the American people in this crisis, a vital task which the administration has failed to perform.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BERLIN CRISIS: A FOCUS FOR NEW GREATNESS

(Speech by Adlai E. Stevenson, attorney; presidential candidate of Democratic Party 1954, 1958, delivered at a dinner meeting, Boston, Mass., March 5, 1959)

We meet as Democrats, but the grave crisis in Berlin reminds us again that we must think as Americans, indeed our parties exist and should exist only as they serve the Nation.

After so much peace talk and propaganda, the Russian leaders have set the stage for another showdown in Berlin—the one place in Europe where the Western Powers are at an extreme tactical disadvantage.

The Soviet plan to maneuver the western garrisons out of free Berlin was first thrust at us in such an uncompromising and abrupt manner that one could well question whether negotiations with Russia at any level could be anything but fruitless. Not only were Mr. Macmillan's quiet efforts to sound out Russia's intentions drowned in a tirade of abuse and threats, but senior Russian officers chose this moment to boast of Russia's superiority in death-dealing missiles, and even the talks at Geneva on the control of atomic testing have, at this very time, reached a deadlock on the key issue of inspection.

All the talk of peace, of relaxing tensions and of better relations hardened into cold, uncompromising willfulness and power.

What purpose is served by this sudden return to the brutal hostilities of the cold war? Are such threats and bullyings the language of responsibility when the survival of humanity is at stake? Has Mr. Khrushchev no compassion for the feelings and the fear in so many human hearts? This was not the language of a man of peace. It was the deadly old jargon of the man of power.

But now, in the last few days, another miraculous and sudden change in the Russian climate has taken place, and we are assured that this tough talk was only for campaign purposes. I haven't noticed that the Communist Party needed much help in Russian elections.

And I get cold comfort from the Kremlin's fleeting flirtations with sweet reason. This isn't a time for capricious talk and arbitrary positions by anyone, let alone the heads of states charged with preserving peace. And we are all grateful to Mr. Macmillan for his contrasting restraint, open-mindedness and firm dignity during his trying visit to the Soviet Union.

But why has this crisis been thrust upon us? Why is Mr. Khrushchev stubbornly insisting on his unilateral solution of the German problem? Why is he taking risks of such enormity?

I wonder if the dictators in the Kremlin could be making the mistake that has destroyed nearly all the tyrants of this time—the mistake of underestimating and misunderstanding their opponents. Has Mr. Mikoyan taken back from America the impression of a people enervated by comfort and the foolish slogans of peace and prosperity? Has he mistaken the voice of free debate for the expression of doubt and division?

I talked with him when he was here and detected no such confusion. But if this is by any chance an element in the Russians' sudden disregard for all save their own interests, let me add my voice at once, with all the energy and conviction that I can command, to warn them not to drive this Nation too far and not to mistake the underlying temper of our people.

The memory of Hitler is much too fresh for citizens in this country, whatever their political convictions, to believe that knuckling under to threats can pave the way to a lasting settlement. Munich was the prelude to total conflict, not to "peace in our time."

I would plead with the Russian leaders to remember their own terrible experience with appeasement of Hitler—or to recall the more recent miscalculation which sent North Korean troops into South Korea in the belief that the Americans, once out, would never come back.

These are not partisan memories in America. They are the very stuff of our most recent historical experience. When the President says we will not give in to force, he speaks for all of us. I pray that there are no illusions in Moscow on this vital score.

But Russia's new pressure may not spring simply from a miscalculation of the American mood. I believe the men in the Kremlin also suffer from some acute political compulsions which may be driving them to bring the situation in Germany to a head.

The satellite empire in Eastern Europe is unstable. Tito's declaration of independence is now 10 years old. The East German outbreak of 1953, the riots in Poland and the Hungarian revolt of 1956 point to the insecurity of these minority Communist governments and the whole Soviet position in Eastern Europe.

Whatever the other reasons for precipitating a crisis over Berlin, it doubtless reflects their fear that this island of freedom through which tens of thousands of Germans flee from East to West creates a special degree of instability in a generally unstable area.

For this reason, I trust that we shall not show too much unwillingness to negotiate at the summit or at any other level. In the critical field of popular support we play from strength in Europe. No bayonets prop up Western governments. They are rooted in the assent of the peoples. But in uneasy Eastern Europe only Soviet military dominance insures Moscow's control.

Don't we have a supreme interest in reducing that control by gradual withdrawal of Russian forces? Have the Eastern European countries any other hope of national freedom? Don't we in the West—and I include West Germany—have a supreme interest in exploring new ideas on the possible future shape of a European settlement?

WITHDRAWAL HELD UNLIKELY

Because of the dependence upon their garrisons in Eastern Europe, I doubt if the Russians will negotiate seriously on the possibilities of withdrawing their forces. But if, despite all their protestations and propaganda about peace, self-determination of peoples, and noninterference, they dare not risk serious negotiation, we shall at least have recovered the initiative and made clear our own readiness for a more stable and hopeful settlement.

While under no circumstances will we forsake the people of free Berlin or compromise on the question of free access, we must face the fact that no Russian withdrawal can be secured without a modification of the Western position. In order to take, we will have to give. And one must equally face the widespread fear in Western Europe that any search for an alternative to the status quo ultimately entails a total American retreat—back to isolationism and "fortress America."

We cannot dismiss this sense of insecurity, especially among our good friends in West Germany. But I wonder whether this fear of American withdrawal from Europe and its affairs is not becoming a real enemy to thought, maneuver, and flexibility on the Western side?

Actually, in the age of missiles, supersonic flight, and Lunik, the concept of "fortress America" is wholly obsolete. We cannot escape the human situation. It involves us all. The America of 1959 is not the America of 1939. And the deterrent in Europe today is not just the six American divisions stationed in Germany, but the knowledge that a Russian attack means retaliation by America's Strategic Air Force.

The Russian leaders must know this. And I would urge them to ponder the Korean crisis of 1950. In that case, in a genuine effort to reduce tension, America withdrew its troops. The Communists misread the signals and evidently took this for an expression of American disinterest. But the North Korean invasion brought America promptly back—fighting.

Though Korea is, in contrast, of marginal strategic importance, the American response was clear and immediate. Who can suppose it would be less so if the vital security of Europe were at stake?

I repeat, I do not believe we Americans can ever again stand aside while aggression attempts to take history by force. We are involved permanently in mankind's efforts to evolve a workable security system, and our concern is far too deep rooted to depend only upon the location of American soldiers. Any negotiated settlement in Europe would have behind it the full weight of American commitment and the full strength of our arsenal and our economy. In the missile age, Fortress America is no more.

So I would say: Let us yield nothing to force in this Berlin crisis. But I don't think the issue of who stamps the passés is important.

If the Russians hand over their control functions to the East German government or sign a separate peace treaty, I cannot see that any great harm is done. The East Germans are so blatantly and totally dependent upon Russian military support that no ceremonial dickering about their status or functions will change them from puppets, as someone said, "even to puppies."

I am reminded of the Finnish Communist Republic established by Stalin, which so failed to command popular support that in the end the Russians forgot about it, too.

Any interference with the West's freedom of access to Berlin must be understood by the Russians to entail the risk of war. But, with this position clear, let us seek to explore with the Russians the possibility of a settlement in Europe less unstable and explosive than the present situation—one that gives some hope to the millions from the Baltic to the Black Sea who yearn for freedom again, one that is based upon the tremendous asset of freedom as a popular force, and one that is finally rooted in America's lasting commitment to Europe, whatever the local pattern of security may be.

I would hope that in this supremely difficult time, when Secretary Dulles' illness has deprived our Government in Washington of its only active practitioner in the field of foreign policy, that the Democratic Party, as a responsible opposition, would use its influence to focus public opinion to make good the perilous deficiencies of the executive branch and provide a little of the leadership an uninformed and bewildered public so desperately needs.

I would trust that our distinguished Democratic leaders in the Senate would consult together and bring their collective weight and wisdom to bear responsibly on the crisis. This opportunity for a demonstration of party responsibility is matched only by the urgency.

We are fortunate that we have a number of Democrats in Congress, like Senator FULBRIGHT, with exceptional experience and wisdom in foreign affairs. And I trust that the administration too will draw upon these resources at this time so that we can face what may be the greatest test of this decade in a mood of national determination and unity.

The months ahead are far too grave for partisan bickering or for personal competitiveness in political influence. I believe the

whole country would respond to a Presidential lead, telling us of both the danger and the opportunity we face. And, if the administration is silent, let us, as the loyal opposition, speak with all the gravity and wisdom that we possess.

This crisis can still be a focus for new greatness. And the greatness of America is the greatest purpose of our great party.

Community Enterprise at Grassroots Builds Portland, Oreg., Zoo Railway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, many of us in the Federal Government are continually encouraging action at the grassroots level to combat juvenile delinquency, to provide healthful recreation, and to stimulate interest in scientific and technical devlopments.

All three of these goals have been attained by my home community of Portland, Oreg., in its construction and expansion of the Portland Zoo Railway, which will be the most elaborate and farflung recreation railroad ever built in our land.

The city government, business firms, labor unions, schools, and civic organizations all have cooperated to launch this undertaking. In addition, some 20,000 local people have purchased shares of stock in the enterprise; many of these are children, making an investment for the first time in their lives.

Business Week magazine for March 28, 1959, has published a most comprehensive and thorough description of the history of the Portland Zoo Railway. Furthermore, I myself wrote an article about this extraordinary project for the issue of Railway Progress magazine of January 1958, under the title "Portland Builds a Railroad." The Business Week article is entitled "A Railroad So Popular It Must Expand."

Indeed, expansion has occurred even since the Business Week article was printed. The vast Weyerhaeuser Timber Corp. has agreed to build a fire train for the Portland Zoo Railroad system, which traverses magnificent stands of fir and cedar forests. The Portland Trust Bank has loaned $20,000 to the Portland Zoological Society for enlargement of the railway, and no security was demanded. Charles Francis Adams, president of the bank, has described the action as welcome because his institution desires loans which are good for the customer, good for the community and good for the bank. A loan to the Zoo Railway is in that category.

The 104th Infantry Division, of the U.S. Army Reserves, has agreed to construct two-thirds of a mile of track for the Zoo Railway at the Oregon Centennial Exhibition and Trade Fairgrounds, for this is a prime feature of our State's 100th year. The commander of the division, Brig. Gen. Eugene Cushing, will bring 200 men to tackle the job as a training exercise. General Cushing is arranging for division chaplains to conduct Catholic and Protestant services to be held at the centennial rail track site Sunday, April 19.

Advising and assisting the soldiers in the track laying will be executives of the railroads serving Portland: The Southern Pacific, Northern Pacific, Union Pacific, Great Northern, Spokane, Portland & Seattle Railway, Northern Pacific Terminal Co., and Portland Traction Co. These rail men will be led by John H. Jones, manager of the Northern Pacific Terminal and president of the Portland Zoo Railway.

Assisting also will be members of the Construction and General Laborers' Union, Local 320, and the Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way, AFL–CIO.

Approximately 3,000 crossties have been donated to the Portland Zoo Railway by the Templeton Lumber Co. of Portland, of which Herbert A. Templeton is the president and moving spirit. This was arranged by Bert Thomas, vice president of the Valsetz Lumber Co., a division of the Templeton lumber holdings. These ties are now at Valsetz, Oreg. They will be loaded in freight cars and hauled without charge to Independence, Oreg. From that point the Portland Zoo Railway will bring them to Portland.

The Oregon Building Congress, a group of contractors, suppliers, labor leaders, architects, engineers, and others interested in the building industry have voted to join with the Portland Zoo Railway in designing and building a 250-foot glulam bridge over a scenic ravine north of the new bear grottos. This bridge, supported by two large wood arches, will be 40 feet above a series of pools housing waterfowl. The bridge will provide a truly beautiful and spectacular feature of the Portland Zoo Railway route. Completion of the bridge, a part of the Washington Park line, is slated for August 1, 1959.

I have cited all these accomplishments and donations, Mr. President, because they demonstrate what can be attained at the local level by public-spirited people, whether they are in industry and management or in the ranks of trade unions and organized labor.

So that a record may be compiled of the unselfish and altruistic community interest in the Portland Zoo Railway, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the article published in Business Week of March 28, 1959, on this unique project and my own article published approximately 1 year earlier in the pages of Railway Progress on the same general subject.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Business Week, Mar. 28, 1959]

A RAILROAD SO POPULAR IT MUST EXPAND

From the Aberdeen & Rockfish to the Zug Island Road, it takes 14 columns of fine print to index all the transportation lines whose vital statistics appear in the fat monthly Official Guide of the Railways. Nowhere in the list, though, is the Portland Zoo Railway, despite the fact that in Portland, Oreg., union station its emblem enjoys equal prominence with those of the five major railroads serving the city.

The Zooline, a strikingly uncommon carrier that's an exception to almost every contemporary railroad rule, currently traverses half a mile of realistic 30-inch gage track in the new municipal zoo at Portland. More roadbed and rolling stock are soon to come.

OPPOSITES

It sounds slightly Lilliputian, yet in its own small way the Zooline represents an achievement to make the harried brass of the class I roads take note.

While most railroads are disconsolately dropping runs or ripping up track altogether, the Zooline is aggressively laying new iron and ordering new equipment, to add to a system that first went into operation only last June.

Against an earnings picture of the most unmitigated gloom on the grownup roads, the Zooline figured 1958 revenues at $9.70 a mile, though its accounting procedures might not pass muster with an ICC auditor.

While more and more of the rails advertise "freight service only," the Portland Zooline is designed exclusively for the delight of passengers.

PITCHING IN

The effort that went into creating Portland's Zoo Railway had all the community participation of an oldtime small town quilting bee, though Portland, at 404,000 population within the city limits alone, is far out of the quilting bee class. Businessmen donated cash and time, industrialists contributed facilities and manpower, and ordinary citizens even doubled as "gandy dancers" to pound spikes and set rails.

The same spirit is continuing as the line expands and as it ties in with next summer's celebration of the Oregon Centennial, the 100th anniversary of statehood.

HOW IT BEGAN

At the outset, the railroad was only an incidental feature of the plans for Portland's new zoo, for which the city's voters approved a $4 million bond issue in May 1954. The new zoo was to replace a cramped, moth-eaten layout, and mainly because the sponsoring Portland Zoological Society included one or two rail buffs, the budget included $25,000 for a recreational railroad.

From the beginning, perhaps the prime mover has been 53-year-old Edward M. Miller, assistant managing editor of the Oregonian, Portland daily, and a quietly ardent aficionado of the rails.

Miller's first step was to arrange a study of recreational railroads in operation all around the country—from Seattle to Spartanburg, S.C., Sunbury, Pa., and St. Louis. The findings: Most lines were both popular and profitable especially those elaborate enough to appeal to adults as well as children.

WIDENING PLANS

This report contributed to the decision that a $25,000 toy train such as usually featured in zoos just wouldn't do for Portland. Anyway, Miller and cronies felt a bigger layout would be more suitable for the hilly, fir-studded terrain on which the zoo was to be built.

About this time, Miller cautioned the zoo architects that eventually they would be designing the zoo to fit the railroad, rather than vice versa. "They laughed when we first warned them about that," recalls Miller, "but they soon stopped."

BABY AEROTRAIN

After a design competition among Portland architects and engineering firms, rail planners selected a proposal from Northwest

Marine Iron Works, a maker of sawmill and heavy machinery and heavy marine engines. Northwest Marine's staff included a mechanical engineer, John Flaschner, with experience in rail equipment manufacturing in his native Hungary. Flaschner worked up drawings for train roughly half the size of an ordinary passenger train, to run on 30-in.-gage track (standard gage: 56½ in.).

The diesel locomotive was a scaled-down version of General Motors' experimental Aerotrain, and it was to trail four passenger cars topped with clear plastic for unobstructed views. Inside, there would be room for 99 adults or 132 children.

To go along with the train, the zoo architects shuffled bear pits and monkey houses to provide room ultimately for 6,460 feet of right-of-way through the grounds, with tunnels, trestles, stations, a shop, and sidings. All told, train and track, the system would cost $280,000.

HELP WANTED

Northwest Marine agreed to build the train at cost, and a Portland fabricator, Hirschberger Sheet Metal Co., went to work making the locomotive and car bodies.

It was an ambitious program, considering that originally only $25,000 had been allocated for the Zooline. But Miller and Stewart H. Holbrook, Portland author, already had a plan. Forming the Portland Zoo Railway Co., they invited brass of regional railroads to lunch and made their pitch. "Railroads are becoming more and more a legend in the popular mind, less and less a living reality," said Miller. "Why not help us build in Portland a recreational railroad for children which they will never forget?"

Railroad executives are traditionally conservative, but the Portland group was moved by Miller's plea. To work with the Zooline, they tapped Jack H. Jones, manager of Northern Pacific Terminal Co., jointly owned by Northern Pacific, Southern Pacific, and Union Pacific, which runs Portland's passenger station and surrounding yards.

MAN OF ACTION

Jones took over as president of the Zoo Railway. At the time, there was doubt whether the initial stretch of track—half a mile with loops at each end, to make a one-half ride—could be finished in time for the proposed opening in June 1958.

The Terminal Co. shops turned out two 30-inch-gage cars for a work train. Miller and Jones found a 30-inch-gage diesel logging engine rusting in the yard of Portland Machinery Co. With a new cab and a coat of red paint, the diesel became "Casey Pioneer" and started hauling the work train.

Then Jones organized "Gandy Dancer Day," with hundreds of Portlanders volunteering to help lay track. The pace still wasn't fast enough; so crews of real-life gandy dancers quitely appeared.

Jones also recruited other railroad brass to the Zooline. Frank Landsburg, an ICC inspector, became safety director—and, thanks to his official Government inspection, brought a big reduction in liability insurance rates. Other volunteer executives flocked to the Zooline from the Southern Pacific, Union Pacific, Northern Pacific, Great Northern, and Spokane, Portland & Seattle.

MORE TRACK

No sooner was the Zooliner first in operation than attention turned to an extension through virgin timber along steep slopes, with spectacular views, to the city's Washington Park, which adjoins the new zoo tract. There wasn't any money to pay for it, but the Southern Pacific donated 40 engineering man-days to map a route. Then the Spokane, Portland & Seattle provided a detailed engineering study worth $5,000. James Yost, Inc., general contractors, volunteered to do the work for just the cost of labor.

To begin meeting Yost's weekly payroll, the Zooline started issuing stock—at $1 a share, offering as dividend two free rides when the extension was complete. Bartenders in all of Portland's taverns wore engineer's caps and peddled the stock to patrons; schoolchildren canvassed neighborhoods.

FREE BALLAST

The Cinder Hill Co., of Prineville, Oreg., gave 2,500 yards of ballast, which the railroads hauled to Portland free in cars loaded by Prineville and neighboring Redmond. In return, every youngster in grade schools of the two cities got a free share of Zooline stock.

With all this help the Zooline finished the right-of-way and laid almost 3,700 feet of track on the extension before winter rains halted work.

CENTENNIAL TRAIN

The next scheme was a train for the 100-day Oregon Centennial next summer. At the celebration it would bring revenue to the Zooline; later, the rolling stock could be used on the Washington Park route.

For this train, George Burton, a service-repair supervisor in a Portland radio, TV, and music store and a leader of rail-fan groups, is building a replica of a classic old steam locomotive from authentic drawings. Fellow rail buffs are helping in the labor, and all of Portland's foundries are contributing parts. Five cars similar to those on the first Zooliner are under construction at Northwest Marine Iron Works and Hirschberger.

To cope with an expected flood of passengers, the Zooline plans to put still another train on its home track by summer—this one built around the Casey Pioneer work locomotive. Hirschberger is doing the job for $6,000—"cash when he catches us," says Miller.

BONANZA

Miller is still sketchy about where all the money will come from, but he exudes confidence nonetheless—as well he might, from the results of the original Zooliner's first 80 days of operation last summer.

The figures are such as few professional railroaders ever see: in 80 days 107,000 paying passengers and a net profit of $5.61 per mile on revenues of $21,339. Even though this doesn't take into account capital costs, depreciation, or all the free services, it still gives the Zooline every reason to believe its passenger business is here to stay.

[From Railway Progress, January 1958]

PORTLAND BUILDS A RAILROAD

(By RICHARD L. NEUBERGER)

In his recent autobiography, Bernard M. Baruch, adviser to Presidents, has told how the sight of expresses and fast freights highballing through his native Camden, S.C., invariably instilled in him a youthful desire to be the owner of the Southern Railway.

My own boyhood ambitions followed a more modest scale. Watching Union Pacific, Southern Pacific, and Great Northern Mallets coping with our rugged Oregon mountain grades, I decided that sometime I might qualify to be a brakeman, conductor, or even an engineer.

These yearnings, alas, always remained unrequited. For one reason or another, I never became a railroader. Now, however, there is to be some belated measure of compensation. At the ripe old age of 44, I have been invited to serve on the board of directors of a railroad. Even though it is of only 30-inch gage, the blare of air horns trills in my ears and the smell of diesel fumes twitches my nostrils. Despite the railroad's projected total length of a mere 2½ miles, I already feel the earth quavering to the rumble of its locomotives. Perhaps the personal satisfaction is so great because this railroad will carry the most precious cargo of all—children.

My home city of Portland, Oreg., where I was born and raised, is undertaking to build and operate the most elaborate and picturesque home-sized railroad yet planned anywhere in the United States. It will be part of a brandnew zoo in the city's fir-mantled hills, so our system is officially known as the Portland Zoo Railway Co.

No railroad, large or small, was ever more of a community project. Leading citizens are raising funds for its completion. Railroad management and labor in the Portland area are contributing both work and materials, as well as general operating wisdom and know-how. Manufacturing firms are producing the motive power and rolling stock at cost. This spontaneous voluntary effort has been necessary because Portland, a city of 400,000 residents, is constructing a zoo rail route far more elaborate than that ever attempted by metropolitan centers with 10 or 12 times Portland's population.

To begin with, the 30-inch gage is no toy. Railway Progress has reported that jungle products of India and Ceylon are hauled on some 2,000 miles of actual operating railroads of this slender width. Furthermore, the 2½ miles of Portland Zoo trackage, while no threat to the Pennsylvania or Santa Fe in length, will actually outdistance the only other two major recreational systems in the country which might be considered its rivals—Disneyland, near Los Angeles, and the Detroit Zoo railroad.

The first stage of the Portland Zoo Railway is now nearing completion. This is 1¼ miles of track looping around the new zoo, plus a sweep to be added through primitive forests of conifer trees and up the ramparts of a wooded canyon. As income is collected at the ticket office, another 1¼ miles will be thrust into the most densely timbered solitudes which stockade the city limits of any community in the United States.

The train penetrating these scenic surroundings will be of substantial proportions. The locomotive, patterned generally after General Motors' Aerotrain, will haul three streamlined coaches and a club car in which soft drinks and ice cream can be served. Each car will have a capacity of 24 adults or 32 children. Length of the entire train will be 112 feet, 9 inches. The 24-foot locomotive will weigh 12,000 pounds and develop 140 horsepower. It will be held by a governor to a maximum speed of 15 miles an hour, because some of the track will go over high viaducts or along the sides of steep ravines. Dead-man controls will bring the train to an automatic stop in the event of sudden emergencies.

Perhaps because children all over the State of Oregon are thrilled with the prospective completion of their railroad, high-priced talent has been put at the disposal of the Portland Zoo Railway Co. on either a volunteer or at-cost basis.

Certain unusual aspects of this extraordinary little railroad have required that the train be built locally. Portland's damp climate, refreshed with rainstorms from the Aleutians, called for cars with glass roofs of the vista-dome variety rather than the open-type coaches in vogue at California's sunny amusement parks. The spectacular but hazardous right-of-way dictated a gage wide enough to eliminate dangerous spills. Interviews with small fry ruled out locomotives which looked like steamers. "We want diesel streamliners," said they and it was evident from their tones that anything less would have an adverse influence upon patronage.

So the zoo train is being constructed in Portland, according to these and other special stipulations. An iron works and a sheet-metal company are combining to handle the job on a nonprofit basis. Cost to the

zoo fund will be approximately $60,000. If the train were manufactured by Northwest Marine Iron Works and Hirschberger Sheet Metal along conventional fiscal lines, the expenditure would amount to at least $100,000. Locomotive and cars have been designed by a rail enthusiast named John Flaschner, who fled to America from the tyrants and barbarians invading his native Hungary. In Budapest he had worked as an engineer for a firm building trains for the export market. Rolling stock which took shape on Flaschner's drafting board is still in service on South American and African railroad lines.

With such men as Flaschner placing their talents at the disposal of the little zoo railroad, help began to come from other sources. L. R. Smith, Portland superintendent of the Southern Pacific's extensive operations in Oregon, put one of his regular survey crews to work locating the right of way for the extension through the stately forests surrounding the zoo. This spared the fund of the children's railroad at least $1,500. A manufacturing firm in distant Los Angeles agreed to fabricate the switch frogs for the entire system without any payment at all, which represented a saving of $1,000. Bricklayers from the building trades unions put trowel and mortar to thousands of bricks at the zoo while foregoing their wages, and much of the building material was presented as a gift by local suppliers.

Two men have been principally responsible for organizing this kind of participation. One is J. H. (Jack) Jones, manager of the Northern Pacific Terminal Co., who serves as president of the Zoo Railway. The other is Edward M. Miller, assistant managing editor of the Portland Oregonian, the newspaper which recently won a Pulitzer prize for exposing alleged criminal elements in certain labor unions. Miller, one of the mayor's civic appointees to the Portland Zoo Commission, is a zealous railfan who would rather travel by train than via Cinderella's coach-and-four. Before the first bulldozer ever had cleared ground for a bear pit or tiger grotto, he decided that the majestic terrain was ideal for America's finest recreation railway. To make this possible in spite of the limited population and financial resources of the community, Miller had to enlist an immense quantity of volunteer skills and equipment.

The newspaper executive rallied to his cause Jack Jones and other local railroaders by stressing one theme consistently. "Look," Miller would tell them, "fewer people every year have direct contact with railroads, as travel by airplane and private automobile increases. This means railroads are becoming more and more of a legend in the popular mind, less and less a living reality. Yet trains have great dramatic impact on people. Why not help us build in Portland a recreational railroad for children which they will never forget? It not only will have a profound effect in our own State of Oregon, which is an important source of raw materials to be hauled eastward, but its fame will radiate throughout the land. And the children thus thrilled and entertained will some day be the shippers of this country's freight. • • •"

"I decided Ed Miller was about 200 percent right," said Jack Jones, "and that's why I agreed to become president of the Zoo Railway. I also decided that, if I were the head of a big system myself, I would endow children's lines in zoos and parks all over the United States, with the colors and emblems of my own particular system very much in evidence. What better way to make an impression on the next generation of Americans?"

As head of the Northern Pacific Terminal Co., Jones would have to feature a chameleon's multiple colors to please all his bosses. The system, which operates 100 miles of track in or near Portland's Union Station, is owned jointly by the Union Pacific, Southern Pacific, and Northern Pacific Railroads. When the Portland Zoo picked up $4,000 at the Oregon State Fair in Salem with an exhibition, Jones provided one of his railroad-section gang crews to erect and dismantle the zoo's tents. He also persuaded the Spokane, Portland & Seattle Railway to haul to the fair the first car fabricated for the zoo train.

Another railroad celebrity whom Ed Miller has recruited for the forested zoo system is Stewart H. Holbrook, the noted Oregon author who specializes in books about Americans and American folklore. One of his most heralded volumes, "The Story of American Railroads," has been a persistent seller ever since it was first published in 1946. Holbrook, who will be chairman of the board of the railroad, contemplates an imposing list of officials, ranging from general superintendent to chief of redcaps. These will stem predominantly from the ranks of railway management and labor in Oregon.

Although all of these individuals long ago grew to manhood, they are deriving great nostalgia at present from seeking a name for the zoo train and an official medallion for the zoo railroad. Designer Flaschner favors Bluebird for the domeliner which will swoop through the fir glades. The first medallion featured a jolly elephant in an engineer's visored cap. This drew some frowns from the Democrats on the board of directors, so a frolicking Bengal tiger was substituted instead. "Anyway," rationalized one of the Democrats defensively, "tigers are cousins of cougars, which are indigenous to Oregon, while elephants don't have a solitary kin among the wildlife of our State."

On June 1, 1958, the most lovingly-created zoo train ever to operate in America will make the inaugural pilgrimage over a recreational route without scenic counterpart anywhere in our Nation. Youthful passengers in the club car of the Bluebird will order their first root beers and Eskimo pies. Some lucky youngster will ride the fireman's strategic seat—at an extra cost of $1 from dad's wallet. Small young faces will dot the glass-enclosed vistadomes as the hillsides and evergreens fleet past.

But the real fun will be enjoyed by all of us adults who watch proudly from the station platform.

Nomination of Lewis Strauss To Be Secretary of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Drew Pearson, published on April 12, 1959, with respect to Adm. Lewis Strauss, who has been nominated to be Secretary of Commerce, and Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DREW PEARSON SAYS: "DR. ROBERT OPPENHEIMER, ONCE PURGED BY ADMIRAL STRAUSS, FEELS NO BITTERNESS TOWARD HIS JUDGE AND PROSECUTOR; OTHER SCIENTISTS DO; PRICELESS SECRETS REVEALED TO RUSSIA IN OPPENHEIMER TRIAL"

WASHINGTON.—In Princeton, N.J., the man who built the atomic bomb goes about these spring days as if he had never been subjected to one of the most unfair purges of the McCarthy era.

Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer is tall, stooped, and thin almost to the point of emaciation. But if he suffers from his past experience he does not admit it. He even jokes about those days when "Lewis," referring to the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission who ordered his trial, was his "friend."

There were long, dark hours for the scientist shortly after he was forced to leave the Atomic Energy Commission for "slanting his advice or tempering his professional opinion because of apprehension that such advice or opinion might be unpopular." For months he did not write or speak about his inquisition. But bitterness, if there ever was any, has now gone out of his heart. Oppenheimer does not even feel bitterness for the man who ordered his trial—Lewis Strauss.

All over the United States, however, scientists, who knew Oppenheimer either personally or by reputation, are watching the Senate hearings to ascertain whether the man who purged him will now be confirmed for promotion to Secretary of Commerce. They are watching the Senate hearings because they know that any favorable outcome will mean that Congress puts the stamp of approval on the purge of the man who built the atomic bomb.

SECRETS TO RUSSIA

The details of that purge have now been largely forgotten. They have even grown dim in the minds of Senators. They are still fresh, however, in the minds of scientists. They suffered along with Oppenheimer; they wondered if they would be next.

They especially remember that although Dr. Oppenheimer was completely exonerated of disclosing any secrets, the chairman who tried him, Admiral Strauss, was a party to disclosing a long chain of vital secrets in order to convict the man he sought to purge.

He disclosed:

1. The exact date when Dr. Edward Teller discovered the hydrogen bomb. This gave Russia the priceless means of estimating just how many bombs we could have built since then—in brief, the size of our atomic stockpile. The size of our stockpile is the most carefully guarded secret in the Nation. But for the sake of convicting Dr. Oppenheimer, it was disclosed.

2. The fact that the Air Force had worked out a long-range system of detecting Soviet H- and A-bomb explosions.

3. Various details about the H-bomb which could give Soviet scientists a very clear picture of our important discovery. This again was one of the most carefully guarded secrets in the Nation. Yet it came out during the course of the Oppenheimer trial, revealed in the course of trying to convict him.

4. The fact that we have been able very accurately to analyze Soviet air samples, so we know exactly the type of material the Russians have in their stockpile. This could permit the Russians to change their method of bomb detonation.

Russian intelligence would have spent millions and risked the lives of many to secure this information. Yet all they had to do was read the printed transcript of the Oppenheimer trial.

Today the man whose education, associations, political philosophies, from boyhood to

manhood, were scrutinized and diagnosed in one of the most excruciatingly painful inquisitions held since the days of Galileo, walks about his garden in Princeton, trying to forget the past.

But thousands of other scientists who suffered with him and shunned Government service because of him have not forgotten. They are watching to see whether the Senate promotes the chief judge and inquisitor at the Oppenheimer trial.

Resignation of Walter S. Robertson as Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, few men have served more difficult positions of our Government with greater ability and honor than Walter S. Robertson of Virginia.

His recently announced decision to resign as Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs has been followed by widespread tribute to his great service.

I desire to join in this tribute and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Richmond Times Dispatch of April 8, and articles by William S. White, David Lawrence, and Marquis Childs.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Richmond Times-Dispatch, Apr. 8, 1959]

WALTER ROBERTSON PROVED RIGHT

It is seldom that a public official goes out of office with as many tributes to his ability, his dedication, and his integrity as those which are being heard for Walter S. Robertson of Richmond.

Mr. Robertson's announcement last week of his retirement as Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, effective July 1, would have been noted ere this in these columns, but for the urgent and pressing necessity for extended comment on the Perrow Commission's report and Governor Almond's message dealing therewith.

Walter Robertson's steadfast and unyielding determination to fight Red China with all the power he possesses, is now seen by practically everybody to have been the right policy. That country's brutal and cynical attack on Tibet has opened the eyes of those who for years were inclined to poohpooh Mr. Robertson's clear-sighted realism as "narrowness" or "fanaticism." Even Nehru of India has had his eyes opened.

Columnist William S. White, one of the keenest observers in Washington, paid a glowing tribute to Mr. Robertson in this newspaper yesterday, and David Lawrence called him in yesterday's News Leader "truly one of the great public servants of our time." Marquis Childs, who is as liberal a columnist as Lawrence is conservative, wrote last September that "the administration's policy on China is embodied in one man" (Mr. Robertson), and paid admiring tribute to his "skill, intense conviction and unflagging persistence."

All these qualities were needed as Walter Robertson battled for years against a clique in Washington and throughout the country which was trying to undermine his adamant opposition to Red China and his unyielding support of the Nationalist Chinese on Formosa. What made his struggle doubly exhausting were the recurring ulcers which have plagued him intermittently since he took his present post in 1953.

A less dedicated man would have given up long ago and returned to Richmond, where he could work a normal 8-hour day, instead of remaining at his desk in Washington 12 or 14 hours a day, usually 6 and often 7 days a week.

He says he wouldn't be resigning now, despite his health problem, were he not convinced that there will be no yielding in Washington to Communist China. His confidence in this regard is reassuring, for with Secretary of State Dulles seriously ailing, and Acting Secretary Herter apparently scheduled to take over, many wondered if the policy toward Red China would be as strong as ever. Apparently it will.

This should make it possible for Mr. Robertson to return to Richmond and regain his health, sure in the knowledge that the policy for which he fought so ably—and despite such physical handicaps—has at last been vindicated before the world. The Red Chinese butcheries in Tibet have made that vindication certain.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Apr. 6, 1959]

NONRECOGNITION OF CHINESE REDS—STATE DEPARTMENT LOSING ROBERTSON AS PEIPING SHOWS ITS BRUTALITY ANEW

(By William S. White)

The stoutest defender of one of the most truly rational of the foreign policies of the Eisenhower administration is leaving office just as events are proving how right he has been all along.

Walter S. Robertson is resigning as Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs amid new and overwhelming evidence of the brutality of the Chinese Communist regime of Peiping. The Chinese Communists have driven the young Dalai Lama, the god-king of Tibet, from his homeland. They are baying at him like fierce hounds in the refuge granted to him in India by Prime Minister Nehru.

Mr. Nehru has spent years righteously tuttutting our absolute refusal to make any deal with Peiping. So, unhappily, have most of our allies, though in a less pompous way. Perhaps he is now learning that there has been more to the steadfast American policy of nonrecognition of the bandit regime in Communist China than mere stubborn wrong-headedness. For the implacable Red neighbors toward whom he has been so very reasonable are increasingly unreasonable with him for sheltering their chosen victim.

It is sadly possible, however, that it will require yet another really big Chinese aggression, similar to their aggression against our own troops and those of all the United Nations in Korea, to convince the well-meaning that you can't do business with Peiping.

The departure of Mr. Robertson, therefore, raises special problems, apart from its historic irony. His role, though a sturdy one, could well be overstated; he was not the initiator of nonrecognition, but only its faithful executor.

Basically, it has been the policy of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles and also of a great majority of both political parties in Congress.

All the same, Robertson, a Virginia banker in private life, had a degree of political protection which his Foreign Service career-officer successor, J. Graham Parsons, cannot hope to have. As the voice of Dulles, Robertson had in Dulles a backer who was the most powerful member of the Eisenhower Cabinet. He had the support, too, of the dominant conservatives in both parties.

(True, he was supported also by ultraconservative extremists who did much to alienate reasonable opinion from a policy that was sound in itself but suffered, as other policy has, from some of its friends.)

Thus, the whole domestic political understructure for maintaining nonrecognition is now twice weakened. First, there was the incapacitation by illness of Mr. Dulles. Now there is the exit of Mr. Robertson, who also is in poor health.

No one in Washington pretends to know exactly what is in the mind of the monolith of terror that is Communist China. But many fear that Peiping, which for years has been trying to shove or shoot its way into the United Nations, may try again before many months have gone.

Certainly the times will be evilly ripe. A spirit of accommodation toward Soviet communism is spreading, in the understandable and general Western hope that some decent cold war armistice can be struck at the summit conference.

Any outbreak of Communist-inspired trouble in Asia would be a most damaging distraction, and there would be temptation to buy it off. Indeed, it probably would be unwelcome to the Russian leaders, because they need a summit settlement. There is, however, increasing doubt among highly responsible intelligence sources here that Moscow can necessarily control Peiping. The Red Chinese have already put in a slave system so vast and coldly wretched, so totally denying the human personality, as to frighten the Russians themselves.

It will not be surprising if the eastern branch of international communism seizes the opportunity to put on more pressure for recognition, perhaps bloody pressure, while all are preoccupied with the summit.

It is possible that some such estimate underlies the fact that the United States is preparing simply to deploy a naval and Marine task force to the western Pacific.

[From the Washington, D.C., Evening Star, Apr. 6, 1959]

ROBERTSON'S CHINA POLICY BATTLE—RETIRING ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOUGHT TO DENY RECOGNITION FOR PEIPING

(By David Lawrence)

Sometimes it takes the news of an illness or a departure from public office to bring about a true evaluation of the services of a man to his country. The announced resignation of Walter S. Robertson from his post as Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs focuses attention on the valiant and successful fight of a sick man to keep America from blundering into recognition of the Red China regime.

Mr. Robertson, who leaves the Department of State in a few weeks, says frankly he never would give up his work if he did not feel assured that the United States will not yield to the tyrants in Peiping. Few people outside the Government are aware of the indefatigable battle Mr. Robertson has waged against all manner of intrigue that has been going on inside and outside the Government to win for Red China a place in the United Nations and diplomatic recognition by the U.S. Government.

Mr. Robertson served under the Truman administration, but has played an even bigger role under the Eisenhower administration in steering foreign policy as it relates to Asia. It was most unfortunate to read the other day a comment by former President Truman accusing the Eisenhower administration of "surrendering" because an

armistice was signed in Korea. All one has to do is to read the book by Adm. C. Turner Joy, who presided for the United States at the Panmunjom negotiations, to find out that, before the Eisenhower administration came into power, the American representatives had been instructed to accept the principal portions of the final agreement.

They did so, and only a dispute about exchange of prisoners remained when Mr. Eisenhower became President in 1953. So the real question was whether to repudiate or to honor the agreement made by the Truman administration. President Eisenhower chose to honor the signature of the United States on the sections already agreed upon by the previous administration.

As a matter of fact, it is only in what happened prior to 1950, when State Department officials were being accused by congressional committees of catering to Communists in the Far East, that there is any basis for controversy. In a speech delivered 3 weeks ago at Ottawa, Canada, Mr. Robertson said:

"Since 1950, the difference in basic China policy between former President Truman and President Eisenhower is the difference between tweedle-dum and tweedle-dee.

"In early 1950, following the Communist takeover of the mainland in December 1949, at about the time of British recognition, President Truman vetoed the recommendation made to him that we recognize Red China. The Republican attack on the Democrats in the 1952 election campaign was not on basic China policy as it then was, but rather on what was alleged to have been the vacillations and blunders which had helped create the Frankenstein monster of Red China and enhance its menace to the free world.

"In 1956, an election year, a Democratic-sponsored resolution, reaffirming support of the Republic of China and opposing the seating of Red China in the United Nations, passed the House of Representatives by a vote of 391 to 0 and by 86 to 0 in the Senate. Not a single Congressman or Senator of either party was willing to vote against this resolution. This is a phenomenon unprecedented in American political history.

"When the parties later assembled for their national conventions, they adopted almost identical planks in support of this policy. In the recent Taiwan (Formosa) crisis, Mr. Truman was among the first to come out in strong support of President Eisenhower's position.

"To repeat, the differences of opinion about China policy do not represent differences between political parties, but rather differences between individuals, irrespective of party lines."

Mr. Robertson has made numerous speeches about the whole China problem in the last few years, and has been perhaps the country's most outstanding champion of the American policy in the Far East. He says opposition to the Red China regime is not based on "disapproval of an ideology or an economic system, much as we abhor both."

He asserts that American policy is based "on the collective security of the free world." He sees any possible acceptance of Red China's regime as meaning the liquidation of American alliances in the Philippines and Southeast Asia, danger to the Korean Republic and the collapse of our military allies in the Western Pacific, who possess considerable manpower which, if not available, would have to be substituted for by millions of American soldiers.

Mr. Robertson points out that very few countries have recognized Red China since the Communist aggression in Korea in June 1950. He adds:

"Instead of being isolated, we stand with the overwhelming majority of the countries of the free world in this position. It is essential that this majority continue to stand together."

Walter Robertson's espousal of the cause of a free China will long be remembered. And it is a safe bet that he will continue to give whatever energy he has left to the cause for which he has struggled this last decade, despite frequent intervals of ill health. He is truly one of the great public servants of our times.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Apr. 5, 1959]

WEST PURSUING WORN TACTIC IN RAISING INDIGNATION OVER REDS' SUPPRESSION OF TIBETANS—COMMUNIST CHINA'S POWER CONTINUES TO GROW AS ALLIES MISTAKENLY HOPE THAT ANGRY DENUNCIATION WILL TAKE CARE OF FAR EAST SITUATION

(By Marquis W. Childs)

WASHINGTON, April 4.—What happened in Poland, in Czechoslovakia, and in Hungary is now occurring in the remote, almost dreamlike country of Tibet.

Communist power is crushing with relentless force the ancient way of life of a people who have lived to themselves since time immemorial in the high Himalayas. It is bent on wiping out all traces of dissent and difference to achieve the mass conformity of an all-powerful state.

The tragedy of Tibet as the Dalai Lama and his followers are hounded out of the country, has set off a wave of indignation in India. The ties with Tibet of religion and commerce have long been close. For Prime Minister Nehru, the realization of what Red China means by "autonomy" for Tibet is obviously painful.

The moral indignation with which the West reacts is now an old story. It is the automatic response to a tragedy repeated many times over. Perhaps because it is so familiar, this response tends to be an exercise in righteousness, giving us a comforting feeling that merely by exploding in angry denunciation we are accomplishing something.

DANGEROUS ILLUSION

That is a dangerous illusion, as even a glimpse at the past makes clear. The anger over the betrayal of Czechoslovakia 11 years ago was deep and real. Yet Communist power has organized that country in such a way that production today is at a high level.

It would be comforting to think that the iniquitous methods used by the Red Chinese were bound to fail. This is the conviction so often expressed by American policymakers. While in the long run it may be true, in the long run, as has been wryly said, we shall all be dead.

In the meantime, there is the fact of China's ever-growing power. A recent visitor to Peiping, with a long background of experience in China and every reason to detest communism, has come out with a report of the extraordinary progress being made in the construction of highways, factories, government buildings, hotels, and airports. In the 10 years since the Communists took over, China has a new look.

The "great leap forward" proved too ambitious and one consequence is that the Chinese are defaulting on their trade agreements. But this, in the view of a stanch capitalist from the West, is only a temporary condition. In the present phase, the excesses of the "great leap forward" are being compensated for. It is a pause before another stride forward.

There is nothing essentially new in this. Almost every observer of whatever nationality has reported the amazing organization of the Chinese mass under the constant goad of propaganda, surveillance, reward, and punishment. What more advanced industrial nations do with machines, the Communists are undertaking to do with harnessed manpower.

QUARANTINE THEORY

Shortly before his unexpected resignation as Assistant Secretary for Far Eastern Affairs, Walter Robertson, who has shaped America's China policy in recent years, made in Canada a speech that put as forcefully as possible the whole quarantine theory. A man of dedicated zeal rare in Washington, he put the case this way:

"The Peiping regime was imposed by force with the volition of only an infinitesimal fraction of the Chinees people. Today, after 9 years, less than 2 percent belong to the party. It has kept itself in power by bloody purges and the liquidation of some 18 million of mainland Chinese in 9 years. In our view, the security interests of ourselves, of Asia, and of the free world as a whole demand that we take no action which would create international prestige for this regime, which would increase its capacity for advancing its objective of communizing all of Asia, or which would betray the hopes of those having the will and the courage to resist it."

The premise in this is that American recognition would give Red China a prestige it does not now have. It does not answer the question of how we are to meet the challenge of ever-growing Communist power other than by moral indignation stirred when some particularly bloody deed commands the headlines. The moralistic tone may well serve to conceal the reality of China's power and therefore encourage us to wait for the inevitable triumph of virtue.

GEOGRAPHICAL BARRIER

In the recurring tragedies that have seen one nation after another go down under Communist aggression, either from internal subversion as in Czechoslovakia or by naked force as in Tibet, two factors have inhibited the West. The most obvious one is geography.

In each instance, the country taken over has had a border with communism so that infiltration or invasion has been relatively easy. The power of the West has been once or twice or many times removed from the scene of the disaster.

To intervene in Tibet would mean complicated air drops of men and materiel from bases near enough to make such an attempt practical. The United States has bases in Pakistan, but Pakistan has formal diplomatic relations with Red China and whether permission would be given for an attempt to halt Communist aggression is doubtful. The massive assistance in men and transport planes necessary for any such strike in incredibly difficult terrain is simply not available, even if there were any intention here to try to check the Communist takeover.

The second factor is the cloak of internal quarrel which the Communists have managed to throw around the use of force. Thus, in Tibet, a convenient puppet, the Panchen Lama, is brought out to give a cloak of legality to Communist action. In Czechoslovakia, the tragedy was played out behind a mask of acquiescence by native Communists.

The West observes the rule of law and the canons of diplomacy. In meeting any crisis, the democracies must take public opinion into account, while the dictatorships act without regard to dissent or criticism. This may help to explain why the burst of angry indignation is too often the beginning and the end of Western reaction.

What many observers are saying is that the West must follow up with constructive action to strengthen the free world, even though it calls for far more resolution and sacrifice than is now evident. The Tibetan

situation points up this criticism. The Dalai Lama has taken refuge with a few of his followers in India and Nehru has promised him sanctuary.

INDIA HIGH TARGET

But India is a target high on the Communist list. The province of Kerala in the south is already Communist-controlled. As Nehru's Congress party loses its dynamism with age and internal dissension, the Communists push forward. The danger is far from imminent—the threat of a takeover may be 5, 10, or even 20 years away. Nevertheless, it is real, and the time to avert it is now and not when a crisis poses the question of whether and how to act.

The response to Tibet could well be the launching of a far-reaching program of aid and loans for India. There is already a considerable program, but as Nehru pointed out to a recent visitor, former Gov. Averell Harriman of New York, while it may be sufficient to hold off bankruptcy, it does not permit growth and development. In this way communism would be challenged and India would have a chance to show how progress can be made in a free society.

That is the essence of the matter. There is no way to calculate the help that Soviet Russia has given Communist China. It has been vast and the objective is simple: To enable Red China to demonstrate to Asia and the world that communism can make over a feudal country into a modern industrial nation.

The outcome of this contest between communism and freedom in raising standards of living—between China and India—means everything to Asians. China's successes thus far have had a wide propaganda effect. Unfortunately, American policy has taken too little account of the realities of this contest. One searches in vain for any recognition of it in Robertson's Canadian speech.

Today, as in the past, there are only two choices available to us: The anti-Communist Republic of China, our friend, or the international Communist regime of Peiping, a deadly enemy dedicated to our destruction.

No one questions the enmity of Communist China. But there are those who argue that there is another choice. It is the choice between the Communist system and its advance under a modern form of slavery and the opportunity in the West to forward the progress of such free and uncommitted nations as India with an all-out program of assistance.

A Look at Foreign Aid in Thailand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, one of the most objective analyses of how American foreign-aid funds are being spent around the world in an effort to make over other countries in our image was contained in the April 9, 1959, issue of the Wall Street Journal. I refer to an article, by Vermont Royster, entitled "Anatomy of an Aid Program." Although it attempts to draw no conclusions, it is a powerful indictment of the follies and excesses of foreign aid as it presently is being practiced by the United States. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANATOMY OF AN AID PROGRAM—A LOOK AT THAILAND SHOWS THE U.S. PROBLEMS ALL OVER THE WORLD

(By Vermont Royster)

BANGKOK.—An inquiring American who wants a clear look at what the U.S. foreign aid program is trying to do all over the world can hardly do better than to come here to serene and peaceful Thailand.

The aid program here is small, as those things go; its $20 million a year sinks almost unnoticed in a total foreign aid budget of $4 billion. It seems to be handled with reasonable care; at least it has not been plagued with public scandals.

Moreover, it is an aid program that does not have to wrestle with the special problems that, in so many countries, are used either to justify or excuse the results. The Thai Government is solvent. It has been spared extreme political chaos. The Siamese people lack neither rice nor roofs. They are easy-going and happily unconscious of any great problems.

Perhaps all this robs the American aid program here of a certain amount of color. But it does permit the ICA to plan its program under almost ideal circumstances and its more than one hundred officials to apply them with a minimum of hindrance. And so if the present U.S. program can look good anywhere, it should look good here.

It certainly looks ambitious. The American foreign aid help for the Siamese reaches into the financial structure of the country, the homes, the schools, down Bangkok streets, across rice paddies and into the almost impenetrable jungle.

ADMINISTRATIVE MACHINERY

To see how, perhaps the best way to begin is with a glance at the size of the administrative machinery the International Cooperation Administration has found necessary to erect to spend this $20 million a year.

At the top of the U.S. Operations Mission ("Usom" is a ubiquitous word in Southeast Asia) is the Office of the Director together with an Office of the Deputy Director. Spread out below them is a rather intricate array of division offices, reporting not only to the Director but in some cases to each other.

These are, separately, an Office of Technical Services, a Division of Agriculture, a Division of Education, a Division of Public Health, the Public Administration Division (this is to help the Siamese run the thousand-year-old city of Bangkok), a Division of Public Safety (to make the Siamese better policemen), an Audiovisual Division (teaching with pictures), a Training Division (to teach the Thai Government how to govern Thailand), a Division of Public Works and a Division of Industrial Development.

These, of course, are only the divisions dealing directly with aid to Thailand. To do the housekeeping and general management of these divisions there must be other administrative divisions. There is, for example, an Office of Management to keep track of the other divisions, an Office of Finance to keep track of the money, and an Office of Programing to coordinate the programing of the programs of the separate parts.

Even so, categorizing these on an organization chart does not give the full sweep of the U.S. aid program to this small country, because under nearly every division there are branches or sections for specific projects.

A sampling of these shows that even in an underdeveloped country atomic energy is not neglected; there's a program for training a cadre of nuclear scientists. There's a skilled-labor training program, a regional telecommunications program, an English language teaching program (few USOM personnel speak Siamese), and a project for stimulating villagers to take more active interest in community affairs.

Nor are these merely paper programs. For example, a visitor finds that though the Siamese, being blessed with rich land and adequate rainfall, are a people who have never know famine and who are heavy rice exporters, they are nonethless getting the benefit of a very active and extensive agricultural program.

The United States is bringing to Thailand the American system of farm extension services, and even the 4-H Clubs. More than 100,000 farmers have been instructed to date, more than 250 extension agents have been trained in American methods, and something like 4,000 farm boys have been signed up for 4-H. Not content with this, the agriculture program envisions for the future creating a "unified extension service with clear line of administration, staffed with best available personnel; trained extension workers at national and regional levels and establishment of plans for continuous training of future extension workers."

But this is only a part of what we plan for Siamese farmers. Some time this year the USOM agency plans to demonstrate contour cultivation on some 200 farms and to organize some 30,000 village seed associations. About 50 breeding bulls are being brought in and will be distributed to selected villages. The American cooperative marketing system is being encouraged, and this year a cooperative management program will be organized for more than a thousand families.

Meanwhile, industrial development is not being neglected. Technical surveys are underway of the country's mining and water resources, including an airborne geophysical survey. The highway program involves not only actual roadbuilding but the reorganization of the Thai Highway Maintenance and Equipment Division and the replanning of the streets of Bangkok.

There's also an airport construction program, an air communications program, a meteorological program and, in fact, "a comprehensive program" for the reorganization of the whole Thai transportation system.

Nor is U.S. aid limited to agriculture and industry. There's a health program which includes teaching 7 million Thai householders to spray for mosquitos (this would be followed up with a "surveillance program"), training doctors, organization of district health units.

And so it goes on. The educational program embraces projects on the elementary, secondary and university levels of the Thai school system. "Usom's" arm also reaches out, through the Public Administration division, into local city planning, the National Government's taxing and budget offices. The United States also plans to "improve the Thai Government economic policy and planning procedures," to revamp its statistical services, and in general guide its officials in doing their jobs.

In short, ambition is a small word for the U.S. aid program in Thailand. Indeed it looks less like a program to give an economic boost to these hard-working and self-reliant people than an effort to redesign, if not to remake, their country. The visitor must constantly remind himself that this is a very small program, less costly, less complicated and less comprehensive, compared to others.

A visitor, touring the country, can see that some of these projects have in fact helped the Siamese people. You can't put $20 million a year into so small a country, build highways through the jungle, or fight malaria, without leaving some benefit behind.

But passing over entirely the question whether the program has a point other than generosity, you can't look at this program—a plain, rather ordinary, standard U.S. aid program—and its effect on the Siamese people and fail to see that by its very nature it has some built-in problems that the system itself makes insuperable.

For example, one of the chief complaints of foreign aid officials (and one of their excuses when things go wrong) is that they can't get enough good people to fill all the billets in these far-away places.

ONE OF 70

Yet Thailand is only one of 70 countries in which we have aid programs. And the scope of this comparatively small program would require, to be carried out properly, more than a hundred first-class officials, not only technically knowledgeable in their fields but in their manners, vision and understanding.

So it is hardly surprising that the director here, who strikes the visitor as an able man, has his personnel problems. To run a program of such magnitude he needs superior accountants, horticulturists, entomologists, soil chemists, veterinarians, livestock biologists, parasitologists, sanitation engineers, highway engineers, electrical engineers, civil engineers, machinists, geologists, doctors and nurses, electronics technicians, air operations specialists, police administrators, and meteorologists, just to name a few.

Look for instance, at what the aid director's "TO"—or technical organization chart—calls for in just the single category of police administrators: He needs a chief police adviser, a deputy police adviser, a police program officer, two police program assistants, four police adviser investigators, and a police adviser who's a training specialist. That's only the beginning. He also needs police advisers who are specialists in border control, traffic control, logistics, identification and laboratory investigation, not to mention a police adviser (administrative) to run it all.

In addition to all of this there are, of course, the secretaries, clerks, auto drivers, and miscellaneous personnel necessary to keep all this administrative machinery functioning. And these people, too, are unofficial U.S. ambassadors abroad.

Now since it is difficult to find enough competent people to fill all these billets in little Thailand, it is plainly impossible to find them in sufficient numbers for all the other countries too, in many of which the program is mammoth compared to here.

Thus the inquiring visitor is brought relentlessly to the conclusion that the sheer size of the U.S. aid program, and the scope of what it is trying to do, makes the personnel problem an almost impossible one.

Unfortunately this is not the only problem built in by the size and concept of the foreign-aid program. More important for our own self-interest, are the irritations it creates among those blessed with our giving.

Consider that here is a country which, for all that it may be backward by American standards, has managed to get along for a thousand years without U.S. dollar aid or U.S. aid advisers. Its people are proud of their independence, their tradition, their own way of life and are probably as successful in the pursuit of happiness as any people can be.

Yet here come the Americans with a program which, when you look at it, would remake the country from one end to the other, from top to bottom. There is no area of Siamese life—schools, farms, business, language, homes, government, customs—left untouched in some fashion by the U.S. aid program.

No one, be he a visitor here among the ancient temples and palaces or a stay-at-home reading about it, need be surprised that a program so conceived rubs many Siamese the wrong way. Certainly the evidence of it is not hard to find.

REFUSE ADVICE

It crops up even in the official ICA documents when officials plaintively report that all is not going well, because the Siamese are reluctant to accept all their advice. "Only limited progress has been made to date due to the reluctance of the Thai Highway Department to accept the advice * * *." Or when they note that part of the job is to sell a program to the Siamese, one operational goal for the 1959 health program, which we designed, is "to secure official backing of the Thai Government."

It crops up in conversation, polite and courteous though the Siamese be. By any abstract standards it may be progress to fill in the dirty, old klongs (or canals) that once made Bangkok the Venice of the East. But it's bound to seem a mixed blessing to poor people who once could move readily by boat and now have to forage for some kind of motor transport for the modern boulevards.

The Government officials with whom the visitor talks are not unmindful of the value of dollar bills, but nonetheless they can be a little rueful of all that comes with them. Some of what comes with the dollars is the feeling that the Americans are meddling in everything. And sometimes what comes are real practical problems.

One such practical problem is inflation. Since every country nowadays (including the United States) has an inflation problem, Thailand might have one without our help. But our help does intensify it. The U.S. aid also intensifies the management problems of the Thai Government by increasing the number and the scope of tasks undertaken by the Government. Furthermore, the Thais could not possibly keep up such a program without the United States; so some of them are beginning to wonder if the Americans will not have to stay forever.

This last feeling is met quite frequently once the visitor gets outside the Government offices. Among the people, who may not see how helpful the Americans are being, it is even easier to find a kind of weary wishing that they would just all go home.

One friendly Siamese, with a twinkle in his eye, put it to his American visitor this way: "I suppose we ought to be glad that you are helping us, but we do wish you wouldn't help us so hard."

So here is the U.S. aid program to Thailand, a classic miniature of our economic-aid programs. It's small in dollars, perhaps, but it's plainly big in ideas. And, as this visitor says farewell to Bangkok, it is with a growing sense of wonder at what we think we are trying to do all over the world.

The Fight To Save Sunday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1959

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently I read an article in the April issue of Catholic Digest entitled "The Fight To Save Sunday." The subhead of the article is "If It Becomes Just Another Day To Make a Buck, Everyone Will Suffer."

Considering the importance of this article, I ask permission to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD to include the text of this article. The article as it appeared in the Catholic Digest is as follows:

THE FIGHT TO SAVE SUNDAY—IF IT BECOMES JUST ANOTHER DAY TO MAKE A BUCK, EVERYONE WILL SUFFER

(By Elliott W. Robbins)

I had been told that I might find a flagrant example of business-as-usual on Sunday near Paramus, N.J. The cop who took my 50-cent toll on the George Washington Bridge (between New York City and Fort Lee, N.J.) explained just how to get there along Route 4. The time was a little before noon on a Sunday in mid-November.

When I arrived a few minutes later I found that the large shopping center—with its branch department stores, carwash service, discount carpet shop, and seat-cover outfit—was shut tight. There were no cars in the parking lot, no visible signs of activity.

I was only mildly surprised. I knew that the Holy Name Society of the Church of the Annunciation in Paramus had passed a resolution opposing unnecessary business on Sundays. Later, I learned that the local citizens had voted decisively to close things up.

Arthur Mannebach, chairman of the committee of the New York Professional Sodality, had informed me that almost every one of the 49 States has laws banning Sunday business. The laws would be enforced, he said, wherever citizens made an issue of enforcement.

A mile or two farther on my journey, I turned left on Route 46. Here, apparently, was an area where no issue had been made of Sunday business. I stopped near a highway store for women's and children's apparel. To judge from the eight cars out front, business was light. Inside the store, music was playing. Two small children were rocking on a teeter-totter that operated when you put a dime in the slot.

A little farther down the highway I hit the jackpot: a big shopping center wide open. Parking spaces were filling up rapidly. An outdoor speaker was going full blast. As I got close enough to see the vegetable concessions and soft-drink bars, I could hear what was being broadcast: a church service from a gospel tabernacle.

Inside, I found a carnival-like atmosphere. Each concession seemed to have its own radio. There were booths selling men's clothing, hardware, books and magazines, and religious articles. A pitchman was demonstrating a child's parachute toy, all the while making an eerie sound with a kazoo. Vendors of Italian sausage rolls were handing out the stuff as fast as they could put them up.

The forces of business-as-usual on Sunday go blithely on their way, helped immeasurably by the fact that many competitors close on Sunday. They beckon to the housewife with newspaper ads and radio commercials that urge her to bring the family and to buy big-name merchandise at terrific discounts. Signs advertise coffee at 20 cents below market price. This is the come-on. The establishments make their big money on refrigerators and TV sets, which nobody needs to buy on Sunday. The shops are open, most of them, from 9 to 9 the other 6 days of the week, too.

Governor Meyner, of New Jersey, last August signed a new law banning Sunday business. The unsophisticated visitor, finding a shopping center still doing business on a Sunday in November, might well ask what the score is. Many a conscientious store owner could ask the same question.

The answer, in a word, is "confusion." New Jersey's old Sunday law banned practically everything except business involving charity or emergency. Police looked the

other way where certain types of violations were concerned and when activity was slight. Then came the development of huge highway shopping centers, often located where their taxes give them a disproportionate influence on township officials.

Merchants in the regular business districts found business being drained away. They called for enforcement of the law. Police listened sympathetically. Then a discovery was made. The law provided no penalties. When violators pressed the point, the New Jersey Supreme Court decided that the law had no force.

Chief Justice Vanderbilt did not agree. In his minority opinion, he warned that the decision could "affect both living and business in almost every municipality of the State." After describing the Sunday business problem as one of the most far-reaching problems ever to come before the court, he declared that the situation was one where sound business standards were degenerating into the "business ethics of the jungle."

A provision in the law had provided that a local community could add penalties by passing a referendum which modified the law. Some communities had done so. The modification provided for sale of such items as newspapers, milk, prepared foods, as well as for the operation of restaurants, gas stations, and other "necessities."

In 1955, the Advocate, official organ of the Archdiocese of Newark, began a campaign to preserve Sunday as a day for worship and family life. It sent registered letters to New Jersey State legislators asking their opinions on the Sunday situation. For a number of issues it published the replies: pro, con, and fence-straddling. Eventually the legislators went through the motions of preparing another Sunday law, with penalties, but they excepted three shoreline counties which contain resort areas like Atlantic City.

The legislators were "off the hook." They had passed a law against Sunday business. But the legality of the new law has been challenged because it makes exceptions for three counties. And while the issue remains in doubt, shops in many areas run wide open on Sundays.

The situation threatens to destroy many small independent merchants located in the regular business districts and to hurt even the large stores. These businesses have served their customers for years, given support to local charities, and paid their share of taxes for State and municipal services.

George S. Hochberg, a New Jersey lawyer, went out one Sunday to demonstrate what could be bought when regular stores are closed. In drugstores and gas stations he purchased camera film, flash bulbs, a Scrabble set, a hula hoop, a Polaroid camera and camera print machine, car wax, a ball-point pen, a whiskbroom, and stationery. At a local golf club he found golf hats and shirts for sale. He reports that he could have bought clocks, lunch boxes, and luggage. All these products, he says, compete directly with what his client sells. His findings show why some people think effective Sunday laws must be commodity laws governing the sale of specific products.

Many reputable concerns not only observe Sunday closing laws, but enthusiastically advocate them. William J. Kent, Jr., president of the large Bohack grocery chain, declares, "We believe that our people are entitled to this day to relax, and to give attention to their religious duties and to their home obligations." He cites economic arguments for Sunday closing: "I believe that a 7-day week would result in such added expense to the individual that it would actually raise the price of food. That would be bad for the customers and bad for the general economy."

Bruce Gimbel, president of Gimbel Bros., says that he most emphatically is opposed to Sunday selling. Since his stores have food and restaurant sections which could legally remain open, the question is not just an academic one for him.

George W. Dowdy, president of the National Retail Merchants Association, and J. S. Mack, head of the Variety Stores Association, both warn of the destructive nature of Sunday selling. Mr. Dowdy says that Sundays "make no contribution to the good name of retailing, perform no vital service for the vast majority of customers, and contribute little to the Nation's economy. They create public relations difficulties for retailing, and contribute mightily to the industry's problems of personnel relations and recruitment."

Civic and religious organizations opposing Sunday business include the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the Protestant Council of New York, the National Catholic Welfare Conference, and the Lord's Day Alliance.

New Jersey is only one of the States that have Sunday business problems. In Ohio, Bishop George J. Rehring of Toledo has denounced the desecration of Sunday. His protest came as the result of an announcement that a large supermarket chain planned to open six more of its shopping centers for Sunday business. In Billings, Mont., Protestant and Catholic churches sponsored a series of newspaper advertisements protesting against Sunday business as usual.

Labor is generally against Sunday work. Many contracts, like that of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Food Handlers in Wisconsin, contain clauses against Sunday work or specify double time for Sunday. Businessmen and workers alike want a day of rest, undisturbed by thoughts of business being snatched away by competitors who remain open while they are closed.

Sunday closing is by no means just a religious issue. The desire for a day of rest is confined neither to Christians nor to people on this side of the Iron Curtain. A member of the Russian delegation to the UN told me that in Russia the usual policy is for nobody to work on Sunday. (This policy has nothing to do with religion, he hastily assured me; it is simply based on the conviction that everybody needs a day off.)

One of the arguments of the Sunday law violators is that, after all, "those who believe that Sunday should be a day of rest can stay closed." Illinois Chief Justice Hershey has demolished this argument. "If there is to be a cessation from business or labor at a particular time," Chief Justice Hershey wrote, "a day for that purpose must be designated for all, and not one day for some and another day for others, even though the one selected is regarded by the majority of the people as their Sabbath or day of rest. This involves no religious discrimination, since the Sunday regulation is based fundamentally on civil and not religious considerations. It is a regulation of business to promote the moral and physical welfare, and is valid as an exercise of the police power."

Of course, there will always be opportunists who see in Sunday business a chance to make big profits fast. One large store has declared it is worth a quarter of a million dollars a year to stay open on Sunday. In a sense, the situation offers the same kind of opportunity as existed under the old prohibition law. When the established liquor dealers were out of business, bootleggers found a huge demand for illegal sales, and the whole underworld empire grew from the profits.

Consistent enforcement of laws is essential if Sunday is to be saved from opportunists. But successful enforcement of Sunday laws depends on the public's determination to regard Sunday as a genuine day of rest; as a day for family activities and religious observance. So the problem comes down, in part at least, to a question of education. How can a decent attitude toward Sunday be fostered.

The New York Professional Sodality has shown the way for Catholics. That organization of business and professional men and women has drawn up a Sunday code. It calls for family worship at Mass, no unnecessary buying or selling, no servile work. Other groups can establish similar programs to rescue Sunday from those who have adopted the just-another-day-to-make-a-buck philosophy.

Second City in United States of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Peoria Journal Star sets out very graphically the size and growth of the Federal bureaucracy by referring to it in size as the "second city in the United States of America." Those of us who have long been foes of a big centralized Federal Government are happy to have editorial support in this form, although with due respect to the present Republican administration, I should like to point out that the 2,361,000 men and women now on the civilian payroll of the Federal Government are 288,400 fewer than were on the payroll when this administration took over the reins of government in January 1953 from Harry S. Truman. Senator BYRD's own report of January 1953 discloses that at that time the civilian Federal payroll numbered 2,649,400. In other words, notwithstanding all the talk of a growing Federal bureaucracy, the number of Federal employees has not increased in the past 6 years under Republican administration, but has been decreased better than a quarter of a million even during the period when we have been experiencing an unprecedented growth in the overall economy:

[From the Peoria Journal Star, Apr. 13, 1959]

SECOND CITY IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

New York City still is the largest city in the United States but Chicago and Los Angeles can quit squabbling over which is second largest. Neither one of them is.

Bigger than either Chicago or Los Angeles is an imaginary city called Federalville. It's made up of the people on the Federal payroll and their families. Right now, according to an estimate made by Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, it numbers at least 5,489,325. And it's still growing. It seems only a matter of time until it will surpass New York also.

Senator BYRD reaches his figures this way: He says that the Federal payroll now totals 2,361,000 men and women. Assuming half of these are unmarried and taking the Census Bureau's estimate of 3.65 persons in the average American household for the other half, you get the figure of 5,489,325.

This means that our Federal taxes are providing the salaries on which live as many

people as reside in the city of Chicago. The monthly Federal payroll is estimated at a billion dollars.

Senator BYRD, who long has been the leading advocate of economy in government, says that more than 150,000 of these Federal jobs could be abolished wtihout reducing efficiency in the slightest.

But we aren't reducing jobs; we seem to be increasing the number. That's why even New York's population figure isn't safe from being passed by the fastest-growing municipality in the United States—Federalville.

It's time we put a stop to the increase in Federal jobs and began trying to see to it that we keep Federalville in second place.

Modernization of the Public Land Townsite Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 20, 1959

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following extract from an executive communication from Assistant Secretary of the Interior Roger Ernst, with which was enclosed a draft of a proposed bill to consolidate, revise, and reenact the public land townsite laws. I have introduced the bill as H.R. 6290.

Under the public land townsite laws, there were created thousands of our prosperous western towns and cities of today. However, only one townsite in the Western States has been created under the general townsite laws since World War II—the town of Wallula, Wash., on the shores of the reservoir created by McNary Dam.

For several decades, the public land townsite laws have practically gone into disuse in the south 48 States, although continuing active in Alaska. Nonuse is partly due to the obsolete character of many provisions. More importantly perhaps is the preoccupation of the public and so-called land locators with the Small Tract Act. The administration of the latter act has been shown in hearings conducted by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in California in 1957 to be an inefficient means of passing title to public land home and business sites in areas of rapid urban and suburban growth.

The purpose of H.R. 6290 is explained in the extract, which follows:

Over the years the Congress has enacted a series of laws providing for the withdrawal, location, use, and disposal of townsites upon the public domain. The varying procedures prescribed by these laws are partially interdependent, partially alternative, and partially unrelated. Many of the provisions of these laws have become obsolete by reason of such circumstances as changes in other provisions of the public land laws, disposition of substantially all the public lands within a particular category upon which a particular set of provisions was designed to operate, or development of new and better techniques for townsite planning and management that have caused the public to lose interest in employing the older and less advantageous techniques. Practical experience has also revealed a number of particulars in which the existing laws are ambiguous, contradictory, incomplete, or otherwise in need of technical improvement. In short, the time is now ripe for a comprehensive revision of the townsite laws in their entirety.

The proposed bill is designed to establish an integrated up-to-date set of legal rules to govern the administration of public land townsites throughout the United States. While the chief needs for townsites are in Alaska, nevertheless situations that call for the creation or enlargement of townsites also arise from time to time elsewhere in the United States. The provisions of the proposed bill are patterned upon those features of the present laws that have worked best in actual practice and that appear to offer the most favorable opportunities for encouraging the formation and growth of needed communities. The bill also seeks to bring about a formal measure of local participation in all phases of townsite administration.

Proposed Purchase by Stutsman County of a Tract of Land Lying Adjacent to Jamestown Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Board of County Commissioners of Stutsman County, N. Dak., regarding a tract of land used by the Bureau of Reclamation and an offer to negotiate the purchase of the land.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED APRIL 7, 1959, BY THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF STUTSMAN COUNTY, N. DAK.

Whereas the United States of America, on April 24, 1952, acquired title in fee to the east half of the northeast quarter of section 23, township 140 north, range 64, west of the fifth principal meridian, Stutsman County, N. Dak., for use as borrow material in connection with the construction by the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, of the adjacent Jamestown Dam on the James River; and

Whereas the taking therefrom of large quantities of materials for said dam, long since completed, left a deep, ugly, and unsightly pit, dangerous and unsafe to life and health, a blemish on the improved reservoir area, and an eyesore to project visitors; and

Whereas it is believed that the Bureau of Reclamation has no further need of said tract, that its value is very small because of the deep excavation thereon and the high cost of refilling and leveling the same, and that the pit is fast becoming a nuisance because of the rapidly spreading, uncontrollable noxious weeds growing therein; and

Whereas the said board is desirous and anxious that Stutsman County, N. Dak., acquire said property for public purposes in connection with the park development in the reservoir area and for other public use: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Board of County Commissioners of the county of Stutsman and State of North Dakota, That the Secretary, Department of the Interior, be, and he hereby is, respectfully requested to determine and declare said property surplus and not required for the needs and the discharge of the responsibilities of Federal agencies; and be it further

Resolved, That the Administrator, General Services Administration, be, and he hereby is, respectfully requested to determine and declare said property surplus and not required for the needs and the discharge of the responsibilities of Federal agencies; and be it further

Resolved, That the county auditor transmit by certified mail authenticated copies hereof to project manager, Bureau of Reclamation, Bismarck, N. Dak.; regional director, region 6, Bureau of Reclamation, Billings, Mont.; Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation, Washington, D.C.; regional director, region 2, National Park Service, Omaha, Nebr.; Director, National Park Service, Washington, D.C.; regional commissioner, region 6, General Services Administration, Kansas City, Mo.; Secretary, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C.; Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C.; Governor of North Dakota, Bismarck, N. Dak.; Senators WILLIAM LANGER and MILTON R. YOUNG, and Representatives QUENTIN N. BURDICK and DON L. SHORT, Washington, D.C.

Approved:

ALBERT BREDAHL,
Chairman of the Board of County Commissioners.

Attest:

GEORGE WHITNEY,
County Auditor.

Flood Control in Sandusky River Watershed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. D. BAUMHART, JR.
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. BAUMHART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by the Thurston-Zwir Post, No. 121, of the American Legion in Fremont, Ohio, one of the sections in my 13th Congressional District hardest hit by the latest flood disaster of this spring. The resolution speaks for itself, and is an expression of the deepest feelings of my constituents regarding their desperate need for relief in the form of flood-control projects.

The loss and damage to property, both real and personal, has been of the severest type, and has caused intense suffering hand hardship throughout my district. This in turn has extended to other areas in the State, and we all rightfully feel our plea for the necessary funds to carry out proper flood control is most legitimate.

I therefore present this resolution, on behalf of the Thurston-Zwir Post, No. 121, of the American Legion, of Fremont, Ohio, and commend it to the attention

of the entire Congress of the United States:

RESOLUTION: FLOOD CONTROL IN THE SANDUSKY RIVER DRAINAGE AREA OF NORTHWESTERN OHIO

Whereas the city of Fremont, and parts of Sandusky County, Ohio, suffered and experienced a heavy loss of, and damage to property, as a result of two disastrous floods of the Sandusky River, in January and February 1959, both within a space of 3 weeks time; and

Whereas the city of Fremont, and parts of Sandusky County, Ohio, have suffered from heavy losses of property in the past, from many disastrous floods of the Sandusky River; and

Whereas business and industry in the city of Fremont, have suffered heavy losses in real property, equipment, machinery, tools, goods, trade and services, in both of the 1959 floods, and floods of the past; and

Whereas residential property owners and citizens of the city of Fremont have experienced great losses in real and personal property, in the two floods of 1959, and floods of the past; and

Whereas the danger and risk of floods in the city of Fremont, from the Sandusky River, discourages, deters and prevents the location of new industries and business in this city: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of Thurston-Zwir Post No. 121, Inc., the American Legion, Department of Ohio, in regular session assembled at Fremont, Ohio, to petition and solicit the Congress of the United States of America, to authorize and appropriate the necessary funds and moneys, for surveying, dredging, cleaning, straighten, and widen the Sandusky River, from the Sandusky Bay to the city of Fremont; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States of America, authorize and appropriate the necessary funds and moneys, for surveying and aiding in the construction of dikes, dams, reservoirs, and the like, along by the Sandusky River, in the counties of Sandusky, Seneca, Wyandot, and Crawford, to prevent floods in cities and communities located along side of the Sandusky River, from Bucycrus to Fremont; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded by mail to the folowing: Hon. A. DAVID BAUMHART, Member of Congress from 13th Ohio District; Hon. FRANK J. LAUSCHE, U.S. Senator from Ohio; Hon. STEPHEN M. YOUNG, U.S. Senator from Ohio; the American Legion, Department of Ohio; Chamber of Commerce, Flood Control Action Committee.

Adopted by unanimous vote of the post, this 6th day of April 1959.

RICHARD G. NUHFER,
Commander.
CARL H. STROUP,
Acting Adjutant.

GTA Daily Radio Roundup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the GTA Daily Radio Roundup broadcasts of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association of St. Paul, Minn., on April 10 and 13, 1959.

There being no objection, the text of the broadcasts was orderd to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GTA DAILY RADIO ROUNDUP OF APRIL 10, 1959

How big is a farm? We hear so much talk these days about farmers and farm problems and Government farm budgets that it is worth taking a look at the facts.

Actually, it requires surprisingly little in the way of either area or agricultural activity to be classified as a farm. Officially, any place of three or more acres is a farm if it raises as much as $150 worth of produce a year exclusive of the garden. An even smaller acreage can be classified as a farm if it has production worth $250.

Obviously, any operation that size, or even two or three or four or five times that size, is not a farm in the sense that we talk about farming. It is estimated that there are about 4.5 million farms in the United States today and at least 1 million of them are farms only by the grace of statistical measurement. They might be small acreages owned by people who work in the city and live in the country—"hobby acres" sort of thing. In some parts of the country a few people may even scratch out a sowbelly existence on a few acres. But that's a social problem, not a farm problem.

And these tiny units have every right to exist. This is a free country. If a city man enjoys dabbling in the earth nothing should prevent him. But let's not call this weekend retreat a farm. Let's draw a line between farms that are operated to support a family and acres that are operated for fun or as a sideline.

That leaves maybe 3.5 million farms. About 5 percent of these have nothing to do with families. They are corporation farms. Some examples of the biggest of these are Seabrook Farms in the East, the British-owned Delta & Pine Land Co. in the South—and Campbell in Montana. Most of these giant operations are admirably equipped to take care of themselves.

The real backbone of American agriculture is found in the 3-million-plus commercial family farms. These are the farms that are doing the most efficient and economical job of feeding 173 million Americans and many millions of people overseas.

But they are in trouble. Many family farmers are forced to work off the farm to keep going. The reason is simple enough. Farm prices are too low, farm operating costs have never been higher.

This is the farm problem. So far it has defied solution. But a solution must soon be found because if the family farmers cannot survive the corporations will take over and industry's "administered prices" will be brought to the farm markets. That would be a sorry day for consumers.

These family farmers are tackling their own problem with every weapon at hand. They are organizing and sending their spokesmen to Washington seeking better farm laws. They know that the organized farmer has the best chance to survive.

And they are using their cooperatives more and more to gain even greater marketing and supply efficiency. They are building up and redirecting their co-ops to meet the challenge of bigness in business. That's why GTA is expanding and moving into new fields. So join your neighbors. Join the family farmers who are organizing to help themselves—GTA the co-op way.

GTA DAILY RADIO ROUNDUP OF APRIL 13, 1959

One of the big national farm magazines blushed all over its editorial face the other day. It took an opinion poll of farmers and with great fanfare announced the results. But things didn't turn out the way the magazine said they would.

In its April issue this magazine said that its poll showed 55 percent of its 3.5 million farm readers want no controls, no floors, and no price supports. Instead, they want the Government to "clear out of farming."

To quote a sentence from the magazine: "This poll reveals that the South's farmers are no longer the high price support and strict control advocates they once were assumed to be."

But no sooner had the magazine hit the mailboxes than results of this spring cotton referendum came out. They tallied up just about opposite from the findings of the magazine poll. The overwhelming majority voted for plan A, the longstanding program of acreage allotments with a higher support. Only 15 percent voted for plan B, which called for overplanting with only a token price support.

So opinion polls have their hazards. Maybe people have a way of saying one thing and doing another. Or maybe the farmers were just poking fun at the opinion testers.

But we suspect that the cotton farmers were dead serious about the way they voted in their referendum—just like the wheat farmers who have always voted around 95 percent in this area to stick by their wheat program.

The Wall Street Journal, the eastern businessman's newspaper, was perplexed enough to send its reporters into the cotton areas to find out the "why and wherefore" of the vote. One Texas farmer said he voted for acreage allotments because "it's the difference between making a little money and losing a lot." Another cotton farmer, in Arkansas, said he voted for plan A because it is "safer and saner." Overplanting just doesn't make sense, he told the Wall Street Journal reporter, "what with the extra expense for insecticides, fertilizer, and labor. I'd end up with less money than under the allotment plan. I'd be planting those extra acres just for fun."

A farm manager of 1,576 acres in south Texas said his operation would "go in the red" under plan B, even though it would let him plant 40 percent more acres to cotton. Plan B, incidentally, was highly favored by the administration and Secretary of Agriculture Benson. But the cotton farmers turned it down. They voted to hold back on production.

So this appears to be more evidence that farmers are willing and eager to abide by intelligent production controls. But in return they need a decent break on prices or price supports. And that's a reminder that farm prices are made in Washington and that in just about 1 month now Secretary Benson must announce the alternative plans he'll offer wheat farmers in the wheat referendum next June. That will decide what's going to happen on wheat in 1960. It will be another serious decision for farmers.

But while farm prices are being made in Washington—remember to keep your co-ops growing—GTA the co-op way.

The Right To Earn Versus Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 23, 1959

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an

article from the May 1959 issue of the Journal of Lifetime Living, by Dwight S. Sargent, entitled "The Right To Earn Versus Social Security."

In this piece, Mr. Sargent brings out the fact that many elderly people need the extra earnings they might make, over and above their social security. I think it is worthy of my colleagues' attention.

The article is as follows:

THE RIGHT TO EARN VERSUS SOCIAL SECURITY

(By Dwight S. Sargent)

Few people these days question the value of social security. But let's talk about one phase of social security which I think should be changed.

In the midthirties when the social security system began, our country was in a depression. Jobs were hard to get. So, one of the then legitimate objectives of the social security program was to get workers of 65 and over out of the labor market to make room for younger workers.

At the time there was considerable discussion whether social-security benefits should start at age 65 or at 70. Without much doubt, the need to make room for younger employees was a strong argument for selecting the lower age figure of 65.

Accordingly, the first retirement test rules required an applicant for social security to return his check for any month in which he earned $15 or over. But since 1937, when the first social-security payments were made, this $15 sum has been progressively increased to the present $100 a month ($1,200 yearly) which may be earned without the loss of a month's social-security benefit.

We all know what is going on today. By and large, men 65 or older and women 62 or older do not accept part- or full-time jobs which would pay them over $100 a month—because if they did, they would lose their social-security benefits for that month. And no one can blame them.

TYPICAL CASES

Consider a man of 65 with a wife aged 60. Let's say he is drawing $116.50 from social security and is offered a part-time job at $40 a week. Ignoring the tax angle, he figures that if he accepts the $40 a week job he will actually net only $15.40 from it because he will lose 11 social security checks a year. He decides he won't do $40 worth of work for $15.50, and declines the job. As a guess, maybe 35 percent of all men his age are in the same position.

But it is even worse if the same man has a wife aged 62, or older. In that case, his gross improvement by working would be only about $3 a week, for both he and his wife would lose their social-security benefits. Possibly 60 percent of the men aged 65 fall in this category.

Now let's say this same man has a wife and children under 18, and that he now receives a combined total of $254 a month in social-security benefits. Taking a $40 a week job under these conditions would mean a loss of some $13 a week, for he would lose 11 of his 12 social-security checks.

In short, under our present system one is penalized for being useful. For doing more, he gets less. I feel that it should be just the opposite. The rules should provide an incentive for being productive.

I base this on the premise that the average man who works and earns is an asset to the Nation, whereas the average retiree is pretty much of a liability. If our older citizens were encouraged to do more in order to have more, the number that would then go back to work would increase the productive total of the country and decrease its liabilities.

No one seems to know how many people now collecting social security benefits would actually go back to work if the present rules were reasonably liberalized. Some believe that the $100 now allowed is adequate. They argue that many of our people drawing social security are disabled and can't work anyway, while most of the balance can't, or don't want to, earn more than the present allowance. But on the other hand, there are many older people now in the working force who would probably retire and draw benefits if the law were liberalized to permit larger earnings in retirement. This, in turn, would raise the costs of the program to the taxpayers.

Let's Eliminate Roadblocks in Interstate Highway System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD a letter from Mr. George C. England, mayor of the city of Inglewood, Calif.

The city official, I believe, clearly sets forth the problems imposed on the completion of the Interstate Highway System by the pay-as-you-go plan provided for in the Highway Revenue Act of 1956. The adverse effect of this proviso is and will be felt by many other communities faced with traffic congestion.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I respectfully urge my colleagues to give full consideration to the following letter:

LETTER FROM MR. GEORGE C. ENGLAND, MAYOR OF THE CITY OF INGLEWOOD, CALIF.

APRIL 8, 1959.

Hon. JAMES ROOSEVELT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROOSEVELT: The Inglewood City Council, at their meeting on April 7, requested that I write to you, urging your support of measures to insure completion of the Interstate Highway System during the 16 year construction period originally planned and repealing the so-called Byrd amendment of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956.

It is our opinion that provision should be made for the highway trust fund to borrow from the Treasury to make up shortages as they occur, to be repaid from the trust fund with interest, in later years as surpluses occur.

The pay as you go plan provided for in the Byrd amendment will seriously undermine essential highway improvements in our State. The problem in Inglewood has been particularly severe, with a great many of our streets carrying traffic volumes of 25,000 vehicles and over, per day. The majority of this traffic is through traffic from aircraft plants, defense and other industries surrounding the Los Angeles International Airport and other sections of the county; as well as traffic of visitors from all over the United States to the beaches and other seaside attractions.

The freeway program in our area is the only means which we know of that will assist in solving this serious problem. These freeways are being financed, in part, by the Interstate Highway construction program and any delay in appropriations will, of necessity, delay the construction of these facilities so essential to the entire economy of our area. In addition, it would disrupt the orderly prosecution of work already planned and would seriously undermine the engineering organization of our California Division of Highways.

We know you are cognizant of the critical need of an adequate highway system as an integral part of the national system of Interstate and Defense Highways and that the economy of our country is substantially dependent upon the early completion of this system. While our particular problem is only one of many thousands, to us it is critical and demands a solution.

We will appreciate your consideration of our comments on this most important matter.

Sincerely,

GEORGE C. ENGLAND,
Mayor.

Forgotten Warriors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an interesting article with reference to the Spanish-American War, which appeared in the National Tribune-The Stars and Stripes recently.

FORGOTTEN WARRIORS

Ask the average young man or woman in high school or even college today what they know about the Spanish-American War and the chances are they will not know what you are talking about.

We will go a little further on the subject. Ask the average Member of Congress about the Spanish-American War and he or she may recall that they passed a law or laws limiting the date of that particular conflict from April 1898 to July 4, 1902. These are the limiting dates of the War with Spain, the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection.

The fact is overlooked that from July 4, 1902, to December 31, 1913, many thousands of Americans fought the fiercest of wars against fanatical Moros and other tribes in the Philippines.

Not a war? Ask the man who fought in tropical jungles against the hatred of their opponents in heat and rain, with forced marches, often without sufficient rations, and almost always without proper medical care.

From time to time there have been introduced bills which would give these servicemen the same rights as are now enjoyed by the men who fought between April 1898 and July 4, 1902. These bills have been good bills. Sometimes they have been passed by the House but bypassed in the Senate.

There is actually a precedent which is worthy of consideration when it comes to a decision on these measures. It may be recalled that during the Indian Wars men who had fought against hostile Indians in the winning of the West were granted pensions. Those who did not leave their home camps or forts and who did not participate in these Indian campaigns were not granted a pension but those who took part in the cam-

paigns were given pensions because they had fought with the so-called hostiles.

Surely, never did any man fight against more fierce and hostile tribes than did the men who fought between July 4, 1902 and December 31, 1913, in the Philippines.

Surprise attacks, massacres, bolos flung in the darkness of night, along with the fierce heat of the tropics, were but part of their service. But they are denied recompense for this service because of the present delimiting dates.

It is time that their service was recognized and in their behalf the National Tribune-The Stars and Stripes asks Congress to lose no more time in recognizing that service. Let us not make fish of one and fowl of the other. If service against hostile Indians in the West is worthy of reward so, also, is service in the Philippines between July 4, 1902 and December 31, 1913. It is high time to right a wrong which has long existed. This is as good a time as any.

Inflation: Cause and Cure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JESSICA McC. WEIS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 23, 1959

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, last week I received one of the most intelligently written, thought provoking letters it has been my privilege to read since becoming a Member of the House.

Because it was written by a resident of my congressional district, because it deals with one of the most serious problems confronting this country, and because it deserves the careful attention of every thinking American, I am pleased to include in today's RECORD the letter which I have received from Mr. Milburn E. Wilson, of Rochester, N.Y.:

GERBER BABY FOODS,
April 8, 1959.

Hon. JESSICA McC. WEIS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. WEIS: My personal concern about the deep inroads that are being made on sound economy by inflation prompts me to write to you at this time. My friends, business associates, and others I come in contact with from day to day join me in this concern. The threat of inflation today is greater than ever, and unless positive action is taken by the Congress to turn the tide immediately the value of the dollar—already seriously devalued—could become well-nigh worthless.

The President has made a plea to the Congress for a balanced budget in 1960. I am sure this is a sincere plea and one that should be heeded in all deliberations. The President has also made a sincere plea to labor leaders and business leaders to hold the line on wages and prices.

No one will deny the theory that it is desirable to raise our standard of living. But to do so by forcing prices ever higher defeats the purpose and soon will come the day of reckoning.

Labor unions continue to demand and get wage increases that go beyond increases in productivity. Sumner Slichter, Harvard economics professor, estimates that in recent years hourly compensation of employees (including fringe benefits) has risen more than twice as fast as output per man-hour. Jules Backman, professor of economics at New York University, estimates that in the years 1956–57 average hourly earnings in manufacturing industries, including fringe benefits, were increasing at a rate of 6 to 7 percent a year, while output per man-hour was increasing at a rate of less than 1 percent per year.

Our thinking today with regard to taxation, spending, paternalism, and more taxation has destroyed all incentive for improvement, investment, and positive thinking for the betterment of all the people.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics can furnish you with excellent information to show that historically prices go down after wars and during recessions. But after the price inflations of World War II and Korea prices did not fall. Neither did they fall during last year's sharp recession. This is food for thought, and we must find the means to break this trend. William McChesney Martin, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, has said: "This battle against inflation is at a crucial point."

How is it possible for anyone to plan his financial future when we are confronted with the following facts:

Item	1946 price	1958 price	Total rise
			Percent
Milk, quart	$0.17	$0.25	47
Bread	.10	.19	90
Coffee, pound	.34	.93	173
Bus fares	.079	.162	105
Movie tickets	.40	.50	25
Gasoline, gallon	.147	.22	50
Coal, ton	15.97	29.14	82
Steel, pound	.027	.06	122
Copper, pound	.14	.25	78
Lumber, board foot	.04	.12	200
Auto (Chevrolet)	1,081.00	2,600.00	140
Tuition alone (year)	150.00	502.00	235

Consider the impact, on retirees with fixed incomes (and their numbers are swelling annually because of the extension of life expectancy), of the above figures.

What can be done about all this? Let's take a look at what England is doing in contrast. For 11 years after the end of World War II, prices rose there at the rate of 4 to 5 percent a year. People got the idea that continually rising prices was a normal way of life. Then in the fall of 1957 the government took a firm stand against this trend. The traditional weapons against inflation were dusted off and sent to battle. The rediscount rate was allowed to soar to 7 percent. Government spending on capital improvements was cut back to the previous year's level, and a limitation was put on installment buying. A council was appointed to closely watch the results of this program. Recently, that council reported that the program was a success. Installment loan restrictions did check the rise in sales of consumer goods. Higher interest rates and bank credit restrictions did reduce the amount of business borrowings. Government capital outlays restrictions did prevent spending from rising as fast as it had been. Profits also rose more slowly. There were few wage increases, and the average rise was smaller. There was an easing of demand for labor. The number of married women working declined and so did overtime. But unemployment never went much higher than 2 percent, and production went up a little. Inflation was dampened down, and prices leveled off. And no one suffered seriously in the process.

The Wall Street Journal for Thursday, April 2, 1959, on page 24 contains an article titled "British Report Indicates Nation Has Come Out of Slump Into Biggest Boom in Years." It is well worth your reading as it is further evidence that inflation can be controlled with commonsense thinking and without crushing any segment of the public. The article states that "prices hardly changed at all last year."

I do not intend to have this letter contain nothing but destructive criticism and without some note of suggestions for positive action for the immediate future, so here are some steps that I believe should be taken:

1. The Congress must insist that the Government live within its means.

2. The executive branch must be able to live within a balanced budget and work toward eliminating present debt.

3. The Federal Reserve Board must be encouraged to throw its weight against inflation without fear of criticism from any quarter.

4. Organized labor must be made to understand that wage increases, including fringe benefit increases, be geared to increased productivity.

5. Businessmen, especially large industrial companies, must exert every effort to hold prices down.

6. The public must be willing to accept a program leading to a stable price level and thus must be properly informed so that it would be willing to accept it.

I feel that a sound program against inflation will also serve to cure many of our other ills, such as juvenile delinquency; for, among other things, it will alleviate the necessity for the married woman with children to continue working and stay at home where she is sorely needed.

Sincerely yours,

GERBER PRODUCTS CO.,
MILBURN E. WILSON,
Office Manager.

Loyalty Oaths and Patriotism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, this session has seen the introduction of measures to amend the National Defense Education Act to eliminate the negative disclaimer affidavit, a provision which is a negative approach in the matter of loyalty and in contradiction to our constitutional concepts.

One of the most able speeches on the subject of loyalty was made by my charming and competent colleague, Congresswoman EDITH GREEN, on the floor of the House on March 9.

As one of the many who has introduced legislation to amend the National Defense Education Act in the matter of the negative disclaimer affidavit and as one who commends my associate for her incisive and needed comments, I am more than pleased to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the March 31, 1959 issue of the monthly publication of

the United Papermakers and Paperworkers, AFL–CIO:

A LECTURE LONG DUE

Our most enjoyable reading last month was the speech of Congresswoman EDITH GREEN, Democrat of Oregon, attacking the notion that loyalty oaths are a protection against communism.

A former schoolmarm, Mrs. GREEN delivered what was, in effect, a lecture on constitutional intent to her colleagues—more than that, it was a lesson in positive (as opposed to negative) patriotism.

She directed their attention to that section of the Constitution which says "no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust."

Then Mrs. GREEN explained the climate in which that constitutional guarantee had been drafted. The Founding Fathers, she explained, "hated and despised the only test oaths with which they were familiar in the age of autocracy in which they lived. That age was an age of intolerance in the religious field. They were determined that no such nonsense would plague the country they had founded.

"It has remained for our time to revive the principle of the test oath, not attaching it to religion, but to patriotism, and equally sacred emotion, and one, which like religion is too fine an expression of man's highest aspirations to be made a vehicle for the fears of the insecure."

The Oregon Congresswoman went on to point out that the first to seek camouflage by taking such an oath would be the very persons against whom the oath is directed. She reminded the House that the Communist "is bound in conscience by no oath."

On the contrary, she said, "It is not the Communist who refuses such oaths, it is the dedicated American, true to the grand oath which Jefferson swore—the oath of eternal hostility to every form of tyranny over the mind of man."

Mrs. GREEN places disclaimer oaths in their proper perspective. They are not merely un-American, they are patently anti-American. They represent an affront to the democratic heritage of this country, a heritage which protects the dissenter, the unorthodox, the nonconformist, and, in that protection, demonstrates the fundamental strength of our free political system.

Scripture and Benediction Offered by Acting Chaplain Rev. Charles W. Holland, Jr., B.D., Th. M., at the Dedication of the Robert A. Taft Memorial Tower, April 14, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Scripture and benediction offered by Acting Chaplain Rev. Charles W. Holland, Jr., B.D., Th. M., at the dedication of the Robert A. Taft Memorial Tower, April 14, 1959.

The Word of God says, "And even things without life giving sound, whether pipe or harp, except they give a distinction in the sounds, how shall it be known what is piped or harped?"

Omnipotent and omniscient God, eternal Father, we know that for centuries bells have been used for various purposes. They have been used to summon men to battle and yet again to ring out the message of liberty, they have been used to herald the approach of a great catastrophe, and yet to summon men to the peace and joy of worshiping Thee in Thy complete righteousness and purity.

We realize if there should be dissonance of jarring and unmodulated instrumental sounds, the message of these bells would not be understood. Dear God bless Thy children; that like these bells we might always sound a clear note which would echo the high ideals, rock-like integrity and unconquerable commonsense, of the one for whom this memorial has been erected. God bless his family, bless our President, and all the leaders of our great Nation to Thy glory, in Thy precious name we pray. Amen.

Improving State Welfare Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, although great improvement has been made in the welfare programs in this country during the past quarter century, experience has shown that much more needs to be done, especially in the State programs.

I am today introducing a bill providing for such improvements.

This bill is designed to alleviate the plight of those many families throughout the country who find themselves in need as a result of unemployment and other factors beyond their control and for whom no provision is now made under Federal law. This bill, which would authorize the Federal Government to assist the States in meeting the full range of needs now confronting their public welfare agencies, is similar to bills I have introduced in previous Congresses but is given a new urgency by the persistence of unemployment currently affecting some 5 million American workers and their families.

This bill, entitled the "Public Welfare Act," incorporates the recommendations of leading national welfare organizations representing both public and voluntary agencies. Taken together with the bill, H.R. 4700, previously introduced by me to extend health benefits to beneficiaries of the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program and the bill establishing minimum benefit standards in the unemployment insurance program which I am likewise supporting, this bill rounds out the program of immediate improvements in our total social security program urgently necessary to meet the most pressing needs today confronting large segments of our population. As such, the basic provisions in the bill have the support of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations; the American Public Welfare Association; the National Association of Social Workers, and other groups representing those affected by our social security measures.

We are rightfully proud of the steady growth in coverage and benefits under the social insurance aspects of the social security program and the extent to which this has reduced dependence on public assistance among the able-bodied aged, surviving widows, and the older disabled group. Last year improvements were also made in the financing of public assistance and in the child welfare program. But pride in progress cannot be allowed to blind us to the areas of insecurity and hardship that still remain. Extensive and persistent unemployment over the past year has served to remind us of the vulnerability of our working people to the hazards of the modern economy. We must move toward a national policy which, first, reduces the chances of any individual or family in the United States becoming needy but, second, provides its own built-in assurance that if this contingency befalls, provision will be made to meet those needs. This is the purpose of my bill.

Public welfare provides the ultimate protection to individuals under our total system of social security. When all other resources fail, it is to the State and local public welfare agencies that an individual must turn for help. If a worker cannot find a job, when his unemployment insurance rights and savings are exhausted he becomes dependent upon public assistance. If a worker or farmer or small businessman becomes ill, he may find his savings quickly exhausted in heavy medical and living expenses. Then he has no choice but to turn to his State or local public welfare office. But under the present assistance provisions of the Social Security Act the Federal Government takes no responsibility for assisting the public welfare agencies in meeting the needs of people who do not qualify under the four existing categorical programs of old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled. As a result, in most States provision for the needy unemployed is miserably inadequate and even, in some localities, virtually nonexistent. In other States with a heavy incidence of unemployment, funds for the purpose have been repeatedly exhausted despite every effort to make adequate provision. It is self-evident that the States with heavy and persistent unemployment not only have a disproportionate need but are in the worst fiscal position to meet that need from State and local resources.

Unemployment is an attribute of the national economy, and the development of policies to assure individual security is a national responsibility. The Federal Government should not only take steps to prevent unemployment and to assist depressed areas in making needed economic readjustments, but it should also assume its fair share of responsibility in protecting all its people, wherever they may live, against its hazards. The first line of defense is through a strengthened unemployment insurance program; the second is through a

strengthened program of public welfare which is the purpose of this bill.

Public welfare, under our Federal system of government, is the primary responsibility of the States and their political subdivision. The grant-in-aid system, which has developed extensively as an instrument of public policy since 1933, is designed to combine the advantages of decentralized administration with the broader financial base of the Federal Government and the need for basic national programs in areas of national concern. My bill, following this extremely successful principle, is designed to give the States the maximum latitude in adapting their own public welfare programs to changing needs. It does not affect the existing provisions of titles I, IV, V, and XIV of the Social Security Act but rather offers the States the option of combining all or part of these specialized public welfare programs for particular groups into a comprehensive program of aid for all needy persons and of needed social services. The administrative and policy advantages of such a simplified plan are obvious, especially to the individual in need of public welfare aid, who today often finds himself bewildered by a variety of agencies, eligibility standards, and requirements. Many State welfare policymakers and administrators would welcome the opportunity to move in this direction but are today prevented by the limitations of Federal law. On the other hand, there is no compulsion upon the States under my proposal to abandon any specialized welfare program which is felt to be serving the best interests of a particular group.

The rapid growth in our social insurance programs has created a substantial change in the character of the public welfare function which has not yet been reflected in changes in Federal and State law. Increasingly, public welfare is being called upon to meet the unusual or unpredictable situation or to provide for needs which have not yet been provided for through social insurance or other preventive measures. Thus, the nature of the public welfare task tends to change in emphasis. Today, for example, many retired OASDI beneficiaries are obliged to turn to public welfare for help when they become ill. But soon it is hoped we can provide hospital and related benefits for these people as a part of the insurance program. No one wants a large public welfare program, but we do want one which is sufficiently flexible and comprehensive to meet actual need as it occurs. The only way to do this is through legislation which provides the machinery, the policies, and the built-in financing provisions to meet such needs whenever they arise. We do not want to be confronted aagin with the need for emergency legislation as we were in 1933—or even last year, or again this year, with our unemployment insurance program. We want a strong institutional structure that can be quickly adapted to actual needs whether they arise from economic factors, social change, or disaster situations.

The State public welfare agencies have been handicapped in adapting their own programs and in making the best use of their own resources and personnel by the rigid compartmentalization and restrictive scope of Federal aid. This bill proposes to remedy this situation by providing the optional alternative of a single public welfare plan with more adaptable provisions relating to eligibility, financing, and scope of service. In return for this greater flexibility, States are required to provide assistance for all persons who qualify within their own standards of need without arbitrary exclusions such as those based on residence. The bill also recognizes the importance of individual determinations and service as an intrinsic element in all public welfare functions thus making it possible to bring about a closer coordination of all welfare programs in a single public welfare agency. The advantage of such a simplified approach to the person who needs help to the administrator, and to the public constitutes a major argument for giving early consideration to this proposal.

In the statement which follows a more detailed explanation of the provisions of this bill is given.

First. General: The bill provides a new title XVI for the Social Security Act under which a State could submit a comprehensive public welfare plan for assistance to needy persons and welfare services as defined in the bill. States that wish to do so could continue to operate programs of assistance under the existing provisions to titles I, IV, X, and XIV but the new matching provisions described below are applicable only to title XVI and the usual provision is made to preclude assistance payments to any individual under more than one title of the act. For most States the scope, flexibility, and financial provisions of title XVI would probably prove an inducement to change, but the optional feature would ease the transitional process and make it possible for a State, which wished to retain certain programs—as, for example, aid to the blind—on the present basis, to do so.

Second. Coverage for assistance: This bill makes it possible for a State to receive Federal aid for assistance to any needy person, including those who are in need because of unemployment, and not exclusively for those over 65, blind, permanently, and totally disabled, or those meeting the restrictive definition for aid to dependent children—as at present. Administration by categorical groups would, however, be optional with the States, provided the basis for establishing the categories was reasonable. Assistance could not, however, be paid to persons residing in public institutions other than medical institutions nor to patients in an institution for tuberculosis or mental disease.

Third. Financial ceilings or the maximum average payments subject to Federal aid would be increased to $75 a month for all adults and $50 for all children. Present maxima in old age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled are based on an average of $65 a month; in aid to dependent children the present ceiling is an average of $30 for each individual.

Fourth. A new and simplified system of matching would replace the present formulas. Under the proposed formula the total of all assistance payments—within the average ceilings as shown in 3 above—would receive a 62 percent Federal reimbursement in any State whose average per capita income was the same as that of the United States as a whole. For States above this average the percentage of Federal reimbursement would be proportionately decreased but would in no case fall below 50 percent. For States with a lower than average per capita income the percentage of Federal reimbursement would be proportionately increased but the maximum level of reimbursement would be 80 percent. Under this formula the needy in both the high and low income States would benefit: The former by the higher reimbursable ceilings and the latter by the higher rate of reimbursement.

Fifth. Welfare services provided by the public welfare agency would be subject to the same rate of reimbursement as assistance payments. Increasingly those persons turning to public welfare agencies for aid are those with special needs requiring knowledgeable service for their solution. Such service can often help speed the return of the individual to self-support, secure for him the care he needs from other sources, prevent serious or long-term future difficulties, and reduce the cost to the public of extended dependency. For example: Many people needing medical care or rehabilitative service do not know what provisions are available or how to go about applying for them: Many people are lingering in general or mental hospitals simply because they have no other place to go—and no one to help them find such a place; many people living in areas where their former source of livelihood has ceased to exist need help in moving to areas of new opportunity; many children might be saved from juvenile delinquency or other forms of costly social maladjustment if their parents received helpful guidance at the crucial time or—in cases where substitute family care was necessary—the child welfare services of the public welfare agency could make prompt and adequate provision for their adoptive or foster-care placement. An advantage of this bill to the child welfare program is the fact that it permits child welfare workers to apply assistance funds to the placement of needy children requiring foster care. The grave injustice done to this neediest group of children under the present act, which denies assistance to children not living with a close relative, was pointed out by the welfare report of the Commission on Inter-Governmental Relations.

Sixth. Simplified administration, with consequent benefits to those requiring public welfare aid as well as to those who do its work and pay its cost, is provided in this bill in several ways. Matching on the average of all payments, the optional elimination of categorical administration, and the provision of the same reimbursement formula for all types of aid would permit reduction in paperwork with subsequent reduction in the cost of overhead administration. The bill also requires that the program be administered by a single agency at each level of government. From the point of view of the individual or family requiring help the advantage of a single agency is obvious.

Seventh. Availability of benefits: The bill make is a condition of the broadened base of Federal financial assistance provided by this new title that its benefits should be available to all qualified persons without residence or citizenship requirements. No public welfare program can be considered to be fulfilling its function as the ultimate guarantee against individual need if it arbitrarily excludes needy persons solely because of their length of residence. The very factors that make it essential for the Federal Government to share the broad public welfare responsibilities of the States make it equally essential that such aid be available to all.

Eighth. The Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico: This bill rights a long-standing injustice toward our fellow American citizens in the Virgin Islands and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico by extending to these jurisdictions the same program provisions as apply in the States and Territories.

Ninth. Confidential assistance records: This bill restores to all persons receiving assistance under this title the protection formerly required by all titles that the facts concerning their receipt of assistance be treated as confidential information.

Tenth. Personnel training: The bill recognizes the serious shortages in qualified public welfare personnel by providing special financial aid on a continuing basis for training such personnel.

The Advent of the Common Law of England in the New World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, on May 17, 1959, the Virginia State bar will commemorate an event of great historical importance to this nation with a celebration at Jamestown, Va.

The ceremony on that day will honor the first introduction of the common law of England to the new world when the first Colony at Jamestown was established in 1607. The Governor of Virginia, the British Ambassador and the President of the American Bar Association will speak in honor of the occasion.

The common law which we inherited from England is the source of true justice and it is proper that this great and significant event be appropriately honored.

The General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Virginia, believing that the people of our great Nation should forever cherish and remember this important event in our national history, passed the following resolution and the Governor, pursuant thereto, issued the following proclamation, all of which I make a part of this RECORD:

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 3

Joint resolution relating to the advent of the common law of England in the New World

Whereas the common law of England was first introduced in the New World when the colony at Jamestown, Va., was established in 1607, by virtue of provisions of the charter granted to the Virginia Company of London in 1606; and

Whereas the Virginia State bar will commemorate this event of great historical importance with a celebration at Jamestown on May 17, 1959; and

Whereas the principles of the common law form the fundamental basis for the system of justice enjoyed by the people of Virginia and of its sister States: Now, therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of Virginia, the House of Delegates concurring, That the General Assembly of Virginia calls to the attention of the people of Virginia the importance of the advent of the common law in this land in the year 1607, and of the principles of justice, fair dealing and liberty thereby established in this land.

ADVENT OF COMMON LAW—JAMESTOWN 1607 DAY

The common law of England was the growth of many centuries and its aim was to provide justice and fair dealing. Without such law, the great charters of English constitutional liberties would have offered little protection and a sturdy and independent race of men would have been at the mercy of those who ruled.

In England, the common law was the law of the land and the declaration that it would be in full force and effect in the Colony of Virginia was contained in the first charter granted in 1606 to the Virginia Company of London. While other colonists, in time, claimed the common law as a measure of rights and of protection when they migrated to this country, the settlement of Jamestown in 1607 marked the beginning of a fundamental system of laws for this Nation.

The Convention of 1776, which directed the Virginia delegates to the Continental Congress to propose a resolution declaring our separation from England, ordained in general convention at Williamsburg on July 3, 1776, that the common law of England and all acts of Parliament made in aid thereof prior to the fourth year of the reign of King James I, and which were of a general nature, shall be in full force until altered by the legislature. This ordinance of convention may still be found in the code of Virginia.

The other original States also adopted the common law and today, except as modified by statute, its principles are in force in all of the States of the Union other than Louisiana.

The Virginia State bar has planned to commemorate the advent of the common law through Jamestown by erecting a tablet in the Old Church on Jamestown Island at dedication services to be held on May 17, 1959.

Now, therefore, I, J. Lindsay Almond, Jr., Governor of Virginia, do hereby designate the 17th day of May 1959, as the Advent of Common Law—Jamestown 1607 Day and do call upon the people of Virginia to commemorate this ocassion and give thanks for their rich heritage of freedom, long protected and guarded by the common law.

Given under my hand and the lesser seal of the Commonwealth, at Richmond, this 11th day of February, 1959, and the 183d year of the Commonwealth.

J. LINDSAY ALMOND, JR.,
Governor.

By the Governor:

MARTHA BELL CONWAY,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Nixon Adds to Lead Over Rockefeller

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I attach herewith the results of the most recent Gallop poll on the standing of Vice President NIXON with the voters of the country, as reported in an article from the Washington Post of Friday, April 10. It shows a net increase in his popularity of three percentage points over the second-place runner since January of 1958.

I also append herewith another article from the Washington Post of the same date by U.P.I. showing NIXON with a 3-to-1 lead with the Republican county chairmen throughout the entire Nation. This condensation of a poll taken by Look magazine also indicates that in the State of New York, of the 30 GOP leaders, 13 were for NIXON, 15 for Rockefeller, and 2 expressed no opinions. This is indeed a splendid showing on the part of the Vice President in a State where his opponent is the Republican Governor:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Apr. 10, 1959]

NIXON ADDS TO LEAD OVER ROCKEFELLER

(By George Gallup)

PRINCETON, N.J., April 9.—While his chief rival, Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, struggled with tax problems in his home State, Vice President NIXON consolidated his position as the No. 1 choice of Republican voters for their party's 1960 nomination.

NIXON's popularity for the nomination has remained unchanged since the first of the year.

Although still in second place, Rockefeller has lost ground since January—a period during which he championed the politically controversial cause of increased taxes for New York State voters.

Here are the standings today compared with those recorded in January.

Choice of candidates (Republicans only)

	Today	January 1959
	Percent	*Percent*
Nixon	56	56
Rockefeller	23	27
Lodge	8	6
Stassen	7	3
Others	2	3
None; no opinion	4	5

In an open primary test immediately following the November 1958 elections, the Vice President was in first place among Republican voters with 51 percent of the vote while Governor Rockefeller, in his initial appearance on the list of prominent Republicans, was in second place with 31 percent of the vote.

Perhaps of equal significance to the trend of sentiment in Republican ranks is the shift recorded since the November elections among the independent voters.

In November, Rockefeller and NIXON were in a tie for first place as the independent choice for the GOP nomination in 1960—each had 29 percent of the vote.

The following table shows the trend of the independent sentiment since then—as recorded in January and in the current test:

Choice of candidates (independents only)

	Today	January 1959
	Percent	*Percent*
Nixon	41	32
Rockefeller	23	31
Lodge	18	13
Stassen	9	11
Others	2	1
None; no opinion	7	12

Governor Rockefeller's tax program, which was at first attacked from both Republican and Democratic quarters, has since been widely hailed by the press as a great Rockefeller victory.

Just what impact, if any, this will have on his popularity across the Nation will be measured in future Gallup poll tests of potential Republican candidate strength.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Apr. 14, 1959]

NIXON LEADS ROCKEFELLER 3–1 WITH COUNTY LEADERS

NEW YORK, April 13.—Three out of four Republican county leaders said in response to a survey that they favored Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON over New York Gov. Nelson Rockefeller for the GOP Presidential nomination in 1960, it was disclosed today.

Letters asking GOP officials to state their choice between the two men were sent out by Look magazine.

Of 1,957 replies received, the score was 1,374 for NIXON, 469 for Rockefeller, with 114 noncommittal.

Rockefeller leaped into the national limelight last fall when he defeated Democratic Gov. Averell Harriman while Republicans throughout the country were taking a trouncing. His first act as Governor was to push a record spending and taxing program through the GOP-controlled State legislature.

The magazine said its survey disclosed that NIXON's greatest support came from the larger States such as Pennsylvania, California, Michigan, Illinois, and Ohio, while Rockefeller received his heaviest backing in Southern States.

"Rockefeller has it 2-to-1 over NIXON in Alabama," the magazine said. "The two men just about break even in Arkansas. NIXON has the edge in Georgia, but there is great interest in Rockefeller, and this is true generally in other Southern States."

The magazine said that of the 30 GOP leaders in New York who replied to the survey 15 were for Rockefeller, 13 for NIXON, and 2 expressed no preference.

Integrity and Courage—Address by Herbert Hoover at Dedication of Taft Memorial

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include the following address by former President Hoover.

INTEGRITY AND COURAGE—ADDRESS BY HERBERT HOOVER AT DEDICATION OF THE ROBERT A. TAFT MEMORIAL, WASHINGTON, D.C., APRIL 14, 1959

Possibly I knew Robert A. Taft during his public life longer than any living person. But I never think of him as Robert. As with millions of Americans he was Bob to me. And, on this occasion, I shall speak of him as Bob, as I have always done during the 36 years of our close friendship and deep affection.

When our country joined the First World War in 1917, Bob was rejected for service in the Army. Seeking some place for service, he joined the legal staff of the war organizations under my direction. That included not only service in Washington, but also service in Paris during the negotiation of the Treaty of Versailles. That great conference on the fate of the world was going on almost next door. Part of Bob's duties were to work with the American delegation and, at times, the delegations of other nations. Here began his first experience in international conflicts.

In those overcrowded days in Paris, the principal members of my staff and I dined together as the only moment when we could consider our overall plans and policies. On one of these dinner occasions Bob joined in with an impressive advocacy of the League of Nations. One of his observations I remember well was an analysis of article 10 of the Covenant and his fears that it might be a stumbling block in Senate ratification.

Later I watched with great pride his rise in public life through the Ohio State Legislature to the U.S. Senate, and his manifold services to our country ever since.

But it is not my purpose to discuss his great record of service to the American people. That has been done and will be done again many times.

As indicative of Bob's character, it is not inappropriate for me to relate my relation with him in his last days.

As Bob was very ill some of us had urged that he come to New York to consult specialists of the medical profession. On June 12, 1953, he hobbled into my apartment on crutches saying he had arranged the appointment for a checkup at a leading hospital later in the day. During 2 hours we mainly reviewed our American situation at home and abroad. He gave not the slightest indication of anything other than that he expected to continue in the battle for his ideas and principles.

I visited him at the hospital where again his conversation bore on these subjects which dominated his mind.

I thought he intended to remain in the hospital where he had the aid of the leaders of the medical world.

But on June 24, a few days after these visits, I attended a small conference in Washington on certain public matters. To my astonishment, Bob was there and taking an active and, as usual, a highly intelligent part. I chided him for leaving the hospital. But he stated he must attend to some important matters in the Senate. Incidentally, 3 days later, he hobbled into the Senate and asked permission to introduce an earlier speech on justice to Poland.

On July 1, I went to Washington especially to see him and urge that he return to the New York hospital. His reply, which remains indelible in my mind, was:

"My friend, you know what is the matter with me. I know what is the matter with me. I am going to die with my boots on."

This anecdote of his courage and devotion to his country was a passing incident. But to me, who had known him from boyhood, this was but another example of his magnificent courage and devotion which never wavered.

Bob's other outstanding quality of character was his intellectual and moral integrity.

His sense of duty, his acknowledgment of obligation, his essential loyalty and patriotism were unusual in a day when men compromised their souls for the crumbs of popularity.

He believed in political parties as a foundation of our elective system. To the end he remained an outstanding leader of the Republican Party. But his mind soared above the party. He regarded himself responsible to safeguard this Nation from the corrosive poisons that were a veritable fallout from the socialistic and communistic bombs being hurled upon this earth. These poisons not only came from Soviet Russia, but they also came form centers of irresponsible intellectualism which had made a creed of change for no greater purpose than to change. He became in the Senate a bulwark against those forces of reaction that would tear the United States into sects and cults of warring theorists. He brought to the social problems of his country a trained and practical mind.

In these late years of my life, I look back with a glowing memory of those men who early joined with me in the work of relieving human beings from starvation and pestilence. Young Bob Taft came into this work early in his life and from it he learned to what depths of misery human beings can be made to sink, not only by the course of events, but by faulty thinking, by whimsical decisions on the part of those who are in control of governments.

This early experience gave much to Bob's direction. His interest in the rights and dignity of man was paramount; his efforts for the worker and their families were endless; his concern with housing and health, untiring.

Robert A. Taft was an official with a social conscience. He not only would not desert his post; he never deserted his people.

Of course, he bore his cross. He was denounced as an isolationist, as a reactionary, as an enemy of the poor and a friend of the rich. These attacks never shook him, because of his philosophy and moral attitude toward life. His conscience was always clear. He was one who lost no sleep nights worrying that he would be found out. He lost much sleep over the fate of his country. He knew to the end that his was a moral attitude toward life and men and that he

had given to his country his last full measure of devotion.

And so upon this hill where long he served the American people stands this monument not to his greatness but to his virtue. Who is great and who is small in a Republic? It hardly matters. What does matter is that the essential virtues among men and women which made this country strong, which built great cities and verdant farms out of a wilderness, which stand for moral principles in public life, be preserved by reminders of such men as Robert A. Taft.

Fortunately, in the belfry of this monument there is a magnificent carillon.

When these great bells ring out, it will be a summons to integrity and courage.

The Ridiculous Case of Mr. Daly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting editorial which appeared in the Virginian-Pilot, Norfolk and Portsmouth, Va., on Monday, March 23, 1959:

THE RIDICULOUS CASE OF MR. DALY

If the mayor is shown on a television newscast greeting a visiting beauty queen in his official capacity, his opponent for office is entitled to equal time. If the latter can't find a beauty queen to match the mayor's, he must be given an opportunity to do or say something—anything—to square accounts. And this something must be masqueraded before the public as news.

This is what the Federal Communications Commission has said in interpreting the law in the Lar Daly case in Chicago. President Eisenhower is right when he terms the effect of the decision "ridiculous." Frank Stanton, president of CBS, is right when he calls it a serious abridgement of freedom of the right to report news.

Briefly, Daly, a perennial candidate for office, objected when the two major candidates for the Chicago mayoralty nomination—one of them the incumbent mayor himself—were depicted in regular news telecast filing nomination papers, and when the mayor was shown greeting President Frondizi of Argentina at the Chicago airport, Daly won equal time on a regular news telecast.

None of the newscasts in question featured political speeches. They simply reflected the station's legitimate efforts to cover what is believed to be news. In a very real sense this vital editorial right was circumscribed in the Daly case. As Mr. Stanton pointed out, a station which had to devote equal newscast time to the dozens of candidates in a primary would have to solve its problem by presenting no primary news at all.

The trouble stems from the wording of section 315 of the Federal Communications Act, not from the FCC, whose Chairman is in favor of changing the act. The purpose of the pertinent part of the section is to provide equal time for candidates who wish to make political speeches, so that no single political view can black out all others on the television networks. But the section is worded loosely, as indicated by this excerpt from the FCC's rules and regulations:

"But if any licensee shall permit any candidate to use its facilities, it shall afford equal opportunities to all other such candidates for that office."

No distinction is made between equal time for a political speech initiated by the candidate and equal time on a legitimate newscast initiated by the station. It is a distinction which must be made.

Remedial legislation has been introduced in the Congress by Representative GLENN CUNNINGHAM. It should be acted upon favorably by the lawmakers.

Art Wall, Jr., Masters Open Golf Champion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STANLEY A. PROKOP
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. PROKOP. Mr. Speaker, the people of the 10th District of Pennsylvania are very proud of the recent achievement of one of our neighbors, Art Wall, Jr., of Honesdale—Wayne County—Pa., who was recently crowned as the Master Open Colf Champion at Augusta, Ga. Art Wall, Jr., is a true friend, a cooperative neighbor and by all means, a master golfer.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials:

[From the Scranton Tribune, Apr. 7, 1959]

ART WALL, MASTERS CHAMPION

All northeastern Pennsylvania delighted Sunday in the tremendous feat of Art Wall, Jr., the native son and resident who won the Masters Golf Tournament at Augusta, Ga., one of the premier golfing events of the year. A victory by the modest Honesdale competitor would have been welcomed under ordinary circumstances. But the manner in which this triumph was fashioned made his success all the more thrilling.

Wall's many friends and followers in this region were quite satisfied with his performance during the first 3 days of play. Because he was 6 strokes behind the leaders after 54 holes, they were confident he would finish well up in the money. It was felt, however, that his winning the tournament was out of the question.

But Mr. Wall took care of that. In what has been described as the most fantastic finish in the history of the event, Art went over the last 18 holes with a 6 under par 66. The sensational performance overtook the field and withstood the best efforts of the other leading golfers who finished behind the Honesdale athlete.

It has been the Tribune's privilege to record the golfing prowess of Art Wall for many years. His name has been on the Tribune's sport pages since boyhood, when he began making holes in one on the course in Wayne County. Wall's uncanny ability to roll up a succession of holes in one made him a subject of a Ripley "Believe It or Not" feature some years ago.

Wall's progress took him through any number of tournaments in this part of the country and he was a collegiate star at Duke University. Upon entering professional ranks he worked with determination to win standing in one of the most competitive of all sports. His advance was steady but not spectacular.

This year, Art Wall's name has been on the lips of every golf devotee in the land. His winning of the Bing Crosby tournament and other successes have made him the leading money winner this year and he solidified his position Sunday by scoring the greatest single triumph of his career. The Tribune is happy to join in the congratulations due Art Wall, the 1959 Masters champion.

[From Scranton Times, Apr. 6, 1959]

REASON TO BE PROUD

All of northeastern Pennsylvania and particularly his native Wayne County can share in the pride at the performance of Art Wall Jr., in capturing the coveted Masters golf tournament championship at Augusta, Ga., yesterday. The victory, achieved under most dramatic circumstances, brought Wall what is probably the richest prize open to the pros of golfdom.

The Masters champion, who had blazed a trail of glory in the other major links tournaments in which he had participated this year, has thus brought added luster to his hometown of Honesdale. What with Gen Lyman Lemnitzer having just climaxed a distinguished military career by his appointment as Army Chief of Staff, the Wayne County seat certainly has reason for being proud these days.

"Blame Yourself if Democracy Isn't Responsive"—Excerpts From a Speech by Clark Mollenhoff, of the Cowles Publications, Delivered at the University of Cincinnati, March 3, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to read the speech which Clark Mollenhoff, of the Cowles publications, delivered at the University of Cincinnati on March 3 of this year. His address was entitled "Blame Yourself if Democracy Isn't Responsive."

From this title, you will know that this address deals with the apathy which exists among large segments of the voters throughout the land. This is an aspect of democracy which concerns me very much, and with Mr. Mollenhoff's permission, I have taken certain excerpts from the speech and ask consent that they be reprinted here so that others can search their souls, as I have done, to try to find ways in which to dissipate this apathy. Excerpts of the speech follow:

Unless this is a highly unusual student body, you are probably a pretty good cross-section of the complacency of America in politics.

You are the highly respectable. You feel you know what democracy means, because you are students and have read about it in textbooks. Democracy is something that George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, and a few other assorted heroes established as a part of our form of government. You feel that the battles for democracy are over in this country. You are con-

tent to sit back and enjoy this birthright handed down to you by others.

When you leave the campus, you will vow to be interested in politics because it is the respectable and decent thing to do. You will reason that politics needs people like yourself to overcome the ignorance of the masses. You will regard yourselves as enlightened, as educated and understanding the issues. There will be phrases from your college texts that will stick with you. They will trip off of your tongues, and you will leave the impression among many of your acquantances that you understand government.

Some of you will take the highly practical business approach to politics. You will be the middle-of-the-roaders on everything. You will be understanding of all positions, except any position that might be considered extreme. You will do your best to avoid any comments that are of an extremely critical nature, for there are those who would regard such comments as partisan. You may even try to keep a foot in each political camp, because you think it is good business.

Some of you will be in the political faddists. You will follow the majority. If it is popular to like Eisenhower, you will like him. If it is popular to criticize him, you will follow that line. If it is popular in your circles to dislike Joe McCarthy, you will criticize him on all counts. If it is popular to hate Walter Reuther or Herbert Hoover or Franklin D. Roosevelt, you will obediently comply. It is easier to go along with labels. It is easier to accept a popular view than to do the study necessary to have a balanced judgment. You may follow the line of some columnists who dislike dealing in facts, but regard themselves as dealing in enlightened impressions. This makes it easy to criticize officials for being too rash, or a few weeks later to accuse another official of having failed to produce a dynamic or an imaginative program.

Some of you will become strict partisans. You will fall into a group that terms everything that is disliked as radical or leftwing. Or, you may be the other extreme partisans who find everything the other party does is reactionary.

Unless something jars your sense of duty, only a few of you will have the industry to really work and learn the facts behind the complex problems that face the Nation. Unless someone stirs your conscience, only a few of you will have the courage to try to do something to stop those forces that work constantly to undermine democracy.

I hope that I can stimulate just a little more interest in thoughtful participation in government. Democracy is not necessarily a success in the broad sweep of history unless it continues for many more years to demonstrate that people can and will learn enough to be able to govern themselves. To succeed our system of government needs thoughtful participation by citizens as officeholders, as taxpayers, as witnesses before governmental bodies, and as plain voters. * * *

Law enforcement must depend on the citizens as well as the police, prosecutors, and judges. If our Government is to succeed, the police must be able to depend on reasonable cooperation from citizens who have knowledge of crimes, or other information that is detrimental to society. Citizens must avoid the attitude that there is something dishonorable in telling the truth to law enforcement officials.

If our courts and our congressional committees are to obtain the truth, it is necessary that the citizens respond to subpenas and to the best of their ability relate the facts without trying to exaggerate or minimize the incidents.

As jurors, each citizen has a duty to weight the evidence carefully and apply reasonable standards under the instructions of the court. If our judicial system is to work and command respect, it must not be thrown out of balance by jurors who let race, religion, nationality, or personal prejudice influence the verdict. * * *

Voters' lethargy is at fault when there is widespread fraud or mismanagement in government. It cannot be overemphasized that your rights are involved in nearly every major scandal that perverts or corrupts government. * * *

There is a common tendency for voters to pay little attention to government. They drift, and they rationalize their lack of interest by explaining that they fill their role in a democracy by periodically going to the polls when something important is up.

I enjoy seeing voters storming to the polls, infuriated at tax bills. Ready to pull the lever in condemnation of government extravagance. I like to see them march out at election day and slap down a safety commissioner, sheriff, mayor, judge, or Governor who wastes public funds or is associating with the underworld. This is democracy in action, but there is too little such action.

It is not enough to stir out and vote every few years when an issue hits directly at your pocketbook. And, there are times when a good citizen should take a long view of democracy and vote against his pocketbook. It is not enough that you express yourself only when the arbitrary action or improper conduct of a public official happens to prick your sense of right and wrong.

Unfortunately, there are many vital issues that voters ignore. They ignore them because they do not understand them well enough even to see that their own personal rights are at stake.

It isn't just the Teamsters Union that is involved when Teamster Boss Hoffa dips into a million dollar tax-exempt treasury in Detroit to help elect city prosecutors, judges, mayors, and Governors. Your right before those public officials could be at stake.

Involved is your right to aggressive investigations, and aggressive enforcement of the law if you, your family, or your friends are the victims of gunmen, robbers or extortionists. This is vital to you, for you cannot live without fear if your law enforcement officials—police, prosecutors or courts—have been bought or influenced by the money of a corrupt union or a corrupt business.

If you can't count on reasonably good law enforcement, then your person and your property are not safe. If you can't count on fair administration of justice by the courts, then you have lost nearly all of your rights.

There is a slogan which says we should "See America First." I would say that it should be "Know America First."

It is as good to know as much as possible of international affairs, but it is a mistake to become so concerned with studying international affairs that you don't know your own Government.

You must know your own system thoroughly if you are to be in a position to analyze other systems, and compare them with your own. Don't be afraid to look at the weaknesses of your system, because in examining it thoroughly you will come across the strengths that make democracy the best system when there is true citizen participation.

Time is a problem for all of us, so we must give priority to those things most important. Ask yourself what you can actually do about international affairs, and you will find there is little you can do unless you plan on making politics or the foreign service a career. Even our President and Secretary of State are limited in their control of the international scene. They can devise the most perfect program, and have 100 percent support in the United States, but they must still depend on the cooperation of allies and the reasonableness of the Soviet bloc.

I am not saying you should abandon interest in foreign affairs. I am merely saying you should concentrate on those matters which you can influence for a better operating democracy.

Study your city, county, State and Federal Government. Dig into both sides of every major dispute, and try to come up with your own conclusions without relying on the force of public opinion. Don't be afraid of arguing one point of view, and don't be afraid to change your mind when you find from time to time that you've jumped at a wrong conclusion.

In learning to know your local government, you will learn about State Government. In learning about State Government, you will naturally follow some threads into Federal Government. If you have done your homework properly, you will be in a good practical position to examine other governmental systems and to analyze the problems involved in international organizations such as the U.N. or NATO.

If you study no more than the Teamsters Union, you would get a good working knowledge of the real—not theoretic—problems of guaranteeing free elections. You would also see how easy it is for union democracy to be turned into union dictatorship, and it will make you more sensitive to those forces that tend to break down and corrupt democracy in unions and in Government.

I do not intend to paint a picture of bad government, and I do not want to destroy your faith in the many fine officials in government. I do want to impress you with these facts:

Government officials are human beings, and they will be only as good as the voters make them be.

They will be swayed by the human desire for money, and they will rationalize their petty larcency or grand larceny on grounds that they have earned it through public service.

They will stay honest as long as they believe that the voters' and the law-enforcement system will punish dishonesty.

They will be courageous and rise above themselves if they feel only reasonably certain that crusade for clean government will be rewarded by your support.

Those who steal your rights and your money will try to make it appear that your rights are not really in jeopardy. They will try to distort the picture or minimize their thefts and tell you that your financial interest is so small that you should not be concerned. They will feed you the line that "everybody is doing it," and that somehow you are naive or too much of an idealist if you become enraged at a little dishonesty in government.

If you swallow this line, then you are no better than those rank-and-file Teamster Union members who kick in their $5 a month in dues, and declare they don't care what Jimmy Hoffa and his friends do with it. You are not free citizens in a democracy under those circumstances, you are spineless and in danger of becoming conscienceless.

There are crooked officeholders who have been reelected year after year by spreading the word that their opponent is just as big a crook as they are. If you have to choose between two rascals, then throw the old rascal out and take the new one. You can throw the new one out in a couple of years. When you are faced with such a dellimma, vote in rebellion against those proven to have violated the public trust.

Proposed Guaranteed Farm Storage Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Eddy County Crops and Soils Committee Projected Planning Group.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDDY COUNTY CROP IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION,
New Rockford, N. Dak., April 6, 1959.

The Honorable WILLIAM LANGER,
Judiciary Committee,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

"RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT MEETING OF THE EDDY COUNTY CROPS AND SOILS COMMITTEE PROJECTED PLANNING GROUP, MARCH 13, 1959

DEAR SIR:

"1. Whereas the surplus grains are now in the hands of the storage industry; and

"2. Whereas the flow of grain into the commercial market can be stabilized by on-the-farm storage; and

"3. Whereas the farmers would receive a greater share of the consumers' dollar, and at a decrease in the expense to the Federal Government and the consumer; and

"4. Whereas the cost of storage can be reduced by farm storage; and

"5. Whereas CCC could then reduce holdings, thereby deducing surplus; and

"6. Whereas farm storage of vital foods would be an asset in the form of decentralization of vital food supplies in case of national emergencies: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we are in favor of giving the farmer a guaranteed storage program on farm stored grain; whereby a farmer would get his loan price, plus storage, for a period up to April first on the third year following the harvest of that crop. The loan price plus storage would be paid at date of loan. If at any time the farmer redeemed his grain before this date, he would be liable for the full price of the loan plus interest. If at any time the Government called the grain in, the farmer would not be liable for any storage used."

If at any time the Government wishes to cut acreage; then price of commodity should go up in the same percentage ratio; this being in line with manmade supply and demand.

Sincerely,

A. J. MULLENBERG,
Chairman, Crops and Soils Committee,
Eddy County Projected Planning.

Now be it resolved that the above resolution be forwarded to:

The Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, Washington, D.C.

The Honorable Ezra Taft Benson, Secretary of Agriculture, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

The Honorable ALLEN J. ELLENDER, Chairman, Agriculture and Forestry Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

The Honorable HAROLD D. COOLEY, Chairman, Agricultural Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

The Honorable JAMIE L. WHITTEN, Appropriations Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

The Honorable W. R. POAGE, Agricultural Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

The Honorable DON L. SHORT, Agriculture Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

The Honorable MILTON R. YOUNG, Agriculture and Forestry Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

The Honorable QUENTIN N. BURDICK, Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

The Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Agriculture and Forestry Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

The Honorable LEE METCALF, Ways and Means Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Mr. Glen Talbott, State president, North Dakota Farmers Union, Jamestown, N. Dak.

Mr. James Patton, National president, Farmers Union, Denver, Colo.

Mr. Charles B. Shuman, president, American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago 54, Ill.

Mr. R. D. Magil, president, North Dakota Farm Bureau, Verona, N. Dak.

Mr. Herschel D. Newsom, master, National Grange Headquarters, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.

Mr. M. W. Thatcher, general manager, Grain Terminal Association, St. Paul, Minn.

The Honorable John Davis, Governor of North Dakota, Capitol Building, Bismarck, N. Dak.

The Honorable FRANK CARLSON, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

The Honorable WILLIAM LANGER, Judiciary Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

The Honorable ODIN LANGEN, Government Operations Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

The Honorable VICTOR L. ANFUSO, Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Mr. O. S. Stauffer, president and publisher, Capper Puplications, Inc., 121–123 W. Eighth Street, Topeka, Kans.

Mr. Dick Hanson, editor, Successful Farming, 1716 Locust Street, Des Moines, Iowa.

Mr. Lane Palmer, managing editor, Farm Journal, Inc., Washington Square, Philadelphia, Pa.

Mr. W. D. Hoard, Jr., general manager, 28 Milwaukee Avenue, West, Fort Atkinson, Wis.

Mr. R. E. Nicholson, general manager, the Dakota Farmer, Aberdeen, S. Dak.

Mr. William H. Kircher, managing editor, the Farmer, 55 East 10th Street, St. Paul, Minn.

Mr. Frank Waddle, editor, Better Farming Methods, Mount Morris, Ill.

Mr. Joseph E. Wills, superintendent, Senate Press Gallery, 2907 John Marshall Drive, Arlington, Va.

Mr. William J. Donaldson, Jr., superintendent, House Press Gallery, 3730 Brandywine Street, Washington, D.C.

Letter From Polish Refugee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the following letter from a Polish refugee, Mr. Tadeusz Gasowski of Detroit, Mich., for whose relief I introduced a private bill which passed the House and Senate during the 85th Congress. I thought this letter would be of interest to all Members of the House since it indicates just how much the people behind the Iron Curtain look to this country for encouragement and reassurances that they are not forgotten by the free world.

DETROIT, MICH., *April 13, 1959.*

Hon. Congressman ALVIN M. BENTLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BENTLEY: I know that you will be glad to hear that I have just received a letter from my sister in Warsaw, who writes me that President Eisenhower's speech on the occasion of the anniversary of NATO made a tremendous impression on all the people of Poland, lifting their spirit, morale, hope, and raising the confidence in the United States and the Western World. She writes that this was the best news for Polish people since the end of the Second World War, which has enslaved Poland and other Eastern European countries.

"We like Ike more and more," she writes in her letter.

Very respectfully yours,

TADEUSZ GASOWSKI.

Lawrence (Mass.) Council No. 67, Knights of Columbus, Protests Presentation of Television Commercials Which Offend Public Morals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution adopted by the Lawrence (Mass.) Council No. 67, Knights of Columbus, on March 16, 1959:

"Whereas certain commercials, especially those advertising ladies' undergarments, currently being shown on television, tend to be indecent and immoral in nature; and

"Whereas such commercials are being exhibited in ever-increasing number and variety; and

"Whereas such commercials are undesirable and improper for viewing by the public in general and by the youth of our Nation in particular; be it

"*Resolved*, That the Massachusetts State council strongly protests the presentation of television commercials which offend public morals; and that notice of its protest be sent to the Columbia Broadcasting System, the National Broadcasting Co., the American Broadcasting Co., and the Federal Communications Commission."

The above resolution was offered, considered, and unanimously voted by the members of Lawrence Council No. 67 at the regular meeting of the council held March 16, 1959.

RENO J. ORLANDO,
Grand Knight.

Attested:

ALBERT J. PETERSON,
Recording Secretary.

H.R. 2729

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to insert the following letter written by Mr. George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, to a glass dealer, Mr. R. N. Park, of Waterloo, Iowa, which I believe is self-explanatory. The letter deals with my bill H.R. 2729, and I believe helps justify its introduction:

MARCH 26, 1959.

Mr. R. H. PARK,
Park Paint & Glass Co.,
Waterloo, Iowa

DEAR MR. PARK: Your certified letter dated March 21 received yesterday and contents of same very carefully noted. In view of the fact you sent a copy of your letter to Congressmen Bentley, Halleck, McCormack, Senators Long, Sparkman, Johnson, and FTC Chairman Gwynne, we are likewise sending a copy of our answer to them.

Our files disclose that there has been correspondence between this office and yourself beginning in July 1957 and, due to this and other correspondence and our contact with people in the glass industry over these past 2 years, we have kept this subject matter in front of us in view of other industries having the same problem so that we could evaluate the overall and at the proper time take the proper action.

If the writer's memory serves him right, the problems of the glass dealers as it relates to their source of supply was brought to my attention some 4 or 5 years ago. In fact a conference was held in Washington, the office of the federation, with a representative spokesman of the independent glass dealers in St. Louis, at which time they proceeded to confer with Federal Trade Commission officials.

Apparently there has been lack of overall unity in your group. We found this out from contacts in this office by a representative spokesman of the glass dealers in the North Atlantic States. We recommended to them that there should be unity in action on the overall objective. Particularly note this in my statement that I made before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on March 20, this year, copy enclosed.

The writer, in his private capacity prior to his official connection with the federation 12 yars back, has been in closest daily contact with both the House and Senate Small Business Committees since their inception. This is an 18-year background that should put us in a position in the overall evaluation of these committee's operation in behalf of small business.

In the early days of the committees, both in the Senate and in the House, in 1941 and 1942, to the everlasting credit of those committees, although they lacked legislative power in introducing legislation they were able to develop legislative action out of the committees and followed through consistently on the recommended legislation. This applies particularly to the action of the Senate Small Business Committee in 1942, legislative action created within the committee itself, and I am referring particularly to the rubber tires bill that provided for complete divorcement of tire manufacturers in the retail field.

Within the past week or two a press conference was held by the House Small Business Committee and it will be found at that time the writer put a question to the Chairman and members of the committee in the press conference, "Realizing that the committee lacked legislative authority, could small business expect some positive action coming out of the committee that would recommend to another standing committee legislative action on the problems affecting various small businesses?" We maintain and rightfully so, that, no discredit to the committee, the study period is over and small business looks for positive relief.

To the credit of the House Small Business Committee in 1947, through our engineering we were able to have the committee take positive action in forcing the hands of the Federal Trade Commission to invoke the quantity discount rule for the rubber tire industry. That was the first time that that action was instituted for any industry during the life of the Robinson-Patman Act.

The action of the Government in this case has been kicked around in the Federal courts and we have made respectful demands on both committees for a thorough investigation of the handling of this major case by the Government agency. Although we were promised nearly 2 years ago that such action would be instituted, up to this time no positive action has been taken.

Bear in mind that this action of the Government at that time applied only to the rubber tire industry in public hearings before the Senate Commerce Committee, and that committee was aware of the importance of this action that if the rule was validated it would have far-reaching effect on other industries plagued with the same monopolistic tactics as the rubber tire industry. In other words, it would have been beneficial no doubt to you in the glass industry.

As to the operation of manufacturers in the retail field, it would be well for you to review the docket of Federal Trade Commission versus Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., the order dated March 5, 1936, and then you will have the whole history of the overall action of the manufacturers operating in the retail field in unfair competition with their own independents.

To the everlasting credit of Congressman ALVIN BENTLEY, I believe the record will show either late in November or early in December, 1958, the Congressman asked me to confer with him on any recommendations we could offer to him that would bring relief to efficient independent business. A conference was held with the Congressman's staff on the preliminaries and in this preliminary conference the utilization of present antitrust laws was considered, not new legislation.

Shortly thereafter I had arranged conferences with the five members of the Federal Trade Commission and also with the head of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice. The conference with the Commission was held on December 10 with four of the five members present, the conference lasting 2 hours and 20 minutes with no interruptions and this is something out of the ordinary. The conference was confined to the present laws entrusted to the Federal Trade Commission as to enforcement in bringing the necessary relief to small business, no particular industry involved. To the credit of the Commissioners, it was probably one of the most productive conferences ever held in behalf of small business, with close attention to the problems given by all members of the Commission, those present.

Later in the day a similar conference was held with the head of the Antitrus Division, 1 hour or more and with no interruptions. In both of these conferences, fortunately, I was accompanied unexpectedly by the Assistant to the President of the Federation.

Upon our return to the office, I prepared a memorandum as to the results of these conferences and I requested him to prepare his memorandum, and then both memorandums were reviewed one by the other. There was no collusion. The memorandums disclosed that under the present Robinson-Patman Act, as to certain unfair trade practices, the action was deficient to bring the necessary relief to efficient independent business.

Then he returned to our head office in Burlingame, Calif., and he prepared a memorandum for the proposed new legislation that would strike at the unfair practices of certain major manufacturers in the retail field. He made at least four specific recommendations of what the legislation should embody. Bear in mind, neither he nor the writer are economists or members of the legal profession, but form our conclusions from actual true experience in the business world.

I might add that the writer has had 50 years' experience in the automotive servicing field, owning and operating his own independent business for 30 years or more. So, this gives me the factual information of the basic problems that are existing within all segments of that industry, which includes your own.

With this information, then we conferred further with Congressman BENTLEY's staff and the outcome of that conference was continual conferences through the cooperation of Congressman BENTLEY with the House Legislative Counsel to draft the best possible legislation that would be enforceable by the Government and the courts.

Bear in mind that the Federation stands for free and fair competition. We have never received any direct directions by majority vote calling for any action that would bring about price fixing, either direct or indirect.

No legislation that could be drafted could ever hope to cure all problems, however, a start must be made and, you believe it or not, at the recent hearings on the fair trade legislation before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, no single person present, representing many groups in favor of the fair trade legislation, rendered one adverse opinion against the Bentley bill, H.R. 2729. In fact, I may state that the chairman of the House Judiciary, in a short conversation with him last week, stated to me, when I explained the objectives of the bill, in simple understanding words, "Burger, that's a good bill, nothing wrong with that." And, only yesterday, the executive manager of possibly one of the most successful trade associations in the United States, I am referring to the National Association of Retail Druggists, stated to me that the Bentley bill was a good bill and that he was going to make recommendation that the bill be reported out favorably in a separate report. A representative of a consumer group that was present stated in substance the same thought.

You will be interested in a statement filed with the committee by a spokesman of the glass industry. He cites numerous cases of unfair competition but it is noted that in the statment no recommendation is made as to procedure to correct this. Bear in mind, Mr. Park, this is no criticism.

Let me conclude this letter, Mr. Park, that if this legislation as proposed by Congressman BENTLEY is approved by the Congress, it can result in major attention by many industries to accept this bill, as voted by the Congress, and put into effect constructive sales policy—and if they fail to take positive action, then Congress itself, to protect independent business, will be forced to bring about more drastic legislation.

Let me confirm this statement in no uncertain terms. The rubber tire industry is notorious in its action in the retail field,

I'll say some of the major rubber companies, and if they don't "stop, look, and listen" on the proposal as outlined in the Bentley bill, there will be no alternative action, as it applies to that industry, but for Congress to take positive action on the rubber tires bill, which is still pending in the Congress.

It is my opinion, and not from a professional standpoint, that a corrective start has been made to bring about fair competition through the splendid action of Congressman BENTLEY, H.R. 2729, and we believe that it ratified by the Congress will go a long way to bring about long over due fair competition in the retail field as it applies to all industries where they are in competition with their own independent retailers.

Further, small business owes a vote of thanks to Congressman BENTLEY, and possibly thanks to the federation, for what we are attempting to do is to bring about the necessary relief.

I want to take this time to complement you for giving us your views, in fact, it is through constructive suggestions from our members that we are able to follow out their recommendations to the letter, as our interest and sole interest is to serve the best interest of efficient independent business nationwide.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE J. BURGER,
Vice President, National Federation of Independent Business.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Boland Pays Tribute to Secretary Dulles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am saddened to learn of the resignation of Secretary of State Dulles. I am sure that all of the peoples of the free world feel likewise. He had a profound knowledge of world affairs gleaned over a lifetime of study and experience.

In my judgment, he was a great Secretary of State who served in that post during one of the most difficult diplomatic periods in the history of our Nation.

DULLES' CONTRIBUTION TO MAINTENANCE OF WESTERN ALLIANCE

Despite great personal sacrifices, he made exhausting trips throughout the world and successfully matched wits with the Communists. His contribution was immeasurable in keeping the Western Alliance together under the most trying circumstances.

His role was compounded with difficulty because he could place little or no reliance on the words of his Soviet adversaries. Yet he had a sixth sense in anticipating Soviet weakness and he was a master at persuading Western statesmen to stand firm with him on vital issues. His adamant position forced the Soviet to retreat many times.

HE WAS ONE OF THE WORLD'S OUTSTANDING STATESMEN

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that when historians view his tenure in perspective, they will record that Secretary of State Dulles was one of the outstanding statesmen in the fight against the spread of communism.

Electric Power From the Oceans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. OLIVER
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, volumes have been written concerning the urgency for all-out efforts for American scientific improvement to meet the Soviet threat. Although the past year has seen an upsurge in scientific activity, it appears to me that we are barely scraping the surface toward attainment of this objective.

Use of the oceans in the generation of electricity is a distinct possibility. In Maine, we are particularly interested in the development of the Passamaquoddy tidal power project. It is hoped that the International Joint Commission report on the Quoddy project, to be released in October of this year, will recommend the construction of a facility to harness the tides in order to generate electricity. If the report is favorable, oceanographic research could play an important role in the development of this project.

The following article, which originally appeared in the New Bedford Mass., Standard-Times, outlines yet another exciting possibility for the development of electricity from oceanic sources. We are naturally happy that our English allies have been highly successful in undertaking research in this field. But where are the funds to support similar achievements by American scientists? We cannot continually trail the international scientific field without losing the prestige and stature so necessary to our success in the cold war. Intense concentration in the field of oceanographic research is urgently required. A lesser effort might prove catastrophic.

The article from the Standard-Times follows:

SEA BATTLE, 1958: KEY TO SURVIVAL, XII—UNITED STATES IS LAGGING IN RACE TO HARNESS H-BOMB

(By Everett S. Allen)

(Whether it be for war or peace, the oceans of the world probably hold the secret to humanity's future. The nation that unlocks those mysteries first will direct the future course of mankind. One of the world's outstanding ocean-study centers is the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution. There and at other marine-science research centers in the East, The Standard-Times conducted a 2-month study to determine who is ahead. These stories tell the results of that research.)

The harnessing of the hydrogen bomb to produce from the oceans enough electricity to supply mankind for 1 billion years is just a matter of time. To Americans, the most important aspect of this international race for cheap power is that the United States presently is not leading the field.

There is considerable evidence to indicate that diplomatic courtesy, rather than scientific justice, brought about the joint United States-British announcement on this process, referred to as hydrogen fusion. For non-Government authorities in both countries have indicated the British scored a clear "first" in the controlled release of the H-bomb type of energy for eventual peaceful application.

FRANCE IN RACE, TOO

It may be that other nations also are ahead of American scientists in this field. Both the French and Russians are known to be working on it. Roger Baifas, director of France's research center on thermonuclear fusion, said experiments were being conducted at the laboratory of Fountenay-aux-Roses near Paris and that "there is no doubt that France is in a good position in the race for thermonuclear energy."

I. V. Kurchatov, director of the Atomic Energy Institute of the Soviet Union's Academy of Sciences, said "several more years of strenuous research" will be required before thermonuclear power can be harnessed successfully for industrial use. He acknowledged the British had attained "signal scientific results" in their efforts along this line.

Here's what the British "breakthrough" amounts to:

This hydrogen fusion process involves the fusing of four nuclei of hydrogen into one nucleus of helium. This is the process responsible for the immense amounts of energy, in the form of heat and light, given off by the sun.

PLENTIFUL IN SEA WATER

The type of hydrogen that scientists are attempting to fuse is deuterium, which is present in enormous amounts in the ocean, and which derives its name from the fact that it is twice the weight of normal hydrogen and is therefore in the category of heavy hydrogen.

Two problems exists in attempting to fuse nuclei of deuterium to generate electricity in quantity. First, a very high temperature is required. Secondly, some type of special container is needed to contain the gas after it has been raised to the temperature needed.

It has been estimated that temperatures of 370 million degrees Centigrade would be required to establish a fire of deuterium that would be self-sustaining and that would give off more energy than was required to keep it going. This temperature is more than 20 times that of the interior of the sun.

As for the container, scientists are using an electrical current to create a magnetic field inside of a material container. This prevents the hot gas from touching the walls of the actual container and thus losing its energy.

American experiments report the reaching of temperatures of as high as 6 million degrees.

TO SURPASS THE SUN

On February 5, Sir John Cockcroft, Nobel Prize-winning director of the British atomic research establishment at Harwell, told members of the Royal Society in London that Britain's Zeta apparatus soon would surpass the sun's core temperature, which he estimated at 15 million degrees Centigrade.

The British group at Harwell also has been credited with being the first in the world to report a 5 million-degree temperature, which at the time of achievement was about five times greater than any temperature achieved up to that time. It is believed, for example, that the French have attained temperatures of deuterium plasma up to about 1 million degrees. What the Russians have accomplished is not known.

Most important of all, however, is the British success in keeping the hot gas away from the walls of the container in which it is heated; if this cannot be achieved, it falls in temperature. The British have accomplished this for periods of two one-thousandths to five one-thousandths of a second, during which the heated gas has been isolated from the tube's walls. Harwell reports there appears to be no fundamental reason why longer times, together with much higher temperatures, cannot be achieved.

LONG-RANGE PROJECT

Dr. Peter Thonemann, research director of Britain's Zeta project, has announced there is no reason why temperatures exceeding 100 million degrees should not be achieved with equipment based on the Zeta principle.

One pound of deuterium could produce 43 million kilowatt-hours of power. The average American family uses about 3,000 kilowatts a year.

This is, however, not a short-range project; best estimates indicate fusion might be harnessed for the production of power in 10 to 15 years. It certainly will be years before we will be able to build and operate commercial reactors utilizing the ocean's deuterium, thus producing electrical power in sufficient quantity for meeting the needs of mankind.

It will take years to develop a thermonuclear device that yields more energy than it consumes; it will take years to get such a device from the status of laboratory experiments to a full-scale power producer, as Lewis L. Strauss, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, has indicated.

But it is a matter of time only before the oceans will produce a cheap and virtually inexhaustible source of electrical energy for a world that already is scanning its dwindling fuel supplies with apprehension—and those include both coal and oil.

RACE IS VITAL

It is, therefore, critically important, not only for domestic well-being and the maintenance of a standard of living that could be lowered only with agony, for Americans to keep in the forefront of this contest.

This is true even if war is not on the horizon—and no one can be sure of that—even if only the cold war continues, in which it is fundamentally necessary to uphold the prestige of the United States in the eyes of the underdeveloped nations. These nations need cheap power; they will have a tendency to turn to those countries, East or West, that can give it to them. Once hydrogen fusion is licked, it can be used on rivers, lakes, and ponds, as well as the ocean, so every country would find it practically adaptable.

Sputnik is flashy, it is visible. When the United States lagged in that race, millions of Americans became irate and demanded action. Hydrogen fusion, at the moment, is both difficult to understand and not in the least spectacular. So most of America, which failed to comprehend what it was reading when the first announcements were made of this process, is not demanding anything.

But if it should be that the cold war were resolved in the theaters of politics, sociology, science, and economics—instead of through gargantuan military contests—the alliance that could show the way to bringing lights, heat, electric motors, automatic water pumps, and refrigeration to the have-not peoples of the world would be a long way ahead.

ENGINEERS NOT ENOUGH

Sometimes, there is a tendnecy to forget this is not the era of World War II when the fruits of British scientific thinking (fog-dispelling apparatus, submarine-detecting devices, radar improvements, and jet propulsion) were handed over the U.S. engineers to be put to practical application.

Engineers alone are not enough. The time has come when the United States has to give its well-qualified scientists the encouragement, time, money, and atmosphere in which they can do their own thinking. No nation has a monopoly on ideas, but the United States voluntarily has deprived itself of its quota.

In America, for far too many years, there has been a woeful lack of emphasis upon pure science—particularly in the field of oceanography and other affiliated earth sciences—which has had a tendency to make us a one-horse country as far as new ideas are concerned, the high horsepower of our superficial gadgetry notwithstanding.

Address by the Honorable Stuart Symington, U.S. Senator, at the Kansas Democratic Club in Topeka, Kans.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEWELL A. GEORGE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, a great address was delivered on the evening of April 11 by Hon. STUART SYMINGTON, U.S. Senator from Missouri, before a dinner meeting of the Kansas Democratic Club at the Municipal Auditorium in Topeka, Kans.

An overflow crowd of 600 heard Senator SYMINGTON and enthusiastically demonstrated their approval of his forceful speech. Seating arrangements were insufficient for nearly 300 who had purchased tickets and were compelled to dine in nearby hotels, most of whom returned and stood in the auditorium during the Senator's address.

Kansas democracy is extremely proud of our neighboring statesman from Missouri, and we hope he will return to the Sunflower State many times in the future and we are certain that he will contribute materially to the great Democratic victory that will be ours in 1960.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the address of Senator SYMINGTON be inserted in the RECORD and recommend that it be read by all Members of the House:

THE DEMOCRATIC PROGRAM: INVESTMENTS IN THE FUTURE OF AMERICA

It is a real privilege to be here at your annual banquet, and I am very grateful for the honor of being asked to come to Topeka.

This address tonight is not made easier by the distinction of the Democrats who have preceded me. The rollcall of former speakers at this banquet goes all the way back to that great popular leader of democracy, William Jennings Bryan.

It includes such distinguished Americans as Woodrow Wilson, Cordell Hull, and Jouett Shouse; and such good friends as Scott Lucas, Jim Farley, Tom Hennings, and Albert Gore.

In 1951, you were able to hear from that beloved gentleman whose loss we still feel deeply, Alben Barkley.

And in 1957, your speaker was the No. 1 Democrat—not only of my State, but also of the country—Harry S. Truman.

Such distinguished predecessors make one humble; but it is comforting to remember you and I are neighbors.

Your State and mine have a common boundary, including a great river, and this boundary gives us common problems.

There was a time, shortly before, during and after the Civil War, when relations between Kansas and Missouri became a little strained. But that is all over now.

In fact, more and more Kansans and Missourians are seeing eye to eye on matters of politics.

The people of both our States have learned that the best way to obtain effective government for all the people is through the Democratic Party.

Look at the Democratic story right here in your great State.

Thirty years ago—even 20 years ago—if anyone had come to Topeka to talk to a Democratic meeting, he might well have talked to an almost empty hall. What a difference today. You have a Democratic Governor. You have three Democratic Congressmen, and last November you almost elected three more.

And let me make this prediction—in 1960 you'll elect not only three more Congressmen, but a United States Senator along with them.

Yes, my Democratic friends, the record shows that you are making Kansas a real two-party State. That is good for you, good for Kansas and good for America.

Much effort on the part of many people has gone into the building up of our party in Kansas.

And one feature stands out. That is the way your magnificent Governor, George Docking, has won the confidence of the citizens of Kansas.

He has placed your government on a basis of good business management, the kind of management so sadly lacking under the Republicans in Washington today.

Governor Docking has practiced sound economy without sacrificing State services. Through his open door policy toward visitors and the press, he has brought your government closer to the people than ever before.

Every Democrat in America is mighty proud of George Docking.

The Democratic Party has also been strengthened by the record of FLOYD BREEDING in Congress; and I am sure it will be strengthened even more by your new Congressmen, NEWELL GEORGE and DENVER HARGIS.

My friends, seven years ago a group of Republicans came here to Kansas to start a "Crusade."

Today the Republican Party in Washington has dropped all pretense of leading any "crusade."

The watchword on the Potomac now is "politics as usual."

Because time is running out on the Republican administration, capable men are becoming steadily harder to find.

Even when they are found, often they are passed over for important public office because they don't have the blessing of the Republican National Committee.

As their time runs out, we find public officials casting around for cushy corporation jobs in the industries they regulate. This practice does not aid their dedication to the public interest.

The result, if not at times chaos, is something pretty close to it.

In fiscal policy, the Republican theme for the next 2 years seems to be a take-off on the old Western song: "There's a tax cut in the sky, by and by."

In defense policy, it is another song: "Praise the Lord, but spare the ammunition."

And this Republican administration is the only government in the history of the world which has undertaken to convince the people that they must reduce spending at home while increasing it abroad.

With such policies it is inevitable that the Republicans are approaching the brink of internal chaos among themselves.

Before last fall's elections, a prominent member of the administration wrote a book "A Republican Looks at His Party."

Now we understand he is writing a new one, "A Republican Looks for His Party."

The Republicans are now trying to pull themselves together for the next election—and so they have appointed a large committee whose sole job is to give their party a fresh new image in people's minds.

This phrase "public image" is a bit of Madison Avenue-ese that needs translation into plain English. It means not what you are, but what people think you are.

So the Republicans are trying to find out what will be the best thing for people to think they are. The answer to that is very simple—Democrats.

Any amusement over the plight of the Republican Party, however, should not distract us from where that party has now placed this country.

It takes little vision to realize that the challenge faced today is greater than any ever faced before by the United States.

The philosophy of State supremacy, as expressed in the Communist dictatorship, has declared economic, psychological, sociological, technological, political, and at times military war against us.

A mighty effort is being made to isolate us in a world where lethal weapons can go from continent to continent in less than 30 minutes. Yet our response to this challenge continues to be slow, grumbling, and inadequate.

The same is true here at home. We are not planning adequate education for our children, or proper conservation of our resources, or enough protection for those citizens who have made their contribution and have now reached the evening of their lives. The chief excuse the Republicans give for this drifting, both at home and abroad, is that if we try to do better we will spend ourselves into bankruptcy.

In 1889, for the first time in peacetime, the Congress appropriated a billion dollars. In those days the Speaker of the House was a Republican—Thomas Reed. And when people complained to him about his billion-dollar Congress, Tom Reed said: "Yes; but this is a billion-dollar country." I wish the Republicans today had some of Tom Reed's commonsense.

Measured by our national product, we now have a $450-billion country—the greatest, richest, most resourceful country in the world. We can afford whatever is necessary for the good of America.

We Democrats are labeled "reckless spenders," but this is just another charge not supported by the facts. Between 1947 and 1952 the Democratic administration showed a net surplus of $4 billion. Between the fiscal years of 1954 and 1959 the Republican administration operated at a net deficit of $20 billion. And last year this administration ran up the largest peacetime deficit in our history.

Now there is a significant difference between what the two parties want to spend for. We Democrats want to increase spending for assets—for schools and roads, hospitals and dams, and airports. Based on the record, Republicans have increased spending for interest. Since 1953 the annual interest on the national debt has increased by $1½ billion, and is now the second largest single item in the budget.

They want to save dollars. We do, too; but we also want to save farms and cities and useful lives.

They have adopted the philosophy that high permanent unemployment is now characteristic of capitalism. We want to give every American who wants to work a chance to work, in order to strengthen the country.

They believe in retrenchment to balance the budget. We believe the way to balance the budget is through the prosperity of full production.

The bills we Democrats are pushing in this Congress—bills for airports, schools, and housing—are not spending bills. They are investment bills—investments in a brighter future for America.

Some people say, "You're right; we do need these projects, but we can't afford them unless we either raise taxes or run a deficit." But if we had today a businesslike administration, we wouldn't have to raise taxes.

You all know my ideas of the billions which could be saved if we started operating our defenses on the basis of progress instead of continuing to let them drift on the basis of tradition.

Now let me give you another interesting case, released recently by the Internal Revenue Service. That Service audited some 36,000 returns of business and professional taxpayers. They found that, if the same kind of audit could be extended to 6,700,000 returns for the same year, the taxable income of these taxpayers would have been increased by 20 percent. And that would have yielded $2.7 billion in additional taxable income. In other words, if we had enforced efficiently the present tax laws, we could have obtained taxes or $2.7 billion more without changing the tax rates at all.

When it took office, this administration fired 3,000 people from the enforcement section of the Internal Revenue Department. What a false sense of economy. Even if the salaries of these 3,000 people averaged $10,000 a year—which they didn't—would the saving of that $30 million justify tax evaders dodging the payment of billions? So you see these poor managers have billions of dollars of additional taxable income available right under their noses if they would only put in good business practices to collect it.

As Americans, we want this tax money and all tax money to be spent for the best possible investments in prosperity and peace. As Kansans and Missourians, we know that one of the most solid of all investments lies in the control of water, primarily flood control.

We all remember the flood on the Kaw and the Missouri in 1951. It cost the Kansas City area alone $1 billion. The tax revenue lost to the Government as a result of that one flood was greater than the entire cost of the projects which could have prevented it.

Despite such occurrences, the present administration refuses to invest in water projects. Projects like those at Lawrence, Fort Scott, Melvern, and Hillsdale are being held up by the sharp budget ax of this Republican administration. The Republican policy toward water resource development seems to be: cut now, suffer later. Water projects needed also for industrial development. New industries are springing up each day. Factories are looking for good places to locate. A new industry needs space and also needs a steady supply of adequate fresh water.

Kansas has acres of land ready for industrial development. If the abundant water resources you now have were properly utilized so they could go to work for industry, your future prosperity would be placed on a broader, firmer footing.

Now a word about our farm program. It is not necessary to tell a Kansas farmer that our present agriculture program is a mess. He knows it. In the past 6 years, the leaders in the Department of Agriculture have built a record which even they are now ashamed of. They have spent $30 billion of our money on a farm program that just doesn't work. Secretary Ezra Taft Benson has spent more money than all the 14 preceding Secretaries of Agriculture combined. And what has he produced? Low farm prices, high food prices, and a mountain of surplus foods.

Before coming into Government, I was a businessman for a good many years. If any businessman tried to run his plant or office the way the Department of Agriculture has been run for over 6 years, he would go broke. Back in 1952 and 1953, the Eisenhower-Benson crusade was going to get the Government out of farming. Well, let's look at the record. In January of 1953, the Commodity Credit Corporation owned $1 billion of farm commodities. In January of 1959—just 6 years later—that inventory was well over $5 billion. And according to the latest Department of Agriculture report, just released last week, the total investment in farm commodities—inventories and loans—is over $9 billion.

But this is not all, because in his last budget message to Congress, the President admitted that by June of 1960, the total investment would be $10 billion. Based on information presented to the Senate Agriculture Committee, and my own study of the situation, I believe the President much underestimated, and that by June 1960 Government investment in farm commodities will be close to $12 billion. How's that for getting the Government out of farming?

Mr. Benson goes around the country speaking in such great agricultural centers as various city chambers of commerce, complaining about the farm problem. But what plans has he made to solve that problem?

A few weeks ago, when Mr. Benson came before our committee to ask authority to spend more billions, we asked him questions any banker would ask a businessman who requested a loan. I asked him if he had any definite plans to move his gigantic inventory. He conferred with several of his 14 assistants who were back-stopping him at the hearing. Then said he had no definite plans.

I asked him how much inventory he though he would move this year. He said he did not know.

I asked him how long it would take to move it. He said he didn't know that either.

Mr. Benson should know that his farm program is bankrupt primarily because it is based on the false theory that the way to lower farm production is to reduce farm prices. As millions of farmers and many of us in Congress have insisted for a number of years, this theory just does not work. And here is why. We all know there are fixed costs connected with farming—payments on notes and mortgages, installment payments on equipment, out-of-pocket costs for fertilizer, seed, fuel, and such. In recent years, these costs have been steadily going up. To meet these fixed and out of pocket expenses, and at the same time take care of family expenses, farmers must have a minimum income. That income, of course, is derived from price times volume minus costs.

If your price goes down at the same time your costs go up—and that has been the case in recent years—you have only two choices: increase your volume, or go broke.

In the past 6 years nearly 4 million farm people have been forced off our farms. But the rest of our farmers have taken the other course. They have taken advantage of every new technique of farming to vastly increase their production.

The story on wheat is a typical example. Since 1952, wheat price supports have dropped from $2.20 to $1.80. Has this brought about lower production or expanded consumption? Of course not.

While the price of wheat to farmers has dropped 18 percent since 1952, per capita consumption of wheat has decreased 11 percent. Last year wheat production set an all-time high—nearly 1.5 billion bushels—and this was with some 5 million acres in the soil bank.

In an effort to deal with the wheat situation, the Senate Agriculture Committee asked the Secretary to submit a new wheat bill. He offered two alternative suggestions. One of these was, in effect, no price-support program at all. Under this alternative, wheat price supports would be as low as 75

percent, not of parity, but of the average price during the last 3 years. It is a farce to call this a price support. A price 25 percent below what you have been getting isn't any support. At best, it is a floor with a hole in it.

The ultimate goal of the Eisenhower-Benson wheat plan is to lower prices until "price supports are adapted to feed use relationships." Those are Mr. Benson's own words.

Do you know what the price of wheat would be under such an arrangement?

My good friend, Senator MILT YOUNG, of North Dakota, and I asked the Agriculture Department about this. They finally admitted that, at present corn and feed grain prices, wheat price supports would be between $1.15 and $1.20 a bushel, in order to be at "feed use relationship." Long before the price got that low, thousands of wheat farmers would go broke, and Mr. Benson knows it.

The other alternative wheat plan suggested by the administration would lower prices; and, at the same time, sharply reduce wheat acreage. This is no wheat program. It is just a rehash of the same old Benson policy of economic attrition.

With the cooperation of the farmers of America, we in the Congress plan to write a new farm bill. This bill will include an effective wheat program based on sound economic principles, and on the belief that farm families deserve an opportunity to earn a return on their labor, investment and managerial ability comparable to that earned by other segments of the economy.

Last month we held comprehensive hearings on new wheat legislation; and heard representatives from many of the farm organizations, from the National Association of Wheat Growers, and from others interested in sound new wheat legislation.

There are certain basic requirements which must be included in any sound effective farm program. That program must give the farmer a fair price for his product. It must give farmers the tools whereby they can compete more favorably with the other closely organized segments of the economy. Any sound long-range farm program must be designed to bring farm production more nearly in line with realistic needs—at home and abroad.

It must face up to the gigantic inventory problem. The productive capacity of the American farmer is not an economic curse. It is, and it should be handled as, a blessing. With wise policies, we can use this capacity to further prosperity at home and peace and prosperity abroad.

Millions of our own people in the United States are undernourished. One hundred thousand children in one of our States have only one-third of the calories and proteins they need in their daily diet. Throughout the world, millions suffer from starvation, while the food that could nourish them, stored at a cost the President himself says amounts to a billion dollars a year, wastes away in our storage bins and warehouses.

The people of other nations are like our people. They want peace in the world. They want food and clothing for themselves and their children. If we can move our food inventories to people in need, we will be using our country's greatest blessing to accomplish our country's noblest purpose.

Twice in our history while under Democratic leadership, this Nation has been called upon to fight for freedom. Today, as Democrats, but primarily as Americans, we demand that our country be made strong enough to preserve our freedom. But this in no way impairs our dedication to peace. In fact, it would further that dedication.

The two greatest charters of peace in our history were drafted by Democrats, the 14 points of Woodrow Wilson and the 4 freedoms of Franklin Roosevelt. Today, we Democrats again advocate the path to peace through a universal disarmament agreement, negotiated from a position of strength.

With firm leadership, we can create an America greater than any we have ever known. With firm leadership we can create the kind of permanent peace our forefathers and our sons dreamed of and died for.

We should dedicate ourselves to creating the kind of permanent peace that would justify our going anywhere in the world and saying with even greater pride, "I am an American."

Address of George M. Harrison, President of the Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, to the National Conference on Unemployment, at Washington Armory, April 8, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the Appendix of the RECORD the address of George M. Harrison, president of the Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, made at the National Conference on Unemployment, in Washington, D.C., April 8, 1959. It is my belief that President Harrisons' well prepared and thought-provoking remarks are of interest to each of us, and I call the attention of the Congress to his enlightening address:

ADDRESS OF GEORGE M. HARRISON, PRESIDENT OF THE BROTHERHOOD OF RAILWAY CLERKS, TO THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON UNEMPLOYMENT, AT WASHINGTON ARMORY, APRIL 8, 1959

President Meany, and delegates to the conference, we have come together here to discuss the grave national unemployment crisis. We have a serious and a disheartening task before us. In the face of a sick national economy, we find it necessary to call the attention of the American people and the American Government to the millions of casualties which that sickness has brought to the working people of the country. Some of us had hoped that the day was long past when such extensive suffering would be brushed off lightly by our Federal Government. We thought that the indifference of the Hoover administration would nevermore appear in Washington. But today we find it necessary to force this human catastrophe to the forefront of national attention. We must not and we will not allow this suffering to continue, if anything we can do will bring about its correction.

The unemployment crisis that brings us here today is nationwide. Every industry and every corner of our country is suffering from this economic catastrophe. We come here to exchange our ideas and our information, so that we may deal with the whole problem more effectively. I want to tell you about unemployment in my industry, on the railroads of America, as I learn from you about unemployment in other industries. I know, as you do, that each industry has its own particular type of problem. Each industry has its own variation of the general illness that has thrown our millions of workers out on the street.

That you may know about railway unemployment, I must begin long before the 1957 recession struck. Unemployment on the railroads has been a chronic illness. Many thousands of skilled and experienced railway workers had been thrown on the industrial scrap heap since the end of World War II. The sharp decline in employment in the last 18 months has been much more serious, to us, than it would have been if so many of our people had not already been out of work.

We had almost a million and a half railway workers when the war ended in 1946; we had a million and a quarter in 1950; but we had only 1 million railway workers in 1956. Employment in 1956 was back at the level of the great depression. We were hauling more than twice as much traffic in 1956 as we had before the war, with a smaller number of railway workers.

That drop in railway employment was due to the great changes in our industry. Some of those changes are well known. Powerful new diesel locomotives had been substituted for the old steam power. The freight and passenger trains of today are much longer, and travel much faster, than the trains of earlier years. We have new systems of communication, far superior to those in use a few years ago. Railroad yards are being made increasingly automatic. Railroad tracks, ties, and road-beds have been vastly improved, and the machinery for maintaining tracks has been revolutionized. Office devices of almost unbelievable complexity have been introduced throughout the industry.

For a quarter of a century these changes have been going on. They have been greatly accelerated in the last decade. Productivity of the railway workers who remained in the service has increased very rapidly. You might not believe it, in face of the charges you read in the papers about featherbedding among railway employees. But the fact is that our output per man-hour has increased much more than even the rise in manufacturing industries. From 1921 to 1946, an even quarter century, our productivity rose by well over 100 percent. Output per man-hour went up another 50 percent in the next 10 years. When this recession hit in 1957, railway workers were producing three times as much per man-hour as in 1921.

Railway traffic was twice as great in 1956 as in 1921. But railway employment was down by 60 percent. That gives you an idea of what we were facing even before this recession began.

We tried to provide for these unemployed workers in every way we could. Up until 1949, railway workers were on a 48-hour week. In that year, we succeeded in establishing in our industry the universal 40-hour week, that American workers generally had been enjoying for many years. We got the 40-hour week without reduction in take-home pay, effective September 1, 1949.

In the first 8 months of 1950, with the 40-hour week, the railways handled exactly as much traffic as in the first 8 months of 1949, on a 48-hour basis, and with exactly the same number of employees. Output per man-hour rose by 20 percent between 1949 and 1951.

After 1950 total railway employment continued to decline.

Railway traffic in 1956 was 16 percent above 1949—railway employment was down by 15 percent. Technological change was becoming even more rapid.

Now let me tell you what has happened since this recession began in 1957.

In December 1956, we had just over 1 million railway workers.

In December 1957 we had 900,000, and in December 1958 824,000.

Railway traffic, of course, had declined. But the railways had reduced employment even more. Railway workers were producing more per man-hour in 1958 than they had at any time in railway history.

Now let me tell you what has happened in the last 6 months. Railway traffic began to improve in the summer of 1958. Carload-

ings in the first 3 months of 1959 were 6 percent above 1958. But railway employment continued to decline. The number of railway workers had dropped about 7 percent from even the low level of 1958. Business was up, employment was still going down.

Now it doesn't take any great mind to figure out what has been happening to railway earnings as a result of that change.

During the first months of the recession, net profits of the railways fell off; but they were still well above many other years.

Beginning in Setpember 1958, railway profits rose rapidly. For the last 4 months of 1958 the railroads were earning at the rate of over $1 billion per year, in net railway operating profit. That is higher than in most of the postwar years, very near the peak earnings of that period. Net earnings were 20 percent above the fall months of 1957.

Railway profits were being protected, were being raised, at the expense of railway employment—even while traffic was rising again.

Now I must tell you one more special feature of railway unemployment.

A large part of the railway labor force works on maintaining railway tracks and equipment. You will understand that keeping up the railway plant is of the first importance. Poorly maintained tracks, poorly maintained cars and locomotives are not only poor management. If the machines in your factory are not kept up, that is poor management. But when your factory machine breaks down, the danger and the loss is comparatively small. When a railway car or locomotive or roadway is not well maintained, it is a multiple danger. It endangers the employee on the train. It endangers the passengers or the goods on that train. There is danger to other workers, other property, other people. So that when a railway management skimps on maintenance, in order to increase profits, that policy is indefensible.

That is just what has happened. Railway maintenance forces have been cut to the bone. Railway equipment is in bad order. Railway tracks and roadbeds are undermaintained. But railway net earnings are soaring again. They are getting the profits out of the industry—by throwing the employees onto the streets.

These employees, like the workers in other industries ,are not just statistics. Each of them is a human being, and most of them have other human beings dependent upon them.

Here, too, we in the railway industry have some special characteristics.

The unemployed railway worker usually has a special skill that is not found in other industries. Many thousands of these unemployed live in what we call railway towns, where there is no other industry. Even the part time, casual work that can sometimes be found in the bigger cities is not available in these railway towns.

We can tell you some things about these unemployed railway people. As you all know, we have a separate unemployment compensation law. We can get more detailed information than in most other industries. Let me tell you about these unemployed.

We had over 300,000 drawing unemployment benefits in 1958. They came from every State in the Union. They were out an average of 111 days of waiting period and compensation. That was the highest average recorded unemployment we have ever had since the law was passed, in 1938. And that average is not the full story, because it does not include all the unemployed time. Many thousands of these railway workers used up all their unemployment compensation. The average I gave does not include the time after their compensation was exhausted.

How many used up their compensation? Twenty-four out of every hundred unemployed railway workers used up their benefits. That figure has never been exceeded—and equalled only once—since the law was passed.

I hope you can see in these figures the extremely critical problem we face in the railway industry. The longest average unemployment, and the exhaustion of unemployment compensation, make this year one of the bleakest and blackest the workers in the industry have ever known.

But that is still not the whole, or the worst, of the story.

At the end of 1956, before the recession began, we had 211,000 experienced railway workers who had not worked at all in that year.

Fifty thousand of those were men and women over 40 years of age, almost without hope of finding suitable employment in other industry, even in good times.

But the workers who were unemployed in 1958 make an even more shocking story. Of the 300,000 drawing benefits in that year, 111,000 were over 40 years old.

Unemployment was greater, on the average, among the older employees than among those under 40.

Not only were these older workers unemployed for longer periods, but more of them used up their unemployment compensation.

Twenty-six out of every hundred among the older unemployed were out so long as to draw all the compensation provided for them.

These older railway workers are the very ones least able to find employment elsewhere. These were men and women who had invested their lives in the railway industry—110,000 of those who drew benefits in 1958 had given more than 10 years of service.

I hope I have been able to convey to you the outlines, at least, of this unemployment catastrophe. To the hundreds of thousands of railway workers, already out on the street in 1956, the railroads have since added another 200,000. The hardship and the suffering of these men and women has been extreme; the distress is multiplied by the fact that a very large proportion of them are older workers, with long service in the industry.

But the worst is apparently not yet known. The last fiscal year was the worst in history; but the current year is piling new and worse figures onto that terrible peak. There were over 300,000 unemployed in the last fiscal year, ending in July 1958. In the last 6 months of 1958, more than 225,000 railway workers drew unemployment compensation. That is an increase of 40 percent over the last 6 months of 1957—and we know, from other information, that railway employment is still shrinking.

Railway traffic has turned upward; railway net earnings have gone up, approaching the peak profits of the whole postwar period. But railway unemployment has grown worse, more are unemployed, unemployment is longer, and benefits are being used up more rapidly.

That is the railway picture. I do not know how I can make more clear to you that the railway workers are in a truly desperate plight. To every one of you, familiar at firsthand with the suffering that unemployment means, I need add no more. But I would like to say a few words to men from that other world, where unemployment is only a figure, to which they can shut their eyes.

Newspapers of yesterday gave us what is said to be the inside story of unemployment compensation. We are told that high-pressure and high-priced lobbyists have been working—openly and under cover—to defeat the proposals for liberalizing unemployment compensation. I wish I could take those lobbyists, and the men of wealth whom they represent, into the homes of some of the unemployed railway workers. I wish they could face the problem of food for the table and shoes for the children, the problem of rent day, and the doctor bill. Perhaps the heads of the great corporations who finance those lobbies could be humanized, if we could only get them to visit the homes made desolate by the specter—by the reality—of losing a job. If we could take their eyes off the stock market quotations, and their minds off the hope of escaping Federal taxation, we might make them realize that America is a nation of people, and that those people—millions of them—are suffering undeserved hardships that can and should be relieved.

But the job facing us is not just that of relieving unemployment, in my industry or in yours, or in all American industries. Our critical situation—economically, at home, and in our foreign relations—is that the United States has been slowing down. Our economy, that should be expanding, has been contracting, and shrinking. We have the natural wealth, we have the capital, we have the skilled labor. No one can set a limit to the possibility of growth in this great Nation. But it is possible for little men of small vision to arrest that growth, by the timidity of their outlook. We can grow, we must grow—and while today we must take care of our unemployed, tomorrow we must provide jobs for all of them. Let those who lead the Nation, the heads not only of government but of our great corporations as well, set for themselves a goal that is in keeping with our national possibilities. An expanding economy is the true hope of all of us. Labor will join wholeheartedly with Government and employers in seeking that expansion.

Let us take care, now, of the casualties of unemployment—and let us for tomorrow plan and achieve an America in which unemployment will be conquered, and new and greater heights of health, comfort, and happiness be reached by all of us together.

Statement on Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, as you know, the Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee No. 5, is currently holding hearings on civil rights.

I would like to include in the RECORD at this point the statement on civil rights issued by the Liberal Party of the State of New York:

STATEMENT ON CIVIL RIGHTS BY THE LIBERAL PARTY OF NEW YORK STATE

The section on civil rights in the Liberal Party's national legislative program for 1959 has this to say:

"The United States should be the leading exponent of freedom—freedom from poverty, freedom for political and social change, and freedom of equality for men of all races and religions. If we are to be successful missionaries of freedom to the rest of the world, we must learn to live in freedom ourselves. The unfinished work of our democracy is to insure the civil rights of all our citizens by

eliminating all manifestations of segregation and discrimination.

"We were encouraged by the enactment in the 85th Congress of the first Civil Rights Act in 82 years. Although the Civil Rights Act of 1957 is inadequate and but a short step toward needed and desirable legislation, it was nevertheless a step in the right direction. It is regrettable that, despite the compromise nature of the bill and the seeming support given by Southern political leaders to the principle of the right to vote, many such leaders are impeding implementation of the law. In several Southern States steps have been openly taken to circumvent the law and to prevent Negro registration and voting.

"It is most unfortunate that the Civil Rights Commission and the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice established by the Civil Rights Act of 1957 have been tardy and timorous in carrying out their mandates. The law originally gave the Civil Rights Commission a life span of 2 years until September 1959, yet the Commission did not initiate its first investigation until recently and it appears to be more concerned about convincing the public of its neutrality on the issue of segregation than it is in securing compliance with the law. It has created State advisory committees but has not moved expeditiously as regards investigations, public hearings and the use of its subpena powers to compel testimony or disclosures of records at such hearings. (Most of its members have indicated a desire to resign.)

"The Civil Rights Division (of the Department of Justice) has done little to acquaint citizens with the provisions of the law or procedures for redress of grievances as to their voting rights. It has initiated only one suit despite rampant denials of the right to vote and the ample authority it enjoys under the law.

"While progress toward desegregation of public schools in compliance with the Supreme Court decision is being made, resistance to the law of the land continues and has been intensified in some States. In light of official defiance of law, it is not surprising that extremists such as the Ku Klux Klan, and the White Citizens Councils commit acts of violence and terror. The bombings of homes, schools, and places of worship demonstrate once again that flouting of law by political leaders leads to a spread of lawlessness both geographically and as regards its victims.

"Court orders are not self-implementing. The executive branch of Government has a responsibility to see that court decisions are carried out. The President has not sufficiently exercised the great moral authority, prestige, and influence of his office in support of the Supreme Court decisions. Such action would encourage the many persons and groups throughout the country, including the South, who believe in orderly compliance with the Supreme Court ruling and would form an effective force under his leadership to bring about such compliance."

The Liberal Party at this time urges that the bill sponsored by Chairman EMANUEL CELLER, be favorably reported to the House by the Judiciary Committee, and that every effort be made to secure passage of this measure, especially with regard to the reinstatement of title III, which authorizes the Attorney General to initiate civil actions against those who deprive anyone of civil rights on account of race, color, religion, or national origin.

The Liberal Party further urges the enactment of the measure introduced by Representative WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH, making mandatory the retention of voting records for a period of 3 years.

Helped to Death

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention again to the problem of Federal interference in matters that concern local communities. This problem is ably stated in an editorial that appeared in the April 9, 1959 issue of the Snohomish County Tribune, a newspaper published in my congressional district at Snohomish, Wash.

The last sentence of this editorial is worth serious thought, because it is a fact that we could easily get to the point where we could be helped to death. Individualism helped make this country of ours the greatest in history. Federal interference, such as including Everett, Wash., and Snohomish County in the Seattle standard metropolitan district, stifles individualism, and could lead to our loss of freedom.

The editorial, entitled "Looks Like We've Been Dealt In," follows:

LOOKS LIKE WE'VE BEEN DEALT IN

Although all our independent instincts rebel against the idea of becoming a satellite community in the so-called greater Seattle metropolitan area, it looks like we've been dealt in, whether we like it or not.

Mayor Oscar Wirsching recently received a letter from the Office of Statistical Standards, Bureau of the Budget, Washington, D.C. In this missive, Mayor Wirsching was informed that all of Snohomish County, including Snohomish, has been included in the Federal Government's definition of the "Seattle-standard metropolitan area." In this connection, we should expect eventually to lose some of our independence of action, especially in the area of planning, water supply, sewer disposal, and communications.

By this, we mean that someday we can expect to take orders from a Seattle-dominated agency, probably to be called the Greater Seattle Metro District, which will have the power to override local considerations in many affairs. When the Federal Government takes the view that Snohomish County belongs in Seattle's orbit, then it becomes official, since Federal funds and supervision come into play with the new science of metropolitan planning.

For instance, we can see the day coming when we won't be able to run our own water supply, but would be forced to surrender our rights on the Pilchuck to the metro district for "the greater good of the metropolis." Or all local buslines combined into one big, government operated system.

How does the Federal Government get off, bunching us in with Seattle and its problems, you might ask? Well this is how that question was answered in the letter to Mayor Wirsching:

"On the basis of a study made * * * during October 1958, it was found that of the presently estimated resident labor force of 42,260, approximately 23 percent are employed in King County. As indicated in criterion 6a, if as many as 15 percent of the resident labor force of a contiguous county are so employed, such a county is considered as being socially and economically integrated with the central county (King) and included in the standard metropolitan area definition.

"In this case of Snohomish County, the criteria is adequately met with the survey figure of approximately 23 percent."

This is not pleasant news, from the standpoint that some of our independence will be sacrificed; but it shouldn't be unexpected news. We've seen this coming for a long time, even before the establishment of the King County Metro District.

Ever since this country turned to Federal bureaucracy to solve its local problems, we have been surrendering local control over the conduct of our affairs. We rely on Federal aid for schools, sewer construction, roads and highways, urban renewal, flood control and almost every other function of local government.

How can we accept these billions without accepting the controls and restrictions that go along with them? We dearly love those Federal dollars, but we squawk like laying hens when the laws start hemming us in. Maybe it's time we too started reexamining our lives and deciding whether we need all this help or not. Frankly, it could easily get to the point where we get helped to death.

Dirksen Carries Hopes for Senate GOP Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues will recall the work capacity and the ability of EVERETT DIRKSEN while a Member of the House.

He has demonstrated again his great capacity to get things done as minority leader in the other body. I append herewith an article by Jack Bell of the Associated Press under the dateline of Washington, April 12, as printed in the Decatur Herald—Illinois—of April 13, 1959:

ILLINOIS REPUBLICAN HEWS TO ADMINISTRATION LINE—DIRKSEN CARRIES HOPES FOR SENATE GOP UNITY

(By Jack Bell)

WASHINGTON, April 20.—President Eisenhower has found a new pinch hitter for his administration in Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, (Republican of Illinois), and is reported mighty happy with the discovery.

Using the Senate as a forum, Minority Leader DIRKSEN has taken it upon himself to go to bat for the administration every time it is assailed in a major way by the Democrats.

In his latest effort last week, the robust 6-foot Senator from Illinois arose from his front-row seat, donned his sparingly used glasses and proceeded to a scathing attack on the Democratic Advisory Council for its criticism of Eisenhower administration foreign policies.

There was a time in the not-too-distant past that DIRKSEN himself might have disagreed with some of the international aspects of Eisenhower's policies.

All of that has changed. "Ev," as he is known to his colleagues, enlisted under the Eisenhower banner a couple of years ago in obvious preparation for the job he now holds as GOP floor leader.

He professes 88 percent support for Eisenhower's legislative proposals. The DIRKSEN stewardship goes much further than that. Much to the pleasure of the White House, he operated under a completely different concept than his predecessor, former Senator William F. Knowland of California.

Knowland made it perfectly clear at the outset of his stint in the leadership he regarded himself as the representative of the Senate's Republicans only. He said it was not his job to take orders from anybody but those Republicans—and that included the General in the White House.

The White House never was sure just when Knowland would jump the administration track. The California Senator did it frequently on such international issues as supplying aid to Yugoslavia.

While Knowland often arose to defend some administration policies, he could be stonily silent while Democrats assailed others with which he did not himself agree.

DIRKSEN has no such reservations. His creed is that he is the administration's spokesman in the Senate. If he has to double back around some roadblocks he himself helped erect in the past, that's just one of the penalties of a job he is mighty proud to hold.

Although he was opposed for the leadership post by a group of Republican liberals who looked askance at his conservatitve record, DIRKSEN has effectively silenced any opposition from that quarter.

He has literally left the liberals nothing to complain about in the way he goes about his job. At the same time he has kept the GOP conservatives happy.

Through long years of outlining his thoughts on almost every subject in little black notebooks, DIRKSEN has built up a treasury of information on which he can draw quickly and effectively for any kind of speech. He can drop an appropriate Biblical quotation quicker than most of his opponents can drop a hat.

This ability has made DIRKSEN a man to be reckoned with in the Senate's sometimes rough-and-tumble debate. Nobody pushes him around without getting a smilingly delivered dig in the ribs in return.

Beyond all this, DIRKSEN has shown he is doing his homework. He knows details of bills that sometimes are vague to members of the committees which have brought out the legislation. He is seldom caught short in parliamentary maneuvering.

Holmes, Sweet Holmes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KEN HECHLER
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, the following syndicated column by Holmes Alexander appeared in recent issues of the Parkersburg (W. Va.) News, Charleston (W. Va.) Daily Mail, and many newspapers through the country:

HECHLER PREACHES MUTINY ON THE BOUNTY BUT FINDS HE IS FLOGGING WRONG CULPRIT

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Congressman KEN HECHLER, who represents 10 West Virginia counties in the Ohio River Valley, was preaching mutiny on the bounty. He was telling the House Agriculture Committee that the free food for needy families in his district was not enough and not what the needy people were demanding.

Congressman HECHLER, born on Long Island and brought up in Missouri, is a strolling New Dealer who recently came to West Virginia and won this seat last year in the Democratic landslide. Now he was laying into the Republican Secretary of Agriculture with charges of ignorant indifference to human suffering ("Let 'em eat shrimp cocktails") and was tagging the Republican administration with spending billions for defense and peanuts for tribulation.

Representative HECHLER had it all going his way until some of the senior Democrats pointed out that he was flogging the wrong culprit. It turned out that the bottleneck was not at the Agriculture Department, but down at the West Virginia localities where the food hadn't been requested or hadn't been distributed for lack of funds, organization or manpower. This seems to be true in other States.

You can see what comes next. The Secretary of Agriculture has almost limitless emergency power to declare that a surplus exists in anything which Americans eat, chew, smoke or wear. He then, can make this surplus product available to "needy" families. Secretary Benson has done this in record amounts of food and dollars to a record number of Americans who are responding in record volume of complaints about the quantity, quality, and variety.

Next? Well, the trend of legislation in the 86th Congress is to vest more and more authority in federalia. Specifically, it may not be long before the Agriculture Secretary not only assigns food to the needy, but fetches it to the door. And pretty soon, as Congress broadens the definition of "needy," we can expect to find huge areas in the United States where people will learn to sing for their supper while obliging bureaucracies serve it up.

If this seems alien to the American tradition, the reason may be that our legislators are turning to non-American models for social betterment. In a major speech in support of his own area redevelopment bill, which was recently passed by the Senate 49–46, Senator PAUL DOUGLAS told a Friday afternoon Senate audience (about six or eight Senators when I was there) that the nearly $400 million measure for rebuilding rural-urban slums "would not result in a radical new program which has never been tried." Was Mr. DOUGLAS saying that Federal factory-building was an old American usage? Oh, no. "The countries of Western Europe," he went on, "have had similar programs * * * the financing * * * made possible by U.S. foreign aid dollars."

Well, I thought I'd heard everything till now. The DOUGLAS line of reasoning is that the American communities are comparable to the foreign lands which were laid to waste by war and then threatened by Communist overthrow. Great Britain actually went to the halfway house of national socialism and Senator DOUGLAS cited, with seeming approval, the British Distribution of Industry Act, passed in 1945 and extended last year. Under this British law, any community having a high rate of unemployment which is likely to persist would get preferential treatment by the Government. This is legislation which flies in the face of Nature by promoting the preservation of unfit communities. The only foreseeable result would be to perpetuate the obsolete sites where industry and agriculture have failed, and to prevent the natural birth of new cities and farm communities where the future wealth must be created, if at all.

Thus Congressman HECHLER and Senator DOUGLAS are double-teaming, the former to pin down the population of our migratory race with drive-in restaurant service from the Federal granaries, the latter to invest in ghost towns and to make it the business of Congress to prevent (although it won't work) the founding of new Detroits and future Pittsburghs.

There is no denying that the industrial revolution has brought privation and hard luck to many Congressional Districts and States. But this is a modern problem, even futuristic. It won't be solved by imitating the Pharaohs and building pyramids with gang labor in the unproductive desert sands.

Mr. Speaker, I am tickled pink that Mr. Alexander has given me all this free publicity. You know, new Members of Congress sometimes have a hard time trying to convince the folks back home that they are really making a dent on the Washington scene. Statistically, any Member is less than two-tenths percent of the entire membership of Congress, but of course the influence of a freshman Member of the House of Representatives is even less.

When a freshman Member arrives in Washington glowing with the flush of victory, sometimes he feels pretty big. Then comes the big disillusionment when he is not even recognized by the hotel doorman.

Lucky indeed, then, is the Congressman who incurs the opposition of a columnist—sometimes spelled c-a-l-u-m-n-i-s-t. I am very proud of this column for a number of reasons. I am proud that Mr. Alexander called attention to my efforts to distribute some of our staggering food surpluses to our needy people here in America, for why should there be starvation in the face of bulging granaries? I am proud that Mr. Alexander calls me a "strolling New Dealer"—which is better than being a creeping reactionary. I am proud that he associated me with that noble warrior, Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, who has always been one of my idols in his battles for economic justice. I am proud, too, that all West Virginian will rise up and demonstrate that their land does not consist of the "desert sands," "ghost towns," and "unfit communities" which Mr. Alexander tries to label them.

Mr. Speaker, men in public life must have a good sense of humor. They must be able to laugh at themselves and enjoy it. If it were not for columnists like Holmes Alexander, I would recommend a program which would transport 20 public officials at a time out to be deposited in folding chairs on the rim of the Grand Canyon for 2-hour periods of silent contemplation every now and then. But fortunate we are that we have people like Mr. Alexander in the business.

Now, if someone would just introduce me to Mr. Westbrook Pegler.

Potato Postulate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, many of us are already well acquainted with the health-contributing characteristics of the Irish potato. To the attention of those not fully familiar with the potato's

health-promoting powers, I recommend the following article by James Hasson, M.D., as it appeared in a recent issue of the Maine Line, a trade publication of the Bangor & Aroostook Railroad:

POTATO POSTULATE

(By James Hasson, M.D.)

People used to pity the Irish who were so poor that they had to live on potatoes. The next time you see a bunch of new Canadians, listen to the brogue of the ginger-headed 6-footer with shoulders on him like a prize-fighter and fists like hams. Not Californian peach-fed hams these, but Irish potato-fed. It was not only economics that made the Irish eat potatoes—it was also sound commonsense. The mother of that man you watched lift a sack of cement as if it were a bag of feathers knew what was best for him when he was a boy—and gave him potatoes, lots of them.

That woman did not need a doctor to tell her that potatoes were good for her boy, because some long-inherited primitive instinct provided the knowledge. What does your dog do if its stomach is upset? It eats grass which will make it well. Nobody ever taught it to do this—it just knows what is the right thing to do. I am a Harley Street specialist and the majority of the people whom I treat have, unfortunately, had their primitive commonsense and their best animal instincts bred out of them by generations of overrich living. They come to me with a variety of ailments—rheumatism, lumbago, the so-called displaced disk, skin disorders such as acne of the young, rosacea, and generalized eczema. They expect, sometimes even demand, complicated and expensive treatments, and I can see the doubt in their eyes when I tell them that a simple diet of potatoes will put them right. But, when I insist, they follow the regimen I lay down for them, and are surprised at its success. What is the regimen? A potato diet. Boiled potatoes or potatoes baked in their skins with butter, black pepper, salt, and a few drops of lemon juice. Why the lemon juice? Because it provides the extra vitamin C which is necessary in all diets.

Why potatoes? Ask a chef what he does if, in error, he oversalts a dish. He will tell you that he drops in a few boiled potatoes because they absorb the excess salt. But what has excess salt in food got to do with the functions of your body? Potatoes have the same quality in your stomach as they have in the oversalted sauce—they absorb acidity. And one of the greatest dangers of continued indulgence in rich foods and alcohol is that the acids in your body, and particularly uric acid, become too plentiful for your organs to eliminate. These acids are the equivalent to the excess salt in the sauce, and a potato diet will rid your body of them and add years to your life. This removal process is called anti-intoxication.

"But I'll get fat if I eat too many potatoes."

Bosh! Let me tell you what happens to the food you eat. Ideally, if you have a properly balanced diet, every bit of good is extracted from your food and is used to restore the energy you have spent since the last meal. It is when the stomach has completed this task that it feels empty, and grumblingly demands more fodder to work upon. But if you stuff yourself with rich food and drink too much alcohol you are placing a heavy burden on your digestive processes. Your intestines, your kidneys and your liver protest because they can't cope, and you have a feeling of fullness, indigestion and even spots before the eyes. Your unlucky organs do the best they can to separate the good from the bad, but their efficiency is impaired and the damaging acids, such as uric acid, pass into your system.

From the fat content of your food your body takes only as much as it needs and stores the rest, usually somewhere around your midriff. There is no fat in the potato diet except that supplied by the small amount of butter, but your body needs a reasonable amount of fat. So, when you are on a potato diet, the body will have to draw upon its reserves. The result is a decrease in your girth. As for the uric acid, that is absorbed by the potatoes and passes out of your system. But the diet, to be really effective, must be continuous and systematic for 2 or 3 days every week.

A person between 40 and 65 should, in my opinion, avoid spirits, wines, and rich foods for 3 to 4 months every year while he follows the potato diet. But, even if you only follow the weekly 2 or 3 days of potato diet (always baked or boiled potatoes, mind you, not fried), you will be lengthening your life.

How often have you heard this conversation, even joined in it?

"Funny about Joe, dying like that within a few years of retiring. He'd worked like a slave for years to get a decent pension and enough to retire upon, then, bang. He's gone."

"Yes; sad, sad. But a lot of guys seem to go that way. Must be because they have no work to do, and no hobbies. I'm going to get myself a hobby when I retire."

No, get one before you retire; get one now. And make your hobby the potato diet. It was not because Joe had no hobby that he died so quickly after retiring. He'd been stuffing himself with good food and drinking far too much liquor for years. He'd been slowly poisoning his system, but while he was working his energy absorbed much of the surplus calories and helped to get rid of the acids. When he took to doing practically nothing he lost neither his appetite nor his thirst, but his organs could not cope any longer. They gave up the unequal struggle and Joe gave up the ghost.

But had Joe eaten a balanced diet (which would not have stopped him from occasionally having the little bit of rich something he fancied), had he gone on a potato diet, he would have lived to enjoy his years of retirement. Are you going to enjoy yours? Then you'd better start the potato diet right away.

Propaganda? Of course this is propaganda. Propaganda, not to increase the consumption of potatoes but to increase the length of your life. Try it.

A greedy man never just dies. He kills himself, he commits suicide. Old age is brought on, hastened along by corrosion of the organs through wrong and injudicious eating and drinking.

Now this potato diet. What? You're sick to death of the word "potato"? Are you sick of life, too?

Hoffa-Bridges Threat to Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEO E. ALLEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Rockford (Ill.) Register-Republic of April 13, 1959, entitled "Hoffa-Bridges Threat to Nation":

HOFFA-BRIDGES THREAT TO NATION

The American public will readily understand the potential threat to a vital lifeline of the Nation in James R. Hoffa's proposal to consolidate all unions engaged in transportation of people and goods—on land and sea and in the air. From both west and east coasts last week, steps were taken to set up joint committees composed of representatives of Hoffa's Teamsters' Union, Longshoremen, Seafarers, and the Maritime Union.

The threat on the west coast is more critical because in that area Hoffa is making overtures to Harry Bridges, whose International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union was expelled from the old CIO in 1950 on the ground that it followed the Moscow line more than it did the CIO line.

Hoffa's union and the longshoremen could exercise a powerful force over commerce. Now that Hawaii has been admitted as a State, Bridges' left-wing union, which has a firm grip on the islands' sugar and pineapple industry, is in an even better position to throttle shipping.

The AFL–CIO, which expelled the racket-ridden Teamsters' Union last year, has attempted to nip Hoffa's plot in the bud by ordering affiliates of the federation not to have anything to do with the Teamsters. But Hoffa's power is so great that the AFL–CIO ban has had little effect; when the Teamsters halt deliveries or throw up picket lines, other unions generally do not challenge the action.

Teamster and dock-worker officials on both east and west coasts say that current steps toward establishment of joint-action committees are not preliminary to a confederation of transport workers. But against those statements must be considered Hoffa's words last November 3, when he said that his plan to merge truckdrivers, seamen, longshoremen, and air-transport workers would not be stopped by the McClellan racket-investigating committee or the courts of the land.

The public would be almost helpless if Hoffa, the man who tried to unionize New York City police last year, carried out his transport federation scheme. This empire would take in about 50 unions and at least 3,500,000 workers; it would have a stranglehold on the U.S. economy.

The Hoffa-Bridges threat can be stopped in its tracks if Congress takes action to put labor unions under provisions of the Anti-trust Act. Hoffa has defied the AFL–CIO and monitors appointed by a Federal district court to supervise the Teamsters' Union; Bridges, after successfully opposing efforts of the U.S. Government to deport him to his native Australia, recently toured Europe, including Russia, and was accorded a welcome by America-hating union leaders.

Hoffa and Bridges would not be able to defy the law and to ignore congressional committees if they were subject to the same antitrust laws which apply to business and industry. These power-hungry labor leaders have already been given too much rein; their transport federation dream should be exploded before it is too late.

Pitifully Uninformed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Gaffney Ledger, Gaffney, S.C., of April 14, 1959:

PITIFULLY UNINFORMED

One of the most alarming things about the United States, and our people, is the fact that they read less and less, apparently, of the serious, informative, and educational things. As the latest example, a widespread poll recently revealed that almost 40 percent of those interviewed did not know that Berlin lay within Red-ruled East Germany.

As has been pointed out so often, the trash which makes the best-seller list, and which makes hundreds of thousands of dollars for its authors, reflects a melancholy picture of what the American people think about, read, and do with their leisure time.

Two courses which every American youngster should study, and which most of them do, are U.S. history and the history of the Communist movement. And, U.S. history should certainly cover the years to the present, since the international picture changes so frequently these days, it is mandatory to give our youngsters an up-to-date history of events up to now.

Of equal importance, and a more urgent problem, is the challenge which faces each citizen—the challenge of keeping himself somewhat informed. Rather than watching television for endless hours, reading sex novels, and piddling away all one's life with leisure, in various forms, each of us should devote some time daily to keeping abreast of the news, and the issues of the day, in order that we might be better citizens.

New York Dinner Will Honor Celler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article which appeared in the March 1959 issue of the Jewish War Veteran.

The Jewish War Veteran award of its Gold Medal of Merit to Congressman CELLER is a highly deserved tribute, and I join his many friends who will honor him on April 18.

NEW YORK DINNER WILL HONOR CELLER

On Saturday evening, April 18 Jewish War Veterans will present its coveted gold medal of merit to Representative EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat-New York, at a dinner in his honor at the Hotel Statler in New York City.

Maj. Gen. Julius Klein, Past National Commander, is honorary chairman of the dinner.

Congressman CELLER, known affectionately as "MANNY", was awarded the Medal through unanimous resolution by Jewish War Veterans at its convention in Los Angeles last year.

What kind of a man is "MANNY CELLER"? Nobody can put it better than has Mr. CELLER himself in his autobiography, "You Never Leave Brooklyn":

"You never leave Brooklyn. The life that spills over from Pitkin Avenue follows you to the placid, well-ordered Connecticut Avenue of Washington, D.C. The hoops, the kites, the skates, the sleds, the fights of Brooklyn's children follow you to the streets of official Washington, where no children scamper through the streets or tumble under your feet. The shadow of Brooklyn tenements falls upon the low houses of Washington.

"Externally, Washington is a lady—proper, hatted and gloved, as becomes a lady. Brooklyn is a woman, overlarge, aproned for work, with a crisscrossed heart."

EMANUEL CELLER came to Congress in 1923 and in his 36 years both as a Member of Congress and as chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives has thrown himself into the battle for the rights of the plain people. Sometimes he is a voice alone in his defense of free speech, free press, free assembly, and all civil liberties. His understanding that democracy anywhere affects democracy everywhere has led to his magnificient support of such democratic countries as Israel and India. Two of his fiercest engagements are in the areas of reducing monopoly power and liberalizing our immigration laws.

His whole record speaks his background and his heart, for he came from Brooklyn and his knowledge of the poor and downtrodden is personal and experienced.

EMANUEL CELLER was born in Brooklyn on May 6, 1888. He attended the public schools, was graduated from Boys High School of Brooklyn in 1906; from Columbia College, New York City, in 1910, and from Columbia University Law School, New York City, in 1912. He was elected to Congress November, 1922. But these facts do not tell the story of MANNY CELLER. He worked as a recreation teacher during his summers. He sold wine after his father's death to help himself through school. He practiced law; he studied music, and to this day plays both the violin and the piano. Now, at the age of seventy-one, he is a man of intense energy, of deep understanding, and still as alive to the issues of the day as he was when he first entered Congress. Today he is the dean of the New York delegation, and considered one of the best informed and staunchest Liberals in the House.

Do You Care About Freedom?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEITH THOMSON

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, the Lifeline radio program features daily broadcasts by Wayne Poucher, radio minister for this nationwide patriotic and religious educational movement.

Mr. Poucher, whose daily commentaries on public affairs and sermons are broadcast over a large number of radio stations throughout the country, is a fervent and sincere crusader in the cause of freedom.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert the text of a recent broadcast by Mr. Poucher, entitled "Do You Care About Freedom?" in the RECORD so that all Members may have an opportunity to read his inspiring message:

We heard a story recently about a man from the Midwest who paid a visit to New York City. Later he was telling friends about walking down a New York City street when he suddenly saw a stranger in the crowd clutch at his chest and then fall to the sidewalk, writhing in pain. "When I got to the corner," the midwesterner said, "I looked back and the man was lying where he had fallen. People were stepping around him and paying no attention to him. Nobody seemed to care."

Of course, the moral of that story is obvious. The visitor to New York was quick to condemn the coldness of the people there—but he himself did not stop to help the fallen man. The New York visitor was like so many of us—he wanted someone else to be the good Samaritan—he was waiting for "they" to do what was necessary.

In just the same way, Americans all over the land are waiting today for they to preserve our individual liberty and save our Nation from its enemies. But they are not going to do it, my friends. This is a job you are going to have to do—you and all other Americans who care about freedom. And who does care about freedom in America? Why, millions of constructive Americans care. Those who know the history of our Constitution and who realize that its basis is the guarantee of individual freedom, care deeply about maintaining local self-government in our Nation.

There are Americans everywhere who care passionately about their country and its symbols: The flag, the national anthem and other partiotic songs, the anniversaries of our freedom's birth, the good name of the United States. They feel a great pride in expressing their love of their country. They agree with that Member of the U.S. Congress who said, many years ago, "The love of country is nothing more than the love of every man for his wife, child, or friend."

And then there are men and women among us who care gravely about the solvency of the National Treasury. This concern very definitely has something to do with honor and integrity. The national character of the United States is injured when, despite a backbreaking burden of taxation, the Government continues year after year to run heavily into debt. This concern over our fiscal soundness also relates to the corruption of character by Federal giveaways. Those who call for sound economy in Government are not selfish persons devoid of human considerations. They are normal persons who place great value on ideals and principles. These are among the people who care about America. They are the constructives.

Opposed to them are two groups. One group is made up of the complacent, the apathetic, those who either say that everything is all right or say there is nothing they can do about the things that are wrong. They fall easily into the traps set for them by the third group—a group made up of the mistaken, the sworn enemies of the kind of freedom that is traditional in America.

The mistaken have no use for the Constitution of the United States, based as it is on guarantees of individual freedom and limitations on the power of big government. The mistaken sneer at the feeling that patriots have for this land of liberty. The mistaken encourage and promote more and more Federal spending and bigger and bigger Federal deficits. The mistaken are those who, whatever the cause, can always be counted on to place the interests of the United States last.

Against the efforts of the mistaken, we must, my friends, place the full strength of all those who care about a free America. Truth and knowledge are the great weapons possessed by those who care. With truth spread by knowledge we can awaken those who care. With truth spread by knowledge we can awaken those who are sleeping, and with our combined strength we can successfully resist the onslaughts of the mistaken against freedom in America, against civilization in the world, and against the love of God in the hearts of men.

Let us remember our history. Liberty was no mystery to our American forebears. They knew that in a self-governing nation, liberty must be universally understood or it is certain to be destroyed. Once the average citizen hands the keeping of his liberty over

to anybody else, he already has lost his liberty. These were the fundamental facts recognized by the Founding Fathers and set down in plain words in our Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States.

Understanding—effective understanding—is the basic need. It is the responsibility—yes, and the privilege—of patriots to spread among their fellow Americans the understanding of the love of freedom and love of country that will save us from disaster. It is a task that must be accomplished by Americans who care—that can be accomplished only by them—that can be accomplished, in your area of relationships, only by you.

Public Interest Ignored—Kennedy Labor Bill Covers Only What Unions Accept

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO E. ALLEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article by Holmes Alexander, which appeared in the Rockford (Ill.) Register-Republic of April 13, 1959, and is entitled "Kennedy Labor Bill Covers Only What Unions Accept":

PUBLIC INTEREST IGNORED—KENNEDY LABOR BILL COVERS ONLY WHAT UNIONS ACCEPT

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON.—Senator JACK KENNEDY, front runner for the Democratic presidential nomination, owes his early lead to energy and a winning personality. But the way things are going, he could find himself more beholden to the American labor movement than a successful candidate in America ought to be.

The prospects of three other presidential possibilities have been recently explored in this place. RICHARD NIXON'S forte is experience and an open record; STUART SYMINGTON'S is a proved ability in business management and labor relations; LYNDON JOHNSON'S is leadership and parliamentary skill. But Kennedy stands out as the favorite of the AFL–CIO, the spokesman for prolabor legislation, and the gadfly of the probusiness opposition.

All this is confusing and unfortunate. Senator KENNEDY is not a laborite or a leftist. Nothing about him deserves the Republican epithets of radical—meaning in NIXON'S language, an extremist. But it may be—and this is written in friendship and warning—that KENNEDY and his backers don't realize how far toward this precipice the Senator's labor reform bill (S. 505) is taking them.

The Senator, for example, has been forced by competition to take a position which opposes making union officers criminally responsible for misusing union funds. True, the Kennedy bill does not blacklist fiduciary responsibility, which is the legal phrase. But of the four principal labor reform bills now before Congress, only the Kenendy bill fails to include a fiduciary provision.

The Kennedy bill is much softer than its three competitors in the matter of financial disclosures by union officers. The Kennedy measure relies on criminal procedures, while the Goldwater-administration bill (S. 748) would provide actions of disapproval by the Labor Department and the National Labor Relations Board. Two other bills by Senator MCCLELLAN (S. 1137), and Congressman BARDEN (H.R. 4473) go still further. They require that the union financial reports be certified by a certified public accountant.

Senator KENNEDY'S bill includes a difficult legal obstacle for the removal of a union officer by vote of the union members. There is a show-cause phrase in the Kennedy bill which is significantly left out of the bill by Senator MCCLELLAN, whose committee has interviewed so many slippery characters. Again, the Kennedy bill is unlike the Goldwater, McClellan, and Barden bills in the matter of protecting union members from threats and violence by union officers and goons. The Kennedy bill tends to federalize jurisdiction over labor affairs which now lie in the no man's land between Washington and the States. Two of the other three bills favor States rights when in doubt, and the fourth bill does not take up the subject. The Kennedy bill deals very gingerly with labor picketing and deals not at all with secondary boycotts, two matters on which the AFL–CIO is very touchy.

In virtually every case Senator KENNEDY does what the labor leaders desire or will tolerate, and what the business community regards as undesirable and often intolerable. This may not be so bad. Labor is entitled to liberal champions in Congress, but there is reason to feel that some of the Kennedy positions are harmful not merely to business but to the public interests. This appears to be true in places where the Kennedy bill fails to go as far in protective language as the McClellan bill. The American Farm Bureau Federation, which represents a large nonlabor public segment, says this of the Kennedy measure:

"The bill nibbles around the edges of the labor racketeering problem. It's no more than a gesture toward what needs to be done. People would be lulled by its enactment into a falses assumption that Congress has discharged its responsibility for effective labor reform legislation."

This is what the labor bosses want, but it is not what the American people are asking their statesmen to produce.

Mandatory Import Quotas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. MEYER
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I would like to include an editorial which recently appeared in the Montpelier Evening Argus, Montpelier, Vt. This editorial shows clearly the great and growing concern of Vermonters, as well as people elsewhere, over the adverse effects of the recent order imposing mandatory import quotas:

[From the Montpelier (Vt.) Evening Argus, Mar. 21, 1959]

THE OIL ORDER

From every conceivable standpoint, the Federal Government's imposition of a mandatory system of import quotas on crude oil, gas, and other principal petroleum products is as irresponsible as it is unwise and unnecessary. It is clearly a decision made in homage to a group of special interests—some of the purely domestic oil companies—at the expense of the general welfare.

It will undoubtedly lead to an oil and gasoline price increase, thus furthering the pressures of inflation, which the Federal administration, incidentally, is supposed to be fighting on other fronts.

It can do nothing but harm to our already damaged foreign trade and foreign relations programs, being, as it is, a restraint on free world trade and competition.

It may well lead to further interference by the Government in economic controls, if the administration's promise to police the program is carried out.

The Government, which sounded more than a little embarrassed at its own decision, gave off with some sop about this being in the interest of national security. This is red herring nonsense, and smells as such.

That statement completely ignores the fact that the restrictions apply equally to Canada. How, now, could there be any interception on the U.S. bound oil on the sea in this case? Canadian officials had protested the decision even before it was made as another example of breaking down friendly relations between the two countries.

And in neutral countries overseas how does the Government think this decision will be interpreted? How else but a contradiction of our high and mighty sounding phrases about international cooperation and free trade? And, in all honesty, what else is it?

The blow may well hit New England harder than other parts of the country, since the import restrictions apply also to residual oil.

President Eisenhower included this in the compulsory program despite repeated protests from the New England delegations in Congress and from others in this part of the country.

Instead of listening to these entreaties, the Government went ahead with a decision that can only result in increased oil prices in New England and give inflation a further impetus all over the country.

What of Tibet and the United Nations?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROSS BASS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on April 11, 1959, the Daily Herald, of Columbia, Tenn., one of the outstanding newspapers of my district, carried an editorial relating to the U.N., which I think merits the attention of the membership of the Congress. I would like to call my colleagues' attention in particular to the comments in regard to this country's failure to remain on the diplomatic offensive in our relations with Communist countries.

The editorial follows herewith:

WHAT OF TIBET AND THE UNITED NATIONS?

What good is the U.N. anyway?

We ask this question in view of the action of Red China in taking over once proud and independent but primitive Tibet.

The revolt in Tibet is certainly a challenge to the U.N. and an opportunity. But it is not even being seriously considered that the U.N. take even token action.

The United Nations acted with great indignation and no success when the Russians brutally suppressed a popular revolt in Hungary.

Although U.N. action did not amount to much, and although the Russians would not even permit the Secretary General of the United Nations to go to Hungary, when things were in a state of turmoil, the cooky-pushing element in New York adopted vari-

ous resolutions, and staged a pretty good propaganda battle against the Russian occupation of Hungary.

Now it is agreed that the Russian action in Hungary hurt them in various parts of the world, all the way from Europe to Asia. It was blunt proof that Soviet talk of peace, etc., is a mere sham and that the satellite nations are actually kept under Russia's thumb by military force.

Now the Chinese Reds have brutally suppressed a revolt in Tibet. Few people know much about Tibet, and few of them care too much about it, but the opportunity for a major propaganda victory is there—if the allies or the United Nations would exploit it.

Instead of concentrating all our attention on Berlin, the allies especially the United States or the United Nations, should focus the world's attention on Tibet, should protest conditions there, and should continue to protest the Russian domination of the Balkan countries. We should counter the Russian squeeze on Berlin with the demand that the Russians withdraw from the small countries they occupied after World War II, and carry on our own aggressive public relations campaign throughout the world.

Unfortunately, the Western World has missed many a propaganda opportunity in recent years. Likewise, we have been inclined to spend more time on the defensive, answering charges made against us, than we have spent on the offensive. We should keep up a drumfire propaganda barrage on Hungary, on Tibet, on the domination of the Balkans, and on the various forms of suppression of freedom which are practiced in Russia and all Communist countries.

Negroes Speak Under Duress of NAACP

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to include an editorial from the Florida Times-Union, Jacksonville, Fla., of April 19, 1959:

NEGROES SPEAK UNDER DURESS OF NAACP

The invitations which are being mailed this week by the Jacksonville Beach Chamber of Commerce to 1,500 high school graduating classes in the Southeast for a visit to the local strands is a reminder that commencement season is not far off in the segregated school systems of Dixieland.

The white youngsters who will respond to the hospitality of our local beaches and enjoy one more class outing are no different from the Negro children of the same age category and school level. Take for example, the Florida High School Senior Day observance last Saturday attended by 1,500 Negro high school seniors at Florida A. and M. in Tallahassee.

Whether conditions remain as they are, with the young people of each race enjoying the privilege of remaining unintegrated may depend on the State legislature now in Tallahassee, where the members of that lawmaking body will undoubtedly have to listen to specious reasons why they should submit to a "little bit of integration."

They will be offered that pabulum in language which is labeled the "moderate approach."

In writing their opinion as to why the Negro children who were at Tallahassee last week and those who will visit our beaches should engage in this activity together, the Justices of the Supreme Court said under the present arrangement in the South the colored youngsters are suffering psychologically because of segregation.

No greater puerility ever came from the pens of supposedly adult human beings.

Ask those young Negroes who were at Florida A. and M., under conditions where they can respond without being under the duress of the NAACP, whether they would want it the proposed new way or the old way. They would say, if they spoke in honesty, that the psychological wounds incurred from going on a beach party in social atmosphere which was forced upon them carried infinitely more danger of psychological wounds.

That's commonsense, and not something out of an "educational psychology" book, and that is the reason our Florida legislators will refuse to submit to any other plan. Why should they when it was never in the divine scheme of things to be otherside, the turncoat southern moderates to the contrary notwithstanding?

The Aftermath of the Sacco-Vanzetti Case and Effect on World Opinion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present Pennsylvania Supreme Court Justice Michael A. Musmanno's views on the aftermath of the Sacco-Vanzetti conviction and its effect on world opinion:

THE AFTERMATH OF THE SACCO-VANZETTI CASE AND EFFECT ON WORLD OPINION

(By Pennsylvania Supreme Court Justice Michael A. Musmanno)

Never in the annals of criminal trials which ended at the gallows or in the electric chair was a case of the prosecution so completely demolished as it was in the Sacco-Vanzetti case. Not only were all identifying witnesses, without exception, proved to be untrustworthy for one reason or another, but many of those associated in an official capacity with the case on the Commonwealth's side were proved to be unworthy of the offices they held. The defendants Sacco and Vanzetti spoke English but occasionally testified in Italian. The official court interpreter, Joseph Ross, was charged with distorting questions and answers of Italian-speaking witnesses so as to favor the prosecution and injure the defendants. Why would he do this? It developed later that he was very close to Judge Webster Thayer, for whom he often acted as chauffeur. His attachment was so intimate that he named his son, Webster Thayer Ross. Was he capable of so flagrant an act of injustice as misinterpreting evidence which had to do with defendants on trial for their lives? I do not know, but it is a matter of record that before the date of the execution Ross was serving a term in prison for attempted bribery of a judge.

And then there was Massachusetts Attorney General Arthur K. Reading, who represented the Commonwealth in the latter hearings in the Sacco-Vanzetti case. Mr. Reading admitted to me that the defendants were entitled to apply to every member of the U.S. Supreme Court for a stay of execution. However, after we had communicated with only four, and there were five more yet to see, Reading notified the Governor that there was no legal impediment to executing Sacco and Vanzetti at midnight, August 22, even though the warrant of execution could have been fulfilled any time during the next 7 days. Following the executions, Reading often publicly proclaimed that the defendants had had a fair trial. Several months later the Massachusetts House of Representatives impeached him on the charge of accepting a bribe of $25,000 in connection with an organization he was investigating. He resigned his office. Still later he was disbarred.

And then there was the Government agent Shaughnessy who made adverse reports on Sacco and Vanzetti. Before the Sacco-Vanzetti case ended, Shaughnessy was sentenced to a 12-year term in prison for highway robbery.

Degradation, exposure and repudiation followed many of the principals on the Commonwealth's side of the case. In contradistinction, there was never produced any derogatory evidence (aside from the alleged participation in the indicted crimes) against the characters of Sacco and Vanzetti. In the 7 years of bitter prosecution and in the 31 years which have followed, not one incident has been presented revealing the shoemaker and the fishpeddler as anything other than kindly disposed, charitable, honest workingmen. It is simply contrary to every experience in life to believe that men of such unblemished personal integrity could participate in brutal and sordid murder. One could almost feel that a wave of insanity, similar to that which hanged the Salem witches, swept over the condemning hierarchy to kill two men who lived lives so diametrically opposite to the lives of murderers and bandits.

The case got to the supreme judicial court of Massachusetts on appeal but that court, under the then existing law, was not empowered to review the entire record and decide whether the charge of murder had been made out. The law was changed by this respected legislature in 1939 and I do not think there can be any doubt in the minds of lawyers anywhere that if the Sacco-Vanzetti record went to the supreme court of Massachusetts today under the present law, an absolute discharge of the defendants would be ordered.

Are Sacco and Vanzetti to be disgraced throughout all the centuries and the milleniums of the eternity to come because of the delay of 12 years in the passage of a law which would have assured them a new trial and an almost positive acquittal in 1927?

On April 9, 1927, Judge Thayer sentenced Sacco and Vanzetti to death in the electric chair and an appeal was made to Gov. Alvan T. Fuller for executive clemency. One can almost feel sorry for Governor Fuller because there was thrust on him a burden for which he was not equipped. With his limited qualifications he did the best he could, and that best was deplorable. So far as court procedure and evaluation of evidence were concerned, he brought to the case a severely circumscribed capacity, which, combined with an inordinate vanity, could only lead him to a chaotically confused view on the entire legal controversy and could only carry him, which it did, to a conclusion which was devoid of order, empty of logic, and totally destitute of the most rudimentary concept of justice.

A couple of instances will illustrate Fuller's manner of evaluating evidence which could free or hang the persons placed in his charge. Vanzetti's defense at the Plymouth trial was that he could not have been in Bridgewater on December 24, 1919, committing a crime there, since, on that day he was selling fish in Plymouth. In reviewing the case, Fuller said he was a businessman and he wanted to see things in black and white. He said that Vanzetti's story would be a good one if it could be proved, by means of an express

company receipt, that fish had been sent to him from Boston, as he said it had been sent, for him to sell in Plymouth. Defense counsel searched through endless records at the fish piers in South Boston and, almost by miracle, found a book of express receipts which specifically recorded the shipment of fish made to Vanzetti, and fish which he sold on December 24, 1919. But now what had been so important a piece of evidence, when Fuller thought that it did not exist, turned out to be of no consequence when it was actually presented to Fuller.

Another illustration. One of the items of evidence against Sacco was a cap alleged to have been found at the murder scene. The prosecution claimed that they proved the cap belonged to Sacco because of a hole in the lining, theorized to have been made when Sacco hung it on a nail above his workbench. Katzmann argued that the jury had the right to convict Sacco on the cap evidence alone. Judge Thayer confirmed the importance of the cap in the Commonwealth's case. Governor Fuller said to me that the hole in the cap convinced him of Sacco's guilt, but when I uncovered the evidence that the hole had really been made by the chief of police looking for identifying marks within the lining, the Governor said that this disclosure was really not important.

Fuller appointed an advisory committee but that committee obviously did not know the record and made numerous serious errors. Although they either ignored or degraded all defense evidence, they heard and declared to believe a witness for the prosecution who was so irresponsible that even Katzmann would not use her at the trial. This woman, Lottie Packard, testified before the Committee that she saw Sacco at 11:30 in the morning at the place where the murder occurred at 3 p.m. When she was asked how she happened to know Sacco, this extraordinary person replied:

"Why, I don't know, gentlemen. I talked with Governor Fuller, and I don't remember, my head is too full of music and things like that, to remember."

Her former employer said of this woman:

"I will tell you, I think she is about 12 ounces to the pound."

The chief of police said:

"My honest and frank opinion is that that girl is a nut. * * * I have known her since she was born. She ought to be in the Brookline Psychopathic Hospital. * * * She is crazy. * * * She imagines things. She has pipe dreams."

But the committee insisted in believing her. They said:

"The woman is eccentric, not unimpeachable in conduct. But the committee believes that in this case her testimony is well worth consideration."

One of the principal reasons which motivated Fuller's refusal to commute the sentence of Sacco and Vanzetti was the fact that the whole world pleaded for mercy for the two men. He was resentful that the world should show an interest in what was happening in Massachusetts, as if Massachusetts were his own private kingdom over which he exercised monarchical authority. Another reason for Fuller's refusal to save Sacco and Vanzetti was expressed by the New York Herald Tribune in the following language:

"It is evident that the decision has not wholly blotted out the impression that political views have colored their fate."

The attitude of Fuller and his advisory committee throughout their hearings and eventual findings lend credence to the fear often expressed that the purpose of the extrajudicial proceedings was to lend respectability to a discredited trial, and that the possible innocence of the subjects was of little consequence compared to upholding the institutions of Massachusetts. But, in point of absolute verity, we who protested the Sacco-Vanzetti execution were as much concerned about maintaining the stability of the courts and government in general as Fuller and his committee. We believed that government could be made stronger rather than weaker, by the acknowledgment of error—and a correction of that error.

France was not ashamed to admit that her military courts were wrong in convicting Alfred Dreyfus. England was not humiliated when she admitted, through a parliamentary investigating commission, that her courts had erred when they twice convicted Adolf Beck, although he was innocent.

I cannot allow myself to believe that Massachusetts would be less noble than England or France in rectifying an injustice. And until that injustice is corrected, it will go on and on. The Sacco-Vanzetti case will not die. Abraham Lincoln, in a message to Congress, said:

"We cannot escape history. * * * The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down, in honor or dishonor, to the latest generation. * * * The way is plain, peaceful, generous, just—a way which, if followed, the world will forever applaud, and God must forever bless."

Massachusetts cannot escape the verdict of history. She will either nobly acknowledge an error or go on vainly fighting the hosts of truth and vindication. Massachusetts has an obligation to herself to cast off the yoke of censure which world opinion has fastened upon the State; she owes a duty to the people, who are justifiably proud of their State, to scour away the stain on her banner. And, in loyalty to America, of which she was an indispensable and glorious architect, she should correct the misimpression which has been engendered throughout the world as to the true character and spirit of America and Americans.

Who can doubt that the United States, in spite of all her tremendous sacrifices in blood and treasure for the betterment of the world, today is at the ebb tide of her prestige? Who can doubt that she is looked upon as egotistic, avaricious, arrogant, and devoid of sympathy for those who are less economically fortunate than herself? And how did this shocking situation come about? The ebbing of the tide began with the Sacco-Vanzetti case. Prior to that time America was admired and loved by the peoples of the world as a land of freedom, liberty, equal opportunity, and tolerance. Then came the conviction of two humble foreigners on evidence which failed to convince the intellect of mankind and brought a pang of pain to the heart of the world. Do not say that we in America have no responsibility to try our cases so as to satisfy the world. I say we have the moral obligation, if we wish to enjoy the respect of the world, to conduct ourselves in a manner which bespeaks fairness, equity, and justice to all.

Judge Thayer may have thought that no one would detect his misrepresenting the record, he may have dreamed that no one would tell how he was maligning and cursing the defendants while hypocritically announcing he was protecting their rights. And Katzmann and his accomplices may have thought that the world could never learn of their cunning, their plotting, and their scheming to convict two men they could not believe were guilty.

But somehow the world knew that all was not well in Massachusetts. And so, in manners which were legitimate, and in ways which were respectful, people gathered in halls, they met in public squares, they filed in procession, they signed and sent on petitions to America—the America of justice, the America of heart as well as of money—pleading, praying that Sacco and Vanzetti not be put to death. Instead of welcoming these prayers, instead of appreciating the feel of the heartbeat of the world, a few men in Massachusetts, dressed in a little brief authority, snarled and sneered. They were not going to be intimidated by people from across the seas, they said. But where was the intimidation, and who were the "intimidators"?

They were coal miners, laborers, carpenters, bricklayers, college professors, lawyers, religionists, poets, scientists—men from every walk and station of life. Among the petitioners were such illustrious and respected names as Anatole France, Ramsay MacDonald, John Galsworthy, H. G. Wells, Arnold Bennett, Romain Rolland, Fritz Kreisler, Maximilian Harden, Albert Einstein, Mme. Curie, Marquis Guy de Lasteye (the grandson of Lafayette), Alfred Dreyfus. They did not threaten intimidation, they did not proclaim an invasion. They only asked for mercy, the mercy of understanding.

But while Governor Fuller and a few others, standing on the ramparts of a superficial or prejudiced knowledge of the case, fulminated and hurled thunderbolts of wrath against these good people, there were others in America, and I am proud I was one of them, who thanked God that humanity was so universal that the peasant of Yugoslavia, the farmer of Australia, the rancher of Uruguay, and the schoolteacher of Sweden pleaded for justice for two men whom they did not know and with whom they had no bond except that of sympathy for their plight—the plight of two helpless creatures caught within the crushing gears of a monstrous injustice. They knew with John Donne that:

"No man is an island, entire of itself; every man is a piece of the continent, a part of the main; if a clod be washed away by the sea, Europe is the less, as well as if a promontory were, as well as if a manor of thy friends or of thine own were; any man's death diminishes me, because I am involved in mankind; and therefore never send to know for whom the bell tolls; it tolls for thee."

And so they sent telegrams, wrote letters, and prepared petitions praying that Sacco and Vanzetti not be killed, until and unless the proof was positive and conviction complete, because they were constantly learning of new evidence which continued to swell the clouds of doubt enveloping the charge of guilt. And then, one day, there burst upon the horizon of despair the thrilling news of the confession which exonerated Sacco and Vanzetti. The heart of the world leaped with hope. Surely, now, exoneration was at hand, or at least a new trial. But achingly the petitioners were to hear that the few obstinate men at the controls of the machinery spurned the confession, sneered at all new evidence, mocked the defense, and scorned the entreaties sweeping in from every point of the globe. Never in recorded history was there such world-wide demonstration in behalf of two men condemned to death.

And as Judge Thayer refused motion after motion, and as the appellate court rejected appeal after appeal, and as the Governor played with the lives of the defendants like a cat plays with a mouse, the hearts of the lovers of America began to fail them, a touch of skepticism began to chill their souls; a doubt began to enter their minds that—perhaps, after all—America was not the land of the free and the home of the brave. And while the petitions still continued to pour into Massachusetts from every corner of civilized creation pleading, supplicating for mercy for the poor shoemaker and the humble fish peddler, the few men, still clad in their little brief authority, went scowlingly ahead to tear away the canvas covering the grim electric chair.

And so, on the night of August 22, 1927, the miserable deed was done. The throwing of the electric switch on that catastrophic night darkened the light in many a home in every country and clime. It also blew out the candle of faith in America as the land of justice, of humanity, and of mercy. An English periodical sadly remarked:

"For the first time in 150 years the flag of the United States has been treated in every land as the symbol of a great wrong."

William Allen White, the celebrated American newspaper editor, said:

"I am satisfied that Sacco and Vanzetti were innocent of the crime for which they were executed. Their execution was a crime for which America lost prestige in the eyes of millions all over the world."

Another American writer, Harry Elmer Barnes, said:

"Rightly or wrongly, the case of Sacco and Vanzetti did more to destroy abroad our ancient reputation of being a 'land of the free' than all of the other historical incidents of the last century * * *. It is scarcely impossible to exaggerate the unfortunate effect of the case upon foreign opinion of American justice."

The great French writer Romain Rolland said:

"I am not an American; but I love America. And I accuse of high treason against America (mind you, he says, against America, not against France) the men who have soiled her with this judicial crime before the eyes of the world. Their abominable parody on justice has destroyed the most sacred rights of humanity."

The time has come for us to rebuild what has been crippled but not entirely destroyed: overseas faith in America. Let us put life again into the words of Emma Lazarus at the foot of the Statue of Liberty:

"Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free.
I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

That lamp guided my parents to these shores, as it perhaps guided the parents of some of the members of the Judiciary Committee. That same lamp was the beam of encouragement which brought Sacco and Vanzetti to Massachusetts, but there lived on these shores a few selfish and willful men who extracted the oil of the lamp so that it might not shine for the shoemaker and the fish peddler, and the countless millions who believed in their innocence. This committee may refuel that lamp so that the populations of the world may know that the golden door of freedom and justice in America has not been locked and sealed.

This committee has the power to take the initial step which will develop into an enormous stride toward achieving the heartfelt desire of all of us, the desire to restore once again to the peoples of all nations the faith which was once theirs—the faith that America truly is a land where the flag of freedom casts no shadow of injustice, and where no person is so slight or lowly that his cause will not be heard in the bright golden sunlight of impartiality and truth.

In the name of universal justice, in the name of all that we hold dear in America, in the name of all the glorious patriots who have made Massachusetts a name to cherish and revere, in the name of decency and honor, I ask this committee to take that action which will soon right a great injustice, correct a terrible wrong, and heal a grievous wound. That action can find its eloquent expression through approval of the Cella resolution.

The Fifty-two Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 14, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to again direct attention to the fine work being done by the dedicated men and women who have banded together under the banner of the 52 Association.

The following editorial from the New York Times of April 11, 1959, tells only a small part of the story:

THE FIFTY-TWO ASSOCIATION

The Fifty-two Association of New York, formed by 52 men in 1945 so that "The Wounded Shall Never Be Forgotten," is celebrating its 14th anniversary of providing personal morale and rehabilitation services to hospitalized and disabled veterans from Massachusetts to North Carolina. The 1,800 men and women members of Fifty-two of New York, with their associated chapters in Los Angeles, Chicago, and Miami Beach, have faithfully kept their founders' pledge. Fifty-two has entertained and, more important, helped to rehabilitate more than 300,000 sick and wounded men in uniform. The present plans for an outdoor recreation center for the wounded will give new significance to the organization's goals. Fifty-two's headquarters at 226 West 48th Street is an address many servicemen remember in New York. Inevitably, the good will of this organization is considered a part of the general hospitality of New York City itself.

Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, the editor has missed the point about the name of the organization. It has nothing to do with the number of members who started this fine work.

It is directly related to their slogan, "The Wounded Shall Never Be Forgotten." These inspired Americans resolved they would not only remember and help our wounded veterans on Veterans Day and on Independence Day and on other holidays. They decided they would devote their energies to doing the job every week—52 weeks a year. Hence the name and the slogan. And they live up to both.

Building Beyond the Rule of Terror to a Law-ful World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I wish to call to your attention, and the attention of my other distinguished colleagues, to the very timely and informative speech made by the immediate past president of the American Bar Association, Mr. Charles S. Rhyne, of Washington, D.C.

BUILDING BEYOND THE RULE OF TERROR TO A LAW-FUL WORLD

(Address by Charles S. Rhyne, president, American Bar Association, 1957–58, before the Junior Chamber of Commerce, Washington, D.C., March 19, 1959)

Today Prime Minister Macmillan and President Eisenhower begin their talks on the Berlin crisis. This is merely another of the recurrent crises which almost paralyze the world with fear—fear of war and its horrors. The whole world knows that our failure to convince the Kremlin that our weapons of terror still outweigh theirs means the unleashing of Communist conquest. Men everywhere are asking, "Is there not some way to end this rule of terror?" Today I would like to convince you that there is—and spell it out to you.

I begin with the obvious, which is that men everywhere yearn for peace. On this Americans are agreed but so are other peoples. In Russia last summer the Russian people's desire for peace was the dominant, definable feeling we encountered. Russians cited the 17 million of their own people who died in World War II as their reason. Last January in India lawyers from Asian-African countries reported to us the same deep feeling among their people. They want rapid modernization and realize that peace is essential to the realization of that hope.

No one can deny that peace is what the peoples of the world want most today. Why is it that such an overwhelming desire cannot be translated into actual achievement?

My answer is that such a crystallized desire of mankind will control the actions of men and governments only when it is directed to a recognized, specific, clearly attainable plan which will bring about the desired result. So far no such peace plan has been advanced to the spotlight in the center of the stage of world attention. So far there is no well-defined plan upon which the universal desire for peace can focus. We have the United Nations, but it has not tranquilized world frictions and no one believes that it will ever be able to do so under its present framework. Berlin, Suez, Quemoy-Matsu and Korea are only a few illustrations of the U.N.'s inadequacy.

Peace in today's world is indeed maintained by "mutual terror," as Sir Winston Churchill has said. Actually, it is not peace we have but an armed truce—a truce that can explode at any moment through mistake or design.

Russia has a clearly stated plan for world peace. She undeviatingly and unceasingly works for it. She proudly and constantly presents it. Her peace plan is to make the world one hundred percent Communist. Concentrating on their goal of world domination with fanatic zeal, the Communists have so harnessed their resources as to smash through to great scientific and other achievements. Today Russia stands as the number-two military power of the world, and there is some fear that Russia may be number-one. But Russia's program of conquest goes beyond destructive weapons. She has sharpened the instruments of propaganda, subversion and manipulation of world opinion into devasting weapons for the advancement of her single-purpose aim. While some may not realize its danger, no one can doubt communism's ultimate goal. Certainly no secret is made of it.

In opposition to communism stand the nations of the free world. Meeting and defeating communism is to the general public the comprehensible part of the free world's cooperative program. Being free nations, they often disagree among themselves as to the best method of meeting the thrusts of the Kremlin. The free nations—chiefly through the efforts and accomplishments of the United States—have matched and exceeded Russia in the arms race. But they have not matched or exceeded Russia in the all-important other battle areas of the cold war—especially in the area of dynamic, positive, clearly expressed and clearly understandable ideas for world peace.

Beyond beating off Russian threats and thrusts, the free world does not yet offer a universally comprehended plan for world peace. We have not gone beyond defensive and destructive measures to constructive measures for peace. The free world has not stated or espoused a peace plan which it urges upon all men with fervent zeal. A great need exists for an affirmative peace plan which clearly states a theme, a goal, an idea, an objective, which will be a rallying point for all men who are free and all those

who cherish that precious status. My recent travels of over 200,000 miles at home and abroad convince me that men everywhere want such an objective to which they can devote the understanding of their minds, the dedication of their hearts, and the creativeness of their efforts. Something beyond defeating communism is called for to meet this need. A defensive battle is not an inspiring maneuver in any arena. The free world will never rally to its side the Indias, the neutrals and the uncommitted—or even hold all of our own people together—without some such ideal or plan which can command from our people the same obvious devotion that the leading adherents of communism have for their program. Vice President NIXON has said of U.S.S.R.'s Mikoyan:

"I was most impressed by his flaming conviction that his cause was right and will prevail."

To win any war people need inspiration. The cold war is no exception. In our war for independence Patrick Henry's "Give me liberty or give me death" fired the minds and imaginations of our people. In World War I our slogan was "to make the world safe for democracy." We fought World War II "to end all wars." While the Communists drive forward to win the cold war under Khrushchev's blunt "We will bury you," the free world has no clearly expressed battle cry, no clearly expressed ideal or ideas to fire the imagination and crystallize the minds of our people upon a great attainable goal of universal appeal. Sure, we are fighting off communism's slavery, but people like to get off the defensive and on the offensive. We must have a goal beyond building more deadly weapons and spell it out in simple language everyone can understand. We need the coining of a phrase which will capsule our objectives—a phrase which all can understand and applaud.

My message to you today is that while it has not hit with the impact of a thunderclap, there is slowly but surely beginning to crystallize an idea, a universal ideal, behind which we can concentrate our effort not only to defeat Communist slavery but to give mankind an attainable plan for achievement and maintenance of world peace.

The rule of law is the ideal of which I speak. I realize that as thus expressed it will not surprise you as something new or novel or immediately inspire you. The outlines of this plan are yet only faintly discernible. It is as yet recognized as a peace plan by only a few. But a realization of its tremendous potential even among a few is creating here and abroad an ever-rising tide of support and dedication.

We must capitalize upon this idea and state it in such a crystal clear way that all men will comprehend its value and strive to place themselves under the banner of the law. Law is one of the few terms all men fully comprehend. The one universal basic principle and idea which the free world has in common, despite many different forms of government, is the rule of law. The attainment of world peace through law is an objective which can be readily grasped by the citizens of every country.

Let me state my case for the rule of law. Let me explain how this idea can grow into successful, concentrated, concrete action which will both defeat communism and create a peaceful world.

In the beginning of time, back through the unnumbered centuries, there was no rule of law. Men settled their disputes through brute force. Evil men made weaker men their slaves. Killing and robbing were the order of the day. Those who killed, robbed and enslaved best became nobles and kings. Might made right and force was glorified. As civilization developed, men slowly realized that killing and robbing and slavery for human beings was not a desirable way of life. History then reveals a gradual development of rules of law growing chiefly out of the moral principles and ideals of the great religions. Courts presided over by nobles and kings decided the disputes of lesser men under the rule of reason, but for many centuries the nobles and kings still operated under the rule "the king can do no wrong." Subjection of individuals to compulsory jurisdiction of the courts was gradually accepted as essential for peace within nations. In still later developments the king, or government itself, was placed under law and subjected to compulsory court jurisdiction.

Today in all civilized nations disputes between man and government are now settled in courts under the rule of law. Within nations the rule of law achieves and maintains order and stability. But between nations the winner of most disputes is still the one who can kill the most men. Having proved what it can do within nations, surely the rule of law should be given a chance to operate between nations. No idea or concept developed by man since the dawn of civilization has greater promise or potential. Yet, the greatest gap in the growing structure of civilization today is still the lack of law in the world community.

President Eisenhower, in his state of the Union message, said:

"All peoples are sorely tired of the fear, destruction, and the waste of war. As never before, the world knows the human and material costs of war and seeks to replace force with a genuine rule of law among nations.

"It is my purpose to intensify efforts during the coming 2 years in seeking ways to supplement the procedures of the United Nations and other bodies with similar objectives, to the end that the rule of law may replace the rule of force in the affairs of nations. Measures toward this end will be proposed later, including a reexamination of our own relations to the International Court of Justice."

Earlier the President in his Law Day, U.S.A., message said:

"The world no longer has a choice between force and law; if civilization is to survive, it must choose the rule of law."

We must rally back of his leadership and achieve the goal he has set for us. Either we achieve a reign of law for the world or you and I and our loved ones may die under a rain of Communist nuclear bombs. Berlin merely underlines the urgency of action. We must build a "law-ful" world before the Kremlin builds a Communist world. If we build a "law-ful" world communism will disappear, for the rule of law and communism are antitheses. Communists are working day and night with fervent zeal to build their world of slavery. They have enslaved 1 billion people from 17 nations since World War II began—but we have scarcely begun our task of insuring freedom for men and freedom from war through the rule of law. Certain it is also that we are not working day and night with fervent zeal on this task as the Communists are on theirs.

We start, therefore, with the undoubted desire for peace, the dire need for something to replace weapons before the holocaust of war explodes, and the further fact that the rule of law has worked within nations and could do the job between nations. How can the idea be translated into political reality?

History teaches that within nations this job has been done by a gradual strengthening of legal procedures and institutions. In England, as the Kings' courts acquired prestige and public acceptance because of the fairness of their procedures and the impartiality of their judgments, barons and lords abandoned the private armies by which they had previously fought out their disputes on bloody battlefields and submitted their quarrels to these courts for decision. In the much glorified western part of the United States, as the strength of legal procedures and institutions grew, gunmen lost out as dispute deciders. A similar experience took place in most civilized nations.

The lesson is clear. We must so strengthen legal procedures and institutions in the shrunken world community that nations, too, will give up their war weapons and submit their disputes to courts for decision under the rule of law.

How do we start and where?

In the past 2 years, I have talked with lawyers of some 70 nations. The broad consensus is that the rule of law will never arrive in the world community until and unless we demonstrate beyond question that we have placed the Government of the United States under that rule internationally as we have nationally.

Foreign lawyers are often better students of history than American lawyers—especially the history of American actions that bear upon the issue of war or peace through law. Those who are frank say this: "Who destroyed the prestige and usefulness of the Permanent Court of Arbitration after it came into being with worldwide acclaim in 1899?" The answer: "Your U.S. Senate by its action requiring the submission of the final decision in every case involving the United States to it for its 'advice and consent'." The Court has been used only four times since 1931. "Who destroyed the prestige and usefulness of the Permanent Court of International Justice created by the League of Nations in 1920?" Answer: "Your U.S. Senate by its vote prohibiting your country from becoming a party to the Court." And finally "Who has destroyed the prestige and usefulness of the International Court of Justice created in 1945 by the United States?" Answer: "Your U.S. Senate by its Connally reservation which makes the United States the judge in each case filed against her of the jurisdictional question of whether the dispute is domestic or international in character." This Court has handed down only 10 decisions in 13 years.

Let us examine into the charge that our U.S. Senate is chiefly to blame for the empty courtroom of the International Court of Justice.

True it is that in accepting the Court's jurisdiction the Senate excepted disputes which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States as determined by the United States. But no one has ever urged, or ever should urge, jurisdiction by the International Court of Justice over domestic questions. Under the terms of the U.N. Charter the Court has no jurisdiction over domestic matters. The Court itself must summarily decline jurisdiction over any domestic subject. It is the distrust of the Court implied in the U.S. Senate's words "as determined by the United States" which destroys the prestige of, and confidence in, that Court. There is an old maxim that no man should judge his own case. Surely we can trust the Court to decide what is domestic and what is international rather than ourselves judging each case to which we are a party. Even if the Court should make a mistake, its decisions can be reconsidered and reversed whereas millions of gravestones are mute testimony to the irreversibility of the results of war.

The International Court through its procedures and in its decisions compares most favorably with the best national courts. Its caseless docket is not due to a lack of an adequate and competent court, nor is it due to a lack of international disputes. Every day the page one headlines demonstrate the existence of the latter. Nations avoid the Court not because they really prefer war to resolution of disputes in that Court, but because they lack confidence in their ability to get a decision there even if they file a complaint. This brings me back to the Connally reservation.

Under the Court's statute the Connally reservation is reciprocal—a two-way street. Anytime the United States is sued all the defendant nation need to do is to notify the

Court that it considers the subject matter of the complaint to be within its domestic jurisdiction, and the Court must dismiss the complaint. The most recent illustration was the claim for $1,300,000 in damages filed by the United States against Russia for shooting down one of our unarmed airplanes over the Sea of Japan. Russia filed an answer saying this shooting was within her domestic jurisdiction. The U.S. complaint was then summarily dismissed by the Court. It is obvious that this boomerang effect of the Connally reservation is disastrous to the rule of law internationally. The crippling and blighting effect on use of the Court is clear.

Reports by many U.S. experts who have studied this situation agree that the Connally reservation has emasculated the usefulness of the Court and rendered it impotent as an instrument for world peace. Removal of this barrier to the usefulness of the Court has been recommended by the American Bar Association and the Attorney General of the United States. But this barrier was created by the U.S. Senate, is maintained by the U.S. Senate and can be removed only by the U.S. Senate—and the Senate has not recognized its responsibility.

The tremendous responsibility of the U.S. Senate for continuing through this reservation to stifle use of the Court is a most serious one when one considers the value of and need for any mechanism which can aid in preventing war under present world circumstances. The Connally reservation is unsound in principle and effect and should be eliminated by the Senate.

Removal of the Connally reservation is there the first step of leadership we in the United States must take on the road to world peace through law. The eyes of the world are upon us. An announcement of this step would receive much more acclaim abroad than the launching of a new ICBM or satellite. Once we take this meaningful step, law business for the International Court of Justice should show a dramatic increase. The free world will, at long last, begin using the Court to settle its disputes peacefully. The neutrals and uncommitted who desire peace so greatly will be drawn irresistibly to this substitution of law for weapons. The Court will become a focal point in international relations instead of a forgotten forum where 15 judges are paid $20,000 each per year to waste their time waiting to decide cases that are never filed.

But the building of a "law-ful" world requires more than this first step by our Senate. It requires a whole series of acts and actions to strengthen legal procedures and institutions in the world community. It requires also the creation of many new legal rules, procedures, and institutions.

The American Bar Association's Committee on World Peace Through Law recently asked more than 6,000 law leaders at home and abroad how a "law-ful" world can be brought about. The responses already received—and they are thoughtful responses—contain more than 100 different worthwhile suggestions of things which can be done to advance the rule of law internationally. These responses and a broad look at law in the world today make crystal clear that wherever the rule of law prevails order and stability prevail. In the absence of the rule of law fear and chaos generally prevail. That certainly is the picture within nations as well as in the world community as a whole.

But our study also makes one realize that the world community is not totally without law. We have some experience to build upon. The law of the sea is perhaps the best illustration of existing world-wide accepted law. The law of diplomatic immunity is another recognized legal concept on a worldwide scale. We have built up through custom and accepted conduct many other international law rules to which we add constantly by treaties and agreements. The trouble is that many of the world's problems growing out of trade, investment, contract and contact, are not yet covered by any accepted legal rules at all. The relations between nations and nationals of different nations are accelerating at an ever-increasing pace. What is needed is the development and worldwide acceptance of many rules of law applicable to the whole world community, covering new and old areas of contact, conduct, and conflict. This is not an easy task. It is not one that can be accomplished overnight.

Within nations we have literally thousands of legal rules and thousands of courts deciding millions of cases each year. These legal rules and these courts achieve and maintain the rule of law within nations. These legal rules, procedures and institutions did not come about in a day or a year, or even in a generation. But they have come about and they get the job done within nations. They can come about and they can do the job between nations.

Recognizing that building a "law-ful" world is peculiarly a task and responsibility in which lawyers should lead, the lawyers of the world in recent days have begun to explore how this job can be done and the ways and means to achieve it. Through correspondence, through meetings, through committees of the organized bar, and through individual efforts there is gradually coming about a concentration of the brain-power of the legal profession of the world upon this enormous, and, to some, impossible and hopeless task. Many of our 1,400 State and local bar associations and many of the foreign bar associations have special committees, or individual members searching constantly for the answer we must find here. With full realization of the enormity of the problem and full appreciation of the many stumbling blocks on the road to success, we of the legal profession have joined hands on an almost worldwide basis in this determined drive to prove that this goal can be accomplished.

A concentration of brain power and manpower brought the breakthrough which split the atom. The same concentration put a satellite aloft, developed a cure for polio, and in fact, is responsible for this age of miracles in which we live. While to the fainthearted the long, hard road toward placing nations under law internationally is unpromising and unprofitable, we of the law refuse to accept that verdict. We are going to do this job because it must be done.

Our world of today has outgrown many concepts of the past in the fields of science and technology, and so it is with law and court machinery. They too can grow and expand to new horizons to meet modern needs. We intend to prove that their usefulness is not confined to disputes and problems within nations. We will burst the bonds within which law has been applied in the past and thereby put bonds around war.

The movement toward a true international rule of law, like other movements, will realize its objective only through the pressure of public opinion. Just think of the possibilities for calm and considerate use of law in the United Nation's Court in disputes such as the Berlin crisis, the Suez crisis, the border incident between Spain and Morocco, the fishing rights controversy off Iceland, and similar differences now fought out in the arena of power politics and backstage diplomacy or by armed might. The focused power of world opinion which forced an end to the use of arms at Suez could—if properly and justifiably directed—so crystallize as to force reluctant nations to take their disagreements to the International Court of Justice for decision. The spotlight of public opinion must be cast upon the Court's potential so that people will cry out "Go to court, not to war," when war-causing disputes flare up. At present, the public at large does not even realize that the Court exists.

Few newspapers or commentators even mentioned President Eisenhower's plea for an international rule of law in his message to Congress. Thousands of words were devoted to ICBM's, summits, satellites, atom bombs, and war moves. This is especially true on the President's Berlin speech yet no newspaper account or newscast or editorial or comment has yet highlighted the President's call in that speech for an end to the rule of terrorism and the beginning of a rule of law and order although he said of the latter:

"Indeed, this is the peace policy which we are striving to carry out throughout the world. In that policy is found the world's best hope for peace."

Either they have missed the significance of that statement or they think it has no significance. If they think it has no significance let them say so and a debate can begin on whether the President has his teeth into something which is a dream or a possible reality. Peace through law is not dramatic news but it can become the most meaningful development in the history of mankind.

We pride ourselves in the United States on being a Nation which operates under the rule of law, a Nation where law is supreme over government. If the world is to move forward from operation under the rule of force to operation of governments of nations internationally under the rule of law, the United States must take the lead. If the United States is unwilling to operate under the rule of law internationally, how can we persuade others to do so? This era is often called the "age of the atom" or "age of the satellite." I say it must be the age when law came of age internationally or it may be the age of extinction for mankind.

Our promise of leadership for the future must not be that we will build the most dreadful weapons to destroy mankind. Our promise must be that we will develop the formula to save mankind by placing nations internationally under the rule of law.

This in broad outline is my argument for a peaceful world through the use of law. Let me conclude by stating why I believe the rule of law can help defeat communism.

Communism is a system built upon constant and continuous domestic and international conflict. The rule of law means individual freedom, order, peace, and stability for all men who live under it. Communism offers slavery and constant turmoil. More and more of the peoples of the world are realizing these facts. The rape of Hungary and the Kremlin's cold war moves fix them indelibly upon the minds of all men who think for themselves. Some lawyers from Asia and Africa told me recently they want order and stability which the rule of law brings, not communism. They realize that the stronger the law grows the stronger freedom grows. The stronger communism grows the weaker freedom becomes. As other people also correctly interpret the rule of law and communism, their choice can hardly be communism.

Russai's propaganda can be blunted and she can be stripped of friends by the powerful appeal of the rule of law nationally and internationally. The billion people who live in the rapidly awakening, underdeveloped, and largely uncommitted areas of the world must all be made to realize that this way of life—the way of the law—is the one by which they can attain their cherished aspirations of freedom, liberty, and dignity of man, along with the better livelihood, social change, and social justice they seek. The appeal of the rule of law might even shrink or make a few holes in the Iron Curtain itself. When in Yugoslavia last summer we were led to be-

lieve that lawyers there respect and want to expand the rule of law.

By snuffing out war-causing disputes among our friends and allies, by its pull on the neutrals and uncommitted, and by its undoubted adverse effect on the international Communist conspiracy, an expanded role for the rule of law would be a success despite the Kremlin's expected opposition. Birth of the rule of law, nationally or internationally, means death to communism. The Kremlin knows this.

It is always an inspiration to speak to young men about peace. You members of the junior board of trade are, or you should be deeply committed to work for the cause of peace, for you have been deeply involved in the results of war. You were babies when that reckless madman, Hitler, was at the height of his power, a time when the world tottered on the brink of war. You were still young children when World War II ended, but to some of you, I have no doubt, that war came very close. Your fathers may have fought in it; some of them may have died in it. You grew up in the era of the cold war; you were in your early teens when that war turned hot in Korea. Some of you already have seen military service; for many of you it is imminent.

To you, who have lived all your lives in the shadow of war or threatened war, there should be few things more important than the way to a permanent and lasting peace. No generation ever born had greater cause to hope and work for the universal establishment of the rule of law. Believe in it and work for it. The universal rule of law is the only way both to achieve and maintain peace. There is no truth I believe in more. There is no greater goal for any generation than to be dedicated to its attainment.

Supremacy of the rule of law within nations has created freedom for man. Supremacy of the rule of law between nations can mean freedom from the scourge of war. Let us hope and pray and work together for the arrival of a law day for the world—a day when law will replace weapons in the control of the fate of humanity.

Mrs. Clifford W. Bigelow Elected to Second 2-Year Term as President of the League of Women Voters of Wilkes-Barre

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader of April 10, 1959:

HONOR FOR MRS. BIGELOW

Election of Mrs. Clifford W. Bigelow to a second 2-year term as president of the League of Women Voters of Wilkes-Barre is an impressive compliment as well as a public acknowledgment of her service to the organization and the community. This seems to be Bigelow year in Wilkes-Barre as her husband, who is secretary-manager of the Wyoming Valley Motor Club, was elected president of Wilkes-Barre Rotary Club just 2 weeks ago. Theirs is quite a record of public service in 7 years of residence. They live in Forty Fort.

The league of women voters in the city has been headed by such outstanding civic leaders as the late Mrs. Leroy Bugbee, Mrs. Charles Shafer and Mrs. Norman Patton who now heads the State organization. To follow in the footsteps of these women and others who have distinguished themselves in the service of the community is no small distinction in itself for Mrs. Bigelow. The fact that she was a unanmous choice enhances the honor.

The purpose of the league of women voters is to promote a political responsibility through informed and active participation of citizens in government. During the past year, officers and members of the organization have been working on issues at all levels including U.S. foreign policy, revision of the State constitution, absentee voting, water conservation, and public libraries. To furnish leadership for such group is a challenging assignment. Mrs. Bigelow has measured up to expectations as her retention demonstrates.

In the year ahead, the league will concentrate on county government and its subdivisions to determine how the public interest may be served most effectively. As president, Mrs. Bigelow again will have an opportunity for outstanding community service.

Less Foreign Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, by my letter of February 27, 1959, I advised OCDM Director Leo A Hoegh that the case against limiting the importation of fuel oil appeared to be a good one and I asked for his comments.

In his reply of March 4, 1959, Mr. Hoegh was careful not to give me his views but remarked solely that, "My recommendations have been submitted to the President, and any comments or information must issue from the White House."

The only comment or information that issued from the White House was an Executive order limiting the import of oil and assigning quotas. That has resulted in the increase of the price of gasoline to consumers. It conserves nothing. It increases profits for those already being subsidized by unfair tax favors.

In this connection I commend to the attention of our colleagues an editorial which appeared in the New Republic of March 30, 1959, as follows:

LESS FOREIGN OIL

If a test of intelligence is the ability to see the relatedness of ideas, the President scored low indeed in signing an Executive order limiting and assigning quotas for the import of oil. For his action bumps head-on into his repeated homilies on freer trade, a sympathetic concern with the needs of our allies for foreign markets, and his almost mystical devotion to keeping domestic prices in check.

On the proclamation of the order, Standard Oil of Indiana raised the price of gasoline in the Middle West; and the Texas Railroad Commission cut the amount of oil that State could produce for the month of April by more than 100,000 barrels a day—thus preparing the way for new price increases on grounds of "scarcity." The consumer has no way of knowing from his fuel bill that foreign oil is $1 cheaper a barrel than domestic oil; nor that imports of oil have in the past served to keep the price of U.S. oil from increasing, except during the Suez crisis. Under the new program, the demand for domestic oil will rise, since the supply of imported oil will have decreased. High cost marginal wells in the United States will be utilized, thus further adding to costs. And there is no consolation for the consumer who heats his house with oil and drives his car with gasoline to be told by Mr. Seaton that oil prices will be held in check through competition with other fuels such as coal and natural gas.

What is the administration's explanation? According to Secretary of Interior Seaton, the order will "provide more oil to protect our national security." Mr. Seaton did not begin to explain (could he?) how the United States will have more oil by limiting imports from Canada and Venezuela and using up its own reserves more quickly.

Senator AIKEN, Republican of Vermont, admirably described the "classic contradictions" of the President's decision:

"You cannot control inflation and promote it at the same time. You cannot improve international relations by restricting the economy of friendly nations. You cannot insure national security by exhausting our vital national resources."

But the Executive order still stands.

Farm Journal Poll: Fact or Fancy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 23, 1959

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on the eve of the 1936 presidential election, Literary Digest, a well-known, widely-read magazine, conducted a nationwide poll and came up with the conclusion that Governor Alfred Landon would defeat President Roosevelt in his bid for reelection. When the votes were actually counted, however, Roosevelt had won in a landslide and the Literary Digest poll faded into oblivion.

In its April 1959 issue, Farm Journal has come up with the results of a farm poll indicating that American farmers do not want a price-support program. The poll in effect is an endorsement of Secretary Benson's theory that farmers prefer to throw themselves on the mercy of a free market rather than particapating in a Government price-support program.

Recognizing that the Farm Journal poll was perfect grist for his propaganda drive against all Federal farm price-support programs, Secretary Benson lost no time in calling on the Congress to give heed to the poll.

A quick look at the Farm Journal poll and the method used to conduct it leaves no doubt that the deck was stacked to insure the results which the pollsters apparently wanted to get. Not since the ill-fated Literary Digest poll of 1936 has any poll been so obviously wide of the mark.

One sentence from the Journal article reads:

This poll reveals that the South's farmers are no longer the high price support and strict control advocates they once were assumed to be.

Yet, the poll had scarcely been printed when the results of the spring cotton referendum were announced showing that southern farmers had voted overwhelmingly in favor of plan A—the time-tested program of acreage allotments with a higher price support. Only 15 percent favored plan B which called for overplanting and almost no support price.

Wheat farmers have gone to the polls time after time in my area and voted 95 percent strong for price supports based on restricted production.

It is my own strong conviction that those farmers who told Farm Journal that they wanted no price support protection, were in many instances farmers who have become so disgusted with Secretary Benson's unbelievably bad management of the price-support program that they have lost confidence in all price-support operations. Considering the debacle that Mr. Benson has produced in his Department, it is a testament to the patience and wisdom of farmers that so many of them still realize that their long-range hopes for agricultural prosperity rest to a great extent on Federal agricultural programs.

Since the Farm Journal poll has been given such wide publicity, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the RECORD two articles which take issue with the reliability of the poll. The first article is the April 13, 1959, radio digest of the Grain Terminal Association, St. Paul, Minn.; the second is the March 26, 1959, Commodity Letter of the Daniel F. Rice & Co., of Chicago, Ill.:

GTA DAILY RADIO ROUNDUP, MONDAY, APRIL 13, 1959

One of the big national farm magazines blushed all over its editorial face the other day. It took an opinion poll of farmers and with great fanfare announced the results. But things didn't turn out the way the magazine said they would.

In its April issue this magazine said that its poll showed 55 percent of its 3.5 million farm readers want no controls, no floors, and no price supports. Instead, they want the Government to "clear out of farming."

To quote a sentence from the magazine: "This poll reveals that the South's farmers are no longer the high price support and strict control advocates they once were assumed to be."

But no sooner had the magazine hit the mailboxes than results of this spring cotton referendum came out. They tallied up just about opposite from the findings of the magazine poll. The overwhelming majority voted for plan A, the longstanding program of acreage allotments with a higher support. Only 15 percent voted for plan B, which called for overplanting with only a token price support.

So opinion polls have their hazards. Maybe people have a way of saying one thing and doing another. Or maybe the farmers were just poking fun at the opinion testers.

But we suspect that the cotton farmers were dead serious about the way they voted in their referendum—just like the wheat farmers who have always voted around 95 percent in this area to stick by their wheat program.

The Wall Street Journal, the eastern businessman's newspaper, was perplexed enough to send its reporters into the cotton areas to find out the "why and wherefore" of the vote. One Texas farmer said he voted for acreage allotments because "its the difference between making a little money and losing a lot." Another cotton farmer, in Arkansas, said he voted for plan A because it is "safer and saner." Overplanting just doesn't make sense, he told the Wall Street Journal reporter, "what with the extra expense for insecticides, fertilizer, and labor. I'd end up with less money than under the allotment plan. I'd be planting those extra acres just for fun."

A farm manager of 1,576 acres in south Texas said his operation would "go in the red" under plan B, even though it would let him plant 40 percent more acres to cotton. Plan B, incidentally, was highly favored by the administration and Secretary of Agriculture Benson. But the cotton farmers turned it down. They voted to hold back on production.

So this appears to be more evidence that farmers are willing and eager to abide by intelligent production controls. But in return they need a decent break on prices or price supports. And that's a reminder that farm prices are made in Washington and that in just about 1 month now Secretary Benson must announce the alternative plans he'll offer wheat farmers in the wheat referendum next June. That will decide what's going to happen on wheat in 1960. It will be another serious decision for farmers.

COMMODITY LETTER OF DANIEL F. RICE & CO.
MARCH 26, 1959.

What kind of a farm program do farmers want? A recent survey of farmers preferences by a farm magazine which is getting a lot of publicity, says that 78 percent favor low or no supports. Fifty-five percent of a cross section of farmers checked the square marked "No supports, no controls, no floors; free market prices; get the Government clear out," only 14 percent favored high-price supports and 8 percent production payments.

According to this article 78 percent of farmers want to eliminate the price and income programs of the USDA either immediately or gradually, and only 22 percent think the Government has a responsibility to secure a fair income for farmers. Frankly, we do not believe it. We do not question the good intentions of the publication and the author. Doubtless, the survey was made and reported in good faith. But, inherent bias shows through.

In order to get such a remarkable result, the game was played with loaded questions in a nonneutral area. There were five programs from which farmers were to choose one: (1) No supports, (2) emergency supports (so low as to have no supporting effect), (3) adjustment supports (a slow process of getting to no supports), (4) high price supports (90 to 100 percent of parity), (5) production payments.

In reality there were only three choices: (1) No supports in three forms, (2) high supports, (3) direct payments. Accordingly, the no supports had three chances to get voted while high supports had one.

There was no neutral ground. Farmers know that parity as a measure of a fair price has been outdated by new production technology. This poll gave farmers no choice other than all or nothing. There was no way in this poll for a farmer to say "I think the Government has a responsibility to see that farmers get a fair share of the national income; that the best way to get a fair income is to adjust production to the market size just as industry does." The way the alternatives were set up, the people who thought this way were disenfranchised; they had no vote.

With what is probably the vast majority of farmers silenced, the trick was to get them to go low instead of high. Accompanying the questionnaire was a long article deploring and condemning price programs. In the article the question was asked, "What do you think the country should do about it (1) let the law of supply and demand take its course, in the belief that while it may be rough on some people, it's the only real answer? or (2) have the Government step in and bail out—and then control—everyone who is in trouble, and do this at taxpayers' expense?" This is practically the same as asking, "Do you think we should have the democratic American economic system, or the state socialism of Communist Russia." We admire the wisdom and courage of the farmers who saw through this and came as close as they could to voting for a fair farm program.

The accompanying article went on to describe the failure of existing programs; the huge surplus; the high costs; the displeasure of an urban Congress. This was a shotgun poll.

We think that farmers want and deserve fair prices. In our market letter of February 18 we said a new farm program should: (1) Establish farm prices for the main agricultural products. A new system needs to be developed to take into account new technology and new methods. And (2) Establish production goals that will result in the desired prices. These goals should be established by a board of non-partisan experts and should be enforced.

Had this alternative been included in the choices given to the polled farmers, we believe it would have been the overwhelming choice.

More realistic appraisal of the farmers' attitude toward price supports and the farmers' needs and desires was provided on Tuesday of this week by the leading financial daily. This was the result of a careful and detailed field study among cotton farmers. Briefly, cotton farmers this year had a choice between fairly high price supports and rigidly controlled acreage and a lower price support with larger acreage. Cotton growers, by a huge majority, chose the higher price supports and the lower acreage, motivated mainly by the desire for the obvious higher net return. The main backers of the higher acreage and lower price supports were the Department of Agriculture and various commercial interests.

Here was a clear cut choice and the evidence is overwhelming. We submit that the case of cotton can be logically carried to the other major field crops. Assuming that the price support program is designed for the farmers, we would suggest that the financial needs and the true basic desires of the farmers be the overriding considerations.

New York Chamber of Commerce Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. DORN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker Governor Rockefeller has proclaimed April 12–19 as Chamber of Commerce Week. Practically all chambers of commerce in the State will present programs designed to highlight the importance of the chamber in the community it serves.

The purpose of Chamber of Commerce Week is to: Create a greater public awareness and need for the chamber. Sometimes the chamber does its job so

well that it is taken for granted by both the members and the public.

Give recognition to the chamber's staff and volunteer leaders for constructive participation in community affairs.

Give emphasis to the changing character of the work performed by chamber of commerce managers who are striving to achieve professional stature.

Improve and strengthen relations between the chamber and other organizations and agencies in the community.

Stimulate pride of membership among curent supporters and encourage others to participate in financing the chamber.

Give credit for past achievements and highlight current activities.

In the spirit dictated by the proclamation, I want to congratulate our own Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce for the splendid work they have done and are doing for the citizens and business people of Brooklyn.

Retail Price Fixing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in Chemical Week of April 11, 1959, entitled "Viewpoint—Retail Price Fixing."

The article follows:

VIEWPOINT—RETAIL PRICE FIXING

Retail price fixing is again in the news, as sponsors of fair trade laws try a new tack: Instead of asking Congress to pass a law that would authorize retail price maintenance on a state-by-state basis, they're pressing for an amendment to section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act that would put price maintenance on a Federal basis.

While the reasons for support of this move by retailers' organizations are obvious, we feel that support by manufacturers is generally a mistake—for these four reasons:

1. Discount prices and discount houses have become fashionable. The growth of the market for many of the lines of merchandise featured by discounters has been substantial; the discounters' realistic prices have meant more profits to manufacturers.

2. The setting of prices at a point high enough to keep the marginal retail establishment in business is just not good economic sense. It, in effect, penalizes the efficient retailer; it discourages consumption; it encourages private-branding.

3. The only area in which a case can be made for retail price maintenance is in prescription drugs. The need for quick availability of a broad range of prescription drugs justifies some sort of public utility treatment for pharmacists. But even here, a broad, any-item-at-all approach to retail price maintenance is not wise.

4. For the drug manufacturer specifically, support of retail prices is unwise. With their current public relations and legal problems over whether prices are too high, drugmakers' support of any measure that could be interpreted as a keep-prices-up move is not in their best interest.

And even if the bill under consideration is declared constitutional, we wonder whether retailers, wholesalers, and manufacturers realize the degree of Federal administrative control to which they would eventually subject themselves.

Only Hope of Saving Alaska's Fishery in Passage of Pelly-Bartlett Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, during the congressional Easter recess, a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce held a hearing in Seattle on various bills having to do with fisheries of interest to Alaska and the Pacific Northwest. In particular, testimony was received on the so-called Pelly-Bartlett bill to facilitate conservation of Alaska-spawned salmon. Senator MAGNUSON, chairman of this hearing, thoughtfully included two members of the House Fisheries Subcommittee, Mr. TOLLEFSON and myself, in order to facilitate necessary joint remedial action by both Houses.

Since that Seattle hearing, three witnesses who testified have submitted a brief giving supplemental information which strongly supports the widely held contention that immediate passage of H.R. 4293 is the only possible hope of saving Alaska's best fishery resource:

BRIEF TO COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, U.S. SENATE, AND SUBCOMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

A statement by Mr. Noel Hemmendinger on behalf of the United States-Japan Trade Council on North Pacific salmon fishing, dated April 3, 1959, was read by Mr. Hemmendinger at the hearing on that date. Due to the importance of the subject matter, we deem it necessary to comment briefly on that statement for the record.

It should be clearly understood that Mr. Hemmendinger is acting in the capacity of being an agent to a foreign nation. This certainly is not meant as a discredit to Mr. Hemmendinger as he did a creditable job in representing the Japanese Trade Council. However, we believe it is of some importance that the relationship should be established so that Congress can judge the statement on its merits.

The Japanese Trade Council expresses its understanding of the concern felt by the American packers and fishermen for a prosperous fishery in Bristol Bay which, in years past, has been extremely profitable. It is the hope of the Japanese Trade Council that the high runs of former years will again come into existence. In our opinion it will take more than just a hope to bring this about. It will take an understanding of the problem plus definite action relative to conservation, and the remarks contained in the Japanese brief will not provide a solution.

We cannot agree with the Japanese Trade Council that the problem raised before the committee is unconnected with the Japanese fisheries, and therefore the embargo, as they put it, of Japanese-caught salmon as provided in S. 502 would be a grave mistake. Mr. Hemmendinger stated that Secretary Seaton's order reflected that the Bristol Bay decline was one of natural causes and could not be attributed to the activities of the Japanese.

The fact is that Director of the Federal Bureau of Fisheries, Donald McKernan, has repeatedly stated that Bristol Bay would be open to commercial fishing by the Americans if an agreement could be reached between the United States and Japan as to the extent of the Japanese fishery for the 1959 season. Our fishery investigations have clearly shown that American fish are being caught in large numbers by the Japanese. We refer the claim of innocence in this matter by the Japanese to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service which will be able to furnish the Congress with a clear picture of the Japanese activities and how they influence the Bristol Bay fisheries.

Mr. Hemmendinger's statement points out that the Japanese are conducting their fisheries more than 600 miles from Bristol Bay. The Japanese Trade Council says it bespeaks a high degree of international cooperation and good will that Japan has ever considered such a request. In our opinion, the language used by Hemmendinger is ambiguous and evidently intended to advance the idea that they couldn't possibly be working on stocks of North American salmon that far from shore.

Our tagging program and other investigations prove American salmon to be present on the high oceans more than 1,200 miles from their native shores.

The Japanese Trade Council wishes to stress that Japan has no legal obligations with respect to their fishing west of the provisional line. However, there is no comment on the results of the fishery investigations which have been in progress for many years, and they have not commented on their failure to agree to follow recommendations based on fishery research made by the American section of the North Pacific Fishery Commission. They wish to see that the problem remains in the hands of the Commission because under the terms of the treaty which specifies unanimous agreement, the problem certainly could remain inactive if the Japanese chose not to agree to future recommendations which we might have on the subject.

The main trouble is that international law is many years behind technical advances made in high seas fishing. It is only in recent years that the science of harvesting the high seas has become efficient enough to deplete a resource on the high seas. We are not in agreement that historical rights to fish this particular area on the high seas have been too well established by the Japanese. Their right to fish these waters was granted under the terms of a treaty which has as its main object conservation of the resource. To say that the United States is trying to throw its weight around, and that the purpose of S. 502 is to turn the flow of imported canned salmon from Japan on or off like a spigot to compel compliance is not to state the issue on a fair basis, and is insulting to those who wrote the legislation so as to protect the legitimate interests of the Japanese. We believe the provisions found in the Pelly bill—which would render the legislation inoperative if there were compliance by the Japanese—are fair, and only show what we have consistently advocated, that the bill should not be construed as a ban on imports, but rather as a bill to provide compliance with conservation.

We may further remark that if the Japanese have strong markets as is claimed elsewhere for their salmon, they should not worry too much about the demand in this country, as that demand perhaps is most strong on the part of the importers who are making the profit from importing the product. We fail to see the concern of the Japanese Trade Council or the possible harm that could accrue to the trade if their state-

ment is correct that they can sell their fish elsewhere.

There are many things in Mr. Hemmendinger's statement which we consider to be unwarranted. For example, saying that the passage of S. 502 would hurt the good relationship between the United States and Japan is one argument we cannot buy, because the good relationship between our respective countries will be hurt far more if through the Japanese high seas fishing activities our Alaska salmon runs are completely destroyed.

Talking about trade, we readily admit that perhaps the balance is in the favor of the United States. We are advocates of free trade among free nations. We believe this to be in the best interests of our country, but we also believe that there are limits to what we can do with free trade. We are not in agreement that free trade should be allowed to destroy a specific domestic industry, and we are completely and unalterably opposed to any free trade which would destroy a great resource such as salmon.

The implications raised in the letter in regard to what Japan would or would not do if this legislation is not withdrawn by us is in bad taste, to say the least.

The United States has consistently rendered all possible assistance to the free nations of the world, Japan included. As a matter of fact, the United States, more than any other nation, has helped the Japanese to recover from World War II.

To say that our desire to protect our salmon resource is going to support anti-American interest is a refined method of suggesting we do it the Japanese way, or else. These remarks have nothing to do with the issue, which is whether or not the Japanese are fishing on American stocks of salmon. That it has been deemed necessary by the Japanese Trade Council to advance this kind of argument is an indication of the weakness of their case. Perhaps the most significant thing about the Japanese Trade Council's statement is the lack of understanding and the failure on the part of the Japanese to recognize that by opposing conservation and by depleting the resource, the salmon problem will be a continued source of friction, which like a cancer, will eat away at the good relationship existing between our two nations. We can see no lasting economic benefits for either the Japanese or the United States, if for the sake of temporary profits, we agree to close our eyes, by not demanding adequate protection and insisting on good conservation.

Respectfully submitted.

GEORGE JOHANSEN,
Secretary, Alaska Fishermen's Union.
MILO MOORE,
Director, Washington Department of Fisheries.
JOHN WEDIN,
Manager, Fishermen's Marketing Association of Washington, Inc., and Northwest Trawlers Association, Inc.

Resolution by the Holy Name Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. DORN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to the resolution adopted by the Holy Name Society of St. Catherine of Genoa Roman Catholic Church, of Brooklyn, at the meeting of that society on March 8, 1959.

The resolution follows:

Whereas the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice has over the years compiled a magnificent record in protecting the security of our Nation, combating communism, and other un-Americanisms, and protecting the rights and liberties of all Americans; and

Whereas the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States had, during its entire existence, served a necessary and worthy purpose in unearthing and exposing the Communist conspiracy in this country and in laying the groundwork for corrective and protective legislation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the society in meeting assembled this 8th day of March 1959, commend and support the work of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives; and be it further

Resolved, That this society enlist the support of all its representatives in Congress and the President of the United States in preserving our Republic from its enemies by the continuance of these two organizations without any further curtailment to their powers or investigative scope.

Monument to Extravagance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note that the Omaha World-Herald has given well deserved recognition to my colleague, the Honorable PHIL WEAVER, of Nebraska, who has called attention to the unbelievable extravagance at the Air Force Academy.

Representative WEAVER is one of the minority in Congress who has consistently fought to restore fiscal sanity in the operations of the Federal Government and it is good to know that his efforts are recognized and appreciated by one of the outstanding and conservative newspapers still published in this country.

The editorial from the Omaha World-Herald follows:

Representative PHIL WEAVER was shocked by his official look at the Air Force Academy near Colorado Springs.

"A monument to extravagance," said the Nebraska Congressman. "A very plush proposition which is not necessary to give the boys the education they require."

Mr. WEAVER'S estimate may be shared by taxpayers whose vacation trips take them past the miles of buildings and landscaped gardens, and by other taxpayers who simply read about the Academy in such articles as the one the Wall Street Journal published last Friday.

A few of the Academy's features were listed by the Journal as follows:

"A glass-walled dining room the size of a city block; a campus with 22 garden pools that will glow at night with underwater lighting; a giant gymnasium with two swimming pools, 18 basketball courts and a row of squash courts; an elegant officers' club; a $5,100,000 social center including two ballrooms and four gardens; a splendid 18-hole golf course with a builtin $118,600 irrigation system, and a dandy visitors' comfort station near the parade grounds that cost $53,642."

All this, and much more, amounts to a total investment of $153 million—so far.

But the Academy lacks one facility that might reasonably be expected at an Air Force Academy—namely, an air field.

The planners were coming to that $17 million item when Congress blew the whistle last year. This was after an investigating committee had reported that, if the excessive spending kept on, the final cost of the Academy would be more than $300 million.

In vain the Air Force protested that the total would be "only" $190 million. Congress said no more expansion. The proposed magnificent chapel will have to be refigured so as to come in at less than $3 million. The half-million-dollar club for noncommissioned officers will have to be delayed. Ditto for the $3 million sports field and for other odds and ends.

Air Force spokesmen are replying to the congressional fire, but some of their arguments make odd reading. For example, the officer in charge of construction says that if all the "gingerbread" had been eliminated the saving would be "only about 3 percent"—or approximately $4 million.

But since when has $4 million been a piddling sum?

It is conceivable that the Air Force extravagance in connection with the Academy may adversely affect America's defenses. And for this reason:

Congress has appropriated billions for planes and missiles because the Air Force generals and their civilian bosses have said the spending is essential. The lavish Academy spending raises doubts concerning the judgment of these people as to what is essential and what is not.

Unless the Air Force pulls in its horns on the Academy issue it may lose much of the respect and admiration with which Congress and the American people now regard it.

Shoe Labeling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. CARROLL REECE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, since I did introduce a bill back in 1924 with reference to the labeling of major parts of shoes, I now wish to insert in the RECORD a quotation from the National Shoe Manufacturers Association News Bulletin of March 31, 1959, with reference to a statement I recently made:

REPRESENTATIVE REECE, REPUBLICAN OF TENNESSEE, NOW AGAINST SHOE LABELING

In 1924, Representative REECE, Republican of Tennessee, authored a bill calling for labeling of major parts of shoes. He says now, "Thirty-five years ago, it occurred to me that there was a need for legislation along this line. But with the improvement in the industry and the keen observation which the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice make of any deceptive materials or practices, I now see no reason for any such legislation. It would not protect, but would work to the disadvantage of, the consumer as well as the manufacturer of footwear." Congratulations, Congressman, for an informed point of view.

Red River Bank Stabilization Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the problem of the wasting banks of Red River has been one which has troubled our people and our engineers for a long period of time. Since the end of the period of the great raft, the banks of the river have caved, sloughed off and wasted, at times changing the entire direction and location of the stream. As these banks have wasted away, they have consumed tens of thousands of acres of rich alluvial farmland, literally chewing up some of the finest land in the world and taking it out of agricultural use.

This process originally was bad enough. As time has moved on and rich alluvial farmland has become harder to obtain, this wasteful procedure of nature whereby millions of acres of our most fertile soil is lost in our alluvial valleys has reached the point where it cannot be tolerated. We believe now that appropriate action must be taken to stabilize the channels of streams like the Red, containing them within their alluvial banks, and preventing the continuation of the tragic and wasteful destruction of millions of acres of rich lands.

The director of the Louisiana Department of Public Works, the Honorable Lorris Wimberly, with offices located in Baton Rouge, La., has as his particular jurisdiction the study of river problems in Louisiana. He has directed his attention to the caving banks of Red River especially, and, Mr. Speaker, on April 6 he addressed a letter to Col. George M. Cookson, District Engineer, New Orleans District, Corps of Engineers, U.S. Army, Post Office Box 267, New Orleans, La., on this vital subject. This letter is well written, well thought out, and should consume the attention of those who, like myself, have for many years worked on flood control in our alluvial valleys. I therefore am placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of this letter addressed to Colonel Cookson, district engineer, under whose office with the engineers this particular work falls, and I am asking that this letter be printed herein. It is as follows:

STATE OF LOUISIANA,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS,
Baton Rouge, April 6, 1959.

Col. GEORGE M. COOKSON,
District Engineer,
New Orleans District,
Corps of Engineers, U.S. Army,
New Orleans, La.

DEAR COLONEL COOKSON: After considering the information on Red River Bank Stabilization report which you presented in Natchitoches on March 20, I find that I have serious doubts as to the propriety of requiring cash contributions from local interests because of land enhancement.

As you know, the Red River was formerly a navigable stream and considerable commerce moved upon its waters. This navigation was considerably hampered by the existence of a raft which extended from Natchitoches to a point considerably above Shreveport. In an attempt to improve navigation the Corps of Engineers, beginning in 1828 and ending in 1872 removed this raft. While allowing for the clear passage of navigation it also caused the lowering of stages in the river to such an extent that before many years navigation was not possible. It was only after the removal of the raft that the banks of Red River began to cave and the valuable farm lands lost. Since the removal of the raft was in the interest of navigation, I would rather think that the Federal Government has an obligation to the valley in protecting the banks of Red River from caving.

There are other results from the removal of the raft. Once the river was free to flow in its channel the river began to enlarge and shorten with each succeeding flood. There was a great flood in 1892 and again in 1908 which further shortened and enlarged the river. From 1892 to the present time the distance along Red River from Natchitoches to the Louisiana-Arkansas line has been shortened from 256 miles to 213 miles, a distance of 43 miles. You can easily see that a tremendous amount of loss of bank occurred during the previously described period when the river had enlarged itself and became shorter.

Because of the flood control needs of the Red River Basin it was necessary for Congress to authorize the construction of reservoirs for the valley. To date three reservoirs have been constructed. Denison was placed in operation in June 1944, Texarkana in January 1958, and Ferrels Bridge in partial operation in August 1957 and there are four other reservoirs, Millwood, Boswell, Hugo, and Mooringsport yet to be built. We can already see that even though necessary for flood control the existing reservoirs are prolonging the caving stages on Red River and causing increased bank caving.

The loss of bank on the Red River from Shreveport to the Louisiana-Arkansas line increased from 2,408 acres between 1930 and 1944 (Denison Dam was placed in operation) to 6,598 acres from 1944 through 1958. This shows conclusively the tremendous increase in the rate of caving due to the prolonging of caving stages on the river by reservoirs.

The Red River levee boards and the State of Louisiana have already made great local expenditures on flood control, bank stabilization, and drainage. For levees alone $8 million has been expended by the Red River levee boards and the State of Louisiana. This does not include any expenditures for levee maintenance, flood fighting, bank stabilization, drainage and drainage maintenance. It is herein evident that the contribtuion already made is much greater than the amount ordinarily required from local interests on projects of this nature. It should be noted that the expenditures given are actual and if brought to present prices would be about four times as great.

When the Congress of the United States authorized the flood-control plan on the Mississippi River for the lower Mississippi River Valley, it established the precedent that flood control on interstate rivers was a Federal responsibility. If local interests are required to pay a part of the cost this would constitute a change in the policy as set forth by Congress in 1928 which we believe would be detrimental to all of our interests.

Since the increased caving on the Red River is due to the results of works undertaken in the interest of navigation and flood control, we do not believe that local interests should be required to contribute toward the cost of the bank stabilization project.

Your careful consideration and cooperation will be greatly appreciated by the Department of Public Works and the people we represent.

Yours very truly,
LORRIS M. WIMBERLY,
Director.

Don't Kid Public That They're Safe From Foreign Diseases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. DORN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to a very thought-provoking editorial from the March 1959 issue of the Maritime Register.

The editorial follows:

DON'T KID PUBLIC THAT THEY'RE SAFE FROM FOREIGN DISEASES

Most U.S. citizens believe they are protected by reasonable Government safeguards against the possibility of communicable diseases being brought into this country.

They certainly have the right to such protection.

Public Law 410, 78th Congress, section 361(a) (42 U.S.C. 264), authorizes the Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service to make and enforce regulations to prevent the spread of communicable diseases from foreign countries into this Nation and its possessions, and from one State or possession to another.

The interstate carrier general sanitation program has been established to provide this protection prescribed by the law. Under the program, the Public Health Service is obliged to inspect all American vessels in the coastwise, coastal and foreign trades; all dining cars and related railroad facilities; all airline feeding and related facilities, and all interstate bus feeding and related activities. The program affects passengers and crews.

Obviously, this is an inspection program of overwhelming proportions. At least, it should be.

ONLY 20 INSPECTORS

But many Americans would be shocked to learn that to carry out this vast program of health protection, Public Health Service has only 20 inspectors and 18 engineering employees.

State and municipal sanitation inspectors think it is good practice to make health checks at least quarterly; monthly inspections are regarded as most desirable.

But due to the small number of Public Health Service inspectors, who must examine ships under construction and those in operation, inspections of ships under the Interstate Carrier General Sanitation Program can be made only once in every 3 years. A dining car can be inspected only once every 2 years.

To attempt to prevent spread of communicable diseases by an inspection of ships once every 3 years is ridiculous.

It is no secret that sanitary conditions aboard many American-flag ships are intolerable. This applies not only to small tramp vessels, but also to large passenger lines and cargo ships operated by some of our wealthiest companies.

As a result of those conditions, passengers, and crews often are subjected to shocking sanitary hazards, though unknown to them. It is not difficult to imagine the dangers

created when passengers and crews subjected to such conditions reenter this country.

Here is one way to gage the total inadequacy of the present ship sanitation inspection program:

American-flag ships now subject to the program total 2,094, of which 1,024 are engaged exclusively in interstate commerce. Subject to inspection on each of these ships are—potable water systems, stored water, water in galleys and medical care spaces, water for making ice, drinking fountains, and coolers, wash water, swimming pools, toilets, and lavatories, discharge of wastes, insect control and rodent control. The inspection of a passenger ship requires an average of 3 man-days; inspection of a cargo vessel an average of 1 man-day.

With the skeleton inspection force now available to Public Health Service, how can passenger or crews be sure the facilities above are meeting health standards?

Because of the present addiction to penny-pinching in the Administration, Public Health Service's inadequate appropriations will force the Service to abandon inspection of interstate cargo vessels. Also headed for probable abandonment is the Public Health Service's "citation program." This program called for citations to companies operating ships with good sanitation conditions and served to encourage competing operators to bring sanitary conditions up to satisfactory levels.

What this means is that we're moving backward from an already sorely inadequate program.

People to People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 17, 1959

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, on March 16–17 here in our Nation's Capital a conference was held on the nationwide people-to-people program, sponsored by the American Municipal Association. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the role American cities can and have played in the people-to-people program. Under this program, a community in the United States "twins" with a "sister" city in Europe and South America. This program is carried on at the grass roots level, having no connection with the Federal Government, although it does have the blessing and encouragement of our national administration.

I am proud that the city of York, in the 19th Pennsylvania Congressional District, was the pioneer in undertaking a "twinning" program with the city of Arles, France. This was several years ago. Since that time, York has continued its efforts in the field of increasing international understanding through exchange of teachers, students, cultural material and the encouragement of travel, by twinning with the community of Asuncion, Paraguay.

During the Washington Conference, Rabbi Moses N. Friedman, of York, who has been very active in the setting up of close relationships between Arles and Asuncion, enumerated some of the results of York's "twinning" program. Rabbi Friedman's "Didactic Reflections" are included as recommended reading for the Members of Congress. The report follows:

DIDACTIC REFLECTIONS

(By Moses N. Friedman)

PEACE—ACTIVE OR PASSIVE?

"The most worthwhile purpose there is in the world today," stated President Eisenhower, "is to help build the road to peace." To achieve this banner purpose the President initiated the people-to-people program which "marshals the forces of initiative, independent action, and independent thinking of 168 million people."

Independent action and thinking, however, does not exclude unanimity in concept of peace. Whether the joint approach toward its achievement is to be of an active or a passive nature greatly depends upon agreement on the import of peace—positive or negative.

In its negative sense—freedom from war—peace might be purchased for the price of the socially repugnant aberration of keeping away from other people; in its positive sense—harmonious relations and mutual concord—peace demands close association with fellow men and united effort to seek peace and pursue it.

Obviously, by calling upon the American people to act, the people-to-people movement gives thought to the approach suggested by the Psalmist of yore and concentrates on the positive meaning of peace which requires action on the part of individual and community.

IDEALISTIC BUT NOT IMPRACTICABLE

On the surface promoting international amity by means of people-to-people contact appears to belong to the realm of pure idealism. Nevertheless, this idea need not be discharged as a mere visionary scheme. Throughout history many a single pebble created the ripples responsible for the waves that veered completely the destiny of peoples and nations. Every action strikes a chord which vibrates far beyond its source of contact and reverberates some reciprocal effect. One deed leads to another and, if this be an act of friendliness, to a whole circle of reciprocating friends each of whom is a potential link in the chain of amity and concord aimed for by the people-to-people program.

Every community in the town affiliation program can attest to some gratifying results of its efforts, to some favorable reaction to its activities, and to some rewarding effects of its endeavors to project the true picture of American friendliness.

SOME VERIFYING STATEMENTS

"It is undoubtedly due in large part to the twinning that the town officials of Arles unfailingly accord the most extensive cooperation possible to any project proposed by USIS. * * * The people of Arles in turn evidence respect and sympathy, engendered certainly in part by the conditioning toward pro-Americanism inherent in their acceptance by the people of York" (USIS, Paris).

"Mayor Charles Privat of Arles, France, defeats Reds for French Chamber of Deputies in recent election. Congressman JAMES QUIGLEY extends cordial felicitations to Mayor Privat and to his wife, the former exchange teacher from York" (York Dispatch).

"Upon his return from York, M. Jean Laurain, exchange teacher from Arles, gave lectures on the American way of life and the friendly people of York which brought favorable press reviews even in the Communist newspapers" (Richard M. Brigstocke, exchange employee from York).

"When I left France, though I didn't have any precise idea about the United States, I though that I would find a country where * * * people don't care about other people, but it didn't take very long before I realized I was wrong. I found people * * * ready to share the advantages of this beautiful country with anyone who is ready to enjoy them. I found a friendly nation where I feel at home. And now, when I'll meet an American in France, I won't have the feeling that I meet a stranger but a fellow countryman" (Edmond Venzin, exchange employee from Arles).

VIBRATING CHORDS AT SOURCE OF CONTRACT

York mayor and city council

Much credit for York's success in its people-to-people program goes to the Honorable Fred A. Schiding, Mayor of York, Pa., and to his city council.

Timely felicitations: On every occasion the York city government extends greeting to the mayor and people of Arles. On the marriage of the York exchange teacher, Miss Margaret Boltz, to the mayor of Arles, Mayor Schiding and the city council conveyed the cordial felicitations of the citizens of York in the form of a beautiful sterling tray.

Bastille Day resolution: In tribute to the French national independence day, the city council adopted a resolution to display the Tricolor in the city hall and to express warm sentiments to the people of the sister city of York, Arles.

This resolution incorporated the aims and objectives of the President's people-to-people program, those of the American Municipal Association International Cooperation Committee of which Mayor Schiding is a member, and well deserving plaudits to Mr. Mark Bortman, chairman of the civic committee.

Holiday greetings: A beautiful car especially designed by Mr. Cole Atwood, former clerk of the mayor, extended holiday greetings to the people of Arles in their native tongue on behalf of the mayor and city council, school board, superintendent of schools and the York-Arles Twining Committee.

Farewell mementos: In addition to the fine reception on their arrival to York, upon the departure of all Arlesian visitors, exchange teachers, factory workers, and students, Mayor and Mrs. Schiding are there to present them with a personal memento from York.

Special courtesies: Realizing the inconvenience of other means of travel for the Arlesian exchange teacher, his wife and baby, Mayor Schiding made his private car and a driver available to drive them to New York (a distance of 200 miles) where they boarded their plane for France.

Additional affiliation: In his desire to widen the circle of friends overseas, Mayor Schiding appointed a committee, headed by Mr. Joseph Garrety, director, York City Civil Defense, to promote affiliation with the city of Asuncion in Paraguay.

York City Schools

The York city schools, which gave birth to the York-Arles twins, continues to lead in the twinning activities in addition to its active participation in other international projects, and deservingly rejoices in its gratifying results.

Teachers' exchange: Under the administration of the distinguished educator, Dr. John C. Albohm, superintentent of schools, one teacher from York has been sent to teach English in Arles and two from Arles have been teaching French in York. (One of the French teachers, Mlle. Gilles, was instrumental in adding one more teacher from York, Mrs. Jocelyn Brysselbout, to the Arles school faculty).

Many study French: Over 4,500 pupils of the public elementary and high school grades and an undetermined number of the private and parochial schools study French in York.

Penpals: About 2,000 letters are exchanged annually between the children of York and Arles. Most of these children exchange

also photographs, books, stamps, dolls, and cordial invitations to visit each other.

Adult classes: Since its inception about 200 adults have been taking advantage of the French classes for adults offered by the York city schools under its adult education program. Many of these adults have utilized their knowledge of French to make and correspond with friends in Arles.

Additional exchanges: The York city schools have long established an enviable record of cooperation with the U.S. Office of Education in according a most cordial welcome to every foreign teacher and educator assigned—and maximum number allotted—them by the Office.

Students exchange: Under the direction of Miss Anne Finkbinder, the student council of the William Penn Senior High School assumes the responsibilities of the foreign exchange students program. The council provides hospitality and entertainment for the visiting students and arranges for the trip and stay overseas for the York students.

Host city: York also serves as host city for the Pennsylvania State University under the Federal vocational education program. The visitors—10 to 12 in number at a time—are the guests of the school board through the duration of their visits.

Attracts visitors: Thanks to its admirable exchange program and vocational education facilities the York schools have been attracting educators from most parts of the world. The visitors return to their native lands with cherished memories of happy associations and indelible impressions of the American way of life and of the neighborliness and unfeigned friendliness of the people of York.

York industry and its manufacturers' association

The organizers of the local adventure in international friendship, the York-Arles Twinning Committee, sincerely appreciated the encouragement York industry accorded them at its inception, and feel equally as grateful for its continued support.

Activated program: Utilizing their manufacturers' association and its energetic director of public relations, Mr. Edmond P. Reiley, as the principal liaison with the York-Arles Twinning Committee, the York industry leaders made a generous basic contribution to get the twinning program activated.

Enhanced reception: The twinning celebration was greatly enhanced by the part York industry played in the reception of the French delegation, headed by Mayor Charles Privat of Arles. The mayor and his party were deeply moved by the honors bestowed upon them by the association that of leading the parade to the industrial exposition at the York Interstate Fair where Mayor Privat crowned the Queen of Industry. The association also entertained the French guests at a luncheon in the Country Club of York and arranged for their tour to different plants.

York-Arles display: In succeeding years the association reserved space at its annual exhibition for a display of the York-Arles twinning activities. A picture of one display attracted the attention of the editors of the booklet "Your Community in World Affairs—Town Affiliations" published by the American Municipal Association. This picture appears on page 9 of its recently revised edition.

Meeting facilities: In consonance with its fine cooperating spirit the Manufacturers' Association of York continues to provide meeting facilities for the meetings of the board of the York-Arles Twinning Committee, Inc.

Industrial trainees: Upon his return from Arles, Mr. Bruno B. Weill, president of the Home Furniture Co., one of the delegates to Arles, conceived the idea of offering employment to an Arlesian for a specified period of time in order that he may learn first hand the true picture of America and its friendly people. Mr. Weill soon materialized his idea with Edmond Venzin, whom he had employed for 2 years; and upon his return to Arles this industrialist has started negotiations for a replacement.

Mr. Burwell B. Smith, another delegate to Arles, has employed an Arlesian draftsman for 1 year in his plant of the S. Morgan Smith Co. Upon request of M. Grossas, one of the new friends he had made on his visit there, Mr. Smith provided employment for two young ladies from Paris for the summer of 1957.

Other possibilities: Negotiations are now underway for the employment of other Arlesians in York for a limited period of time.

York labor

Collectively and individually York labor has been contributing much to the success of the York-Arles twinning program. Its financial support at its inception, its active participation and representation on the committee are, of course, a matter of record.

Dispel doubts: Labor's most valuable contribution to the objectives of the twinning program became evident when it succeeded in distorting the erroneous preconception of the French visitors who were surprised by the revelation of the workman's freedom in America and by his high standard of living.

Inefaceable helpfulness: Working daily side by side, the Arlesians-York factory workers projected an indelible picture of American friendliness and sincere desire to be helpful in every possible way. The Frenchman, unable to express himself in English, deeply appreciated the efforts exerted by his fellow York worker in making conversation with him to make him feel at home and help him increase his vocabulary. Edmond's gratifying sentiments are clearly expressed in his farewell statement:

"Actually, it sems to me that there hasn't been a time we couldn't understand each other. The welcome was exactly the same in the rest of the factory. Though I couldn't speak English, everybody tried to make conversation with me—to make me feel at home. Now we reached a point that when it takes only 2 minutes for everybody to go through the factory, it takes me 4 or 5 minutes because of the men who stop me on my way to ask how things are."

York Chamber of Commerce

In addition to its generous financial and moral support at the start of the twinning activities the York Chamber of Commerce has been in direct contact with its counterpart in Arles.

Chain of reaction: Thanks to the exchange of information literature and correspondence between the York and Arles organizations, M. Jean Serris later sent his son to spend 5 months in York as the guest of the chamber. In appreciation for the chamber's cordial hospitality, M. Serris offered to employ a young man from York in his maritime business at Port St. Louis-du-Rhone. This gracious offer was later accepted by Mr. Richard M. Brigstocke of Dover, Pa.

Continue participation: The York Chamber of Commerce has been participating also in the annual Bastille Day celebrations and it has been supplying their fine publication "York, Pennsylvania—A Dynamic Community Forges Ahead" for presentation to the Arlesians as a memento from York.

Junior chamber of commerce: This organization of energetic young men has continued to promote international friendship through its national headquarters. Every year the members of the local junior chamber assume the role of hosts to visiting foreign students. Their cordial hospitality gives testimony to a vital contribution to the aims and objectives of the people-to-people program.

York Rotary Club

The York Rotary Club, in addition to its fine international relations program, at the organization of the York-Arles Twinning Committee, made first contact with the Arles Rotarians which led them to consider York an ideal place for the summer vacation of some of their children.

West York Rotary Club: This idea was later utilized by M. Maurice F. Grossas when his daughter came to York as the guest of West York Rotary Club. Fifteen member families—each for 1 week at a time—made Mlle. Grossas' visit and tours of the country most pleasant. Her father expressed his gratefulness with an offer to reciprocate hospitality to the first student from York to study in Arles.

York Optimists' Club

Utilizing M. Grossas' generous offer the Optimists' Club of York, Inc., has sponsored a scholarship for a high school student to study 3 months in Arles.

Student chosen: A committee of judges decided in favor of David Stephenson who is a student of the William Penn Senior High School.

Forty-three percent of the total cost of the scholarship has been covered by donations (solicited by past President Hardinge on his own) from members of the York-Arles Twinning Committee, Inc.

York-Arles Twinning Committee

No single annual report presents a complete picture of achievements from conceptions to materialization. Every accomplishment traces its origin to previous planning most of which go back to former workers and administrations. The plaudits enjoyed by the committee deservingly belongs to every member and to every administration of its history. A brief recap of its activities by administration will substantiate the contention that one deed leads to another; and thus help communities, still hesitant in embarking upon a town affiliation program, to enjoy the rewarding experience now shared by the fine people of York, Pa.

Krone-Friedman administration succeeded in gaining the wholehearted cooperation of the community in giving birth and maturity to the York-Arles Twinning program. It entertained a delegation from Arles and Paris at a 10-day celebration at a cost of about $5,500; initiated contacts between people and organizations of York and Arles, and became the source of twinning information to many other American communities.

Albohm-Hertzler-Friedman administration continued to further its cause and added the following to its progress:

Published "The Story of the Twinning of York, Pa., and Arles, France" which served as a guide to other cities.

Appointed Mr. Frank Ashbrook as ambassador to Arles.

Delegated a group of York tourists to represent York at the 2001st anniversary celebration in Arles. As a result of their visit the industrialists on the delegation returned home with the idea of employing Arlesians in York plants for a limited period of time.

Dedicated the continental room in the Yorktowne Hotel which the management had redecorated with an Arlesian motif.

Initiated the annual Bastille Day celebration with appropriate ceremonies, presentation of the French flag by Air France for permanent display in the continental room, and orations by French Government dignitaries and Adm. Ellis M. Zacharias who represented the people-to-people program.

Helped produce French film on York-Arles twinning activities, narrated by the French commentator, M. Pierre Crenesse, which was later televised throughout France by Radio Diffusion Francaise.

Adopted constitution and filed petitions for corporation and charter.

Effected first teacher exchange between York and Arles.

Arranged for tape recorded holiday message from representatives of all walks of life and schoolchildren to the people of Arles. This message was recorded by the personnel and through the facilities of the audiovisual department of the York City schools.

Became instrumental in helping other American communities in the twinning program.

Received favorable comments and commendations from leading Americans and Frenchmen.

Saw six French persons employed in York schools and industry and one visitor spend his summer vacation here.

Hardinge-Albohm-Friedman-Hennessey administration has reached the goals of its predecessors when it received the charter, concentrated on the three types of memberships specified in the constitution—individual, organizational, and student—and utilized the previous invitations from Arles for employment and hospitality for a Yorker.

Bastille Day was celebrated with a dinner given by Mayor and Mrs. Schiding, the York-Arles Twinning Committee and friends in honor of the Arlesian guests. A public reception, which followed at the Jewish Community Center, under the cochairmanship of Mr. Edwin Gentzler and Mrs. John Hennessey, was televised over WGAL-TV.

Farewell party at the home of Miss Marguerite Eriksson was given in honor of Mlle. Grossas by the officers of the York-Arles Twinning Committee and friends. Mayor and Mrs. Schiding presented her with a gold charm and the committee with an album of photographs—appropriately inscribed—as mementoes from York.

Mr. Richard M. Brigstocke accepted the previous invitation of M. Serris for employment in his maritime office and spent 6 months there.

On his way to Arles Mr. Brigstocke took along a collection of paintings from the York Art Club and photographs from the York Camera Club to be exhibited in Arles. M. Jean Laurain, former exchange teacher from Arles, was in charge of the art exhibition there which together with his lectures attracted much attention and favorable comments.

Langston-Friedman-Albohm-Eriksson administration, which has recently taken office, is presently concentrating on the organization of the student membership provided for in the constitution which appears to meet with favorable results.

U.S. Information Agency

Those of the York-Arles Twinning Committee, who helped to found it and continue to be active in its administration, feel most grateful to the Office of Private Cooperation of the U.S. Information Agency and particularly to its program executive, Mr. E. Snowden Chambers, for the invaluable cooperation accorded them, the inspiring manifestations of continued moral help and encouraging spirit which in great measure is responsible for their success.

Civic Committee

Since the inception of the Civic Committee of President Eisenhower's people-to-people program, its energetic chairman, Mr. Mark Bortman, has manifested great interest in the progress of the York-Arles twinning program. Mr. Bortman has been in constant touch with some of its leaders who kept him informed on every new idea which they conceived and put into practice. His enthusiastic comments and sincere approbations proved a source of encouragement to the workers in York. Apparently, President Eisenhower manifested keen judgment in his selection of Mr. Bortman as chairman of this vital committee.

American Municipal Association

It is most gratifying to know of the sincere desire of Mr. Alan Beals, director of town affiliations of the American Municipal Association, to accord every possible assistance to the "twinners" of York. When the York-Asuncion affiliation will be effected, it will be due to a great extent to Mr. Beals' as well as Mr. Chambers' personal desire to help York in its town affiliations adventure.

STEP BY STEP

These reflections, of course, do not present a detailed acount of York-Arles twinning activities, and certainly not a complete picture of York's part in the people-to-people movement, its friendly cooperating people and their readiness to help build the road to peace. It sufficiently helps to refute, however, the argument frequently heard by the proponents of this program that it couldn't be done. York, Pa., and Arles, in France, through their own experience, have reason to maintain that even an objective which requires personal contact with a whole community, needs only one step at the time.

The cadence of marching feet on the highway of life is produced by a series of single steps, one step normally leads to another and finally to a destintion. The basic human urge for self-preservation dictates that this destination be one of peace and security.

Today, in face of the Communist carefully designed "protracted conflict" aimed at the heart of the free world, America stands to lose much by the venomous fangs of Communist propaganda. Consequently, there is more than pure idealism to the town affiliation movement, to the endeavors of the Civic Committee and to the whole people-to-people program. It is a practical investment in helping thwart the propaganda of falsehood and prejudice designed to distort the true picture of the American way of life.

York, Pa., among other American communities, therefore, finds the aims and objectives of the people-to-people program worth working for, its step-by-step experience inspiring, and its reciprocating effects most rewarding.

Fair Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, among the other vicious results of fair trade legislation, we read in the Wall Street Journal of Wednesday, April 15, 1959, where a westerner has gone to jail for selling 25-tablet bottles of Alka-Seltzer for 44 cents each. That is 14 cents below the "fair trade" price established by Miles California Co., Inc., the marketing subsidiary of Miles Laboratories, Inc., under that State's fair trade statute.

We can assume that if a nationwide fair trade law goes into effect other citizens will find themselves in a similar position of distress. I have no doubt that those who favor fair trade over the free marketing enterprise system would see that this man, Charles Hawkins, was committed to the calaboose for any such violation.

In this case the effects of fair trade are plain. Charles Hawkins is deprived of his freedom, the citizens of California are denied the right to purchase commodities at a low price consistent with free economic competition, and the small businessmen of the State see what happens to one who wishes to run his own small business in his own way.

This happening should be a warning to all small merchants.

The article from the Wall Street Journal follows:

CHARLIE HAWKINS TILTS AT "FAIR TRADE"—ENDS UP BEHIND BARS—HE'S OVERWHELMED BY GE, WESTINGHOUSE, GOES TO JAIL OVER ALKA-SELTZER

(By Charles H. Peterson)

FRENCH CAMP, CALIF.—Charles Hawkins peers through the wire-reinforced pane of glass which separates him from a visitor here in the brand-new San Joaquin County Jail, and remarks with a wan smile, "It looks like I'll be here for the full 20 days."

Charlie Hawkins' crime: In his general store in nearby Stockton, he sold 25-tablet bottles of Alka-Seltzer for 44 cents each. That's 14 cents below the California fair trade price established by Miles California Co., Inc., marketing subsidiary of Elkhart, Indiana's big Miles Laboratories, Inc.

San Joaquin County Superior Court Judge George Buck sentenced the stubborn 46-year-old general store proprietor on seven counts of contempt in violating a 1957 injunction restraining him from shaving Alka-Seltzer prices below fair trade minimums. He parceled out 5-day sentences on each count, four to run consecutively and three concurrently, and tacked on a $1,400 fine to boot.

THE BITTEREST FOE

According to S. G. Clancy, vice president of Miles California Co., Mr. Hawkins thus becomes the first individual to go to jail for flouting fair trade laws. Mr. Clancy terms Mr. Hawkins "the bitterest foe of fair trade that I've ever seen."

Edward Wimmer, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., an association which ardently supports the fair trade principle, states, "So far as I know, no judge has ever before sent anyone to jail for violating a fair trade law."

For tall, lanky Charlie Hawkins—who sits on the San Joaquin County Board of Supervisors when not tending his $700,000-a-year store—this latest tiff is just one more incident in a running feud over regulated prices which he's been waging for more than a decade. His victories are conspicuous by their absence.

At one time or another, according to his attorney, the sandy-haired retailer has taken on General Electric; Westinghouse; Kimberly-Clark, maker of Kleenex; the California Board of Equalization; a couple of beer companies; the State's Franchise Tax Board, and the California Bureau of Milk Control—and lost to all.

In his scuffle with General Electric, for instance, Mr. Hawkins was hauled into court in 1955 for chopping the price on a portable mixer from $19.95 to $14.28 and for reducing a coffeemaker from $29.95 to $22.95, his lawyer recalls. In the Kimberly-Clark dispute, Mr. Hawkins says he put the torch to 10 cases of pocket-size packs of Kleenex when restrained from selling it at less than "fair trade" prices. Only one suit resulted in a fine, the attorney says—a $200 penalty in connection with one of the General Electric cases.

As far as Mr. Hawkins is concerned, the issues always have been uncomplicated.

"I SHOULDN'T BE BOUND"

"I believe in the right of free enterprise, which among other things means the right of a retailer to establish his prices as he sees fit," he explains via a telephone-like amplifying gadget. "I believe that unless I sign a contract to sell an item at a certain price I

shouldn't be bound by somebody else's agreement."

California's fair trade law, most recently upheld by the State supreme court in 1955, permits a manufacturer or wholesaler to establish a product's minimum retail price by signing a contract with a single retailer. The price becomes the "fair trade" price for all retailers in the State, so long as they have knowledge of the agreement.

Until the series of violations of Alka-Seltzer fair trade prices which led to his current incarceration, Mr. Hawkins' most memorable skirmish over price regulation was fought in 1950. He then was operating a supermarket in the same lower-middle-class neighborhood in nearby Stockton where his present Tinker's Bigg & Littel store is located.

At that time, Mr. Hawkins recalls, he sold a popular brand of beer below the fair-trade price set by the brewer and policed by a State agency. When he was challenged, he responded by giving away the malty brew, two bottles to a customer.

The State responded by revoking his liquor license, but Mr. Hawkins nailed the document high on the wall to prevent Alcoholic Beverage Control agents from retriving it. And when authorities tried to take him into custody, Mr. Hawkins resisted until he was dragged kicking from his store. He was arrested on two charges, his attorneys says, resisting an officer and selling liquor after his license had been revoked, and was found not guilty on one charge, while the other resulted in a hung jury.

Mr. Hawkins still insists that the State owes him money for the liquor its agents confiscated that day. He says it was worth $5,700, and claims that the tax-collecting board of equalization only gave him an offset against sales taxes of about $3,800 as a reimbursement.

"I tried to collect the rest, but didn't have any luck," he mourns. "So every year for the past several when I complete my State income tax, I just write across the front, 'Please deduct this from the amount you stole from me in 1950.' "

To this gambit, the State counters with one of its own. It simply attaches Mr. Hawkins' $500-a-month county supervisor's salary.

On two occasions since, Mr. Hawkins says, he has tried to obtain another liquor license, but to no avail.

"They say I'm immoral," he snorts. "Why, I've never broken a law in my life, except for a couple of traffic violations." Needless to say, he doesn't consider his nonchalant attitude toward fair-trade prices as law-breaking.

To publicize his struggle to win back his liquor license, Mr. Hawkins bought a "couple of cases" of bourbon at retail a few days before last Christmas, then sold each bottle for 50 cents less than it cost him. When the supply was gone, he passed out 50-cent pieces to customers so they could get the same saving at a next-door liquor store.

Such antics have led many Stocktonians to regard Mr. Hawkins as a publicity hungry posturer, less concerned over the rights or wrongs of "fair trade" than he is in getting his name into the newspapers.

"He couldn't begin to afford the publicity that he has gotten for nothing in all these controversies," says J. C. Sommers, an official in the Greater Stockton Chamber of Commerce.

A Stockton doctor notes: "I'd be more impressed if he'd gotten involved over something besides beer, Kleenex, and Alka-Seltzer."

Mr. Hawkins concedes that his impromptu Yuletide whisky sale was an effort to call attention to his fruitless bid for a liquor license. But, he adds, "all in all, this whole fight has done me more harm than good. I was doing very nicely in the grocery business until I had to get rid of my grocery stores [he had two] because I couldn't handle liquor. I could do a lot better business than I'm doing if they'd just let me alone."

And his attorney, E. R. Williams, declares: "Charlie is the sort of guy who believes he has to raise issues. His theory about 'fair trade' is that the law is unpopular; and that if they'd give him a jury trial, the jurors wouldn't uphold it."

Has Mr. Hawkins learned any lessons in his latest losing joust with the law?

"I don't know if I want to come back to jail over this issue right away," he muses. "Maybe I can give it [Alka-Seltzer] away. I'll have to ask my attorney about that. Still it's worth being cooped up to believe in those things you've always believed in. It gives me a certain nice sense of the right of rebellion."

Gettysburg's Second Battle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1959

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the Members an editorial from the excellent Harrisburg Patriot and some remarks by the Adams County Commissioners anent that editorial. I think if every Representative and every Senator would read these two pieces of information they would have an insight as to why I am so upset over the situation. For, by law, a large portion of the ground upon which the first day's battle at Gettysburg is fought must be sold in effect to the highest bidder if the Federal Government is unable to make an offer. This land is now what is called an inholding—that is land almost completely surrounded by the national park at present. The choice is between a fitting monument for our rich heritage or a monstrous monument to commercialism. The choice, gentlemen, is up to you. The editorial and comment follow:

GETTYSBURG'S SECOND BATTLE—DOLLAR SIGNS VERSUS A SHRINE: LET'S END THE RUNAROUND

Congressman QUIGLEY calls it the Second Battle of Gettysburg. It is an old battle.

The first battle, marking the turning point in the Civil War, lasted 4 days.

This one has been going on for 64 years, off and on. Congress first authorized the acquisition of land adjacent to the Gettysburg National Park away back in 1895.

Those years, when the land could have been added to this national shrine for a comparative song, were frittered away. Worse than that, some of the land was lost forever. Go to Gettysburg and you can see it. There is the automobile junkyard on a site where nearly a century ago the Blue and Gray were locked in deadly embrace. Other flotsam and jetsam of neon-light and billboard commercialization stand in all their ugliness on the very approaches to the "hallowed ground" President Abraham Lincoln dedicated to the dead in one of the most famous speeches of all civilized history.

Nothing can be done about this now.

It is too late.

But it is not too late to keep this commercialization from flowing, in all of its dollar-sign flamboyance, over other privately-owned ground that is pock-marked in or on the border of the national park.

Congress authorized its purchase just 2 years ago, when it approved the Mission 66 program for the National Park Service.

But it hasn't appropriated the money to back up the authorization.

The House has just refused to approve the $750,000 appropriation which would add 600 acres to the 2,700-acre national park.

This land is up for grabs.

You can't especially blame the private owners for putting up the "For sale" sign. A succession of Congresses has been stalling for 64 years, and there has been an outright congressional runaround since the 1957 action.

Not only that; the private owners are following an official governmental example. A 150-acre chunk of the battlefield that soon can be lost forever to the park—and the American people—is owned by Adams County.

It's valuable real estate like all the rest, and the three Adams County commissioners have their eyes, too, on the fast buck. So they've put this county-owned ground up for sale. If Congress doesn't make the money available to bid on it, too bad.

Here is county government unimpressed by the national shrine argument. Even from the standpoint of self-interest, the Gettysburg Park is, after all, the biggest "industry" there with its 750,000 tourists every year. They aren't attracted to Gettysburg by honky-tonk commercialism.

What is the county commissioners' policy? "You shouldn't be asking all of these questions," their chairman argues.

But all of these questions must be asked if the national shrine at Gettysburg is to be saved. Once enough Americans hear the questions and understand the answers, an aroused public opinion will force Government at Washington—and perhaps even in the Adams County courthouse—to put this hallowed ground ahead of the almighty dollar.

Congressman QUIGLEY and Senator CLARK have been able to force all of these questions out into the open. Full-scale Senate hearings will be held. It is here and on the Senate floor that "the Second Battle of Gettysburg" can be won. But it will take the outspoken support of aroused Americans to win it. When enough Americans speak up, Congress listens.

COMMISSIONERS' VIEWS ON GETTYSBURG FIGHT

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The three Adams County commissioners have issued a statement on their decision to put up for sale to the highest bidder county home land which the National Park Service seeks to add to the Gettysburg Battlefield Park. The commissioners, E. Donald Scott, J. Blaine Bushey, and George E. Kane, say they were "presented in a rather unjust position" in both a news report in the Sunday Patriot-News April 5 and a Patriot editorial on April 8. Patriot-News Reporter Hans Knight attempted, unsuccessfully, in an interview to get the commissioners' views. The three commissioners refused to answer an array of questions at that time. Chairman Scott's reply to one of the questions summed up all of their answers. Said Commissioner Scott then: "I wouldn't say. You shouldn't be asking these questions." The Patriot is happy that the commissioners now have decided to state their side of the argument. Their statement follows.)

The Adams County commissioners have determined, after thorough study and a special report on the problem, that it is no longer profitable to operate the Adams County Farm; and with the approval of the court of quarter sessions of Adams County, the county has ceased operation of the county home land as a farm and has disposed of all livestock and farming equipment.

This makes necessary some disposition of the land which for more than a century has been operated as a farm. The County In-

stitution District may own land and buildings for the care of dependents of the county, but when such land is no longer useful for such purposes it must be disposed of.

Because of the condition of some of the buildings at the Adams County Home, and to provide better care for the guests, the Commissioners have decided to construct a new county home. This new county home will be located on county land some distance from the present buildings. It is hoped that construction can begin soon. The cost of construction must be raised, in large part, from sale of the no longer useful portions of the county farm.

The Adams County commissioners are well aware of the historic importance of the County Home Farm land. Possibly the best known of the many men who fought over that land during the Battle of Gettysburg was General Barlow, who was wounded in the fighting on the county home land and who was carried to the County Home buildings along with other injured and hospitalized there.

Historic considerations would lead to the conclusion that the farm land should be retained as part of the battlefield, but what ever feelings the commissioners might have in the matter are irrelevant. Their actions in this regard are regulated by law.

The commissioners must operate in a manner prescribed by the relevant acts of the legislature of this Commonwealth. The same laws also pertain to all other counties in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania for the protection of their citizens. The relevant act in this instance is the county institution district law adopted and approved by the legislature at Harrisburg in 1937.

Under this act, the sale of any land owned by an institution district can be made only with approval of the Court of Quarter Sessions of the Peace, which requires that it be made only to the highest bidder. A public sale of the land could be held. The law also permits a private sale but the requirement of court approval assures that the price must be as good or better than that which could be obtained at public sale. The decision that an amount offered by private bidder is higher than an amount that could be obtained at public sale, is not an arbitrary one. The whole matter must go before the court which will fix a day for a hearing of which public notice must be given. At this hearing qualified appraisers are called to estimate the value of the land proposed to be sold. Any person is free to appear at the hearing and object if they wish to do so. By the same token anyone is free to make a higher offer.

Thus it is legally impossible for the commissioners to sell any county land to any purchaser without complying with the legislature's enactment, and without approval by the court, and without the general public being aware of the sale, and without the sale being in actual effect to the highest bidder.

The commissioners legally have no discretion in the connection. If the Federal Government can obtain the funds with which to purchase the land, and if its offer is reasonable and no other purchaser offers more, then the land will become part of the Gettysburg National Park. If, on the other hand, the Park Service cannot obtain the funds, or if some other buyer is willing to pay more, then the land will not become part of the park. The commissioners have no authority to appropriate either county funds or county property for National Park purposes.

For these reasons the commissioners, while they may wish the situation were otherwise, can only operate within the laws and confines of the above mentioned legislative enactments and the requirements of the court. They must and intend to comply with the law.

Welfare and Pension Funds Legislation Needs Clarification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 18, 1959

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, I have just read with a great deal of interest that the Department of Labor's 1960 budget request to handle welfare and pension plan reports under the 1958 Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act is almost $1 million—$938,000. This is based on the rather shaky grounds that only 250,000 reports will be filed—the minimum estimate of the Secretary's range of estimates, from 250,000 to one and a quarter million plans.

I should like to bring to the attention of my colleagues that during congressional debate on this act last year, I protested that the Department of Labor's estimate of $1.3 million in annual costs to administer the far more detailed Senate bill (S. 2888) was too low—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 6, 1958 at page 15055. Further, during this debate, the following colloquy took place between the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor and myself:

Mr. BARDEN. Let me go a little further with this. As far as we are able to figure, there is no expenditure of Federal money involved, except possibly space for two copies of the summary.

Mr. BOSCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. BOSCH. Will the gentleman agree with me that it would be quite some space with an estimate of 1,250,000 plans? Two times that is 2,500,000 copies which would have to go to the Secretary of Labor, and I think there will be a tremendous cost to the Government in cataloging and indexing these plans.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Let me say to the gentleman: Let us not go off the deep end. Here, after all, I think the filing of those copies with the Secretary of Labor—and I am not so sure that the distinguished gentleman does not agree—is another safeguard to make them available for an employee.

Mr. BOSCH. I agree wholeheartedly with the gentleman. What I was trying to point out was that he said there would be no cost to the Government.

Now, here we have it—S. 2888 would have required the Department to check, investigate, and enforce. The current act gives the Secretary no investigating or enforcement powers yet it is costing approximately $1 million annually.

Today, the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act, which states that those plans are exempt which cover "not more than 25 employees" and defines "employee" to mean any individual employed by an employer, is being interpreted unofficially byt the Department of Labor in a series of "interim" memorandums to include in the "25" figure retired employees as well as current employees and to include even former employees who "may become" eligible to receive a welfare plan benefit. To support these interpretations the Department of Labor cites not the definitional sections of the Act but those sections which deal with the financial details of the plans to be reported and to the usage in these sections of the terms "participants" and "retired employees."

If the terms "participant" or "retired employees" were intended to be used in the exemption provision, it would have been a simple matter to have used them instead of the word "employees." How under such "unofficial, interim" interpretations the Department of Labor hopes to receive only 250,000 reports, on which their $1 million annual costs are based, is a mystery. And exactly how future court interpretations of the act will be affected by "unofficial interim"—and I might ask "interim to what"—memorandums remains to be seen.

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, there is much in the field of pension and welfare funds legislation which needs further study and clarification.

Resolution Pertaining to House Un-American Activities Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. DORN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to the resolution adopted by the Holy Name Society of the Church of Mary Queen of Heaven of Brooklyn at a recent meeting of that society.

The resolution follows:

Whereas a bill has been introduced—similar to proposals made in previous Congresses—to abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee; and

Whereas it is suggested that situations now dealt with by that committee be dealt with by the Judiciary Committee of the House; and

Whereas the obvious intent of these proposals is to discredit the functions of the House Un-American Activities Committee which has performed with distinction a service of vital benefit to our Nation, and done work often disagreeable, which the Judiciary Committee is not constituted to do; Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Holy Name Society of the Church of Mary Queen of Heaven strongly condemns the objectives of the proposed bill and all similar moves to weaken the surveillance of subversive activities by the House Un-American Activities Committee and representatives in Congress to reject all such moves.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate began consideration of labor-management reform bill, cleared for President bills on appropriations for unemployment compensation and space appropriations authorizations, and passed bill on cotton acreage leases.

House passed REA authority transfer and U.S.-Canadian parliamentary conference bills.

House Rules Committee cleared military construction bill for floor action.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 5255–5318

Bills Introduced: 27 bills and 5 resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1672–1698; S. Con. Res. 22; and S. Res. 101–104. **Pages 5263–5264**

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

S. 1555, Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959, together with minority, supplemental, and individual views (S. Rept. 187)—reported during adjournment April 14 under prior authorization;

S. 455, to provide for appointment of an assistant to the Secretary of State to assure joint policy and planning and equitable budgeting of exchange-of-persons programs (S. Rept. 188);

H. Con. Res. 34, favoring the meeting of the North Atlantic Treaty Parliamentary Conference for 1959 in Washington, D.C. (S. Rept. 189);

S. Res. 48, establishing committee to study development and coordination of water resources ($175,000), with additional amendments (S. Rept. 190);

S. Res. 104, gratuity to survivor of deceased Senate employee (no written report);

S. Con. Res. 22, to print additional copies of certain hearings on transportation problems in Maryland, Virginia, and the Washington metropolitan area (no written report); and

S. Res. 100, extend from April 2 to June 30, 1959, time for filing report pursuant to S. Res. 318, of the 85th Congress, to establish a special committee to consider the matter of preserving historical documents of the Senate (no written report). **Pages 5253, 5259–5260**

Bill Referred: Three House-passed bills were referred to appropriate committees. **Page 5253**

Bill Placed on Calendar: H.R. 4601, forfeiture of Federal retirement benefits in cases of offenses involving national security, was ordered to be placed on calendar. **Page 5253**

Supplemental Labor Appropriations: Senate took from desk, passed without amendment and cleared for President H.J. Res. 336, making supplemental appropriations of $40 million for the Department of Labor for fiscal year 1959. This appropriation provides for the unemployment compensation payments carried in H.R. 5916, second supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1959, now awaiting report by Committee on Appropriations. **Page 5255**

Appropriations Authorizations—Space: Senate concurred in House amendment to and cleared for President S. 1096, fiscal 1959 supplemental authorizations of appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. **Page 5283**

Naval Vessel Construction: The hour of 2 p.m. having arrived at the conclusion of morning business, Senate's unfinished business, H.R. 3293, to authorize construction of modern naval vessels, was laid down but was then temporarily put aside for consideration of other matters. **Page 5325**

Cotton: Senate considered and passed without amendment S. 1455, authorizing the leasing of cotton acreage allotments during the crop years of 1959 through 1961. **Pages 5340–5347**

Labor-Management Reform: Senate took up S. 1555, Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959, and agreed to all committee amendments en bloc, which were thereafter considered as original text for purpose of further amendment.

Appendix

Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, Walter A. Wentworth, president general of the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, delivered an inspiring address entitled "I Pledge Allegiance," before the South Carolina Society, in Greenwood, S.C., on April 11. Everyone who has ever pledged allegiance to the flag of the United States should read Mr. Wentworth's address, for his words give a clearer meaning to this pledge.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Wentworth's address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I PLEDGE ALLEGIANCE

One of the objects of the Sons of the American Revolution is to perpetuate the memory of those men, who, by their services and sacrifices during the War of the Revolution, achieved the independence of the American people.

Pericles, the Greek political leader, early in the fourth century, B.C., said:

"I would have you day by day fix your eyes upon the greatness of your country, until you are filled with the love of her; and when you are impressed by the spectacle of her glory, reflect that it has been acquired by men who knew their duty and had the courage to do it."

I pledge allegiance to those men who achieved for us the independence of the American people.

As the years have passed, some of our citizens have lost their appreciation, or become negligent of it, for those men and the liberties and rights written into our form of government by them. Some have lost a realization of the value of the outward expression of the loyalty which is owed to our Nation that was built from the sacrifices of our Founding Fathers.

A short time ago, at home, we were listening to Lowell Thomas over the radio. We heard him say, in effect, that he feels that we sing "The Star-Spangled Banner" too much. He had been telling of adverse reactions by Britishers to standing and singing "God Save Our Gracious Queen." Aroused by this comment, I immediately wrote to him saying in part:

"It is surprising to hear one of your stature make such a comment with regard to the national anthem of the United States. Flying the flag, the pledge of allegiance, and joining in the national anthem are outward demonstrations of loyalty and patriotism. We need demonstrations of patriotism every day of every year to maintain and promote the institutions of American freedom. Any depreciation tends to minimize their importance."

Twelve days later he wrote me saying:

"Many thanks for your splendid letter. Alas, I didn't intend the meaning that you suggest."

Three days after we had heard the comment of Lowell Thomas, Mrs. Wentworth brought home a book to which the speaker at the DAR meeting that afternoon had made reference. The speaker had read from it a much better expression of what these demonstrations of patriotism mean, than had been said in my letter to Mr. Thomas.

The book is "Serenade to the Big Bird," written by Bert Stiles. He was commissioned by the Air Force in November 1943, and went over to Great Britain the following March. After making 35 bomber missions, he requested to be transferred to fighters, instead of returning to the United States as he was entitled to do. He was killed in November of that year. The book tells of what happened to him and others before and during the intensive war service which he saw.

In one part he relates his experiences in the Denver (Colo.) public schools. Let me quote a little from it.

"They taught their kids to read and write, to honor their fathers and mothers, to salute the flag, and brush their teeth. They vaccinated everybody, and the scrawny ones got milk and graham crackers at 10 in the morning, and there was a play festival in the spring where all the schools danced, and we always sang carols at Christmas time.

"They did their best, all the way around, at Washington Park School. After fire drills, when everyone was safely out in the sun, we never went back in again without pledging allegiance to the flag and to the country for which it stands—one Nation indivisible—with liberty and justice for all.

"Maybe they were just words then, but there was a quiet sort of majestic feeling that went with them, like we were part of something big and good that would last forever."

Those words—a majestic feeling that we are a part of something big and good that will last forever—expressed the sentiment of a school child, in retrospect and while engaged in the defense of his country that it might last forever.

As the title of what I might say here, I chose "I Pledge Allegiance." Of course it is taken from the pledge to the flag.

"I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands; one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

The original wording of this pledge was suggested by one of the partner-publishers of the Youth's Companion in 1892. Many of you will recall that magazine which played a large role in the lives of children a half a century ago. The pledge was given national circulation by Francis Bellamy, who promoted patriotic activities among the readers of the Companion. It was first used in public exercises in Boston on Columbus Day, October 12, 1892.

Two additions to the original wording have been made. The phrase, "of the United States of America," was added some time ago to particularize this country for naturalized citizens and immigrant children. The words "under God" were added by act of Congress in 1954.

When President Eisenhower signed that act he said, "in this way we are reaffirming the transcendence of religious faith in America's heritage and future, in this way we shall constantly strengthen those spirtual weapons which forever will be our country's most powerful resources in peace and in war."

This recognition of the transcendence of religious faith is firmly implanted in the traditions of our Nation. Benjamin Franklin said:

"I have lived, sir, a long time. And the longer I live, the more convincing proofs I see of this truth—that God governs in the affairs of men. And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without His aid?

"We have been assured, sir, in the sacred writings that except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain who build it. I firmly believe this. And I also believe that without His concurring aid, we shall succeed in this political building no better than the builders of Babel; our projects will be confounded, and we ourselves shall become a reproach and a byword down to future ages."

On November 13, 1861, when the Civil War was but 6 months along, the Reverend N. R. Watkinson of Readyville, Pa., wrote to Salmon P. Chase, then Secretary of the Treasury, in which he said, "One fact touching our currency has hitherto been seriously overlooked. I mean the recognition of The Almighty God in some form on our coin." He went on to say that antiquaries of suceeding centuries would rightly reason that we were a heathen nation. He then made suggestions of form and wording.

One week later, Secretary Chase wrote to the Director of the U.S. Mint at Philadelphia saying, "No nation can be strong except in the strength of God, or safe in his defense. The trust of our people in God should be declared on our national coins." The Congress passed the necessary law in 1864, but the motto was placed only on some of the coins. On July 11, 1955, an act was adopted making "In God We Trust" mandatory on all currency.

This recognition "one nation under God" in our pledge of allegiance and "In God We Trust" on our currency, expresses the beliefs of our Nation's founders and the continuing beliefs of our loyal citizenry. It marks the greatest distinction between our Nation, with its liberties and freedoms, and the Communist nations, with their aetheistic ideology, tyranny and oppression.

It also marks the distinction between the Western Nations, Christian Nations, which abide by their agreements and the Communists, aetheists, which since Teheran in 1943 through Yalta and Pottsdam in 1945 and Geneva in 1955, have violated all but two of their important commitments. Those which have been honored are: (1) To enter the war against Japan, which they did after that war was won; and (2) to neutralize Austria. Among the broken promises are: (1) To assist Nationalist China; (2) to treat all of Germany as an economic unit; (3) to allow the Western Allies free access to Berlin; and (4) to permit reunification of Germany under a democratic government, chosen in free elections.

So, when with hand over heart or at military salute we make our pledge of allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, what is the meaning of it to each of us?

What duties do we see which will carry out that pledge to this Nation under God?

A Catholic priest and a Jewish rabbi, who were fast friends, went to see a prizefight one evening. After the preliminary bouts were over, the two big fighters gathered with the referee in the center of the ring to receive instructions on the rules of the game. That finished, they returned to their respective corners. The rabbi noticed that one of them crossed himself as he approached his corner and asked the priest what that might mean. The reply came, "Nothing, unless he is willing to fight."

That, too, is the case with our pledge of allegiance. It means nothing unless we are ready and willing to stand up in defense of our liberties and the preservation of the Republic for which the flag that we salute stands.

Is that Republic and are those liberties for which this Nation was founded and for which our forefathers pledged their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor in danger of being lost to us and to future generations? History shows that liberty is easy to loose, and once lost hard to regain.

John Philpot Curran, Irish leader in the resistance to the repressive policies of the British Government in 1790, said "It is the fate of the indolent to see their rights become prey to the active. The condition under which God hath given liberty to man is eternal vigilance; which condition if he break, servitude is the consequence of his crime and the punishment of his guilt." Generally paraphrased as "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty," this maxim is as true today as when spoken nearly 170 years ago.

Benjamin Franklin, when he emerged from the last secret session of the Constitutional Congress, was asked by a passerby, "And what kind of a government have you devised, Doctor?" His quick reply was, "A Republic, my friend, if we can keep it." And what is a republic? It is a state in which the sovereign power resides in a certain body of the people, and is exercised by representatives elected by them.

Eternal vigilance, the price of liberty, is needed now if, as Benjamin Franklin put it, we are to keep the Republic, the form of government established for us by the Founding Fathers.

Eternal vigilance is needed now if we are to guard against and prevent usurpation, such as George Washington charged us with in his farewell address to the American people. There, after expressing concern over attempts to evade provisions of the Federal Constitution, he said, "But let there be no change by usurptation; for, though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed."

Those who builded the foundations of this Nation knew well the need for protecting the rights of individuals, for safeguarding the form of government and for preventing a strong Central Government. History had taught them, and it should teach us, that autocracy, dictatorship, can and does develop easily when great power rests in a central government.

The first 10 amendments to the Constitution of the United States, which are known as the Bill of Rights, were insisted upon by several of the original States and they were assured of the submittal of those safeguards before those States adopted the Constitution as it had been drafted. These amendments were demanded to preserve the right of individuals and of the States which comprise the Nation.

You are familiar with the 10th, the States rights, amendment. It provided that "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people." This basic principle of our Federal structure has been pushed aside by decisions of the Supreme Court. They, the Justices of the Supreme Court, have relied upon other provisions which are not so clear in their meaning.

One of those others which provide for greater centralization of authority of government, to those who seek the form of control, is the 14th amendment. It reads in part, "No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; * * *." Under recent interpretations States rights have been relegated to impotency. When the will to build stronger central control dominates, then our freedoms and our liberties are at stake.

And what are some of the decisions of the present Supreme Court of the United States which have depreciated or even discarded the rights of the States, which has been for so long the bulwark of our liberty and our growth as a Nation?

The Court has denied the States the right to enforce antisedition laws; investigate subversion within its borders; dismiss employees who refuse to testify on the ground of self-incrimination; operate public schools in a manner consonant with local needs or desires.

In some of the first of these cases the decision of the Court has stated that the Federal law transcends the authority of the States, unless the Congress provides otherwise. In the latter case, regarding schools, Congress has provided otherwise. Since the adoption of the 14th amendment, in 1868, which is the basis of the school integration decision, 13 States have been admitted to the Union. In 11 of these, including both Alaska and Hawaii, the enabling acts adopted by Congress provide that the public schools, colleges or other educational institutions authorized are forever to remain under the exclusive control of those respective States.

But, what is perhaps more significant is that the 14th amendment—like the 13th (abolition of slavery), the 15 (right to vote), the 19th (woman suffrage)—specifies that "The Congress shall have the power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article." These four amendments dealing with civil rights are the only amendments which contain this particular provision, except the prohibition amendment which is now repealed. The Congress has not acted on the school integration question, but the judiciary has.

Recently the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association cited 24 decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court which cripple national and State security, with particular reference to Communist activities. The report states that recent decisions have been severely criticised and deemed unsound by many responsible authorities. Remedial legislation will be sought from the Congress. One would restore the authority of the States to enforce laws against sedition. Another would clarify the powers of the Un-American Activities Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives.

You are, of course, familiar with the admonition of the conference of Chief Justices of State Courts of Appeal, meeting in California last fall. They said in part:

"The overall tendency of its (the Supreme Couft of the United States) decisions during the last 25 years has been to press the extension of Federal powers and to press it rapidly. * * *

"This conference respectfully urges that the Supreme Court of the United States—exercise one of the greatest of all judicial powers—the power of judicial self-restraint."

That conference has now established a committee for the purpose of "achieving a sound and appropriate distribution of judicial power between the Nation and the States."

Later last fall, Chief Justice Warren of the U.S. Supreme Court, spoke in California where the conference of State Chief Justices had directed criticism at the U.S. Court's decisions. Apparently in reply to those criticisms, he said that if the Federal Government has infringed on States rights it was generally "only when the States themselves have failed to meet the needs of the people."

I ask you, whose function it is to determine the needs of the people—the legislative or the judicial branch of the Government? When the Court decides what the needs of the people may be, is that anything but usurpation? Let us quote George Washington again. "But let there be no change by usurpation; for, though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed."

At its October meeting, the board of trustees of the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution recognized the seriousness of this situation which has been created by the acts and the decisions of the Supreme Court. The trustees accordingly adopted a statement and resolution entitled "Acts of Usurpation by the Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States." In it the State Chief Justices are commended for their admonition to the U.S. Court that has been mentioned here previously. The SAR resolution then exercises the right of petition by criticizing the U.S. Justices for usurpations committed in cases involving subversion, for interference with the investigating and lawmaking powers of the Congress and of the States in the anti-subversive field, and for its course of action in the integration cases. It further declared that replacement of the present Justices may be the only way of correcting the present situation, which has become intolerable.

Lest there be any misunderstanding, let me say that these criticisms of the acts and decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court are not directed at the institution of the Court, but rather at the performance of the Justices who now comprise it. Like we often criticize the acts of a President or a Senator without any desire but to uphold the office of the Presidency or the institution of the Senate, just so it is the desire to uphold the Court while attempting to guard against and correct the acts of the Justices who now comprise it.

John Marshall, the fourth Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court and who served in that capacity from 1801 to 1835, is often called the Great Chief Justice. His tenure as such covered a period in the history of this Nation when constitutional questions and division of powers were being decided in that Court. He interpreted the Constitution broadly, so as to give the Federal Government the means to act effectively within its limited sphere. But it was he who said, "No political dreamer was ever wild enough to think of breaking down the lines which separate the States and compounding the American people into one common mass."

Walt Whitman states it well in his epigram to the States:

"To the States, or any of them, or any city of the States,
Resist much, obey little,
Once unquestioning obedience, once fully enslaved,
Once fully enslaved, no nation, state, city of this earth ever afterward resumed its liberty."

As one born of New England parentage and reared in the State of Iowa, whose motto is "Our liberties we prize and our rights we will maintain," this encroachment upon the basic principles of the rights of the States and the liberties of individuals is intolerable.

I know that it is repugnant to you, compatriots of the Sons of the American Revolution. It is up to us and other like minded patriotic citizens to resist much, as Walt Whitman so well put it. We have a duty to ourselves, to our forebears, to our children and to all posterity to guard the principles upon which this Nation was founded.

The invasion of States rights is one of the present day challenges against our form of government. It, States rights, has been the bulwark against control, centralized and magnified, by which it has been customary in history for people to lose their hard gained liberty.

Then, too, there are many who seek panaceas, unsuspectingly, which in the end only lead to the loss of all that is dear to freedom loving people.

Last fall I ran across a poem in the Chicago Tribune, which bears on this. It was written by Ellis O. Jones, under the title of "The Light-Head Brigade," and is a parody on Alfred Tennyson's "Charge of the Light Brigade." It goes as follows:

"Half a step, half a step,
Half a step backward,
Back to the fatal edge
Inched and bewildered.

"Back to the yawning brink,
Never a halt to think,
Cheered by the parlor pink
Bumbling and stumbling.

"Theirs not to see behind,
Like the blind leading the blind,
As if bereft of mind
Crazily mumbling?

"Reason to right of them,
Reason to left of them,
Reason in front of them
Volleyed and thundered.

"Theirs not to make reply,
Theirs not to tell us why,
Theirs but to fate defy
As backward they blundered."

We of this patriotic society have the heritage and possess the fabric, if we will but apply the stamina, to take the lead in the preservation of those things which are fundamental to the rights and liberties for which this Nation was founded. Let every one of us seek ways to enlighten other Americans to what they have and enliven them with a will to hold fast to those basic principles.

Can we, who revere our Constitution and the form of government of which it is the foundation, who honor the men who framed that document and put the breath of life into it, can we do anything other than to exert our every energy and all our talents to inculcate into the heart of America a belief in those constitutional principles and a deep desire to keep them unsullied?

That is a field in which we can work. Call it propaganda, if you will. It is basic, it is deserving, it is for the preservation of the institutions of American freedom, which is one of the great purposes and objects that was written into our charter by the Congress of the United States, 53 years ago.

At the time of our struggle for independence, followed by the drafting of our Constitution and the establishment of our form of government, God gave us a group of men, our Founding Fathers, who for courage, intelligence, wisdom, and honor has never been equalled in any nation at any time.

So, when we make our pledge of allegiance let us with the spirit of those who gave us our freedoms resolve that those freedoms shall be perpetuated. That, in the words of Bert Stiles, let us resolve to appreciate that we are a "part of something big and good that would last forever." That, in our prayers in this one Nation under God, we seek that He, in whom we trust, will give us the men and women who can illumine the mind and heart of America so that the heritage which we have shall not perish from the earth.

Why Cities Are Changing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, in the last decade or so our metropolitan cities have been undergoing a tremendous change. While much of the change must be accepted as inevitable, there is much that the cities themselves can do not only in promoting the advantages of city as against those of the suburb, but in developing new ideas to meet the challenge of our changing times. In my own State of New Jersey, the city of Paterson has not only come to grips with the problem, but has set out in a vigorous fashion to overcome it.

To give Senators the benefit of some pertinent information on this whole subject, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a thought-provoking editorial published in the Paterson News of April 3. I think it is of considerable interest.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY CITIES ARE CHANGING

The typical U.S. large city is far from dying or even becoming moribund as a whole, despite the shift of many of its people and some of its business to outlying areas. What may be decaying as a result of the "flight to the suburbs" are the sections lying between the central core of a large city and its outer rim.

This is one deduction from a recently published study by the Committee for Economic Development. The study lists various economic factors keeping certain businesses in the central city and is of interest to cities like Paterson where intensive activities are on to meet the changes.

For instance, some establishments need large-scale low-cost labor (e.g., Puerto Rican and Negro women in New York) that can be mobilized more readily in the city than in most suburban areas. Others need much young female help, especially clerical.

Printers of legal briefs and advertising brochures must be able to get their material and deliver it quickly. Garment manufacturers must be concentrated so that buyers lose little time in visiting each. There's need to find technicians, such as electricians or machinists, in a hurry to minimize work stoppages.

These considerations apply chiefly to small businesses. It is largely big establishments which leave the central city. In eight widespread metropolitan areas studied, almost three-fourths of small business units were in the city, over half the large ones in outlying districts.

Retail trade, like large-scale manufacturing, has shown a shift away from the central city as the population has changed. This population shift to suburbia has been indeed stupendous all over the country.

Whereas the central cities in metropolitan areas grew nine times faster than their suburbs from 1890 to 1900, today suburban population is growing six times faster than central city population. Even in 1954, central cities showed less than three-fourths of the employment in general merchandise stores of 13 metropolitan areas.

(The Census Bureau classifies as a metropolitan area any county containing a city of at least 50,000. Adjacent counties are included if nonagricultural and tied in economically and socially with the central city.)

With more reliance now on trucks and less on railroads to bring in and ship out goods, wholesale establishments move to the city perimeter. This is especially true of those that handle goods more efficiently in low wide buildings than in high narrow ones.

"As central cities decline in population," says the Committee for Economic Development, "Negroes and other groups with more restricted job opportunities constitute a larger proportion of the population that remains."

Certain Federal-aid programs, such as those for housing and urban renewal, aim primarily at central cities, small as well as large, rather than metropolitan areas. However, Congress, which legislates for the District of Columbia, has set up a joint committee to consider problems of the Washington metropolitan area as a whole.

In a report made for this committee, City Planner Frederick Gutheim finds the Washington area population growth since 1930 (198 percent) second only to that of Houston, Tex. Sixty percent of the area's inhabitants live outside the District in adjacent Maryland or Virginia.

These changing conditions are inevitable, and the problem is to face up to them with daring, imagination, and determination, which Paterson is doing.

Protection for Migratory Fish Runs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, convincing and effective arguments for adoption of my bill, S. 1420, to afford protection for migratory fisheries, are advanced in an editorial published by the Oregonian, of Portland, under the title "Equal Status for Fish." The editorial appeared in the Oregonian of March 27, 1959.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD so my colleagues may be informed of these impressive reasons for providing some reasonable statutory safeguards for anadromous salmon and trout when the Federal Power Commission licenses structures on our rivers and streams.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EQUAL STATUS FOR FISH

A bill to give the Secretary of Interior, after consultation with the Fish and Wildlife Service, the right to prevent issuance of a Federal Power Commission license for a dam unless fish-passage facilities are acceptable to the Service's experts has been reintroduced by Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER in amended form.

The bill he introduced in Congress last session gave Interior equal authority with the Secretary of the Army and the Army Engineers, who have the veto power to protect navigation, to protect anadromous fish runs of the Columbia and other rivers. The new bill, S. 1420, has been modified. A rejection of fish plans by Interior would go to both Houses of Congress. If not overruled by Congress within 60 days, the denial would stand.

The salmon and steelhead of the Columbia River system are of great value to recreational and commercial fishermen and deserve equal protection with navigation. This measure would be a step in that direction. The Federal Power Commission has taken the falsely optimistic view in licensing dams on the Cowlitz and Deschutes and proposing construction of Nez Perce Dam on the Snake River that enough progress has been made in fish passage to assure protection of the runs. This simply is not true. No "skimmer" or other device has yet been proved in practice, and tentative results to date are not encouraging.

Adoption of the Neuberger bill might save the great Salmon River spring Chinook and steelhead runs now threatened by dam proposals at Nez Perce and Lower Canyon sites. Conservationists should unite behind this measure, while also pressing for fishery research funds from Congress and the States to make intensive additional studies of the fish-passage problem.

J. Edgar Hoover and the Federal Bureau of Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask that a very well-expressed article entitled, "A Larger Embezzlement," issued by the executive committee of the National Association of Bankers, Accountants, and Comptrollers, paying tribute to the Federal Bureau of Investigation and its renowned Director, J. Edgar Hoover, be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A LARGER EMBEZZLEMENT

Most of us think only in financial terms when we speak of robberies, burglaries, and embezzlements. Banks have been victimized in unprecedented numbers in years past.

In these years the Federal Bureau of Investigation, under its renowned Director, J. Edgar Hoover, has handled such cases in its jurisdiction in a prompt, impartial, and efficient manner. Evidence of this is found in the nearly 97 percent convictions obtained in Federal courts of persons prosecuted in FBI bank cases.

But embezzlements and robberies are not restricted to money. There are those who embezzle the rights and privileges of U.S. citizenship and would rob others of their good name. The Communists are actively engaged in just this type of activity.

For years the Communists have had as a basic goal the destruction of the FBI and the discrediting of Mr. Hoover. A vicious smear campaign of innuendos, misinterpretations, and falsehoods is being conducted.

The Communist press is being joined by others not so readily recognized as subverters or embezzlers of our democratic processes. They are attempting to perpetuate a fraud on the American people.

Every banker must be made aware of what is going on. We must develop our diligence to prevent this broader type of embezzlement to the same degree as in our own institutions. Furthermore, we must become vocal and active in our defense of the FBI and J. Edgar Hoover, its Director. The Bureau with its outstanding record has contributed much in protecting the democratic way of life without which private banking cannot exist.

We in National Association of Bankers, Accountants, and Comptrollers are proud and appreciative of all the splendid efforts the FBI has expended toward helping to curtail bank robberies and embezzlements. The FBI and National Association of Bankers, Accountants, and Comptrollers are both interested in the protection of banks and our way of life, and it is our strong feeling that the Bureau's efforts and services, in all its activities, should in no way be curtailed.

Remember, private banking cannot exist in a Communist state.

Urban Renewal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, urban renewal grants have already helped to transform large areas of many American cities. Plans now on the drawing boards would, with the grants of the future, make even greater transformations possible. Millions of dollars have been spent, and for very good purposes.

Today, however, I wish to draw attention to a more modest sum, a $130,106 grant made last week. The New Jersey State Department of Conservation and Economic Development has geen granted this sum for a pilot study of the regional needs of a large area in New Jersey. An editorial published in the Bergen Evening Record of April 14 well explains, I believe, the significance of this grant. The project is, in my opinion, an imaginative and very worthy use of urban renewel funds.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SEED MONEY FOR URBAN STUDY

It is constructive, not cynical, to ask what difference can be made by the $130,106 Federal grant to the State department of conservation and economic development for a study in the nine north Jersey counties of the present extent of urban blight. What shall we do after we know the truth, which is sobering and humbling, that we can't do now? Doesn't everybody know we need urban renewal?

The answer appears to be that we don't know it in a way which compels us to take action against blight and slum and social rot. We don't know for instance, what Claire R. Hancock found in a study of 112 shattered families and has reported in the April issue of the Welfare Reporter of the department of institutions and agencies:

"The second major problem is grossly inadequate housing. It was a serious problem to 65 percent of the families. * * * They felt like outcasts. * * * It would seem that the community which fails to provide decent housing and exercise adequate control for protection of its families from exploitation * * * runs the risk of increasing the neglect problem."

In Hackensack it was found that careful determination of the facts respecting blight did lead to Government action with decisive popular consent to sweep clean the blighted areas and rebuild them. When we are made aware of the extent and intensity of physical deterioration and human depletion and waste in a town, when we come to understand its cost in squandered life, frustration, problem solving in the form of delinquency and crime and sullen existence on relief-roll almsgiving—when we know the state we're in we tend to see that it's changed. This is the difference it makes.

The Idaho State College Theater Tour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CHURCH
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the Idaho State College Theater was selected by the American Educational Theater Association and the USO to tour American military bases in the Far East with its production of "Bus Stop" for 7 weeks beginning in March of this year.

Last August, the group received an invitation to extend its tour in order to participate in the New Zealand birthday festivals in February. I was confident that these young people from Idaho would be wonderful ambassadors to our friends in New Zealand, and I was happy to be of some assistance to them in arranging for their transportation from San Francisco to New Zealand in Operation Deepfreeze planes which would otherwise have made the southbound flight with unused space. The tour has now been completed, and its success is attested by a letter I have received from the public relations officer in New Plymouth.

I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW PLYMOUTH PUBLIC
RELATIONS OFFICE,
April 2, 1959.

Senator FRANK CHURCH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The citizens of New Plymouth have recently been favored with a visit from the Idaho State College theatrical group. Two plays were presented, "The Miser" and "Bus Stop," and played at the Bowl of Brooklands open-air amphitheater in New Plymouth.

We understand that you yourself were in many ways responsible for the opportunities that allowed the Idaho State College players a visit to New Zealand. Because of this, we would like to say that we are indebted to you for your part in this visit.

The players themselves have acted as splended ambassadors for your country, and the plays that they had chosen to present were very much appreciated by the audience who attended in this city.

The idea itself is an excellent one, and we hope, sincerely hope, that the possibilities of such theatrical interchange will continue. In a country like New Zealand, that is to some extent cut off from the larger, more developed countries, there are wonderful results to be gained from such enterprise, enterprise that can gain a closer cooperation and understanding between our two countries.

As an aside to my letter, I must say that I feel the American Embassy in this country could have been a little more helpful to this company, particularly in regard to prepublicity in our New Zealand centers.

I understand, too, that it was found necessary for the company to travel by commercial aircraft to take up their contracts with the Far Eastern authorities in Honolulu. I can only hope that no great expense will be incurred the players in view of this.

They have made a very good impression in this country and have brought American amateur theater to this city.

We are grateful, sir, for your efforts, and hope that you might find it possible to organize such another tour.

Yours faithfully,

E. HANDBURY,
Public Relations Officer.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the students who made the trip to New Zealand were Robert Cornwall, Dennis Goodenough, Theron Pollard, Alan Nash, David Rayborn, Roy Zitting, Susanne Holman, Beverly Redman, Carene Clarke, and Alice Marie Jackson. Their director is Dr. Hal Todd. Idaho is proud of them.

The Premium Iron Ore Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a telegram I received from Cyrus Eaton, and an editorial from the Toronto Telegram of April 11, 1959, entitled "U.S. Tax Attempt Tossed Out."

There being no objection, the telegram and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLEVELAND, OHIO, *April 10, 1959.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Federal Court of Appeals in Cincinnati has just handed down a unanimous and sweeping decision in favor of Premium Iron Ores, Ltd., of Canada, and its American stockholders. This constitutes a sharp rebuke to the Treasury Department, the Internal Revenue Service, the Attorney General, and the State Department for their 17-year attempt to impose punitive income taxes on Premium and stockholders, and especially for their ill-starred appeal of the original U.S. Tax Court decision, against the advice of some of their own experts and over the official protest of both the Liberal St. Laurent government of Canada and the subsequent Conservative Diefenbaker government, as well as the editorial objection of every important newspaper across Canada. What good does it do the United States to spend billions of dollars for foreign aid for the express purpose of making friends while at the same time conducting an income tax vendetta with Canada, our nearest neighbor and best customer?

CYRUS EATON.

U.S. TAX ATTEMPT TOSSED OUT

Rarely have tax officials suffered a more decisive defeat than has the U.S. Internal Revenue Service in the courts in Cincinnati, in the case in which the service has tried to tax a Canadian company.

Consolidated Premium Iron Ores, Ltd., a Toronto company whose business is marketing the output of Steep Rock Iron Mines, Ltd., has won a clear verdict in the Federal U.S. Court of Appeals against U.S. Government tax officials who assessed it for $4,599,418 in back taxes. In this verdict, the American court has shown more sense than the tax branch of the American Government.

This is a case that has not only ruffled Canadian feelings, but threatened to upset harmonious relations under the Canada-United States tax treaty that provides orderly procedure for avoidance of double taxation.

This is, moreover, the case which would have jeopardized the position of hundreds of U.S. controlled firms in Canada and, if U.S. tax officials had had their way, delivered a severe blow to Canadian economic development to the extent that it has been based on U.S. capital investment here.

The basic doctrine of tax reciprocity, as it prevails between Canada and the United States, is that U.S. investment in Canada operates under Canadian law as to taxes and other administrative matters. Similarly, Canadian investment in the United States operates under U.S. law, with no duplication of taxes or interference from Canadian authorities.

As the Premium Iron Ore case has demonstrated, this is not good enough for U.S. Federal tax officials. Back in 1956, acting on a tax informer tip, they assessed this company, which is wholly subject to Canadian law, for back taxes in the war years when Canada allowed it tax exemption as a development incentive.

The claim rested on the contention that since Premium Iron Ore is financed by the Cyrus Eaton interests, and Mr. Eaton resides in the United States, the company was subject to U.S. tax. Not overlooked is the fact that Mr. Eaton is a sharp critic of some U.S. policies, notably in foreign affairs, and the U.S. attempt to collect taxes from a Canadian property of his has a bad odor of political motive, repugnant to Canadian thought.

The Canadian Government protested formally against this claim, both under the St. Laurent and the Diefenbaker regimes. The U.S. Tax Court described the claim as inconsistent and ruled against it. Now the U. S. Court of Appeals in Cincinnati has upheld this finding.

It's to be hoped that U.S. tax officials will be content with the verdict. Reportedly, they may still appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court. But two clear verdicts are enough to remove any legitimate doubt that the U.S. tax attempt was unfounded. In view of the impact upon Canadian-United States relations, it was unwise in the first place.

The Farm Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, one of the most able and perceptive editors in our country today is Tom Anderson, editor of the Farm and Ranch magazine. In his column entitled, "Straight Talk," Mr. Anderson does not confine himself to the discussion of agricultural questions alone, but when he does discuss agriculture, his thoughts are beneficial to everyone interested in this question.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Anderson's editorial entitled "Straight Talk," from the January 1959 edition Farm and Ranch, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STRAIGHT TALK

(By Tom Anderson)

Ever since there's been a farm program the rich have gotten the gravy—because when the Government gravy bowl runs over the rich have spoons and the poor have forks. The farm program is for everybody except the little family farmer it ought to be for.

Many people have written me proposing plans which would pay heavier proportionate subsidies to the little fellows than to the big. That's socialistic—like free medicine for everybody, rich and poor. I'm for giving the rich nothing—except freedom to farm, without Government help or interference, and the right to sell all they can produce to anybody they can—except the Government.

Dividing the right to produce on an equal-share basis will socialize and pauperize American agriculture.

During the past several years, I've advocated a farm program which would:

1. Make corporation farmers, tax-deduction farmers, absentee landlords, and urbanites ineligible for any Government assistance. No Government agricultural services and subsidies to any but the family farm; the farm in which the family has management control of the operation, whose main business is farming, who are dependent on it for their living, and who actually work their land. All others should furnish their own county agents, financing, drought relief, conservation, and price supports. Many of the big absentee farmers don't cultivate anything but the ASC offices.

The soil bank is a ridiculous bipartisan monstrosity which pays farmers and nonfarmers for not farming. Thousands upon thousands of lawyers, doctors, real estate men, and speculators are getting a $5,000 annual gift from the soil bank for owning land. Thousands of other nonfarmers have tobacco allotments in their backyards.

2. Make every farm stand on its own legs, taxwise. No more rich men farming for a loss instead of a living, at taxpayers' expense.

3. Make all subsidies temporary—no permanent dole.

4. Subsidize hopeless farmers to leave the farm and go into industry.

5. Expand markets, domestic, and foreign, through research and competition.

SOCIOLOGICAL OR FARM PROGRAM?

Much of the so-called farm problem is not a farm problem but a sociological problem.

A man who exists in the country on a little piece of ground which couldn't support a family even if he knew how to farm, ought to come under the welfare program instead of the farm program.

To a large extent the farm problem is manufactured by politicians buying votes and by Government workers deliberately expanding and perpetuating useless departments and jobs. Many self-appointed apologists for agriculture blame "poor public relations" for the fact that agriculture has become a whipping boy. The public "just doesn't understand," they say. That's right. If the public did understand, there'd be a lot of Congressmen plowed under. The best way to develop better city-farm relations is to develop a farm program which makes sense.

The expense of giveaways to foreign nations, disaster relief, school lunch programs, etc., should be shared by other departments of Government and not charged entirely to Agriculture. The extent of the giveaways, of course, is dictated by the fact that we already have unmanageable surpluses, which are better used in hungry stomachs than in ocean bottoms.

A while back I was at a national meeting of extension editors. One of the problems which came up was what to do in counties where subdivisions had devoured practically all the farmland. One editor moaned that he couldn't even get the newspaper to carry his farm stories any more. The ingenuous solution offered was to "quit telling how to treat mastitis and tell how to take care of parakeets." In other words, when there is no more job to do, create one.

FEWER THE FARMERS, THE BIGGER THE USDA

The fewer the farmers there are to serve, the more money and people it takes to do it. The fewer the chicks the bigger the Government brooder.

In the 17-State farm and ranch territory last year, 7,273 county agents served 2,165,470 farm families, 953,867 rural nonfarm families and 1,348,876 urban families. Since more than half the families served were nonfarm families, why not charge that part to welfare? Or maybe there should be a new department to take over that work: The U.S. Department of Socialism. Maybe the Agricultural Extension Service should be renamed the People's Extension Service and be put under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

In 1950, 16.6 percent of Americans lived on farms. In 1958 only 12 percent did. Soon there may be more people in the USDA than there are living on farms—more people farming the farmers than there are farming the land.

If you're a lower half farmer, the agricultural bureaucracy is spending more money on you than you make farming. In other words, it costs government more to keep farmers farming than most farmers make out of farming.

Certainly, all Government agricultural effort is not bad. The consumer benefits greatly from Government research and educational and marketing programs.

Hundred percent parity won't provide a decent living for a family with a cotton allotment of 5 acres or a tobacco allotment of nine-tenths of an acre. No farm program can solve the farm problem unless it's accompanied by a labor program, a tax program, an anti-inflation program, and a foreign trade program, which release the farmer from his cost-price squeeze, improve his competitive position and broaden his markets.

The farmer needs an end to labor racketeering, not unionization of farming. The farmer needs lower prices for the things he buys, not artificially higher prices for his Government controlled production. The farmer needs a balanced budget, not more billions of dollars spent on a sprawling Government bureaucracy from which he may get no visible benefits. The farmer needs less nonfarmer subsidies, not more farmer subsidies. The farmer needs the right to produce, not more curbs; more markets, not less—and less government, not more.

Farmers Should Beware of Grain Gypsies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the Pennsylvania Farmer, in the March 14 issue, has published an article entitled "Beware of Grain Gypsies," written by Armand Gladfelter. The article details the activities of certain individuals who are fast talking some American farmers out of a fair price for their corn crop.

The writer makes several recommendations which every farmer should follow in marketing his corn so as to bring to the farmer the full market price.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BEWARE OF GRAIN GYPSIES

(By Armand Gladfelter)

"How much did you get for your corn, Jim?"—"Oh, I got 4 cents over market price and they shelled it for nothing," chuckles Jim, looking like the cat that swallowed the proverbial canary. When you hear this type of conversation where farmers gather together you know that the gypsies have taken over the marketing of grain.

During the past decade the gypsy system of marketing grain has grown into a multimillion dollar operation, diverting the normal movement of grain from farm to market through the slightly unorthodox middleman known as the gypsy grain buyer, who amazingly makes a profit where seemingly there is not profit to be made.

The requirements for a grain gypsy operation are fairly simple—a truck, a corn sheller and a gift of gab.

By giving the farmer the impression that the legitimate grain and feed merchant has been taking advantage of him for years, he tops it off with an offer of 4 to 5 cents above the prevailing market price for his grain and in the instance of corn offers to shell it at no charge. To the farmer this story seems reasonable and he makes a deal with the gypsy to sell him his corn crop.

MARKET PRICE OF GRAIN

Now the reader must be reminded that the market price of grain is controlled mainly by the large grain pit auctions. To the auction price is added freight and commissions. This determines the actual market price for any given area in the United States. It is usually accurately reflected in local market quotations, and the price quoted in local papers is the price a legitimate dealer will pay for grains on the farm. When the grain is delivered to a mill in the area the farmer will receive from 4 to 8 cents above the quoted market price. This sum total compares with the pit prices after all deductions have been made, making the local and transit grains about the same price.

Now the legitimate feed dealer as well as the gypsy works inside these two figures, the price on the farm and the price at the mill. As all grains finally end up at a legitimate feed manufacturer's mill, the grain gypsy must sell to this market if he wishes to sell at all. There is no other final market.

There is an 8-cent spread at the outside between the farm price and the mill price, and it is a reasonable spread in which either the gypsy or the legitimate dealer can make a normal and reasonable profit.

The farmer who wishes to sell his corn to a legitimate feed dealer will be given market price at the farm for his shelled corn. The dealer will shell it for the farmer for 4 to 5 cents per bushel. If the farmer wishes to shell it and deliver it to the mill he will be paid 8 cents over market price.

But now the grain gypsy enters the picture. He will offer the farmer 4 to 5 cents over market price and will shell it at no charge. This actually gives the farmer an 8- to 9-cent advance over the prevailing market prices, and he does not have to touch the corn.

What manner of magic must the gypsy now perform in order to give the farmer 8 to 9 cents over market price for his corn and then sell it to a legitimate feed dealer for 8 cents over market price?

As there is no possible way for the gypsy to make a legitimate profit on this type of transaction, he must then make an illegitimate one, and the only possibility left to him is to short weight the farmer. A 10-bushel shortage cannot readily be detected in a 250-bushel load of bulk grain and at $1.50 per bushel the shortage will show him a neat profit of $15 per load, and at 3 to 4 loads per day the gypsy may well realize $60 profit for the day's work.

The motto of the short weight artist is "cheat them the very first time and you will never have any trouble cheating them all the time."

NO PREMIUM PRICE

The reason for the continuing existence of this type of gypsy operation is the great desire of the farmer to get more than market price for his grain, and he is prone to sell to any one who will give him a little premium. Little does he realize that there is nothing like a premium price for No. 2 yellow corn as far as the feed manufacturers is concerned, and a little straight thinking will reveal that no man in his right mind will pay a premium when he can always get grain at prevailing market prices.

Nevertheless the gypsy trucker continues to pay premiums when he cannot sell at premium, and the farmer continues to be hoodwinked into believing that he is actually selling at premium prices.

In reality he is supporting gypsy operations to his own detriment and to the detriment of the legitimate grain and feed dealer.

Here are a few simple rules to follow when marketing any grain.

1. Beware of anyone who will pay you a premium for your grain.

2. Insist that you get an official weight slip, or better yet insist that you see the grain being weighed.

3. Insist that both gross and tare be weighed for every load. Many truckers, use a standard tare even when using a public scales.

4. Insist that all weight slips be signed by the weighmaster; you can later check on his duplicates.

5. Insist that you receive weight slips from the mill to which the trucker sells.

6. Never sell corn by measure.

7. Remember that the legitimate dealers can also be gypsies.

Another Side to the Berlin Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in a recent statement on the floor of the Senate I told of the many thousands of refugees who were going from behind the Iron Curtain and from East Germany through free Berlin, the gateway to the West, to a new life of freedom in the West, there being some 4,000 a week, or about a quarter million a year, who have found refuge in the Western democracies from the terror behind the Iron Curtain.

But, Mr. President, there is another side to this picture—what happens to these refugees once they are on the free side of the Iron Curtain?

In the April 4, 1959, issue of the Army, Navy, and Air Force Journal, Mrs. Barksdale Hamlett, wife of the U.S. commander in Berlin, tells of some of the activities being conducted by the wives of American servicemen to help refugees and students in West Berlin.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will pardon my pride in the fact that Mrs. Hamlett is from my State of Texas.

Recently there have been many unflattering statements made about Americans abroad. Therefore, I feel the activity of these women is especially commendable because it shows the real feelings of Americans toward people everywhere. This is practicing as well as preaching democracy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the article by Mrs. Barksdale Hamlett, published in the April 4, 1959, issue of the Army, Navy, and Air Force Journal under the heading "Service Wives in Berlin Busy With People of Service Projects Behind Iron Curtain."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SERVICE WIVES IN BERLIN BUSY WITH PEOPLE OF SERVICE PROJECTS BEHIND IRON CURTAIN

(By Mrs. Barksdale Hamlett)

Most of the Army women I have known have had the feeling that official matters and comments relating thereto are best left in the hands of their husbands. Today, in Berlin, we feel the same.

It is true that there is a great deal going on in the world today about which we would like to know more. There are a thousand questions we would like to have answered. We know, however, that asking would be a waste of time, so we go along, taking each day as it comes.

Our life, in this divided and isolated city, is full. One of our main problems is that there are only 24 hours in each day. There is so much to do, so many people to help, worthy projects to support, so much to see and to learn.

There are our students, boys and girls who have taken their courage and lives in their hands and fled the East Zone in order to seek asylum in this shining city which is symbolic of freedom. These young people, in attempting to prepare themselves for a bright future, attend the free University of Berlin. The school is not free in the monetary sense, but in that it exists in free Berlin and operates free of thought control. As may be imagined, very few of these refugee students have the financial backing which would ensure completion of their courses of study. The Berlin Senate underwrites students, but only for a given number of semesters. This then is where we, of the American Women's Club of Berlin, come into the picture.

VARIED MEMBERSHIP

In passing, it would be proper to describe our membership. Unlike most service women's clubs, this has a Catholic membership—wives of men in the Foreign Service, Navy, Air Force, and civilian positions, as well as of news correspondents, Corps Diplomatique, business and Army men. The latter includes commissioned and noncommissioned officers' wives.

It would be impossible for the club to help all the students worthy of aid. Therefore, through a series of interviews, first established under the direction of Mrs. James B. Conant in 1955, a club committee, headed by Mrs. Bernard Gufler, wife of the Honorable Bernard Gufler, Foreign Service Minister here, selects 10 or more students. Through club aid these collegians are able to continue their work.

This year, led by the president, Mrs. R. J. Lawlor, and through prodigious efforts on the part of the thrift shop workers and other club activities, we were not only able to provide for our usual number of students but to establish several scholarships at our other Berlin University, the Technical.

As everyone who reads the papers knows, there are tens of thousands of refugees who flee to West Berlin from the East. These people arrive without worldly goods, and are taken in by the city government and housed in refugee camps. In addition they must be clothed and given something to do while awaiting emigration to other regions. The flood of refugees sometimes is so great that serious problems exist, making it difficult to know what to do in order to help them. Many organizations help in this field and the American Women's Club plays only a small role.

However, we cast about and someone came up with the idea of supplying the women with yarns and knitting needles. This accomplished two missions at once. Not only would the women have something to do during the long, weary hours of waiting, but ultimately would have new garments for themselves or their children. Recently some of the refugees held a style show and it was amazing and heartwarming to see the clothes which had been fashioned.

ENLISTED WIVES AID PROJECTS

We of the American Women's Club do not stand nor operate alone. The Enlisted Men's Wives Club, headed by Mrs. C. O. Jowers, wife of Master Sergeant Jowers of Berlin Command, is a most active and enterprising group. The principal interest of this group lies in their work with the crippled children of the paraplegic wards in the Oskar-Helene Heim. This hospital is located within a block of the U.S. Army installations.

Of the more than 100 patients in this particular ward, approximately 25 percent are orphans or come from the East Sector of Berlin. Because of these circumstances these young patients are without financial backing. The city of Berlin underwrites the hospitalization, treatment and medical expenses, but someone must clothe these children and furnish a bit of entertainment. The Enlisted Men's Wives Club steps into the breach and supplies each needy child with three complete sets of clothing. In addition, games, books, and recently a radio-victrola, have been provided.

In addition to the above-described work, Mrs. Jowers and her club provide information and guidance to the young wives who come into Berlin; aid them in getting settled and lend needed supplies and equipment until such time as their household goods arrive.

REFUGEE AID PARAMOUNT

Refugees are of paramount interest to the 6th Infantry Wives Club, whose president is Mrs. Keith Stewart. The efforts of these young women are directed toward alleviating hardship in some of the local refugee camps. Since the first of the year, more than 100 pairs of shoes and 20 large sacks of clothing have been collected, refurbished and distributed.

Easter was gay for some of the children in the camps because members of the 6th dyed, decorated and donated hundreds of eggs. Our own Army children have not been forgotten. Through courtesy of the Infantry wives, each child subjected to an immunization "shot," at the local Army hospital, receives a lollipop. Eight hundred were distributed within the last 3 weeks.

Favorite flavor?—raspberry.

Turning from frivolity, some of the younger service people occasionally find themselves in distressing circumstances, in which cases the Sixth takes care of its own, providing whatever aid is necessary in some family crises.

AF WIVES HELP ORPHANS

The Tempelhof Air Force Wives' Club has a delightful means for raising funds to be spent on their favorite orphanage. Each year these women design and make the most fantastically complete doll's wardrobe that ever set a child's eyes sparkling. A contest is held and the proceeds—usually in the neighborhood of four hundred dollars—are used to supply clothing, fruit and needed equipment for an orphanage of 18 children.

The interest of the dependents in Berlin do not entirely lie away from the American community. There are dozens of wives and daughters who work in the Army hospital, putting in hundreds of hours as Gray Ladies, staff asistants and nurses' aids. The Girl and Boy Scout programs as well as the American Youth Activities are strongly supported and subsidized by our community.

Many of us have spent long hours studying the German language. These efforts have been well rewarded. Not only are we able to shop, sightsee, etc., auf Deutsch, but social intercourse with our German neighbors has been facilitated. Recently at an international woman's group meeting (these are held monthly) a Yugoslavian, a German, an Armenian, a French woman and an American were seated at a tea table. The conversation was spirited, general, and all in German.

WHAT ABOUT FREE TIME

What do we do for fun and in our free time? We shop—oh those delightful antique shops on Keithstrasse—the gorgeous clothes to be seen along the "Ku-damm." We golf, swim and sail on the Wannsee when weather permits, and attend the opera. Wouldn't Verdi die to hear his arias sung in German? Berlin boasts one of the finest museums in Europe, one always encounters friends browsing through the exhibits. We play bridge, attend the local outpost theater, listen to lectures, and generally do those things women do all over the world.

We go along day by day, doing that which needs doing. Sometimes this includes taking visitors to the East Sector of Berlin. There, one is brought face to face with our Communist neighbors. A trip to East Berlin is a most impressive experience. There is the great tile facade of Stalinallee—built to show the West what the Red regime can do. It features enormous balconied buildings, one or two rooms deep, with rubble and ruin to the rear.

The few people one sees along the streets are warmly but unstylishly dressed. They do not look happy. Seldom does one see a smile. There is no ring of children's laughter while at play. It is a relief to get back to our side of the Brandenburg Gate. Here, the Berlin Bear is a benign sort of fellow who waves a friendly paw in welcome.

Life in Berlin is interesting, our husbands go about their duties, and we, the women, face each day with confidence and willing hearts.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the article goes on at length to tell of the many hours of the day these wives of American servicemen in West Berlin have devoted to helping the refugees from behind the Iron Curtain as they start to build new lives of freedom.

Importance of a Study of History: William Albaugh, Specialist in Confederate Arms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the study of history is an engaging and rewarding pastime. Bill Albaugh III, of Arlington, Va., has expressed one reason best when he said of his collection of Civil War objects:

To the collector who's not just interested in dollars and cents, every item holds a story of courage under fire, of long marches on empty stomachs, of victory or defeat.

Mr. Albaugh is a recognized authority in this field and is the author of six books: "The Handbook of Confederate Swords," "The Original Confederate Colt," "Confederate Brass-Framed Colt and Whitney," "Confederate Arms," "Here Is the Confederacy"—to be published this fall—and "Tyler, Tex.—CSA."

In his interesting "Tyler, Tex.—CSA," Mr. Albaugh has used the records of the Confederate ordnance works at Tyler, Tex., which he located in the National Archives, to write a historically accurate and readable account of ordnance problems at this major gun and ammunition producing effort of the Confederacy in the Trans-Mississippi Department.

This volume holds special interest for me because Tyler, Tex., is in my family's home area.

While Mr. Albaugh has burnished the arms of another era, he has also made a real contribution to the history of the Tyler, Tex., area.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article on Mr. Albaugh, written by M. D. Rosenberg, which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald for Monday, April 13, 1959, under the heading "Civil War Mementoes Inspire Owners' Books."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CIVIL WAR MEMENTOS INSPIRE OWNER'S BOOKS

(By M. D. Rosenberg)

The Union soldiers marched up to the column-lined entrance of the stately Virginia plantation house and smashed in the door.

That day in 1864 marked the beginning of the double life of Bill Albaugh III of 431 Lincoln Avenue, Falls Church.

Albaugh, a 50-year-old civil service investigator, had not been born when the Yankees paid their unwelcome call in Hanover County. But he remembers the day.

Seated in his pine-paneled hobby den containing some $25,000 worth of curios, Albaugh fed General Beauregard, a pet falcon perched on his hand, and watched the flames dart about the fireplace.

INSPIRED BY GRANDMOTHER

"Grandmother never would allow anyone to repair the manor door," Albaugh recalled. The falcon grabbed a piece of meat with its bill and flew to the top of the bookcase filled with Civil War reference books. "Grandmother said she wanted to make sure her children didn't forget what happened. The impressions I received from her left me with a desire to acquire and examine mementos from the War Between the States. But I want it understood that I don't sit down here re-living the war."

Albaugh's soft-spoken manner becomes increasingly respectful as he talks of the Blue and the Gray.

"By the beginning of World War II, I had built up a small collection of revolvers, rifles, swords, and other reminders of bitter battles. To the collector who's not just interested in dollars and cents, every item holds a story of courage under fire, of long marches on empty stomachs, of victory or defeat. We can't always learn the story, but we know it's there."

Albaugh closed his eyes for a moment and worried his mustache as firelight played across his face. Then he looked up and pointed to a Virginia State flag in one corner of the room.

A FLAG OF MEMORY

"That flag's had quite a history. It became a part of Albaugh tradition when they brought my grandfather's body home in a wagon after he was killed in a battle near Winchester. He was a lieutenant. The flag covered his body. It was handed down and finally came to me."

Then a quick smile erased his serious look.

"But that old flag was destined to fly in another war. See those names inscribed on the edges? U.S. Marines. A group of southern boys in Korea wrote Governor Battle they'd like to have a Virginia flag to fight under. The Governor referred their letter to me. I sent the flag to them—told them it had never been dishonored. I asked them to treat it well and bring it back to me when they got discharged. Never really expected to see it again. Then one day some of the boys knocked on my door and there it was."

Albaugh leaned back in his chair and looked around the room. "I've got Gen. Stonewall Jackson's last general order issued just before the battle of Chancellorsville. You know he was killed in error by his own men shortly afterward. I also have one of the original signed copies of Robert E. Lee's last general order after Appomattox. It's a very moving farewell to his troops. From a money standpoint, it's only worth about $100. But when you talk about feeling. * * *

BEGAN BUYING BACK

"Of course, very few of these things were in my first collection. When I joined Naval Intelligence—that's World War II, not World War I—I sold what I had at prices averaging $5 each. After I returned from the Pacific, I began buying back some of the pieces and discovered prices had skyrocketed with increased popularity. Well, I figured, why not start using my knowledge based on more than 40 years of study. So I set up my typewriter under that portrait of Stonewall—incidentally, it was painted by William Garl Brown in 1862, apparently from life—and wrote my first book, "Handbook on Confederate Swords."

Five other books followed from this man who had never before written for publication and who still refuses to think of himself as a real writer. Although the books are designed for a limited audience, the royalties have enabled Albaugh to decorate his history-filled basement with more flags, revolvers, spurs, bugles, bowie knives, portraits of relatives in the Confederate Army, uniforms and items like Gen. George E. Pickett's field desk.

Albaugh got up and walked around the room, pointing to the guns mounted on the walls. They were obviously old friends, although his collection of arms and accoutrements has a high turnover rate because he's more interested in learning than in mere possession.

A GOOD GUN TRADER TOO

"My most valuable item was a Dance Bros. revolver made in Texas in 1863 and used by the Confederates and Indians. A friend of mine bought it out West for about $3. He traded it to me. The gun later sold for about $2,500—a good tidy sum."

Albaugh is quick to point out that "this would all be impossible without the cooperation of my wife, Lucille. She has helped me entertain collectors; put up with my trips around the country, and kept the place quiet during the long evenings I have spent writing down here."

He paused to dust off a belt buckle which belonged to the executive officer of the *Alabama*, sunk by the *Kearsarge* off Cherbourg, France, in 1864. "My books have made me good friends among Congressmen and business leaders, but my top fans are my wife and our sons, Bill, 13, and Chris, 14."

Despite weapons and military atmosphere, Albaugh never goes hunting. The falcon, its meal finished, flew gracefully across the room and alighted on its owner's shoulder. "After World War II, I vowed I'd never shoot at any person or animal again."

General Beauregard will have to be content with raw beef from the grocery store.

Improved Economic Outlook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we recognize that among our domestic problems a major challenge is that of full recovery from the economic setback suffered by the Nation.

Fortunately, current signs on the horizon justify real optimism. During March, for example, improvements in the economy included: advances in industrial production, housing starts, employment, income, and retail sales.

Too, unemployment declined more than seasonally. However, we recognize that 4.3 million jobless are still far too many.

Unemployment, also, was reduced by 7,800 in my own State of Wisconsin.

Unhappily, there are still an estimated 76,000 workers out of jobs.

We recall that Congress recently enacted legislation to provide extended unemployment compensation benefits to a number of those who are still out of work. While this is of assistance to a limited number of workers, we realize that it does not cope with the basic problem of creating more jobs.

As I understand it, S. 1631, to establish a Commission on Unemployment Problems, is now on the Speaker's table in the House of Representatives. I hope that our colleagues on the other side of the Capitol will find it possible to act expeditiously on this proposed legislation, as did the Senate.

This is particularly important in view of the fact that the return back to work has been disproportionately slow in relation to our economic comeback. The task, of course, is a speedy reexamination of this critical unemployment situation—particularly in hard-hit areas—followed by constructive recommendations as to just how additional jobs can be created for the unemployed.

Recognizing, however, that evidence of upturns in the economy is always good news, I request unanimous consent to have an article from today's Washington Post and Times Herald, on a report by the Federal Reserve Board, indicating recent upturns in economic activity throughout the country, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. OUTPUT UP 2 POINTS FOR RECORD

Output of the Nation's factories and mines rose to a record peak last month, the Federal Reserve Board reported yesterday.

The Board's seasonally adjusted index of industrial production advanced 2 points to 147 percent of the 1947–49 average.

This topped by 1 point the previous record set in February 1957. It compares with a recession low of 126 percent in April 1958.

In summarizing March developments, the Board said:

"Industrial production and prices, housing starts, employment, income, retail sales and bank loans to business advanced and unemployment declined more than seasonally."

Most economic indicators now have made up all the ground lost during the recession. The most notable exception is the unemployment report.

(Some economists pointed out that the "record" output level is more apparent than real. They figure that at least 1.5 points of the index represents steel produced in response to strike fears. Thus, they estimate the "true" index at 145.5.)

The Reserve Board said production of soft goods in March was 6 percent above the prerecession peak. The output of durables, while increasing substantially during the month, still was 3 percent below the high recorded in December 1956.

Originally the Board had calculated that industrial products rose 1 point in February to 144 percent of the base period. However, it has since revised the February figure upward to 145 percent.

The Board said output gains in both February and March were widespread. It mentioned sizable advances in the production of steel, construction materials, farm machinery and most other equipment and household durables.

"Auto assemblies recovered from the reduced February rate," it said, "and were maintained in early April."

It said mineral output held steady in March as a decline in crude oil production was offset by increases in other lines.

Padre Island Can Become a "Ghost of Departed Opportunities" if Not Made a National Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, a report of a survey made by the National Park Service of Atlantic and gulf coasts includes the statement:

The seashore is a priceless resource for which there is no substitute. Once subdivided and developed, it is lost forever.

Mr. President, the Atlantic and gulf coastline is 3,700 miles from the easternmost part of Maine to Brownsville, Tex., yet there are only approximately 247 of those miles in public ownership. The portions of the coast which are feasible for development as park sites are very limited and are fast passing into private ownership for development.

Mr. President, Padre Island is one of the few areas remaining which are feasible for public park development. Padre Island stretches roughly from Corpus Christi, Tex., to Brownsville, Tex., offshore from the Texas coast in the Gulf of Mexico, a distance of about 117 miles. The island width is from one-half mile to 1 mile, and it is offshore about 10 miles. It is unsettled and uninhabited, except for a tourist development at each end.

In another part of the report, the National Park Service said of Padre Island in Texas:

It should be given the highest priority. Padre Island presents an opportunity for beach recreation of a type unmatched by any other area along the Atlantic or gulf coasts.

Its great size, remote character, endless sweep of broad beach, grass-topped dunes and windswept sand formations have great appeal. Its natural resources, historical and biological values should be preserved.

Mr. President, this great windswept waste, with sea, sand, and scrub timber was the last refuge of the Karankawa Indians, who were cannibals, and who therefore were detested by the Spanish settlers of Mexico and the Anglo-American colonists from the north, as well as the other tribes of Indians. The last legend is that as these Indians were hard pressed by the Mexican troops and by the colonists, they launched themselves in their great war canoes from Padre Island into the Gulf of Mexico off the coast and vanished from the sight of men forever.

This summer pirate's hangout—this place of treasure—is now one of the finest fishing spots in the world, and will soon fall into private development and be lost forever as a great winter tourist resort for the American people unless prompt action is taken.

I introduced a bill in this regard last year, Mr. President, and I have reintroduced it this year. The bill would create a national park of Padre Island. This is not something we should simply consider from year to year, for we are in a race against time, since private interests are now seeking to go in and develop the area. If we acquire the area as a national park, it will become equal to Yellowstone National Park for the people of America. It is a priceless treasure for the whole American people, but once it is subdivided—and there are plans to subdivide it as much as Florida is being subdivided—it will be lost forever to our people.

Mr. President, many garden clubs, many civic clubs, and virtually all organizations in our part of the country interested in wildlife conservation, plant conservation, and recreational facilities for the American people, are supporting the bill.

Mr. President, in support of the National Park Service recommendations and my own bill to establish a national park on Padre Island before this fine beach area is cut up into private ownership, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Houston (Tex.) Press of Wednesday, April 8, 1959, under the heading " 'Ghosts of Departed Opportuniites,' an Editorial—Why Padre Island Should Be a National Park."

In addition, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of a letter resolution of the Travis Audubon Society dated April 7, 1959.

There being no objection, the editorial and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"GHOSTS OF DEPARTED OPPORTUNITIES," AN EDITORIAL—WHY PADRE ISLAND SHOULD BE A NATIONAL PARK

The strongest possible editorial favoring a national park on Padre Island was not written as an editorial at all.

It is a single sentence, easily overlooked, in a report by the National Park Service after an 18-month study of the Atlantic and gulf coasts from the top of Maine to the tip of Texas.

This report notes comparisons with the result of a similar survey 20 years earlier, and of the previous report it says:

"For the most part it represented the ghosts of departed opportunities."

The men who made that comment had nothing to sell. They were experts in their field, making a factual report of a careful survey.

They were not beating the drums for Padre Island.

But of Padre, they said:

"It should be given highest priority. * * *

"Padre Island presents an opportunity for beach recreation of a type unmatched by any other area along the Atlantic or gulf coasts.

"Its great size, remote character, endless sweep of broad beach, grass-topped dunes, and windswept sand formations have great appeal. Its natural resources, historical and biological values should be preserved.

Unfortunately, this report was made more than 5 years ago.

During those years, more of the beach areas the experts found still suitable for public recreation have become unsuitable—cut up by commercial development.

Such development by private owners is underway on Padre now. Its tempo will increase and values will increase.

The price of delay is in another paragraph of the same report:

"The seashore is a priceless resource for which there is no substitute. Once subdivided and developed, it is lost forever."

How could it be put more plainly that we must act, and act now, if Padre Island is to be preserved for all the people?

We must not let that magnificent island become the ghost of a departed opportunity.

TRAVIS AUDUBON SOCIETY,
Austin, Tex., April 7, 1959.

Hon. R. H. CORY,
Chairman, State Affairs Committee,
Texas House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CORY: This is to state that Travis Audubon Society, with a membership of over 200 in Travis and adjacent counties, gives wholehearted endorsement to House bill 469, the Padre Island Park bill.

As an organization dedicated to conservation of all natural resources, we recognize the need for immediate action in preserving Padre Island for use as public park area. In no other way can Texans be assured of retaining the natural beauty of the longest unspoiled stretch of beach remaining in the United States, of enjoying the sport of fishing where fish abound, and of providing sanctuary for countless wild birds.

With the population of Texas increasing at an astounding rate, the need of providing wholesome recreation for coming generations becomes a matter of grave public concern. How better can this need be met than by assuring future public access to the wonderful beach on Padre Island.

We feel that to defer action on this matter is to invite further commercial inroads on Padre Island, and will result in permanent closing of beach areas to the public. On the other hand, with Padre Island under supervision of the National Park Service, Texans would be assured of impartial operation of recreational facilities for the benefit of the general public, and attraction of only the most desirable type of out-of-State visitors.

Believing that the Texas Legislature has within its hands the tool for creating a lasting monument to a vanishing wilderness, and to perpetuate a much-needed seashore area where Texans can find wholesome recreation and inspiration, the Board of Travis Audubon Society, speaking for the membership, pledges support to H.B. 469.

Respectfully yours,

FRED S. WEBSTER, Jr.,
Chairman, Board of Directors.
Mrs. MAGNOLIA N. GREENE,
President.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, if favorable action is taken upon the bill Padre Island will take its place with Yellowstone, Grand Canyon, Yosemite, Glacier, and many other national parks which are now principally summer national parks, though Padre Island will be a winter national park.

Status of the Democratic Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the majority leader of the other body is certainly correct when he states that the 86th Congress has a man-sized job cut out for it.

In his speech at Big Spring, Tex., of November 7, 1958, Senator JOHNSON listed 12 objectives.

How are we doing with respect to these objectives? Where do we stand as of April 10, 1959? At my request the Legislative Reference Service prepared for me a brief summary and status of the Democratic legislative program as set forth in the 12 items which Senator JOHNSON listed in his address, plus a 13th having to do with education, which I have taken the liberty of adding to the list.

It is plain from looking at these data, which are set out below, that leadership will have to select particular bills in some instances and in other instances will have to see that further legislation is filed.

The following program as outlined is taken primarily from legislation which has been introduced in the Senate. Certain companion bills introduced in both Houses have been noted. In most cases similar legislation has been introduced in the House and referred to the appropriate committee.

Committee action, not indicated, has already been initiated by most of the committees responsible for such legislation. The enactment of the outlined Democratic program appears to be well ahead of schedule.

Here is the information:

First. We need to breathe life into the newly created space agency and launch a program to explore outer space:

S. 586, Mr. KEFAUVER, January 20, 1959 (Aeronautical and Space Sciences): Department of Science Act of 1959 establishes a Department of Science to carry out programs for developing missiles, rockets, etc., and other programs of research with respect to outer space. Transfers to such agency the National Science Foundation, the Atomic Energy Commission, and similar functions of the Defense Department.

S. 676, Mr. HUMPHREY and others; January 23, 1959 (Government Operations): Department of Science and Technology Act of 1959 establishes a Department of Science and Technology and transfers to such department (1) the National Science Foundation; (2) the Atomic Energy Commission; (3) the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; (4) the National Bureau of Standards; and (5) certain functions now being administered by the Smithsonian Institute.

S. 1096, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. BRIDGES; February 17, 1959 (Aeronautical and Space Sciences): Authorizes an additional $48,354,000 for fiscal 1959 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration as follows: (1) salaries and expenses, $3,354,000; (2) research and development, $20,750,000; (3) construction and equipment, $24,250,000. Passed Senate March 10, 1959; reported in House March 18, 1959.

H.R. 2971, Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana; January 21, 1959 (Science and Astronautics): Authorizes $82,050,000 for the acquisition of property; plant construction, etc.; for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Second. We need a program to develop the peaceful uses of the atom—with emphasis on an atomic merchant marine.

S. 683, Mr. GORE; January 27, 1959 (Atomic Energy): Atomic energy amendments of 1959 authorizes $1 billion for the Atomic Energy Commission (1) to construct a large-scale prototype power reactor; (2) to construct power reactor facilities at major production facilities of the Commission to supply the electrical energy needed by such facilities; (3) to develop reactor designs, etc., capable of a maximum production of not more than 50,000 kilowatts of electricity; and (4) to initiate a program for the development of civilian power reactors of from 10,000 to 50,000 kilowatt capacity.

Directs the Commission to conduct a vigorous program of international cooperation and assistance in the development of power reactors, and to accelerate existing programs for the development of nuclear rocket propulsion and to proceed with the development of a manned vehicle powered by nuclear propulsion.

H.R. 4822, Mr. TOLLEFSON; February 19, 1959 (Merchant Marine and Fisheries): Authorizes the construction of a nuclear-powered tanker for operation by the Maritime Administration.

Third. We need a program to step up the supply and conservation of water for the West.

S. 13, Messrs. ENGLE and KUCHEL; January 9, 1959 (Public Works): Provides Federal assistance, loans for up to 50 years and grants, to encourage the planning and construction of non-Federal municipal and industrial water development projects on a multiple purpose, comprehensive basis.

S. 943, Mr. ENGLE and others; February 5, 1959 (Interstate and Foreign Commerce): Authorizes $10 million over a 10-year period for a program of weather modification directed at increasing the annual average usable supply of water in the Colorado River Basin.

Senate Resolution 48, Messrs. MANSFIELD and MURRAY; January 27, 1959 (Interior and Insular Affairs): Establishes a select committee to make studies of water resources and future needs thereof.

H.R. 8, Mr. TRIMBLE; January 5, 1959 (Public Works): Water Conservation Act of 1959 establishes a national policy and procedure for the development of water resources on a comprehensive multiple-purpose basis.

H.R. 289, Mr. TRIMBLE; January 7, 1959 (Interior and Insular Affairs): Establishes criteria for the utilization by the Secretary of the Interior in the determination of the feasibility of constructing or modifying any reclamation project.

H.R. 1863, Mr. CLEMENT W. MILLER; January 9, 1959 (Public Works): Authorizes loans and grants to provide Federal cooperation in non-Federal municipal and industrial water development projects.

H.R. 2145, Mr. BECKWORTH; January 12, 1959 (Interior and Insular Affairs): Authorizes $200 million annually for Federal aid, on a 50–50 basis, to assist States and local governments to plan, construct, operate, and maintain projects for water conservation and storage.

Fourth. We need to review our foreign policy so that bold, new, imaginative programs can be recommended to responsible officials.

S. 1094 (H.R. 4452), Mr. FULBRIGHT (by request); February 17, 1959 (Foreign Relations): Authorizes the U.S. Governor of the International Monetary Fund to request and consent to an increase of $1,375 million in the U.S. quota for such fund, to vote for increases in the capital stock of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and, if such increase becomes effective, to subscribe to 31,750 additional shares of stock. (Passed House, amended, March 25, 1959.)

H.R. 2159, Mr. CURTIS of Missouri; January 12, 1959 (Foreign Affairs): U.S. Trading Corporation Act establishes the U.S. Trading Corporation to undertake such measures as will effectively meet the threat to the free world of long-range economic penetration of world markets by the Soviet bloc.

H.R. 4452 (S. 1094), Mr. SPENCE; February 12, 1959 (Banking and Currency): Laid on table March 25, 1959; S. 1094 passed in lieu.

House Resolution 113, Mr. MORGAN; January 15, 1959 (Rules): Authorizes the Committee on Foreign Affairs to conduct an investigation of policies, etc., of the State Department and other departments and agencies engaged primarily in the implementation of our foreign policy. (Passed by House January 29, 1959.)

House Resolution 114, Mr. MORGAN; January 15, 1959 (House Administration): Provides for expenses of conducting investigations under House Resolution 113. (Passed by House February 24, 1959.)

Fifth. We need a consistent policy for Latin America which will help our neighbors to help themselves.

Senate Resolution 17, Mr. SMATHERS; January 12, 1959 (Foreign Relations): Favors the establishment of an inter-American regional development bank.

Senate Resolution 31, Mr. GREEN; January 20, 1959 (Rules and Administration): Authorizes a study of U.S. foreign policy, with special reference to Latin American and Canadian Affairs. (Passed by Senate February 2, 1959.)

House Resolution 49, Mr. O'HARA of Illinois; January 7, 1959 (Rules): Creates a select committee composed of members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs to make an investigation of our affairs with the Latin American countries.

Sixth. We need a new farm program because there is something wrong when the Government must spend 53 cents for every net dollar the farmer takes in.

S. 1211, Mr. HUMPHREY and others; March 3, 1959 (Agriculture and Forestry): Family Farm Yardstick Credit Act of 1959 provides for the reactivation of the program of assisting farmers and creditors with voluntary farm debt-adjustment procedures and the policy of adjusting repayment schedules to the net earnings of borrowers from year to year. Provides for long-term, low-interest loans to farmers.

Authorizes $200 million annually for loans and an additional $35 million for the guaranty fund for insurance of loans.

Family Farm Development Act of 1959 provides for the determination of counties, up to 500, having the largest low-income farm population and the assistance of families therein with low-interest, long-term loans for the enlargement and/or development of such owner-operated family-type farms.

H.R. 838, Mr. MARSHALL; January 7, 1959 (Agriculture): Agricultural Relations Act of 1959 creates an Agricultural Elections Committee to establish regulations and practices for the election of community, county, and State agricultural committees. Provides for a National Agricultural Board to establish national production and marketing goals and to allot such goals to farmers.

Provides for referendums to be held on programs proposed by the Board and, if not opposed by a majority of the producers, then provides for such programs to become effective.

Seventh. We need a program to help the people in those areas which are economically depressed to help themselves in restoring their region to prosperity.

S. 1631, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas and others; April 8, 1959 (Labor and Public Welfare): Establishes a Commission on Unemployment Problems. (Passed by Senate April 10, 1959.)

S. 722, Mr. DOUGLAS and others; January 27, 1959 (Banking and Currency): Area Redevelopment Act creates an Area Redevelopment Administration, an Area Redevelopment Advisory Board, and a National Public Advisory Committee on Area Redevelopment. Provides for the designation of redevelopment areas those areas having certain levels of unemployment. Authorizes $300 million for revolving funds to provide aid in industrial redevelopment areas, rural redevelopment areas, and for public facilities. Authorizes $75 million for grants for public facilities under certain conditions; $4,500,000 annually for technical assistance; $10 million for retaining subsistence grants. (Passed Senate March 23, 1959.)

(NOTE.—In the House over 45 bills providing assistance in depressed areas have been introduced, most of which are similar to S. 722.)

Eighth. We need to face up to the high interest rates which are slowing the needed growth of our economy.

S. 860, Mr. PROXMIRE; February 2, 1959 (Banking and Currency): Authorizes member banks to count currency and coinage as reserves.

S. 1120, Messrs. ROBERTSON, FULBRIGHT, and CAPEHART; February 19, 1959 (Banking and Currency): Authorizes member banks to count currency and coinage as reserves. Reduces to 10 percent (now 13) the minimum aggregate amount of demand deposits required to be kept on hand by reserve banks.

S. 1560, Mr. HUMPHREY; March 25, 1959 (Government Operations): Capital Budget Act of 1959 provides for the separation of operating and capital expenditures in the Presidential budget.

Ninth. We need a labor bill to protect honest, constructive labor from the selfish schemes of the racketeers.

S. 1555, Mr. KENNEDY and others; March 25, 1959 (Labor and Public Welfare): Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959, this is a committee version of legislation designed to control and prevent abuses by labor organizations). Sets forth certain findings of fact; requires full and complete disclosure of financial affairs of labor unions and transactions by unions, union officials, and other parties which might give rise to conflicts of interest; sets limits on the establishment of and periods during which trusteeships may be maintained; requires democratic methods for the election of union officials; and establishes an Advisory Committee on Ethical Practices to advise the Secretary of Labor with respect to the administration of the act. (Scheduled to be reported April 13, 1959.)

WAGES

S. 1046, Mr. KENNEDY and others; February 16, 1959 (Labor and Public Welfare): Extends coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to employees of large enterprises engaged in retail trades or services and other activities affecting commerce. Increases the minimum wage to $1.25 an hour.

UNEMPLOYMENT

S. 791, Mr. KENNEDY and others; January 29, 1959 (Finance): Unemployment Compensation Act of 1959 provides for unemployment reinsurance grants to the States. Revises, extends, and improves the unemployment program. Sets forth certain standards which States plans must meet.

Tenth. We need a bold housing program which will set as its goal a home for every American family.

HOUSING

S. 57, Mr. SPARKMAN and others; January 9, 1959 (Banking and Currency): Housing Act of 1959, omnibus housing bill, extends the home improvement programs; increases maximum mortgage amounts; increases dollar limitations on rental housing; increases maximum loan-to-value ratio; increases by $4 billion annually for each year 1959 and 1960 the FHA's general mortgage insurance authorization; extends benefits for displaced families; establishes a new program of housing for elderly persons; provides a 6-year $2.1 billion slums clearance and urban renewal program; permits local agencies to set rents, etc., for low-rent projects; increases funds available for college housing; extends military housing program and provides additional funds for VA direct loans. (Reported in House Feb. 27, 1959; scheduled to be brought before Rules Committee Apr. 13, 1959.)

H.R. 2357, Mr. RAINS; January 15, 1959 (Banking and Currency): Housing Act of 1959, omnibus housing bill similar in many respects to S. 57.

(NOTE: S. 57 was passed by the Senate on Feb. 5, 1959, with an amendment. The act was reported in the House on Feb. 27, 1959 with an amendment. The Rains bill with minor amendments was substituted by the House committee for S. 57 as passed by the Senate. As now before the House the bill provides for (1) lower FHA downpayments; (2) larger FHA repayment periods; (3) reduction (authorized) in FHA insurance premiums, (4) a $500 million yearly (for 3 years) program of slum clearance; (5) an extended low-rent public housing program; (6) a $400 million additional loan authority for college housing; (7) a new program for housing for the elderly; and (8) an extension of the military housing program.)

Eleventh. We need to reexamine our airport program because we are entering a jet age of transportation and present facilities are totally inadequate.

S. 1., Mr. MONRONEY and others; January 9, 1959 (Interstate and Foreign Commerce): Extends the Federal aid program for the development of airports through fiscal 1963 and authorizes $95 million each year for fiscal 1960, 1961, 1962, and 1963. Authorizes additional amounts for projects in Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Authorizes an additional $75 million for a discretionary fund for such aid. Disallows as project costs the construction of parking areas, bars, cafes, etc. (Passed House, amended, Mar. 19, 1959.)

H.R. 1011, Mr. HARRIS; January 7, 1959 (Interstate and Foreign Commerce): Similar to S. 1.

Twelfth. We need a courageous urban renewal program to bring new health and vitality to our cities.

S. 57, as summarized above, contains certain provisions dealing with urban renewal. In general, urban renewal programs may be found in the major housing bills.

Thirteenth. We need a liberal new Federal program of aid to education—aid in loans and scholarships, aid in classroom construction and teachers' compensation.

EDUCATION

S. 2, Mr. MURRAY and others; January 9, 1959 (Labor and Public Welfare): School Support Act of 1959 provides Federal aid for the construction of classrooms, etc., and compensation of teachers.

S. 8, Messrs. MCNAMARA and HART; January 9, 1959 (Labor and Public Welfare): School Construction Assistance Act of 1959 sets forth a $1 billion annual program for Federal aid for the construction of school facilities.

S. 57, as summarized above, contains a program providing aid for the construction of college housing.

S. 234, Mr. LANGER; January 12, 1959 (Labor and Public Welfare): Sets forth a program of loans for students desiring to continue their education beyond the high school level.

H.R. 22, Mr. METCALF; January 7, 1959 (Education and Labor): Identical to S. 2.

We have a lot of work to do before adjournment. With this formidable program in our sights, it is necessary that we assess our progress from time to time.

Hiring the Handicapped in Our Town

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL J. KILDAY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a copy of an essay entitled "Hiring the Handicapped in Our Town."

This essay was written by Mr. Brian O'Leary, an 11th-grade student of Thomas Jefferson High School, San Antonio, Tex., and was awarded one of the two third-place designations in the 1959 national essay contest.

I commend this excellent essay by Mr. O'Leary to the attention of the membership:

HIRING THE HANDICAPPED IN OUR TOWN
(By Brian O'Leary)

Since 1941 San Antonio has made great strides in the field of hiring the handicapped. Before that time very few disabled people were hired, but today thousands are employed in private industry, sheltered workshops, and military installations. These employers cooperate with the San Antonio branch of the Texas Education Agency, Vocational Rehabilitation Division, the Texas Employment Commission, and the Civil Service Commission. Before discussing the operation of these agencies, it would be appropriate to state exactly who may be considered handicapped. Physically handicapped persons include amputees, cardiacs, diabetics, spastics, deaf persons, deaf-mutes, those with arthritis, arrested tuberculosis, muscular dystrophy, and polio.

Among governmental agencies working for the advancement of the handicapped, the San Antonio branch of the Texas Education Agency, Vocation Rehabilitation Division is outstanding. It was founded 17 years ago with Warner Rasco, Sr., its present counselor, at its head. The purposes of this organization are: To equalize employment opportunities for the physically and mentally handicapped; to attempt to remove or reduce the handicap; and to provide the individual concerned with skills and equipment to enable him to compete in business. The agency provides training through colleges, universities, business colleges, and trade schools—but mainly on the job at its own expense. During the training period, the agency pays the employer a tuition of $30 to $40 a month, and maintenance and transportation fees of the employee.

Other governmental agencies coordinate the efforts of private industry. The local office of the Texas Employment Commission locates suitable jobs and willing employers. It is estimated that there are from 500 to 800 handicapped people in San Antonio seeking employment through the commission. The San Antonio Committee of the National Employment for the Physically Handicapped is a group of civic leaders and businessmen interested in furthering the welfare of the handicapped. The San Antonio branch is especially enthusiastic: At the last statewide meeting in Austin it had the largest representation. These groups endeavor to present the problem of the handicapped to the public. They provide speakers at social affairs and meetings and distribute films. Posters, calendars, blotters, and pamphlets were distributed by the Boys' Clubs.

There are several nonprofit organizations devoted to the betterment of the handicapped. The Lighthouse for the Blind, established in 1931 and operated by the San Antonio Association for the Blind, is a sheltered workshop to provide training, work experience, and employment for the blind and those with serious visual impairments. Physically handicapped employees supervise the trainees. The objective of the Lighthouse is to prepare trainees for normal employment. It is financed through the sale of brooms, mops, and other household items manufactured there. The United Fund provides for the supervisors and covers loss of materials. The workers are paid reasonable wages—a total of $36,782 last year. The association also distributes talking books, teaches Braille, and provides other benefits.

Goodwill Industries, founded in 1945, is another sheltered workshop. Its purpose is to provide training and employment for the physically handicapped and to prepare them for normal employment. It is affiliated with the Texas Social Welfare Association, the National Rehabilitation Association, and the Goodwill Industries of America. It is financed through the collection, repair, and sale of discarded household items through three outlet stores. Last year $135,000 was paid in wages from a gross income of $250,860. The United Fund provides $6,760 for essential supervisors. Last year 181 trainees were hired and 14 were placed in private industry. Goodwill also provides many free welfare services to the employees.

Other nonprofit groups are operating in San Antonio. The San Antonio Disabled American Veterans provides counsel and placement for handicapped members. Its functions include the promotion of equal employment opportunities, finding of suitable jobs, and an educational program for employers. The Salvation Army Men's Social Center works for indigent, homeless, and handicapped men. It is financed through the repair and sale of discarded household items. Its program includes food, lodging, living necessities, spiritual guidance, and employment.

The military installations in the San Antonio area hire large numbers of handicapped civilians. Kelly Air Force Base, with 1,300 handicapped civilians, is the largest employer of the physically handicapped in the Southwest. Walter D. Downing, Chief of the Placement and Employee Relations Branch reports that disabled workers work harder and take one-third the sick leave of normal workers. Fort Sam Houston hires over a thousand handicapped civilians, many members of the Disabled American Veterans. They are paid normal wages and are placed in jobs suited to their abilities. Lackland Air Force Base hires handicapped civilians on the basis of their limitations and abilities. They are also paid normal wages.

Private industry provides work for many handicapped people. Joske's of Texas and Sears, Roebuck & Co. are two department stores that are noted for hiring them. Also outstanding are Howard Aero, Inc., and Handy-Andy Supermarkets. Joske's has been hiring handicapped people since 1940. Eleven have been hired in the last 2 years. Howard Aero was named "Employer of Disabled Veterans in Texas in 1958" by the American Legion. Representatives of the Texas Employment Commission and other placement agencies survey openings in these and other companies for positions with suitable working conditions and within the limitations of a certain type of handicapped persons.

A study of some handicapped employees of Joske's of Texas will exemplify the suitability of handicapped people on certain jobs. There is a deaf and dumb lady who prints names on pencils, another who prints names on personal Christmas cards and several deaf cashiers. They perform exceptionally well on their jobs because they are not distracted by loud noises and can devote their full attention to their jobs. A mentally retarded girl makes bows for gift wrapping. A person of normal intelligence on the same job might become bored to such an extent that he would not perform at optimum efficiency. Because of the fear of the results of their handicap, many blind people exert such efforts toward becoming proficient at a certain job that they ultimately become more skillful than their sighted counterparts. Thus we find blind price markers and furniture assemblers.

The reason that so many handicapped people are working in San Antonio is that employers have come to realize that it is good business to hire the handicapped. Employers are not asked to accept these workers simply because they are handicapped; they are recommended because they can do the job as good if not better than normal employees. Lackland Air Force Base reports that handicapped workers have better conduct and efficiency but about the same absenteeism as other workers. Other sources report that handicapped workers have fewer major accidents and slightly higher productivity. Skills, abilities, minor accidents, and quit rate are about the same in both groups. Furthermore, governmental agencies have found that the cost of rehabilitation is repaid in a few years through income tax on increased wages. Consequently, the progress of the handicapped in San Antonio proves that it is one thing to have disabilities but quite another to remind handicapped by them.

"California: The Golden State"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 17, 1959

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am very pleased and, naturally, proud to place before you some of the text of a very informative and, to me, as a native son of California, inspiring booklet just issued by the Honorable Frank M. Jordan, secretary of the State of California. Said booklet is printed in blue and gold, the California State colors, and is entitled "California: The Golden State."

Since I am a native son of the Golden State, I, naturally, take great pride in being a Member of this great legislative body these more than a dozen years from this magnificent State, the history of which has already been of such great significance to the development of our beloved Nation. Since the present estimate of the U.S. census is that California will be entitled to seven additional

Representatives in this great legislative body upon the final tabulation of the 1960 census it would appear that my native State will achieve even greater importance to the ultimate destiny of our beloved Nation in the family of States.

At this time I only offer the text of a very few of the pages of the abovementioned booklet, as follows:

CALIFORNIA: THE GOLDEN STATE

From the time of the discovery of the present Lower California by Ortuno Ximenez in 1533, until 1862, the origin and meaning of California was a topic of vast speculation. The Jesuit missonary historians of the region, Miguel Venegas, in 1757, and Francisco Clavijero in 1789, discussed it inconclusively and at some length. Capt. Frederick William Beechey, English explorer, who visited San Francisco and Monterey in 1826–27, was the first to record the belief that the name originated with the Latin words calida and fornax, "signifying heat and furnace." Many students concurred in this opinion.

But Mariano G. Vallejo and Juan B. Alvarado dissented, maintaining the word stemmed from the Lower California Indian term kali forno, translated both as "high hill" and "native land." Other possible derivations from Latin and Greek roots were widely debated, including calidus fornus, caliente fornalia, caliente horno, kala phor nea, kala chora nea, etc.

In April 1862, the noted American antiquarian, Edward Everett Hale, solved the origin of the name to the satisfaction of all. in the "Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society" for that date he reported that the name was contained in the romantic novel, Las Sergas de Esplandian (the deed of Esplandian), which comprised the fifth book of the omnibus novel, Amadis de Gaula. Las Sergas was an example of the humorous fantastic fifteenth century tale, the literature that Cervantes satirically blamed for addling the brain of his wandering knight, Don Quixote.

The author of Las Sergas de Esplandian was Garcia Ordonez de Montalvo and the book was first printed in Seville, Spain, in 1510. It went through a number of editions and was widely translated. In it occurs this passage—the first known use of the word "California."

"Know y that at the right hand of the Indies there is an island called California, very close to that part of the terrestrial paradise, which was inhabited by black women without a single man among them, and they lived in the manner of Amazons."

The majestic Queen Calafia was the monarch of this fabulous land. There is some evidence that Hernando Cortes and other Spanish conquerors of Mexico were familiar with Montalvo's romance.

The name California first appeared officially in a Spanish document, under date of July 2, 1542, in the diary of the expedition of Juan Rodriguez Cabrillo, who was then off the tip of Lower California.

California lies along the Pacific Ocean for a distance of 1,000 miles from Mexico to the Oregon boundary. It is the second largest State of the Union, both in area and in population. It is a State of contrasts. It contains within its boundaries both the highest and lowest points in the United States. Its climate in general is temperate, but it has both hot, dry deserts and high, mountainous areas of perpetual snow and ice. Not only is it the leading State of the Union in the value of its agricultural production, but it is also in the forefront of the Nation in industrial output.

GOLD DISCOVERED

The period of California's great development started on January 24, 1848, with the discovery of gold in the tail race of Sutter's lumber mill at Coloma. At that time the total number of persons of European blood in California was estimated at 13,000; 7,000 of them Spanish speaking, the rest of various nationalities. With the famed gold rush, Spanish predominance quickly vanished and by 1850 there were 100,000 people in the territory, with Anglo-Americans forming the substantial majority.

POPULATION CLIMBS

California has experienced an extremely rapid growth, and in the 1950 census became the second ranking State with a population of 10,586,223. By 1959 the population was estimated at around 16 million. It has gained more than 9 million people in the last 19 years as compared to the 1940 census of 6,907,387.

ADMITTED TO UNION

California was admitted to the Union as the 31st State on September 9, 1850, after the territory of which it was a part had been relinquished to the United States by Mexico in February of 1848 as the result of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo.

The first California Legislature was assembled at San Jose in December of 1849, shortly after a constitutional convention, called by the military governor, Gen. Bennett Riley, in June, had completed its work at Monterey.

MISSIONS ESTABLISHED

Before the English colonists on the Atlantic coast started the American Revolution, the Spaniards had already established Franciscan missions along the California coast. The pastoral civilization, however, which developed in California remained isolated from both the Old and the New Worlds for more than 50 years, except for the occasional visits of foreign vessels, chiefly engaged in the sea otter trade.

COVERS LARGE AREA

The State of California embraces three-fifths of the western coastline of the United States and if transposed to comparable latitudes along the Atlantic coast, its shoreline would extend from Boston, Mass., to approximately Charleston, S.C. The width of the State varies from 150 to 365 miles.

The land area of the State is 156,803 square miles, and therein exist nearly every combination and every contrasting extreme of topography, climate, soil and mineral, plant and animal life which can be found in the United States, as well as some which are unique to California.

BRITISH ISLES SMALLER

California is larger in area and has a greater diversity of natural economic resources than some of the principal European nations. Its land area is larger than the British Isles.

About one-fourth of this land area is level and most of the valley lands are between sea level and 500 feet in elevation. They compromise the principal agricultural areas of the State. The warm belts—most characteristic of California, and where most of her people reside—are below the 2,000-foot elevation.

MOUNT WHITNEY HIGHEST

Three-quarters of California's area is in rolling hills, foothills, and rugged mountain areas which range in elevation from 500 feet to over 14,000 feet. Mount Whitney, in California, and the highest peak in the United States, outside of Alaska, reaches an elevation of 14,496 feet. Death Valley, 60 miles east of Mount Whitney in the Sierra, is 282 feet below sea level. This is not only the lowest spot in the United States, but also the hottest.

Approximately one-half of California's land area, or 49,897,574 acres, is publicly owned, of which 23,822,359 acres are in national forests and national parks and monuments.

CALIFORNIA'S CAPITAL

After meeting in San Jose and for brief periods at Vallejo and Benicia, the legislature moved to Sacramento which was established as the State capital in 1854.

However, the recorded history of California goes back 400 years to September 28, 1542, when Cabrillo discovered San Diego Bay and explored the coast as far north as Point Reyes. In 1579 Sir Francis Drake landed probably at Drakes Bay, naming the territory New Albion, and claiming it for England. In 1602 Sebastian Vizcaino again explored the coast but it was not until 1769 that Spanish colonization started with the arrival at San Diego of the expeditions led by Gaspar de Portola.

STATE MOTTO

The State motto, "Eureka," appears on the State seal. It is a Greek word meaning "I have found it."

Historical sites of special note are the Gold Discovery locale, Donner Monument, Columbia, Pueblo de los Angeles in downtown Los Angeles, Sutter's Fort in Sacramento, and the Hearst-San Simeon area in San Luis Obispo County.

Recreational facilities of statewide attraction include many ocean beach areas as well as reservoir sites in the interior.

ANNUAL RAINFALL

Annual average rainfall varies from three inches or less in the southeast corner of the State to over 100 inches in the northwestern section. In most of the highly developed agricultural sections of the State the precipitation varies from 5 to 30 inches yearly, and it is largely concentrated in the winter months from November to March. Consequently supplemental irrigation during the summer months is necessary for most vegetable and fruit crops.

DIVERSITY

California has a sufficient diversity of the great natural economic resources to enable its people to sustain themselves as an isolated empire if necessary, but, without trade, it would be on a lower scale than now enjoyed.

Every agricultural product of the temperate zone is produced in California, as well as many subtropical crops not grown elsewhere in the United States.

All staple foods and textile materials from cotton to wool are produced. Although silk is not produced commercially, experiments have demonstrated its possibility.

FARMING AND TIMBER

California has some 123,000 farms that include an area of 37.8 million acres of which 13.2 million acres are used or available for crop production and 7.0 million acres are under irrigation.

Commercial timber resources of California include 36.1 billion board feet of redwood and 323.9 billion board feet of all other species.

Mineral resources include nearly all the basic materials used in the chemical, structural materials, and metal working industries. Some of these, such as iron ore, chromite, and managanese, are now being developed for expansion of the iron and steel industries.

GOLD STARTED IT

Gold was the economic resource that led to California's first development. From 1848 to 1957, inclusive, California's gold mines have yielded $2,386 million in treasure.

Petroleum has far outstripped gold as a source of new wealth from mineral production in California. From the time oil was discovered in this State, about 1861, through 1957, total oil production is estimated at 11,157 million barrels having long-term average value of $1 a barrel.

MISCELLANEOUS

San Bernardino County is the largest county in the United States, San Francisco Bay is the largest land-locked harbor in the world, and Los Angeles has the largest area of any city in the world. Mount Lassen is the only recently active volcano in the United States, and the California Redwoods are among the largest and oldest living things to be found anywhere.

California leads the world in the production of motion pictures.

During 1957, cash farm income in California was about $2.8 billion, highest among the States for that year.

Cotton is king in California as this State receives more farm income from this source than from any other crop, about $268 million in 1957. California is second among the States in average yield of cotton per acre—1,035 pounds in 1957.

Following cotton as important farm crops in 1957 were grapes, tomatoes, lettuce, oranges, hay, peaches, barley, prunes and plums, rice, melons, sugar beets, potatoes, lemons, celery, strawberries, dry beans, and cottonseed.

Principal livestock products were milk and other dairy products, beef cattle, poultry and eggs, sheep and wool, and hogs.

California furnished nearly half of the Nation's commercial supply of fruits and nuts, and one-fourth of the vegetables sold.

Mineral products sold in 1957 were valued at $1.65 billion and included petroleum, natural gas, cement, sand and gravel, building stone, borates, tungsten, gold, lead, zinc, mercury, iron ore, and many other industrial minerals.

THE LEGISLATURE

California's State Legislature is composed of 120 members. The assembly, or lower house, has 80 members elected every 2 years in even numbered years. The senate is composed of 40 members. One-half of this number, or 20 members, is elected every two years for terms of four years each.

The legislature meets annually. In odd numbered years the "regular" session meets the first Monday in January after the first day of January.

At the end of January, a recess of 30 days or more sends members home to discuss bills already introduced, after which they reconvene for the balance of the session. The total length of the session is limited to 120 calendar days.

In even numbered years, budget sessions are held starting the first Monday in February. These sessions are limited to 30 calendar days. Following introduction of the budget the legislature is permitted to recess for a period up to 30 days.

The Federal plan of representation has prevailed in California since 1928. It is the same plan as that practiced in the U.S. Congress wherein the House of Representatives is composed of members elected on a basis of population, while the Senate is composed of two Senators from each State. In the California Legislature the 80 members of the assembly each represent one-eightieth of the State's population, while the members of the senate are elected from counties or combinations of counties, no county having more than one senator and no senatorial district containing more than three counties.

The most populous county in the State has only one senator, but has 31 assemblymen. The county of least population shares its senator with two other counties, while its assemblyman represents nine other counties; so it might be said to have one-third of a senator, but only one-tenth of an assemblyman. Thus a balance is maintained between urban and rural areas.

THE CONGRESS

Because of its intense growth in poulation California was reapportioned in 1951 on the basis of the 1950 census. As a result, seven new Congressmen were added in 1953 bringing the total number of Representatives to 30.

As in other States California has two U.S. Senators.

Truth as an Instrument of National Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BYRON L. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I should like to insert in the RECORD an article published in the Friends Journal of March 28, 1959, summarizing the great importance of truth even in international policies. This was written by an attorney, Lawrence S. Apsey, now head of the legal department of the Celanese Corp. of America, and formerly an attorney in the Department of Justice:

History teaches us that truth is the most potent weapon in the battle of ideas. A telling example was the Soviet contention that the United States was fomenting an attack by Turkey against Syria. When this charge was aired in the United Nations, it could not withstand the light of truth and promptly collapsed.

That truth is the only certain instrument for overcoming error is proven by its very nature. Jesus recognized this as the basis of His ministry when He said, "I have come into the world to bear witness to the truth." He defined its power when He said, "The truth shall make you free." The struggle to perceive and remain loyal to the truth is the struggle of human life itself.

A SYNONYM FOR REALITY

Truth is imperishable because it is a synonym for reality. As experience teaches us to distinguish between reality and fantasy, we gain freedom.

Many instances could be cited in which truths, at first universally rejected, were ultimately accepted because it was found that no other hypothesis would work. Galileo was forced by the Inquisition to recant his support of the Copernican theory that the earth travels round the sun; but in the end all the power of the church proved inadequate to suppress this truth. Similarly, the theory that the world is round had to be accepted after the voyages of Columbus and Magellan, although at first this truth was universally rejected. The ideas of Jules Verne that man could build a submarine to travel under the sea or a spaceship to travel to the moon were regarded for decades as the wildest fiction. Yet as men played with these fascinating ideas, they found them, step by step, to be true, until now what was formerly regarded as fantastic is generally accepted.

In the political field no one any longer seriously advances the theory of the divine right of kings. Quakers played a part with others in discrediting human slavery, until today virtually no one is heard to defend it. Quakers and others for many years have been reiterating the truth that war is not the way to settle international disputes. As wars persist, we tend to feel that this truth is making little progress toward acceptance; but certainly the general attitude toward war has greatly improved over that which existed before World War I, when it was regarded as a glorious expression of patriotism. Now humanity throughout the world yearns for peace. Even governments give at least lipservice to this desire, and the glories of war are no longer extolled in song and story. For those who still believe in it, war has become a grim and terrible necessity, to be abolished if possible.

Since a factually correct course is by nature the only one which can work successfully, truth is the most realistic, and therefore the most practical policy. Nothing but ruthless realism can prevail against the militant propaganda of our day. One reason we have found the Soviet Government so difficult to deal with over the years is that it has used Marxist propaganda to create a national psychosis which accepts reasoning and action based on certain mistaken concepts as real.

A GRIEVOUS BLUNDER

Permitting the seeming successes of this propaganda to lead us into believing that it can be overcome by the use of untrue counter-propaganda is the grievous blunder into which the West is falling. Untrue propaganda, whether in the East or in the West, leads people down the road of fantasy and tends to undermine their ability to recognize reality. This psychologically dangerous course incapacitates people from making their actions conform to the facts of their environment.

The scientific achievements of the Soviet Union are testimony to the fact that its scientists and educators in their approach to nature and education have been sufficiently governed by reality to discover and follow some important truths. The same can be said of other achievements of the Soviet Union, such as its rapid economic growth and its overcoming of the language barrier separating the many peoples in its vast territory.

If any government, however, uses its discoveries and achievements to threaten the destruction of other nations with which it disagrees, instead of using the truth to destroy the false ideas underlying the disagreements, a wrong course is being followed, which can lead only to catastrophe.

THE POWER OF TRUTH

If any government, however, uses its disoperate long enough in their own sphere, the inevitable failure of their false ideas will ultimately force them to the truth. Continual, persistent statement and restatement of the truth by the Western governments, in and out of the United Nations, will gain the support of the neutral world and undermine the support of the false premises of communism by its own people, provided the West lives by the truths which it professes.

To do this, a good may of our practices will have to be changed. When we give technical aid to less developed countries, for example, we must not compromise our motives by attaching political conditions which make it only too clear that we are not seeking their welfare but merely trying to buy their support. We must definitely avoid the fallacy that the threat of force can be substituted for the truth as a means of defeating error. We certainly cannot hope to strengthen our position by boasting that we have enough bombers and nuclear bombs to annihilate the Soviet Union. Such an attitude is in direct conflict with the truth which our words and actions should convey to the world; namely, that we have an intense desire to terminate the arms race and are willing to go to great lengths to achieve this.

Truth requires us to embrace every opportunity to discuss disarmament with the So-

viet Government at all levels, from the summit down. If such discussions are seized by the Soviet as opportunities to launch false propaganda, they should be welcomed as presenting even greater opportunities for the West to expose to the world the fallacy of Soviet propaganda and to demolish it with truth.

Even Communists will accept truth when a false position becomes sufficiently untenable. Witness their ultimate repudiation of Stalin's excesses. Some truths become so obvious that they must be accepted in a very short time. Thus the fact that a major nuclear war would ruin civilization seems now to be accepted by both sides. This is a great advance. It should lead to realization that neither side can gain its objectives by force of arms. Once this truth dawns, universal disarmament is in sight.

To "speak truth to power" successfully, we must recognize that error is the Achilles' heel of power. We must make our own action conform to the law that ultimate power resides in the truth. Once our policy proclaims our belief that right makes might, we shall find that this truth will keep us free.

The Interstate Highway System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I asked unanimous consent which was granted me to include therewith a letter to me from Mr. John Butter, chief engineer of the Iowa State Highway Commission and a resolution passed by the Mississippi Valley Conference of State Highway Departments.

IOWA STATE HIGHWAY COMMISSION,
Ames, Iowa, April 8, 1959.

Hon. BEN F. JENSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. JENSEN: I am enclosing herewith a resolution passed by the Mississippi Valley Conference of State Highway Departments requesting that the interstate funds be provided so that the interstate work in the Mississippi Valley may proceed as scheduled.

Iowa is a member of this conference, and the Iowa State Highway Commission by this fall expects to have under contract all of the Federal aid interstate funds allotted to us through the fiscal year of 1960.

Anything that you can do to continue the interstate program in the Nation and in Iowa especially will be appreciated.

Very truly yours,
JOHN G. BUTTER,
Chief Engineer.

[Enclosure.]

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY CONFERENCE OF STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENTS AT 50TH ANNUAL MEETING, CHICAGO, ILL., MARCH 19–21, 1959

Whereas because of the constantly increasing vehicular registration and mileage traveled on the Nation's highways; and

Whereas deaths and injuries to people and property damage on the Nation's highways are continuing to increase; and

Whereas it is in the national interest to reduce death and injury on the highway at the earliest possible date; and

Whereas many States have committed themselves, both legally and morally, to vastly accelerated programs of highway construction in order to carry out the intent of Congress, as expressed in the Federal Highway Act of 1956 that the Interstate System be brought to simultaneous completion in all the States by 1972; and

Whereas several of the States, in order to provide their share of the cost of the Interstate System, must thoroughly review their State highway revenue position, and be in the position of knowing the Federal aid matching needs; and

Whereas any curtailment of any part of the program, or any cessation of allotment of finances to carry out the program as originally scheduled will cause hardship and serious financial and economic disturbance to the highway industry, including contractors, material suppliers, equipment manufacturers, labor, and trained engineering personnel: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Mississippi Valley Conference of State Highway Departments in annual meeting assembled in Chicago, Ill., March 19–21, 1959, urges and petitions the Congress to provide adequate financing for continuation of the ABC highway system; and for the Interstate System in accordance with the intent of the 1956 act; and be it further

Resolved, That the conference reassures the Congress and the public of the ability of the State highway departments to construct the Interstate System in accordance with the original schedule set forth in the Highway Act of 1956; and be it further

Resolved, That the conference firmly believes that any cutbacks, interruptions, valleys or peaks in the construction program will cause serious economic impacts and further that under such conditions the program cannot be efficiently planned and constructed; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the chairman of each subcommittee of highways of the Congress of the United States and Members of Congress from the respective States of the conference.

The Nationalists in Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Nationalists in Action," published in the Economist of April 4, 1959.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NATIONALSTS IN ACTION

If ever a country's foreign policy was dictated by circumstances it is that of Formosa, known to some as the Republic of China. And it must be allowed that it practices its foreign policy with single-minded rigor. That policy consists, basically, of two articles: To harass communism wherever it may be found and to maintain itself, in the eyes of a majority of the United Nations, as the legitimate Government of China. Another point, the "recovery of the mainland," is an article not merely of policy but of faith; but, from the Nationalist standpoint, it belongs to domestic rather than to foreign policy.

The second foreign policy aim of the Nationists is more visible in the implementation than the first. But the first is just as vigorously pursued. For instance, Nationalist aircraft have been dropping supplies to the Tibetan rebels, presumably from one of the airstrips still in Nationalist hands in the Burma-Siam border region. Several thousand Nationalist guerrillas stayed behind in this area after the bulk of them had been evacuated under United Nations auspices in 1954. Nationalist broadcasts from Taipeh have claimed that the Tibetan rebels were being helped by anti-Communists in a neighboring province of China. The Nationalist intelligence network in China is often well informed (it was first with the news of Mao Tse-tung's decision to abandon the chairmanship of the Republic); but in this instance it seems that the help reaching the rebels comes from Sikang, an ethnically Tibetan area, China's claims to which are dubious, and which Peiping incorporated into Szechwan Province come years ago.

On less obvious fronts, the Nationalists are also busy. There is no reason to disbelieve Communist reports that the Nationalists have resumed airdrops to the Indonesian rebels in Celebes and are training rebel pilots in Formosa. On the other hand, a Communist report that the Nationalists are attacking Yunnan Province from Laos, with Laotian assistance, is probably part of the Chineses Communists' current war of nerves against their American-protected neighbor.

As for the main front—the Formosa Strait—Taipeh has been at pains to point out that, contrary to western reports, it did not renounce the use of force to recover the mainland after Mr. Dulles' visit to President Chiang Kai-shek in October. Indeed the joint communique then merely made it clear that force was not the principal means to be employed.

A National Lottery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to note that the people in the State of Oklahoma finally got smart by wiping out hypocrisy after 51 years of prohibition.

The Oklahomans voted to repeal not because they could not get liquor. The bootleggers were there to supply them with all they could drink. The good citizens of that State decided that as long as people wanted to drink then the best thing to do would be to repeal the law, get rid of the bootleggers and legally tax this thriving industry.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this Congress will also get smart and realize that the urge to gamble is deeply ingrained in human beings and that by proper Government regulations, supervision, and control we can bring into the coffers of our Federal Treasury $10 billion a year in additional revenue.

Mr. Speaker, the enactment of my national lottery bill would not only satisfy the American gambling spirit but would, in addition, wipe out a large segment of our professional gamblers, legally tap a lucrative industry and provide enough money for a badly needed tax cut and reduction of our national debt.

A Workable Wheat Plan for America and the World Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in the April 1959 issue of the magazine Farm Management there appears an article by Clancy Jean, executive vice president of the Oregon Wheatgrowers League, at Pendleton, Oreg., entitled "The Growers' Own Program: A Workable Wheat Plan."

Mr Jean points out that wheatgrowers are well aware of the need for a revised farm program to deal with the problem of surplus wheat production. He recounts development by the growers of the concepts contained in S. 1484, which was introduced by the distinguished Senator from Kansas on March 20, of which I am a cosponsor, and explains the operation and benefits of the plan. He indicates what adoption of this policy would mean to the taxpayer, to the wheat producer, and to the feed grain producer.

Because Mr. Jean's article represents such a cogent presentation of the justification for enactment of S. 1484, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD for the information of the Senate.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GROWERS' OWN PROGRAM: A WORKABLE WHEAT PLAN

(By Clancy Jean)

The word "wheat" used to have an admirable meaning—"the staff of life." Today the same word has quite a different meaning. The mere mention of it is a reminder of what some people call a national scandal—the current wheat program that spends billions of taxpayers' dollars and encourages increasingly vast surpluses.

No one realizes this better than the wheatgrowers themselves. And one one has launched a more constructive effort to correct this than have those same wheatgrowers with a new bill they recently put before Congress.

Traditionally, organized wheatgrowers have advocated the domestic parity plan for wheat. Last December, when the National Association of Wheatgrowers met in Denver, growers developed and approved what they call a stabilization plan for wheat. It is a modification of the domestic parity plan and contains several features that should be given serious consideration as a new approach to the wheat problem.

BEFORE CONGRESS

The growers' proposal is now before Congress; in late February, Senator FRANK CARLSON, Republican, of Kansas, introduced the plan as Senate bill 1140. Senator CARLSON told the Senate that this bill offers some changes "* * * not simply changes in a new 1959 model of the old bill. They are changes in engineering, which result in a wheat price stabilization plan that deals effectively with the current excessive accumulations of wheat and feed grains." Joining with Senator CARLSON in cosponsoring the wheatgrowers' plan are Senators MORSE and NEUBERGER, of Oregon; MAGNUSON and JACKSON, of Washington; CURTIS, of Nebraska; and CASE, of South Dakota. Simultaneously, a number of identical bills were introduced in the House by western Congressmen.

In developing their plan, the wheatgrowers have kept four basic concepts in mind:

BASIC CONCEPTS

1. Wheatgrowers' net income must be maintained if they are to reduce production below the current level.

2. The buildup of CCC stocks must be stopped and gradually reduced to a normal level.

3. Further reduction in acreage of wheat must not be shifted to other crops.

4. Increased yields per acre must not be reflected in increased Government holdings of wheat.

What is needed, the growers say, is to stop the build-up of Commodity Credit's stocks and even reduce them while also reducing production through a program that takes increased yields into consideration and prevents diverted wheat acres from creating problems with other crops—do these things and maintain growers' income.

To accomplish this, the wheat producers are proposing a production and income stabilization plan.

BUSHEL ALLOTMENTS ADVOCATED

Eliminate acreage allotments and checking of compliance along with current marketing quotas—and substitute for these a marketing allotment expressed in bushels. They want marketing allotments based on the wheat base acreage for average of the 1952–53 planted acreage. Each farm would receive a bushel allotment. This would be arrived at by multiplying the base acreage by the normal yield per acre, factored to the county allotment. Normal yields, they say, should be based on the period that provides the most equitable relationship between counties and States.

NATIONAL ALLOTMENT IN BUSHELS

For example, it would work out this way for 1958 (millions of bushels):

1. Estimated amount used for food in the United States	485
2. Estimated amount of U.S. exports	+430
Estimated demand	915
3. Less amount of wheat to be moved out of CCC stocks each year	−75
National marketing allotment	840

The plan calls for price supports at 65 percent of parity for the national marketing allotments. This allotment, as shown, would be spelled out for each farm in bushels and there would be a price support on this amount of about $1.53 per bushel. Marketing cards, similar to those now used, would be issued to each grower for his bushel allotment. In addition, certificates would be issued on each grower's share of the 485 million bushels used for food in the United States.

CERTIFICATES

These certificates would be redeemable in an amount equal to 35 percent of parity on that portion of his production. Using 1958 as an example, food uses of wheat are equal to about 60 percent of the national marketing allotment suggested by the growers. Certificates would be sold to processors. This provision is taken from the domestic partity plan, long advocated by wheat growers. This would relieve the taxpayers of a major part of the costs of the stabilization plan. Wheat growers have long held that they are entitled to full parity for at least that portion of their crop that is used for food consumption in the United States. There is little relationship between the price of wheat and the price of bread. In the past 6 years, wheat prices have dropped 35 cents per bushel while the price of a 1-lb. loaf of bread increased 3.2 cents.

CONSERVATION RESERVE

But, in order to be eligible to receive these certificates, the grower would have to put at least 20 percent of his wheat base in the conservation reserve. This would increase the conservation reserve by 12 to 14 million acres of wheatland that now produce from 5 to 8 million tons of wheat or feed grains yearly.

While the stabilization plan would control the amounts of wheat to be marketed for domestic food uses and exports through its bushelage allotment and certificate features, there are no restrictions on the production of nonquota wheat. Neither is there any price support for this wheat. Anything in excess of the bushel allotment quota produced would have to be either fed on farms where produce, sold to other farmers or sold to bonded feed processors.

This feed-wheat provision would enable many wheat growers to return to producing their best crop. Under the present program, commercial wheat growers have been forced to produce feed grains as an alternative crop. This has caused serious production and economic problems for the wheatman and it has contributed to the feed grain producer's problem. In the west coast area, this would mean less barley produced on wheat farms; in other areas, growers would turn to wheat in place of sorghum. A supply of feed wheat on the west coast, for example, would contribute to a more balanced supply of local feed grains.

SAVINGS TO TAXPAYERS

Compared with present and projected costs of the current wheat program, growers' stabilization plan would save the Federal Treasury an estimated $788 million annually. This is to be accomplished through (a) lowering cost of price support operations, (b) reducing CCC stocks, (c) lowering export subsidies, (d) placing CCC stocks on 5-year storage contracts.

Presently about 200 million bushels are added to CCC stocks annually. The stabilization plan stops the buildup of CCC stocks and actually provides for a 75 million bushels removal each year for export. It is expected that export subsidies will be reduced about 20 cents per bushel. The growers' plan calls for setting aside 500 million bushels of present CCC stocks as a defense stockpile. By letting Government storage contracts out for competitive bids on a 5-year basis, there would be an estimated saving of 6 cents per bushel. As the accompanying table shows, these features would result in an annual cash saving of $178 million and achieve a net decrease in CCC stocks of $610 million annually.

INCOME SOURCES

To the grower, the proposed program offers income from four sources:

1. He would receive at least 65 percent of parity (about $1.53 at present) on his bushel allotment. The bushel allotment would provide that only 840 million bushels could be marketed in this manner nationally. By controlling amount moving into the markets, there is reason to believe that producers of high quality and specialty milling wheats who market effectively would receive more than this price for their wheat.

2. About 60 percent of a grower's bushel allotment would be covered by certificates which, when redeemed, would return him an amount equal to 35 percent of parity. Thus, on this amount of his wheat, he would receive 100 percent of parity.

3. As a prerequisite to receiving a bushel allotment, the grower would be required to put at least 20 percent of his base acreage into the Conservation Reserve, for which he would receive the customary payments.

4. Should his production exceed his bushel allotment, he could only market this wheat through livestock on his own farm, by selling to other farmers or by selling this wheat to bonded feed dealers—at open market prices.

The national bushel allotment of 840 million bushels appears to be quite realistic, particularly when compared with the 1958 wheat crop of 1.49 billion bushels. This plan would stop the buildup of present stocks and even reduce them. It provides for substantial savings in storing present Government stocks. It embodies many of the advantages of multiple pricing. Wheat growers believe it approaches the problem realistically.

Senator CARLSON said in introducing the bill: "This is a marketing control, not a production control program."

IN SUMMARY

What it is: A program developed to stabilize wheat marketing, thereby stabilizing the income of wheat producers and reducing Government stocks of wheat.

Who developed it: The National Association of Wheat Growers, recognizing the precarious position of the wheat industry, the drain on the Federal Treasury and the continuing accumulation of wheat and feed grains in Government stocks under the present program, is presenting this plan to Congress.

What it will do for the wheat producer: (1) Stabilize producers' income at reasonable levels, (2) allow freedom to plant and harvest crops best adapted without Government interference, (3) permit producers to carry reserve for short crop years, (4) prevent wheat prices from reaching disastrously low levels, (5) enable wheat producers to market best quality wheat in domestic food and export market, and lower grades in feed market.

What it will do for the feed grain producer: (1) Prevent shifting of diverted wheat acreage to feed grains, (2) materially reduce feed grain production on wheat farms, (3) make a substantial contribution to the balancing of feed grain supplies with demand, (4) aid in an orderly reduction of present surplus feed grain stocks.

Program that will save $788 million

	Present program	Wheat stabilization program
1. Price support operations:		
Amount taken over by CCC (annual increase)	200,000,000 bushels	Net reduction, 75,000,000 bushels per year.
Estimated acquisition cost per bushel	$2	
Total annual investment	$400,000,000	
Interest on investment at 2.5 percent	$10,000,000	
Storage charges at 17 cents	$34,000,000	
2. Reduction of CCC stocks:		
Annual reduction		75,000,000 bushels.
Present inventory value (acquisition costs and storage charge)	CCC stocks increased 200,000,000 bushels annually.	$2.80.
Reduction in present investment		$210,000,000.
Saving in interest annually		$5,250,000.
Saving in storage cost annually		$12,750,000.
3. Export subsidy costs:		
Estimated domestic price (terminal)	$1.90	$1.70.
Estimated world price (terminal)	$1.40	$1.40.
Export (bushels)	430,000,000	430,000,000.
Estimated total subsidy	$215,000,000	$129,000,000.
Totals—items 1, 2, and 3:		
Total difference in CCC inventory		$610,000,000.
Total cash savings		$148,000,000.
Total net difference in CCC inventory and cash savings.		$758,000,000.
4. Reduced storage costs on defense stockpile (recommended 5-year contracts on competitive bid basis):		
Storage rate per bushel	17 cents	11 cents.
Annual cost on 500 million bushels	$85,000,000	$55,000,000.
Cash savings in storage costs		$30,000,000.
Totals—Items 1, 2, 3, and 4:		
Total net difference in CCC inventory and cash savings (items 1, 2, and 3).		$758,000,000.
Cash savings (item 4)		$30,000,000.
Total cash savings plus net CCC inventory reduction.		$788,000,000.

NOTE.—The losses incurred in disposing of 200,000,000 bushels annually would average an estimated $250,000,000.

This We Owe to Our Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my answer to a letter recently received from Mr. Charles H. Percy, chairman, Republican committee on program and progress:

THIS WE OWE TO OUR COUNTRY

APRIL 9, 1959.

CHARLES H. PERCY,
Chairman, Republican Committee on Program and Progress, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PERCY: I was pleased to have your letter of April 6. It states in part, "it is our belief that your own observations on the following questions would be invaluable to us in our efforts."

Your questions and my answers follow:

1. "What are the enduring principles by which Republicans must guide themselves now and in the future?"

Honest, efficient government. Oppose with all of our might, the wasteful spending of the people's tax dollar.

2. "What, in your opinion, are the chief dogmas we must discard?"

We have already discarded too many Republican dogmas. While those dogmas were operating, we built here the greatest Nation on earth. We must recapture many of those lost Republican dogmas.

3. "Trying to look ahead 10 or 15 years, what are the greatest problems you foresee for the United States and the Republican Party?"

Stay out of war, maintain a balanced budget, and prove to the so-called little fellow that he will suffer first and most from inflation caused by a constant unbalanced budget.

4. "In the same period, what are the greatest opportunities you foresee for the United States and the Republican Party?"

Broad publicity reaching into every home in America, reaffirming the Republican principles of the free private enterprise system for which we firmly stand; invite every loyal American to join hands with us, that they and their children may continue to enjoy the profits and blessings of liberty.

5. "Have you any other observations you think would be helpful to this committee in its attempt to state principles and objectives as well as analyze problems and opportunities?"

Yes, we should employ several of the very best editorial writers to be found. They should be scattered north, south, east, and west; they should take the offensive for our party. Publicize the virtues of individual Republican candidates from the courthouse to the White House, and nail the radicals, labor racketeers, and leftwingers in the opposition party to the mast with no holds barred. Use effective salesmanship for our party first, and then fight the lying opposition with truth and might. This we owe to our country.

Respectfully submitted.

BEN F. JENSEN,
Representative in Congress for the Seventh Iowa District.

John Foster Dulles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, there is not an American today with concern for our relationships on the international scene who has not experienced a benumbing shock as he hears the word that our top diplomat, and one of the greatest international figures of the generation, has been immobilized by a malignant disease.

The tears which our President could barely restrain fill the eyes of all of us who have been unwavering in our support of our great Secretary of State, and as he bows to the inevitability of his Maker's decree our sense of irreparable loss is well nigh overwhelming.

In every public address which I have delivered during the last 4 years I have underscored as heavily as I know how our dependence on this great and dedicated American. And I paid special tribute to his philosophy of "going to the brink" as the only practical summation of the principles of a sound foreign policy that have been enunciated since Theodore Roosevelt's admonition as regards "carrying a big stick."

John Foster Dulles—diplomat, statesman, churchman—a soldier battling in the cold war who has been stricken on the field of battle. Here is a compatriot whose place in the Hall of Heroes is assured and whose place in the hearts of his countrymen will be kept forever warm by an affectionate admiration. May Almighty God in His boundless mercy put His healing hand on our brother and ease his hurt. And may He give us strength to carry on in the spirit of this patriotic American.

"What Shall It Profit"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, several weeks ago I asked permission to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a prize-winning editorial by Dr. L. Nelson Bell entitled "What of Tomorrow?" This editorial was based on a trip to Korea and a study of the report of a special committee of our own Army, analyzing and giving reasons for the alarmingly high percentage of our own boys who, when taken prisoner by the Communists, eventually succumbed to brainwashing and became collaborators.

Dr. Bell has written another prize-winning editorial entitled "What Shall It Profit?" which I herewith ask permission to have printed in the RECORD.

In this connection let me urge upon my colleagues the reading of a new book "In Every War but One," by Eugene Kinkead, one of the able editors of the New Yorker. This book and the two editorials have much in common although neither author is acquainted with the other. I would like to quote from the description of this book:

In every war but one that the United States has fought, the conduct of its servicemen who were captured and held in enemy prison camps presented no unforeseen problems to the Armed Forces and gave rise to no particular concern in the country as a whole.

Our experience in the Korean war, however, was different. Why? Why did 21 of the Americans captured as members of the United Nations forces decide to remain with the enemy? No other American captives— in all the wars in our history—had chosen not to return home because they preferred an enemy's form of government to our own. Why, in this war, had collaboration of prisoners with the enemy been so widespread that one out of three was known to have aided the enemy? Why were there so many instances of prisoners behaving brutally to their fellow prisoners? Why was the prisoner mortality rate higher than in any other war in which this country had taken part—while among prisoners of another nation that fought beside us in the U.N. line there was not a single death? Why did no single American prisoner escape?

Eugene Kinkead, one of the highly accomplished editors of the New Yorker—with the official permission of the Defense Department—has made a unique report on the intensive, 5-year study by the Army of the effect of Communist indoctrination of those of its men held prisoners of war in Korea—an overwhelming 90 percent of the total Americans so held. The highly disturbing and important findings produced by this investigation are here in this book—a fascinating study of vital interest to every American.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANOTHER PRIZE WINNING EDITORIAL
(By H. B. D.)

In 1953, our associate editor, Dr. Nelson Bell, received recognition by the Freedoms Foundation of Valley Forge for his Journal editorial "While Men Slept." For this he was awarded a George Washington Medal.

Last year Dr. Bell's editorial "What of Tomorrow?" was selected as the top editorial of 1957—newspapers, secular and religious magazines all being included in the survey. For this Dr. Bell was honored at a special convention at Valley Forge—Gen. Curtis LeMay, ex-President Herbert Hoover, Mr. Cecil DeMille, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, and Gen. Lewis B. Hershey also receiving awards.

He received a lucite encased medal, a check for $1,000 and an exact replica of the watch George Washington carried at Valley Forge.

Just as this issue of the Journal goes to the press we have been notified that Dr. Bell's editorial "What Shall It Profit?" which appeared in the May 21, 1958, issue of this Journal has received special second-place recognition.

This editor is particularly gratified that this distinguished and dedicated foundation has selected this particular type of editorial as worthy of special recognition.

Our congratulations to them, and to Dr. Nelson Bell.

WHAT SHALL IT PROFIT?
(By L. Nelson Bell, M.D., F.A.C.S.)

The world is intrigued with the scientific progress which makes an assault on the moon a very real possibility. In almost every realm of human endeavor new discoveries and their exploitation open up vistas for the future, limited solely by the boldness of imagination and the willingness to explore.

To minimize present achievements or to question their ultimate dwarfing by those of the future is utterly foolish. In the writer's own specialty (surgery), the advances of the last dozen years have opened up fields at one time thought to be beyond the realm of successful approach. To illustrate: That which is being done in the area of cardiac, vascular, and neurosurgery is so startling that the public is but vaguely aware of it. For all of this we should thank God and take courage.

But it is imperative that we shall not become blinded either by that which man has accomplished, or that which yet lies in store for the future. It is desperately important that we maintain our proper perspective. Man has never discovered, nor can he, anything which the Creator did not put there in the first place. For this reason it is of primary importance that we accord to God His rightful place in His own universe. That He is so often ignored, or pushed into the shadows, by the assertiveness and blindness of man is but a reflection of man's sinfulness and need for redemption.

What shall it profit if we shall successfully conquer outer space, set up a station on the moon and attain domination of these hitherto unattainable areas of the universe if at the same time we do not learn of Him through whom alone the inner reaches of the soul are cleansed and disciplined?

For a generation we have worked to establish the highest living standards the world has ever known. Gracious living has become a reality for millions. Compared with the rest of the world we are wallowing in material prosperity. But what shall all of this profit us should we lose our national soul in the process?

No amount of religiosity, or pious affirmations or participation in church programs can compensate for the lust and selfishness and pride which is gnawing at the vitals of our moral and spiritual lives.

Enamored with the achievements of today, and the promise of yet more ease of living for tomorrow, we need to stop before it is too late and ask ourselves the question: "What does all of this profit if Christ is left outside the door?" How bleak and hopeless the future without Christ, and yet our desires seem so largely centered on the present.

We are concerned about the problems of education. We are frantically trying to recoup our lost supremacy in the realm of science. We recognize the very real danger of becoming a second-rate power from a military standpoint. These and many other problems highly deserve our concern and should enlist our support for every legitimate and fruitful effort to improve the situation. But at the same time let us remember that a nation's strength is to be found primarily in the character of its people, for it is righteousness which exalteth a nation and sin that drags it down. The trend in America, so far as moral and spiritual standards is concerned, is down and not up, of the flesh and not of the spirit.

Because of this it is of vital importance that the church shall maintain her vision and discharge her rightful function. We have no fault to find with those who would have the church exercise upon the contemporary social order her influence for righteousness, provided there shall be a comparable zeal to maintain the personal message of the church to sinners.

The Holy Scriptures leave neither to the imagination nor the interpretation of men just what is the content of the Gospel message and in the forefront of that message is the fact that men out of Christ are lost sinners, that they need His cleansing and redeeming salvation, and that while the wages of sin is death the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.

It is the dilution, the evasion of, or the substitution of something else for the message of sin, of righteousness and of judgment to come which is the most ominous sign on the horizon of contemporary Christianity. We are rightly concerned about Christian race relations; about a just social order; about a sense of world brotherhood which recognizes the needs and aspirations of the less fortunate. We long for just and durable peace, and sanction a multitude of humanitarian activities, all of which are good—and for which we should strive. But what shall the attaining of all of these things profit us, or those for whom we are concerned, unless at the same time Jesus Christ is received as their Saviour from sin and made the Lord of their lives?

The primary task of the church is to preach Christ, crucified, risen, and coming in triumph. What shall it profit in the church if she neglect this task or dilute the content of the message while helping usher in a world order still in the clutches of the Devil?

We are not being facetious but are desperately in earnest. We are in the gravest danger of continuing to treat world symptoms while we neglect the cause of those symptoms—sin in the human heart and for which there is but one course, and for the preaching of which we and we alone are responsible.

Looking through the astigmatic lenses of immediate problems we are in danger of losing sight of those which are ultimate and eternal. The Apostle Paul reminded the Corinthian Christians that he had put first things first: "For I delivered unto you first

of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures" (I Cor. 15: 3).

It is because this is no longer the primary message of so many pulpits across America that we as people, and the church as the church, stand in jeopardy. God is not going to be mocked. The salvation He wrought out for mankind in the counsels of eternity and brought into effect on the cross of Calvary is God's way and there is no other.

In every activity and emphasis the individual Christian and the church as such should ask the sobering question: "What shall it profit if I carry this through to a successful conclusion—only to lose my own soul or the souls of those who need the message that Christ died for our sins?"

There is no better way to keep our perspective of time and eternity than to frequently ask ourselves the question: What shall it profit?

Get the Government Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CARLTON LOSER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including a reprint of an article which appeared in the July 1958 issue of Farm and Ranch magazine, published in Nashville, Tenn.

Readers of Farm and Ranch were asked what they thought on several national issues. The figures shown below on the survey will be of interest to all of you. The article follows:

Get the Government out—"Farm and Ranch" asked: "What do you think about these national issues?"—Here is how our readers answered

	Number	Percent		Number	Percent
1. Cooperatives should be taxed, nationally and locally, on same basis as corporations.	1,402	72.2	1. Cooperatives should not pay Federal and local taxes on same basis as corporations.	540	27.8
2. Postal rates should be raised (including rates on magazines) to enable the Post Office Department to break even.	1,237	63.2	2. Postal rates should not be raised (including rates on magazines) to enable the Post Office Department to break even.	719	36.8
3. Government should guarantee support prices at 90 to 100 percent of parity, and control production on major crops.	521	26.9	3. Government should not guarantee support prices at 90 to 100 percent of parity, and control production on major crops.	1,416	73.1
4. Farming should return to a free supply-and-demand system, as soon as possible, with minimum Government control.	1,730	87.5	4. Farming should not return to a free supply-and-demand system, as soon as possible, with minimum Government control.	248	12.5
5. Public utilities should be developed and operated by private companies instead of by the Government.	1,652	85.0	5. Public utilities should not be developed and operated by private companies instead of by the Government.	291	15.0
6. States should run their own schools without interference from Federal Government, and Federal aid to schools should be stopped.	1,606	80.9	6. Federal aid to schools is good and necessary.	380	19.1
7. Integration in schools should be prevented by any legal means.	1,486	77.6	7. Integration in schools should not be prevented by legal means.	429	22.4
8. Federal aid to States means extravagance, high taxes, waste and Federal control. It should be stopped.	1,465	75.3	8. Federal aid is good because it helps the poorer States which can't help themselves. It should be continued.	481	24.7
9. Secretary Benson is doing a good job as Secretary of Agriculture.	1,027	55.0	9. Secretary Benson is not doing a good job as Secretary of Agriculture.	839	45.0

NOTE.—Figures above are based on a total of 2,016 returns. Individual totals may vary since in some cases readers did not indicate a choice.

HAVE SOUTHERN FARMERS RADICALLY CHANGED THEIR THINKING, OR HAVE THEY BEEN MISJUDGED?

The majority of Farm and Ranch readers who answered a recent survey in this magazine gave answers which were quite surprising to Farm and Ranch editors. And they may be considerably more surprising to some politicians who think they're voting the way the majority wants them to vote.

Farm and Ranch editors were anxious to know what our readers think on vital questions of the day. Unlike some surveys this one was conducted, not to prove something, but to find something out. As every statistician knows, figures don't lie but liars do figure. Forty bowlegged and 40 knockkneed women in a room average out 80 straight-legged women.

The startling facts: 72.2 percent of Farm and Ranch readers answering this survey think co-ops should pay the same national and local taxes as corporations; that an almost unbelievable 87.5 percent favor returning farming to a free supply-and-demand system, as soon as possible, with minimum Government controls; that 75.2 percent vote that Federal aid to States should be stopped.

We leave it to the reader—and to the experts—to explain this return. True, some of the questions are a choice between black and white, when many readers might prefer some shade of gray. On the other hand, to have included gray areas would possibly have complicated the survey and made clear-cut answers less likely.

Also, Farm and Ranch has previously editorialized on these problems, so perhaps the Farm and Ranch audience is preconditioned and does not represent the typical southern farm audience.

Perhaps the survey is partially a tribute to Farm and Ranch's literate, serious-minded audience. Or, perhaps it indicates a sharp change in farmer thinking which is as yet largely unrecognized in political circles.

Perhaps it indicates that people are awake to the dangers of a centralized Socialist-labor welfare state and are ready to follow the right kind of leadership; honest no-ax-to-grind leadership fighting for the best interests of America. Perhaps farm people are fed up with Government bureaucracy, waste, pork-barrel politics, foreign giveaway, inflation—fed up with farm programs which have piled failure on top of failure, mistake on top of mistake, and left the farmer worse off than if there had not been any program. There's no doubt that there's been a change in southern grassroots thinking—so much so that some southern Congressmen with their ears to the ground have asked Secretary Benson how they can get off the hook. They're now ready to renounce some of the ridiculous farm programs they've supported since the first little pigs were plowed under. They want to get back to supply and demand, commonsense, and the multiplication table without losing face and votes.

The results of this survey indicate the southern farmer once more reasserts his historic independence, his fear of government, his devotion to self-help, and his love of freedom. We would not be truthful if we failed to state that we are greatly surprised—and greatly gratified—by what the response showed. We plan to continue testing our readers' attitudes and convictions on other subjects. And we'll continue to report the results, whether bowlegged or knockkneed.

Report of Dr. William M. Hitzig on the Ravensbrueck Lapins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT ZELENKO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I take this opportunity of placing in the RECORD a most significant report by one of the world's leading physicians, Dr. William M. Hitzig.

This distinguished American and humanitarian is once again acting in the case of humanity.

Dr. William M. Hitzig, of New York, served as medical consultant to the Hiroshima maidens project.

The volunteer band of Americans that brought 25 atomic bomb victims to the Mount Sinai Hospital, New York, for plastic and reconstructive surgery has recently been called upon to help in the rehabilitation of a group of Polish victims of Nazi medical atrocities, known as the Ravensbrueck Lapins.

On their behalf Dr. Hitzig proceeded in October 1958, to Warsaw, Poland. His purpose was to examine the survivors of these experiments with the view of bringing to America those who can be benefited by medical care.

What follows is Dr. Hitzig's report on his visit to Warsaw to Mr. Norman Cousins, editor of the Saturday Review of Literature. The greater part of the report was written while he was in Africa with Dr. Albert Schweitzer. It was completed on his return to New York.

The report follows:

LAMBARENE,
FRENCH EQUATORIAL AFRICA,
October 20, 1958.

Here amidst the relative peace and serenity of Albert Schweitzer's Lambarene, I have found the first opportunity since leaving

Warsaw to prepare a comprehensive report for you on the Ravensbrueck Lapins project. I believe I can safely say that the committee, which included Jeanne Benenson, Erica Anderson, and yours truly, performed well in a rather delicate situation. The fruit of our labors will probably first see light some months hence when the cornerstone we have laid during our two recent Warsaw visits will come into prominent focus—assuming, of course, that the project will meet no obstructions from any untoward (at present unforeseen) sources seeking to thwart its birth and development.

The Polish project, especially its genesis with its initial labor pains, has been a source of great satisfaction to our committee, if I may be permitted to speak for the entire group.

Working in the front alley of a confused world situation, with Poland's unique role as it relates to the East-West struggle not yet clearly delineated, this medical and public relations combine turned in an excellent performance in the art of creating and maintaining good will. This seemed a herculean task the moment we touched Polish soil, because we became aware very early of the contrasting forces involved in the Polish political upheaval. From our initial contacts with the distinguished Polish medical committee appointed by the health ministry and by ZBOWID (the Polish governmental agency for the care of concentration camp survivors) at a conference held on the day after our arrival, we realized that our future work with the Lapins had to take into consideration a much broader canvas than we had originally anticipated. As a result, we sought, and we were prepared for, new vistas which steadily unfolded themselves until our enthusiasm for the project eventually reached a much higher pitch than it had at the beginning.

Here I must confess that when Miss Caroline Ferriday first consulted me about the Lapins project in December of 1957, and even much later when you were already involved in its implementation, I was still uncertain about the feasibility of bringing the Polish ladies to the United States for medical care. At that time I could not foresee how such a project could possibly exert a beneficial influence in fostering brotherly love on the international scene, nor how we could find more than superficial justification for our own involvement as the original Hiroshima committee in a Polish reparations problem which, after all, concerned only that tiny segment of "Ravensbrueck" Poles who had survived Nazi barbarism under the plumage of experimental surgery.

After several days in Poland my uncertainties gradually vanished. My change of heart occurred when our committee began to document horrendous episodes of criminal surgery that were perpetrated from 1940 to 1945 in the concentration camp at Rovensbrueck, as well as other inhumanities that were directed against the Polish people everywhere, not only in other concentration camps throughout Central and Eastern Europe, but in every nook and corner of Poland. (Shelled facades of almost every old building still stand in Warsaw to bear silent testimony to those grim and heroic days of Nazi butchery.) Even then, I was still guarded about my complete approbation for the plan to aid only a selected group of Ravensbrueck victims. About 1 week later when I returned to Warsaw, following a hurried tour of Moscow, I was convinced that the Ravensbrueck Lapins project deserved our full-hearted and active support; even if it served as only a symbolic gesture. I knew, however, that several disturbing angles still had to be solved. My trans-Atlantic telephone call to you from Warsaw betrayed my earliest feelings. And my initial written report, submitted to Mrs. Benenson several days later, represented my unbridled thinking at that time.

To understand the broad significance of the Lapins project, it is not necessary to relive the human misery of a decade and a half ago nor view it against the background of Polish history today. Yet, being on the Warsaw scene and coming face to face with the many unsolved human problems that have persisted since the Nazi marauders willfully ransacked the minds and hearts and polluted the bodies of Poles in their carefully planned strategy of Poland's gradual extermination, helped me gather unforgetable impressions. I gained these not only from the agonizing, incredulous stories of broken, middle-aged women who still bore their visible and invisible scars of the bitter struggle for survival during years of confinement at Ravensbrueck, but also from casual meetings with every-day people in all walks of Polish life who still suffer emotionally from both the unsavory flavors of Nazi occupation, and from the ruthless Stalinist domination that followed.

Each and every Pole I met deplored the heinous crimes of the recent past as well as the present down-trodden spirit of the "People's Poland." I will never forget their whispers: "Look what has happened to our poor Poland," as they pointed shamefully, with tears, to the towering eyesore in the heart of Warsaw. "You can see it from every part of our beloved city. We call it our 'birthday cake.'" This architectural Babel, a gift from Stalin to the Polish people, is styled after Moscow University and is known as the Palace of Art and Culture. "It reminds us forever that our country is even now, as it has been throughout its history, a helpless buffer state molded at will by our powerful neighbors."

I gained my impression from meeting bureaucrats of the higher and lower echelons of Polish officialdom whose minds revealed a subtle kind of dichotomy in their cryptic thinking which was intended to hide from obvious view their basic patriotism toward the mother country.

I gained my impression from visiting the concentration camp at Oswiecim (Auschwitz), now a museum, and seeing firsthand the residual of the flagrant cruelties and of the ideological tramplings which man had imposed upon man—inhumanities that outstripped (quantitatively, if not qualitatively) the ancient barbarism of the orientals. This workshop of bestiality emphasized even more the incomprehensible dynamics behind the purposeless and pseudo-scientific experimentation of Ravensbrueck.

I gained my impression from heart-to-heart discussions with Polish medical men and women who practice their respective specialities of surgery and medicine under governmental control. However, their thinking, unlike that in the U.S.S.R., was not tainted either through fear or through constant exposure to ideological regimentation. They revealed, instead, a common heritage with the traditions of Western medicine, which brought joy in "doing for others," especially wherever there was a need for alleviation of human pain and suffering. When greater confidence on a personal basis was finally attained, they spoke to us freely of the present confusing Polish situation, of the need for these Lapins to go to America to represent, not only their own cause, but that of their countrymen who had shared similar (and some even more tragic) fates. (Almost every Polish family bore the cross of one casualty or another during World War II.) They made us understand the broad significance and the humane implications of America's open arms, of the great urgency for Poland to continue to create and maintain meaningful ties with the West, of their own personal harassments as professional servants of the state, and of the relentless role that their powerful neighbors play directly and indirectly in thwarting the fullness of their daily lives. They stressed the psychological benefits of renewed hope (in contrast to present despair) that would result from such a visit to America—and of untold rewards that would be heaped not only upon each Lapin, but upon Polish people everywhere. In this way, they pointed out, the world would not forget the infamy of recent Nazis medical and surgical experimentation, thus helping to insure that such atrocities could never be repeated.

The canvas broadened constantly during my two Polish visits. When I returned from Moscow, I became immediately aware, despite previous inconveniences and restrictions in Warsaw, that, relatively speaking, greater freedom did exist in Poland—a country now hopefully veering more and more toward Western standards. A sense of heaviness and exploitation seemed strangely lifted from my mind and body when I returned to Warsaw; I felt free to breathe more deeply once more—even to wheeze if I chose to do so. I realized that even in Communist ranks there had been a tendency to lean toward the West under a political modification called revisionism, as opposed to the dogmatism of old line Stalinism and that Gomulka was doing his utmost to clean house of both left and right wing elements to maintain the precarious balance of his avowed aim to lead Poland on the road to a form of moderate socialism. I had learned earlier from my attempt to contact revisionist thinkers and journalists that their wings had been clipped because Gomulka regarded revisionism as synonymous with bourgeois-liberal tendencies of a nature more sympathetic to the West.

It was in this political climate of verification and the abolition of revisionism that our committee visited Poland and which makes our work with the Lapins, to my mind, even more important at this time. The need for such contacts can readily be gleaned, for example, from my failure to establish a footing with Polish intellectuals. A journalist and prominent revisionist would not even talk to me on the telephone. She bluntly told my interpreter she could not be seen with an American no less talk to him on the phone since "One never knows whose telephones are being tapped and when." Her husband was recently transferred from an important editorial post to head an insignificant "Tageblatt" in the hinterland. I was shocked when she refused to accept a gift from an American friend for whom I had carried it this great distance unless I could quietly deposit it at a club for journalists in Warsaw. Even the poet Slonimski, I was told, could no longer maintain any obvious communications with people from the West, especially with Americans. I learned from visitors at the Bristol Hotel, as well as from members of the lesser intelligentsia, that Poland could at this time go no further toward Western standards of political freedom. That was why Gomulka was now forcing discontinuation of university student publications which were critical of government policy. That was why, in addition to clamping down on universities, he was stricturing the intellectuals, the journalists, the philosophers, etc.; he was extending the tightening up processes now to include even lesser Polish contacts with the West.

Despite all these cross-currents and seeming contradictions, I feel that Poland still holds a unique position as a nation behind the Iron Curtain and deserves our fullest consideration for the following reasons:

1. Its moderate socialism differs from its parent model, the U.S.S.R., in two outstanding respects:

(a) Private farming exists in Poland, as opposed to collective farming in the U.S.S.R. Available statistics state that about 80 to 85 percent of Polish farming is privately owned.

(b) There is a policy of co-existence or accord with the Catholic church. This, I think, is only a short-lived, transitory affair, despite the fact that Poland is regarded as the most Catholic country in Europe. Judging by an intimate conversation I had with our Communist guide who was presumably specially selected to accompany our committee to Oswiecinl concentration camp, the outlook for Catholicism in Poland is not too good. I quote: "Catholicism will eventually die with the death of the older generation. The younger generation is having a different bringing up. The piety that has existed, and still exists, in the old will never again be part of the young." I later learned that the government has already cracked down on formal religious teaching in state-supported schools and that even religious publications are censored. The uncensored ones are legally abolished.

2. It still has some connection with the West, but, as I have indicated above, this may dwindle in time—the tightening-up process progressing steadily from orders meted out by the upper echelon. Some remnants of old Poland, when it was steeped in the Western tradition, still remain—as in the Zelazowa Wola, the estate which marks the birthplace of Chopin, an hour's ride out of Warsaw. Here every Sunday during the summer months, between the hours of ten and twelve, outstanding concert pianists (employing the old Chopin piano) perform in the regality of the West. The doors and windows of the old house are opened to let the music reach the thousands who have gathered on the lawn to hear it. The shabbiness of the modern audience contrasts dramatically with the austerity and the capitalist splendor of the past, but both seem united by the universal bond that great music always inspires.

3. Despite recent restrictions there is nevertheless everywhere in Poland a sense of freedom of expression of which the Pole readily boasts when he discusses the days prior to October 1956. Although this may also lessen in time, I found that among the Polish professors, in particular, there was a sense of academic freedom, even though their outgoing opinions were only confidentially transmitted.

It was in this political climate, as dramatically revealed in both the relative freedom of the Polish mind to still speak out and in its hunger for western ties of any sort, that our project became suddenly urgent to me as a tiny voice for spreading the gospel at this unique period in world history. An interesting aside which may be revealing occurred at a dinner given for our committee by ZBOWID. There, while sitting beside Mr. Banach, the president of ZBOWID, I told him in all humility that our project was but a "drop in the ocean" in the longstanding happy relationship that has existed between our respective peoples since the birth of our Nation. He quickly disagreed with me and stated: "No, it is like a river flowing into the ocean." This contradictory thinking on the part of an alleged Communist was puzzling in the light of what was going on in Poland, but the enthusiasm with which Mr. Banach sponsored the Lapins project, under the aegis of ZBOWID, may nevertheless be significant.

Even if I repeat myself, indications for the project exist, and they are as follows:

1. To further diagnose and, if possible treat the direct and indirect ills of the Lapins, especially to exclude the possibility of amyloidosis, a complication that often results from longstanding suppuration, e.g., osteomyelitis. Most of their serious ills (if any) would fall within the realm of internal medicine or psychiatry and, in my opinion, can readily be treated anywhere medically and/or psychologically. But even just the visit to America, with all its byplay, hospitality, etc., might offer adequate psychotherapeutic benefits, as in the case of the Hiroshima maidens, where the psychological regeneration that took place while they were in the United States of America was perhaps even more effective than the act of lessening the physical scars through cosmetic surgery.

2. From a surgical standpoint, plastic or reconstructive surgery might be remotely indicated in a few badly mutilated cases, the mutilation being caused not only by the original surgical disfigurement of the Nazi pseudo-experimentation, but possibly by the attempts to drain bone abscesses or deep-suppurations within the operated extremities. It is not at all unlikely that subsequent unsuccessful Polish attempts, after the war ended, to improve the late sequelae of the initial criminal operations, may have added to the tissue distortion and scarring.

3. The issue may be debatable as to whether at this late date it would serve any useful purpose to remove from man's memory the weeds which have almost crowded out and erased the unforgivable cruelties and bestialities of Nazi medicine. Nevertheless I feel that there is great merit in recalling to the minds of the world's peoples the infamy that horrified mankind when it was exposed at the Nuremberg trials over a decade ago, and which has been so quickly forgotten. The Lapins bore living testimony against their torturers, and, although the scientific purposes of these surgical crimes have never come to light, it is assumed that they were expressions of national policy under the Nazi regime. These men of science were strangely employed either through fear or dedication as the instruments or puppets for permanently establishing the concept of the super race. In this way, the Nazi rulers hoped that perpetuation of Aryanism as a dominant people could be assured for all time—a dominance which would exist not only in Europe but throughout the rest of the world. The rekindling of such knowledge about human bestiality might deter future generations of the human race from committing similar crimes against man, a purpose which the presence of the Lapins in America would serve immeasurably.

4. The subtle handling of this delicate subject of Nazi criminal experimentation might achieve one of the most important hopes of the Polish people, including that of ZBOWID, namely the prompt settlement of the reparations claims against Germany which, to date, she has refused to recognize. The Bonn Government has offered as an explanation for this action the fact that there are no diplomatic relations between Poland and Germany at the present time. I am hopeful that such a good will journey of the Lapins to America, if properly handled, might help not only in causing Germany to reconsider the reparations problem, but in establishing also a better understanding on other subjects that are at present harassing the relations between Germany and Poland.

5. The Polish people who reside behind the Iron Curtain might feel the influence of the Lapins' presence in America. This nucleus of women could serve as a means to broadcast by word of mouth how good will and brotherly love operate through freedom and kindness. Experience has taught us, if we may borrow from the Hiroshima story, that our Polish visitors could be excellent ambassadors of good will to perpetuate the human story of America—just as the Hiroshima Maidens were when they returned to Japan 2 years ago.

6. To teach the Lapins some gainful occupation during their stay in America, which might aid them later in their battle for survival. Many of them have been disabled by disease and have lived in penury without some means of earning a livelihood.

At a tea given by Dr. Eleanora Reicher, the professor of rheumatology, she made a plea for American physiotherapists to come to Poland to teach the citizens the specialty of physical medicine which has reached a high degree of technocratic efficiency in the United States of America. The professor has been greatly distressed that so little help has been given to young people who suffer serious disability from Still's disease or from rheumatoid arthritis. Mrs. Benenson proposed that the Warsaw committee select from among those who will be coming to America a group whose interest might be to lessen the suffering of those less fortunate who will be remaining in Poland. She thought that arrangements could be made through cooperation with American institutions whereby they could observe and acquire some knowledge of either physiotheraphy or occupational therapy.

During my second visit to Warsaw, I repeated Mrs. Benenson's original suggestion to Dr. Dworakowska, who as assistant to Dr. Reicher was equally dedicated to this phase of the rehabilitation program for the disabled young. (I was told that Dr. Reicher was stricken with a heart attack on the eve of my arrival from Moscow.) I urged her to select a group of volunteers from amongst the Lapins and introduce them to the needs of rheumatology. They would thus become better versed in this field prior to their departure for America. I thought that in this way the Lapins would learn the rheumatology problem as it exists in their country and become fired with enthusiasm to see this problem through when they arrive in our midst. I also told Dr. Dworakowska that I would present this phase of the problem to our committee in New York and, if approved, we would solicit the cooperation of American rehabilitation centers such as that headed by Dr. Howard Rusk. In my discussions with Dr. Rusk prior to my departure for Poland, he assured me of his willingness to cooperate on a therapeutic level. I had no foreknowledge at that time of this possible phase of the project.

7. The humanitarian implications of the project are tremendous. They are obviously of great value for international consumption as an American expression of good will and of brotherly love, emanating from private citizens and not from governmental sources. I learned via cable from Jeanne Benenson that Ambassador Lacey, head of our State Department East-West contacts staff, had endorsed this project wholeheartedly. This bilateral endorsement from both Communists and Americans at this stage was most encouraging.

If certain suggestions are accepted, I hope the project will be executed as quickly as possible.

Thus far, I have discussed the contradictory forces that served as background for our project and have indicated the need for accepting the Lapins project even before I reported on the mechanics of our visit to Warsaw. Let me, therefore, take you now to the conference room at the Orthopedic Clinic of Professor Gruca on the morning following our arrival.

An assemblage of about 30 physicians met us when we entered the long room, and we found them sitting on both sides of a lengthy conference table at which refreshments were being served continuously. In adjoining anterooms, the women of Ravensbrueck waited patiently for the conference to begin. Professor Gruca, a distinguished orthopedist, made the opening address and then called upon each attending physician to present the case of the Lapin who had been assigned to his particular care. As each Lapin appeared, she took her place in a chair. They ranged in age from about 30 to 60 years. They sat motionless, as if isolated from the world about them, and listened to a scientific recitation of the genesis of their scars—the lengths in centimeters, the depths and how their organs were affected by the presence of pus that oozed from their wounds over a long period of

time. Theirs were pale faces, sickly faces, tortured faces, embarrassed faces, faces bathed in tears as they followed a minute recital of the cruelties they had suffered. Only a few looked upon their situation stoically, probably compelled by sheer pride not to betray the tragedy of their concentration camp days. Most of them, however, were unable to control their emotions.

One former prisoner related her story to me. It was a characteristic one that could apply to all members of the group. Her tragedy began in August, 1942, when she was among a group of Polish women from Warsaw and Lublin who were repeatedly tortured on the slightest provocation. Not infrequently, deaths from torture or from firing squads occurred before their eyes. It was part of their daily routine of being alive and of living.

"One day," she related, "I was suddenly pulled out of the barracks and, together with several of my girl friends, was brought into the camp infirmary. I was ordered to lie down on a crude operating table. I asked the purpose of the operation, since I had no complaints. No answer came, so I refused to obey their command. When they finally overpowered me, I was thrown onto the table and gauze saturated with ether was stuffed into my mouth. I feel asleep. I do not know when I awoke, but I found myself lying in bed shaking with terror. Both my legs and thighs were in casts extending up to the groin. Openings had apparently been cut into the casts at the level of the shinbones. I will never forget the agonizing pain I suffered that day. What was most horrible was that no one told me what had been done—and why. Naturally, I thought this was the end.

"On the following day, several Germans in SS uniforms covered with white gowns came to my crude bed. One of them, presumably a physician, injected some oily substance through the opening in the cast. The pain was excruciating, and I had the sensation after the injection that my calves had increased tremendously in size. My fever rose to over 40 degrees (over 104° F.). My stomach became upset and I vomited throughout that night.

"A week later, the casts were brutally removed, and the physician (may God forgive me for giving him that title) incised the swollen, pussy wounds with a scalpel, and disregarding my torturing pain, he continued to examine the wound for a lengthy period. I endured a hectic fever for a long time, and the wounds did not heal for months and months. I was only able to move about, with great difficulty, 6 weeks later. In the meantime, I learned that my Polish friends who had come to the sickroom with me on that fateful day had been similarly butchered.

"The pain and the fever continued, and it seemed my suffering would never end. Walking precipitated insufferable pain. For some strange reason, the physicians who had previously been concerned about my legs suddenly lost interest. Occasionally, when one did inquire about my health, it was not to discuss my physical condition, but only to sneer at me with disgust. Pus continued to drain as if from a faucet, and only after a year did the wounds begin to granulate slowly and heal. At the present time, long deep scars are present in both my calves and in the lower part of my thighs, which cause me great discomfort and disability—but I am thankful that I am alive."

The Medical Commission at the conference that first morning consisted of leading Warsaw professors and their staffs. It was headed by Prof. Dr. A. Gruca as chairman, and included Prof. Dr. Z. Askanas, Docent Dr. I. Hausmanowa, Docent Dr. Z. Molowski, and Dr. H. Dworakowska. After the presentation of each of the Lapins, including their histories, the physical findings, the X-ray examinations, and the recommendations for therapy, the meeting ended with a summing-up speech by Professor Gruca. He then called upon me to address the group for a few minutes. I told them the purpose of our visit was to help the victims of the criminal experiments and that it was our hope that the women who had suffered these bestial brutalities would enventually be invited by our committee to come to America. I assured the doctors that these women in Poland had had the best care that modern medicine anywhere could offer, and that we in America could not improve on any of the methods of therapy which they have already received in their own country.

That evening, a special meeting was organized at the Orthopedic Hospital where all the victims gathered. At this meeting, Jeanne Benenson and I talked to them individually. The women seemed most enthusiastic about our visit and exhibited great cheer. As each one of them came up to be examined (the examinations being limited solely to the neck, the heart, and the blood pressure), Mrs. Benenson asked them whether they would be willing to take the trip to the United States. Only about 35 answered affirmatively. One of the older women who has passed the sixth decade of life said, "I would like to go but I am too old. Better that I let my place go to a younger person." When the examinations and the meeting were over, the women stood up as a group and sang beautiful and warm Polish folk songs, songs that moved the spirit and the soul. They were unlike the tragic song which I still recall which the Hiroshima girls sang at the cenotaph in Hiroshima prior to their departure for America and which they resolved, once here, never to sing again. And they never did.

Here in Lambarene, I have thought a great deal about the fate of the Lapins' project. What will happen when we, the Warsaw committee, return? Will the project be endorsed by the whole committee? And what will be the reaction of the American public? Many more questions will probably be asked of us: "Will our Government approve the project?" Inasmuch as you head our committee, you probably more than anyone else will have to face these questions in your travels about the country. In that case, my medical evaluation of the Lapins' health as it exists today may be of help to you. Of course, my impressions are based on my own superficial or limited examination and mostly on the findings presented to our committee at the conference with the Polish Medical Commission. I will attempt to summarize them in a general way. These evaluations have already been tabulated on individual cards in joint session with Professor Askanas and are already in your possession.

The examinations as transmitted to us by the official Polish Medical Commission revealed that there was almost universal scarring of the lower extremities following the operative incisions. The latter involved one or both legs and either one or both thighs. In some, both thighs and legs were incised once or twice or on occasions three times. In others, the multiple incisions seemed illogically arranged. In four instances, only injections were employed in these pseudo-scientific experiments. The injections were presumably of infectious material (the bacteria of gas gangrene, and probably the bacteria of tetanus or of pyogenic infections), but the nature of these could not be determined. In a few cases, in addition to the incisions, manipulations or fractures, even removal of segments of bones of the lower extremities were carried out. It appeared also that experiments to graft bone tissue were on the Ravensbrueck agenda. German surgeons from a nearby military sanitorium (probably Hohenlychen) were supplied with sections of bone to mend bone deficiencies in soldiers. These healthy Polish women of Ravensbrueck were therefore designated to serve as a living bone bank. Small splinters or larger segments of the bones of the legs were removed for this purpose. Foot bones, and at times bones of varying size were removed from shoulder bones, collar bones, and even from the spine. I was told that an entire shoulder girdle with the attached extremity was removed from some Polish girls in the attempt to graft them on Germans whose shoulders were severed by war explosions, but that these victims never survived to tell their gruesome tales to the world.

In some, or possibly even in many of these incision cases, the infections that ensued following surgical manipulation were a consequence to the infectious material that was willfully introduced into the operated wounds. In others, the infections that ensued may have resulted from lack of aseptic technique, because the nature of the procedure was frequently complicated by mad violence which members of the Gestapo or of the SS exhibited in their attempt to overpower their unwilling victims. Anesthesia was just thrown into their faces without any mask.

As far as I can see, the degree of scarring and distortion of an operated extremity was dependent upon the following factors:

1. The severity, duration, and the nature of the suppurative condition (directly induced or accidental due to poor technique) at the operative site.

2. The integrity of the underlying bone when segments of bone for bone grafts were partially or totally removed.

3. The occurrence of soft tissue abscesses requiring incision and drainage or of recurring osteomyelitis with sequestration. In some cases, there were frequent recurrences even 13 to 15 years later. I was told that the latest recurrence occurred as recently as 1 year ago.

4. Depending upon the initial operative trauma, the following sequelae occurred which distorted the affected extremity secondarily:

(a) There was atrophy of muscles.

(b) There was atrophy of bones leading to foreshortening of the affected extremity and consequently, because of the poor posture that ensued, to secondary changes detrimental to the spine.

(c) There was osteoporosis (or softening of the bones) and periostitis of bones at the site of the infection.

(d) There was ankylosis (contractures of joints) at the site of the infection.

(e) There were peroneal nerve injuries, either those that followed direct incision of the nerve at the time of the criminal operations or secondarily due to damage by the suppurative processes or by constriction of neighboring scars that developed following long-standing infection. There were several cases of foot drop among the Lapins for this reason, and neuro-surgical repair was evidently carried out and may again be attempted in such instances after careful evaluation in our country.

(f) Other nerve injuries, such as damage to cutaneous nerves, either the direct result of incision at the time of the criminal operations or following long-standing suppuration, leading to all sorts of muscle aches and pains (myalgias), neuralgias, etc.

It appears that the involvement of the lower extremities may have led to secondary changes in the spine which, in a few Lapins, has caused considerable disability. These may be attributed to mechanical factors, such as postural defects secondary to foreshortening or atrophy of bones as occurs in the course of infection and disuse, or due to complications such as ankylosis of ankles and peroneal nerve injuries with foot drop. In some, the spinal alterations are further complicated by the development of chronic

spondylitis or osteoarthritis. Such changes probably owe their origin to the toxic effects of suppurative foci in the lower extremities. The history of hectic fever of long duration indicates that some of these survivors may have suffered from a septicopyemia which may have been complicated by secondary foci of suppuration in the spine and that these, on hearing, produced the secondary changes of those bones. Amyloidosis as a possible disturbance of protein metabolism incidental to long-standing suppuration may have to be implicated as a possible explanation for the arthropathies, but no laboratory means for such identification was available at the time of my examination of the Lapins. This laying down process of an abnormal protein in the connective tissues in prolonged suppuration will be studied in those who may come to America—but of course those most seriously affected may not be acceptable for the long journey.

It is not inconcelvable, however, that some of the medical conditions that these women presented were not due to the atrocities of Ravensbrueck but due to the "wear and tear" of life and of living. Malnutrition and avitaminosis often do accompany the famine of war and may lead to disturbances attributable to such conditions. But in these cases, known suppurations led to a variety of toxemias whose pathogenetic effects could not be denied as possibly playing prime roles in the genesis of certain diseases.

There were also the shocks to the nervous systems from which many suffered repeatedly, and these must have precipitated stress phenomena which played an etiologic role in the development of certain syndromes. I was impressed with several instances of Graves Disease (hyperthyroidism) due to toxic goitre, and of several cases of essential hypertension which may have followed the extreme emotional reactions of the Ravensbrueck horrors during the periods when they feared death or even when they dreaded survival following their various tortures.

I was impressed with the many disturbances of the involuntary nervous system which come under the medical label of "autonomic imbalance" (which is synonymous with dystonia neuro-vegetativa). There were instances of cardiac neuroses, characterized by atypical pains suggestive of pseudoangina.

Many of these girls, at the time of my examination exhibited extra systoles, which are extra heart beats that are of a relatively benign nature and are probably unrelated to Ravensbrueck. They often occur under happy conditions and simply represent an excessive irritability of the heart, but I cannot deny that in the case of the Lapins they bore no relation to the tragedies of the past. Yet, such psychosomatic disturbances could have been part and parcel of their daily lives as an expression of the difficult days that faced them after the cessation of hostilities and which were followed by the hardships of life under Communist rule. Due to language difficulties, I could not evaluate the psychogenic disorders which were manifested in varying degrees by some of the Lapins.

I was especially interested in the severity of a depression which occurred in a case of climacterium praecox who was sterilized at the age of 16 and who, following the sterilization in Ravensbrueck, was subjected to two more operations after the war in a vain and heroic attempt to restore her fertility. How sad that so early in life she was deprived of her right to womanhood. Following her marriage, she was even more disturbed that infertility removed all possibility of a complete life for her. A depression followed which required 28 insulin shock treatments, as a result of which she gradually became better adjusted to her situation and to her marital status. Because of his history of severe depression she was naturally rejected by this committe for transportation to America until, on discussing this problem with the professor of medicine, Dr. Askanas, I became convinced that her depression was more hopeful—that it was a simple reactive depression rather than a complex guilt-laden one. Moreover, the number of shock treatments was not an absolute index of the severity of her psychogenic disorder, since in Poland shock therapy is more readily employed than in our country. It was the opinion of the Polish professor of psychiatry that even though no surgical help could be given her in America, except possibly through some form of hormonal replacement, a change of environment simply by including her in the Lapins' group might be sufficient to restore her psychogenic balance so that on returning to Poland she would eventually lead a more useful and complete life.

The remote effects of longstanding suppuration as occurs in osteomyelitis, either through the mechanism of toxemia or of amyloidosis, was suggested by the Polish Medical Commission in many instances where the important body organs were alleged to be involved. For example, there were several cases suggestive of a postinfectious myocarditis, although I could not definitely exclude in such instances the possibility of secondary amyloidosis without resorting to laboratory aids. There were several very suspicious instances suggestive of renal amyloidosis, since the presenting albuminuria could not be attributed to a nonexistent hypertension. Unfortunately their exact diagnoses will not be known since they were automatically excluded from consideration by our committee.

There were atypical cases of "myocarditis" and also instances of bone and joint involvement which could not be readily explained by the electrocardiographic and X-ray findings, respectively. I think that these could be more fully evaluated later if the Lapins were eventually admitted to our country.

Postconcussion states due to head injuries following beatings by the Gestapo were, I was told, not too infrequent in this group. I could not ascertain at this late date whether some of the women suffered from earlier skull fractures or from possible contra-coup lacerations of the brain, secondary to traumatic blows upon the lateral aspect of their skulls. Headaches and dizziness were symptoms suggestive of postconcussion states in a few instances, but there were also instances of injury to cranial nerves, notably to the acoustic nerve and to the facial nerve in cases where the paralysis was also alleged to be directly related to head injuries that some of the Lapins received at the hands of the Gestapo.

Now that I have described the many ills with which the Lapins are possibly afflicted, you will probably wonder how I could describe at the same time their capacity to assume normal roles as they did on the night of our committee banquet. How can this be true, you might say, when on the morning of our initial meeting at the conference, they seemed such human wrecks? Mysterious as it may seem, that is exactly what happened.

You, as a nonmedical man, would have been even more amazed had you joined us at the dinner for the Lapins at the Hotel Bristol. You would never have believed that these were the same pathetic women of Ravensbrueck who had testified so eloquently at Nuremberg in 1945–47 about their rampant misery, their purulent wounds, their festering scars and their disabilities of gait. At this dinner, there was a happy combination of joviality and good fellowship. Smiles of a new-found happiness seemed to pervade the banquet hall. It was difficult for me to believe that this was the same group that on the preceding day had been represented with such professional austerity by the Polish Health Commission, and how, as most of the Lapins in turn took their places before the assemblage, they relived with heartbreaking tears, the savagery of Ravensbrueck. How did they hide their invisible scars and their psychologic ills?

But this is not too difficult to understand. They are women who possess a heroic quality. They were privileged to have received the best schooling in the theater of reality where life was dominated by hate. What they learned at Ravensbrueck was how to change rapidly from one role to another—and they knew that their ability to do so meant their ultimate survival. They knew that the slightest s'ip would mean their death. They survived only because they were the hunted animals who knew when and where to hide, when and where to laugh, to sing, to love and to hate. They escaped the gas chambers or the firing squads only because they trained themselves to understand the narrow marginal differences between life and death and they play-acted accordingly. That is why they survived, all except one.

That evening, in the course of my superficial examinations, I met Krystyna Iwanska, a young physician of 35 years, of charm and beauty. To my great amazement I found a little mass on the left side of her neck and its firm texture suggested that it was a cancerous nodule. It was a Virchow node, a finding described by the famed German pathologist as a late sign of gastric cancer although it often appeared as the initial finding. Noting that I had fussed too long with her neck, Krystyna smiled and looked up at me as if to inquire what it was all about. I reassured her, "You must have been told that you had a thyroid goitre?" She replied negatively. When she left her chair, I whispered to the committee that her days were numbered; she was suffering from a metastatic cancer. It had spread from her stomach.

That night, Krystyna was the last one to leave. She stayed with us until we were carefully deposited in the taxicab that drove us to the hotel. As if she had a premonition about herself, she seemed vitally concerned about our welfare and about our hospitality. We were all deeply touched by this generous soul and her noble spirits. "I want to go to America and take some postgraduate courses and be a better trained doctor," she said with a pleasant smile. I patted her on the shoulder, "It will be all right."

Krystyna came on the following night to our banquet for all the Lapins. She enjoyed the evening tremendously. Afterward she said to me, "I have never before had such a wonderful time. Does this always happen in America?"

Four days later, Khystyna became ill, and I offered to come to her bedside. She refused my visit. It was probably because of her humble surroundings. I did not see Krystyna again until my return to Warsaw about 10 days later, when Dr. Dworakowska told me that Krystyna had repeatedly asked that I visit her at the hospital to which she had been admitted for observation. A consultation was arranged with Professor Plocker and Professor Rutkowski. It was Sunday noon, an unusual hour for a consultation in Warsaw, but the professors came. It was only a few hours before my departure for Paris and Lambarene. I discussed Krystyna's case with them at great length. My diagnosis of cancer of the stomach was confirmed by X-ray, and by the physical examination which revealed extensive metastatic deposits in her abdomen. I advised against operation, since her condition was no longer operable. But Krystyna had apparently convinced the hos-

pital authorities that operation was the only thing left for her, since she was under the impression that her malady was a gastric ulcer. I reassured Krystyna that if the operation was completed and if the Lapins came to America, she could join them there for her long convalescence.

I was deeply touched by her charm and by the story of her lonely suffering, being separated from her Lapin sister, Nina Iwanska, whom she loved. She asked, "If you see my sister Nina in Paris, give her my love, but don't tell her anything about my operation."

In Paris, Caroline Ferriday greeted me with, "What's new about Krystyna Iwanska? Her sister Nina is very anxious to meet you." That afternoon Nina Iwanska came to my hotel. There was a tragic dignity to her face—a pleasant face that bore an eczema which extended to her extremities. Nina related the story of her escape from Warsaw aided by French diplomats. Here in Paris she was earning her keep as a journalist for a Polish-French newspaper. Being out of Poland she had received her reparations from Germany (with immense difficulty), but that did not last long enough to keep body and soul together. She had long ago used up that money in her attempts to cure her skin malady—and it wasn't even enough for that. Most of it had gone towards the extensive treatment, the so-called "cellular" treatment of the aged Swiss who used injections of fresh animal cells without benefit to her erupting skin. Why was she as a Pole so miserably cursed? These expensive injections were alleged to have helped the Pope and the German Chancellor. But now she was tortured even more by the separation from her critically ill sister.

"Is there any chance for Krystyna?" she implored, "tell me everything." Remembering Krystyna's warning not to communicate her problems to Nina, I hesitated, but Caroline Ferriday urged me to speak up. I told Nina everything—that her sister was suffering from cancer, that she was hopelessly inoperable, and that an operation was contemplated only because it was requested by Krystyna who was unaware of the accurate diagnosis.

"How long would you say she can live?" she asked, seemingly resigned. I told her, "Possibly 6 months at most if she was not operated upon but inasmuch as she was inoperable, surgery might shorten her life span considerably."

Why Nina suddenly changed the subject, I will never know. Now she was more concerned about her own skin problem. It was apparent that she was suffering from a neuro-dermatitis, a skin disease of psychosomatic nature that lent itself poorly to therapy. I prescribed some medication for Nina and urged her to let me see her again in Paris when I returned from Lambarene.

During our next visit she told me that her sister had been operated upon successfully and although extensive metastases were found in the abdomen, the liver was not involved, which made her now more hopeful and thankful. "Does this not mean that my sister still has a chance?" I nodded, not wishing to remove whatever hope she still had as her only reason for living at this time.

When I returned from Africa, Nina was emotionally disturbed. She told me about the medications she had purchased in Paris to help cure her sister in Warsaw. She spent all the money she earned and all that she could borrow for quack cancer medicines. I asked Nina what she thought of a visit to America if the Lapins came, inasmuch as she could not return to Warsaw to visit her dying sister. I thought that this might help her bear the tragedy of separation and perhaps neutralize her guilt feelings. Nina, without hesitation, replied that as long as her sister was alive she wanted to be near her, and Paris was so much nearer to Warsaw than New York. As she talked, Nina bubbled with tears, evidently deeply moved by the suggestion that she might join the voyage of the Lapins if they were invited to America. "I am very thankful to you and the committee," she sobbed.

I presented Nina Iwanska's name as a possible candidate for transportation to America because she had served the Lapins' cause with dedication by calling attention to this project through the Association of Deportees and Internees of the Resistance, a French organization known by the name of ADIR and also by her reports to the U.N.

I discussed Nina's impending visit unofficially with a few members of the committee and even Krystyna's eventual transportation, so that a reunion of the two sisters—impossible in Warsaw—could take place in New York. Then I wrote to Professor Askanas along these lines and asked him to engage Professors Plocker and Rutkowski in the evaluation of Krystyna's case. He was to let me know whether Krystyna's days were numbered or whether she had a long enough period ahead of her so that she could be transported to America for the reunion and for treatment. Here, I thought, with the aid of the miracle drugs and the long-awaited reunion, her days could be lengthened. This is a dramatic story of life and death, of a cruel separation for ideological reasons of two sisters who had suffered together as "experimental animals" in a concentration camp and who now were destined never to be together again. One committee member rightfully pointed out that if Krystyna died in our country it might detract from the strength of our project and probably even endanger it. What would have happened was not the issue. It is a heartbreaking human story, and I championed it only for its own intrinsic human values.

This problem finally resolved itself. News came a few days ago that Krystyna died but until her end came, she believed that a trip to America was waiting for her and that she would soon have her reunion with Nina in New York.

I recommend that Nina Iwanska should eventually come to America anyway if only to tell in her own words the story of Anise Postel-Vinay, known as the "Danielle" in the French Resistance and to romanticize the role that Danielle played in the story of the Ravensbrueck Lapins.

Who is this Danielle? I learned about her through sheer accident on the last day of my Paris visit and only an hour and a half before my plane departed for New York. She came from nowhere, but there she was at Gare des Invalides waiting for me.

"You are Dr. Hitzig," she said with a warm French accent. "I am Mme. Postel-Vinay, and I do the same work in Paris that Caroline Ferriday does in your country." She invited me to her home and without waiting for an answer, gathered my bags. I was still protesting when we arrived with my bags in her hands and I met her family.

My visit with Anise and her four children was in spirit as if I had known her all my life. It was one of the most exciting moments of my European and African journeys. She was like a breath of fresh air as she talked about her work in the underground during the occupation of France. "I did not know very much. I was an amateur. I was picked up early and sent to Ravensbrueck. My father was sent off to Buchenwald for similar activities in the movement, but when he was released several months later he was a physically broken man and died. My sister was shot by the Gestapo during the last days of the occupation and my brother was an internee of a concentration camp in France. At that time, I did not know my husband. He escaped from a concentration camp and had managed to land in the English Channel. There he was picked up and brought to England where he subsequently became active with General de Gaulle, and is still associated with his government, which he now serves as treasurer for French Africa."

When I asked her how she as a Frenchwoman became interested in the Ravensbrueck Lapins, she told me a fascinating story which had hitherto been unknown to me. In a soft, inspiring voice, full of modesty, she continued:

"There were thousands of women at Ravensbrueck, and amongst them were many Poles who had been members of the resistance movement in Poland. Amongst them was Nina Iwanska. We were both young. I was only 20, then, when I became ill with abscesses all over my body. One day Nina Iwanska came to my bed and said, 'You are a Frenchwoman so you're going to live. I'm a Pole and I'm going to die. Take this medicine, it will help you survive. I received it through the underground movement in Ravensbrueck. This medicine, I am told, has specific value against infection. My father sent it on to me. He heard about the infections in my operated legs and he thought this would help them heal. It's of no use to me if I am going to die—but I want you to have it so that you can live and tell the world our story. You must live to tell of the barbarism and cruelty of these experiments to which my people have been and are still being subjected at this camp.'

"What else was there to do? Nina was determined and I accepted the medicines, and the abscesses gradually disappeared. Fortunately, Nina survived, too. I vowed then, never to forget the story of the Ravensbrueck Lapins and that I would do everything in my power to bring it to the attention of the world.

"News of these experiments had previously been smuggled out to England, but the English had refused to believe that such experimentation was anything other than mere propaganda designed against Nazis. But we did more than that right at the camp itself. Through our underground at Ravensbrueck the news came that on a certain day all the Lapins were to be exterminated (to hide all traces of their existence) either by firing squads or in gas chambers and crematories. The Nazis were determined to leave no traces that such barbaric experiments were ever conducted at Ravensbrueck. We French are a determined lot, so we decided to help save the lives of the Polish girls, and that is what happened. We hid them, we changed their numbers and, as you can see, many of them survived later to bear witness in Nuremberg against the infamous Nazi surgeons of Ravensbrueck."

It has been rumored that some French women who took the numbers that belonged to the Ravensbrueck Lapins went to gas chambers as replacements for the Poles. From another source, I learned that Nina Iwanska, aware of the fact that some unknown French woman had given her life so that she might live, was guilt laden since then and depressed. It is not impossible to believe that her guilt feelings may be the root of the neurodermatitis from which she suffers and probably always will.

When the war ended, Anise Postel-Vinay managed through diplomatic channels to bring Nina Iwanska to Paris, where she underwent operations to save her badly butchered legs.

As long as I live, I will remember "Danielle," the dynamic, exciting young woman of 36 and that last night in Paris. It is my earnest hope that Mme. Postel-Vinay will come to America to join the Lapins if the project is approved and, if so, that such an invitation will be extended to her by our committee. I regard her as the godmother of the project and somehow I feel that Caro-

line Ferriday's inspiration had its origin in her courage and genius.

One last piece had to be found before the jigsaw puzzle picture of the Ravensbrueck Lapins story was completed. Why were these particular experiments conducted in the first place? During my examination of the Lapins, I was puzzled by the peculiar scars which resulted from the criminal experiments on the legs and thighs of these Polish women. I could not decipher the nature of the experiments, why then had been done, what controls were employed, what drugs had been titrated against the infectious organisms (gas gangrene bacilli, etc.) that were introduced into freshly made wounds complicated by tissue destruction.

In the early part of this report, which was written in Lambarene, I stated that the scientific purposes of the experiments were unknown. I was wrong; they were only not known to me at that time. Upon my return to New York I was supplied with the missing piece to my puzzle by Dr. Leo Alexander, of Boston, who had been a member of Medical Intelligence for the U.S. Army at the Nuremberg trials. I was astonished. It was as simple as it was dishonest.

Reinhard Heydrich, the hangman of Czechoslovakia and head of the Gestapo, has apparently earned the undisputed right to be called the father of Ravensbrueck's barbaric experiments. His death was costly to the Poles.

Dr. Alexander gave me information which pieced together fit into the genesis and body of our project as follows:

Professor Gebhardt of Hohenlychen, who was the chief surgeon at Ravensbrueck, became known through his surgical associates as the killer of high-ranking people in Germany whenever his friend Herr Himmler gave the go-ahead sign for their liquidation. Professor Gebhardt's colleagues were adept in their ingenious experiments which established the best way to kill an undesirable general or a high-ranking intellectual, who was in the way. At first, phenol or gasoline by vein were employed but the odor was too distinctive after death. Methods to cause a lingering death were then devised, in a way that these would not be readily detectible. To do so, they injected pyogenic organisms into the inner aspect of the thighs of victims. The pus that formed at the injection site was subsequently aspirated in a syringe and injected into their bloodstream—the idea being to simulate the conditions of a septicopyemia. When these experments failed to produce death, Gebhardt's associate, Hassmeyer, decided to employ, whenever a lingering death to simulate a natural death was requested, the intravenous introduction of live tubercle bacilli. Before his arrival at his post in Ravensbrueck, he was already well known for his group's masterful work at Hohenlychen of slowly killing many distinguished Nazis with live tubercle bacilli which required at least a month of ailing.

When Heydrich came to Czechoslovakia, where his back was ripped by a bomb thrown at him, Professor Gebhardt was flown there to save him. After all, Gebhardt was the specialist on surgical infections. He performed a debridement operation on Heydrich's wounds; but the hangman died from infection and from hemorrhage several days later. Professor Gebhardt, being the friend of Himmler who did not always see eye to eye with Heydrich, was suspected of foul play. He was called on the carpet by Hitler who asked him why he did not employ sulfonamides in the case of Heydrich. "Is it not definitely established that sulfonamides are of value in infections?" asked Hitler. "They are of no value, and that's why I did not use them in the case of Heydrich," Gebhardt pleaded. "Prove it," yelled Hitler, adding, "take some prisoners and, by using controls, determine whether they are or are not of value."

Gebhardt, who had just come to Ravensbrueck, preferred to use the healthy women who had been part of the resistance movement in Poland during the German occupation. He promised Hitler that he would execute these experiments and determine once and for all whether sulfonamides were effective against infections. And so, in 1942, these experiments began under Gebhardt. He introduced the organisms of gas-gangrene, tetanus, and the pus producers into the legs and thighs of these Polish women. And he did the most unusual control experiments. A thief at heart and under suspicion for the death of Heydrich, who did not receive the benefits of sulfonamides and died, he was hell-bent not only to establish the fact that sulfonamides were of no value against infection, but also to save his own life. He proved it. It was a perfect experiment, in which he demonstrated that many, if not most, of his victims that died met this fate in spite of sulfonamide treatment. It is alleged that those women who had received sulfonamides died because Gebhardt did not drain their tissue abscesses. He was thus able to prove unequivocally the fact that sulfonamides were useless chemotherapeutic agents and his records established to Hitler's satisfaction that Heydrich's death was "fate determined" (a favorite SS phrase) and that Gebhardt was not guilty of causing Heydrich's death.

By committing these heinous crimes against the innocent Polish women Gebhardt tied himself into a deeper union with his criminal organization through the mechanism of "SS blood cement." ("Blood cement" or "Blut-Kitt" is a principle which Hitler borrowed from the criminal writings of Genghis Khan.) He did even more than that. He involved the entire German medical profession in the same criminal hookup when he presented his Ravensbrueck report before a national medical meeting without objection being aroused by any of its members against the principle of human experimentation.

So the surviving Lapins of Ravensbrueck with their multiple incisions that mystified me, were not those who received the sulfonamides. Those who may soon come to America are probably the fortunate controls whose developing abscesses were carefully incised and drained because Professor Gebhardt hoped that by saving them he would save his own life. But he died with this secret which only later was unmasked by Allied Medical Intelligence. It is ironical how Gebhardt cleared himself of the murder of Heydrich in whose case he did not employ sulfonamides. Yet he was hung for murdering Lapins whose death helped him prove via phoney experimentation that sulfonamides were of no value in combating infections.

May I now, in concluding this report, propose that we should take the responsibility for a move which to my mind would serve our purpose of international good will in the spirit of human oneness. I am just a simple human being who knows how to play and feel the game of life, of love, and of hate. In the solitude of Lambarene, I thought about this continuously and it is not impossible that, sitting at the feet of a great theologian and physician, his philosophy of reverence for life rubbed off on me and soaked into my bones.

In the case of the Lapins, the basic situation is as follows: These women still bear the scars of Nazi bestiality. Applying the logic and the meaning of the Hiroshima maidens project, namely, the mutuality of the doer of the hateful deed and the victim of the deed, this is essentially a relationship between Germans and Poles. I am compelled to offer some working solution to this problem, but I doubt I will be successful unless men of good will join in the struggle.

What can be done is this: We must find a way either through some intermediary or through some diplomatic channel to convince the Germans to act in good faith with the victims of Ravensbrueck. It so happens that Theodor Heuss, the President of Germany, was married by Dr. Albert Schweitzer at Strassbourg. Could we not, through the world influence of Dr. Schweitzer, find some way to ask President Heuss to intervene in behalf of this project? The greatest concern the Lapins have borders on the question of whether reparations will be given or denied them by the Germans. They need these reparations so that they can continue to survive with decency during the lean years that lie ahead—lean years which are due mostly to the disabilities that were generated by the cruelties at Ravensbrueck. I feel that if this project is properly presented to the authorities at Bonn, reparations will be granted and we will bring prompt understanding out of chaos. If we could only convince the Germans that by making these financial arrangements, one great hope for the restoration of brotherly love, and international good will will have had its brightest day.

I enjoyed working with the Hiroshima Peace Center Associates, and especially with its representatives in Warsaw—Mrs. Jeanne Benenson and Mrs. Erica Anderson. It was their light that shone ever brightly and gave me insight into the problems of Poland and of her Ravensbrueck Lapins.

With gratitude for the faith you have had in my judgment throughout the initial phase of this project, I remain

Faithfully yours,

WILLIAM M. HITZIG.

The Tucker Sno-Cat Story Continues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Post and Times Herald of April 8, 1959. It describes the work of a U.S. team of polar experts which measured an Antarctic mountain range. The explorers used Tucker Sno-Cats, manufactured in Medford, Oreg., to make the hazardous journey.

The article follows:

IGY GROUP EXPLORES LOST POLAR RANGE

(By James Donavan)

A United States team of polar experts has found and measured a mysterious range of Antractic mountains whose location was an enigma for the past 20 years, the National Science Foundation reported yesterday.

The location was reported to the foundation by the 4-man group after a 3-week, 500-mile trek over the polar wastes that ended last month. The expedition was part of its Antarctic research program and its continued participation in the International Geophysical Year.

The mountain range was first sighted during an expedition in 1939–40 by a pilot on a flight from Little America. In 1947 two pilots estimated two peaks had heights of about 20,000 feet.

The four-man team, using three Sno-Cats, a tractor-like vehicle, located the 60-mile-long range in the heart of Mary Byrd Land. The party spent 2 days at the site measuring the peaks and making other scientific studies.

The smallest of the 10 peaks in the range was found to be 7,144 feet high, about 1,000 feet higher than Mount Mitchell in the Great Smokies, the highest mountain east of the Rockies. The highest was 13,856 feet, about 600 feet lower than Mount Rainier in Washington State.

The team reported that the range is volcanic and covered 90 percent by snow and glaciers.

According to T. John Pirrit, the leader of the expedition, a widely scattered array of volcanic rock was found strewn over an area stretching as far as 5 miles from the foot of the range. The rocks gave the appearance of having been scattered by an eruption.

Pirrit said the rocks "have every appearance of having been recently placed there," inasmuch as they were not covered by ice or snow.

Other members of the team were George A. Doumani, of Oakland, Calif., a glaciologist and geologist; William H. Chapman, of Sacramento, a topographic engineer; and Gerard A. Bennett, of Boston, a transport specialist.

"Mary Worth" Is 20 Years Old

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which appeared in the Long Island Daily Press of April 10, 1959, on the 20th anniversary of the comic strip, "Mary Worth."

The series appears in the Long Island papers and several hundred other newspapers throughout the country. Her creator, Allen Saunders, is past chairman of the Newspaper Comics Council, Inc., and has been president of the Toledo, Ohio, Board of Education, the Advertising Club, and the Community Chest. He takes an active role in community affairs, and, in addition, has publicized the American National Red Cross and other national organizations in his series.

The article follows:

"MARY WORTH" IS 20 YEARS OLD

"Mary Worth" the famed dramatic comic strip character, is 20 years old this week.

Her creator, Allen Saunders, isn't taking any time out for celebrations though.

The former college teacher is too busy working on future problems that Mary will solve for her daily audience of 30 million readers.

The serious, motherly oldster isn't a "funny" character in ordinary comic strip fashion.

She deals competently—and successfully—with an endless array of emotional problems faced by the younger and usually attractive young ladies that people her strip.

"Mary Worth's" huge mail proves to Saunders that the "romantic problems" strip is effective.

Many of the letters are from women seeking advice.

One piece of mail that startled him read: "Yesterday I gave up. I knew it was the coward's decision, but I came home fully determined to take the easy road out.

"Habit led me to your picture story and I found myself reading. It was as if you were speaking to me.

"Suddenly I realized you had given me the answers no one else had been able to put into words.

"Thank you, 'Mary Worth,' for saving my life."

Saunders won his master's degree at Wabash College, in his native State of Indiana. He taught French and other languages there for 5 years, before becoming a newspaperman on the Toledo News-Bee.

In 1939, he took over the writing of "Mary Worth," drawn by Ken Ernest.

Saunders gave the strip its unusual romantic flavor and the public quickly responded to the gentle, helpful ways of "Mary Worth."

Reevaluation of Federal Farm Programs Is Long Overdue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL B. BREWSTER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, during fiscal 1960 our Federal farm programs will cost U.S. taxpayers $6 billion. This cost represents almost 8 percent of the total 1960 budget.

I know that many of my colleagues are concerned, as I am, about the spiralling increase in the cost of administering a program which has failed to accomplish its primary stated purpose—to help the low-income farmer and preserve our heritage of small family farms.

The Baltimore Evening Sun recently carried a series of articles which pointed up some of the problems of the program and some of the glaring abuses which have occurred. These articles were summarized in an editorial in the Evening Sun of Monday, April 13. I find myself in complete agreement with the opinion therein expressed, and under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to have the editorial inserted in the RECORD:

FARM AID BREAKDOWN

For decades, Congressmen have tended to look on the farm problem as being the special province of Representatives and Senators from the major farm States. This is so no longer, from a very simple reason. The Federal farm programs now take such a huge bite of the Federal budget that no Congressman, no city dweller or suburbanite, can ignore them. As Mr. Ray Cave has been reminding us in an excellent series of articles in the Evening Sun, the Federal Government will soon hold $9 billion worth of surplus wheat, corn, cotton, and other crops, despite herculean efforts to get rid of the stuff in oversea programs. Interest and storage charges alone eat up $1 billion a year. The President, in a conservative estimate, suggests that farm programs during the fiscal year 1960 will cost $6 billion—$1,600 million more than in the fiscal year 1958.

The ironies in this tremendous overproduction and oversupply are many. The Republican administration came into office in 1953 hoping to pare the agricultural budget; it has risen astronomically. Farm policy is ostensibly designed to preserve a way of life, the family farm, or at least ameliorate the hardships of that life; instead, the greatest profits have gone to the highly mechanized industrial-type farming operations and to the businessmen who deal in storage of crops. Congress has given the Secretary of Agriculture some of the tools to try to bring the problem under control but has not given him all, nor has he used efficiently all he has received; yet the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD are filled with wondering questions as to why the farm programs don't work. Price supports are asked in the name of the farmer; yet poll after poll has shown that in principle at least the farmers don't want them, so long as there is some satisfactory alternative. People all over the world could use the food and fibers we don't want; yet to provide these commodities in quantity would upset the delicate balance of trade relationships on which governments, international relations and even the livelihood of millions rests.

There is no point in attempting to reproduce here the statistics and illustrations which show how clearly past farm programs have failed. They abound in awesome number in Mr. Cave's article. The point is, the failure stares every taxpayer, in every city, in the face. It is not only present failure to fashion workable programs for the coming year or the next one. As Mr. Cave points out, we can't even get rid of the surpluses left from our past failures. The interest and storage charges on the surpluses go on. A national effort must be made to prevent the drain from becoming worse. This newspaper has supported a good many attempts to correct aspects of previous farm programs. We have supported lower, sliding price supports; the soil bank, as originally conceived; surplus disposal overseas, if restricted so as not to constitute dumping. But it is clear now that these and other remedies have been only palliatives. The time has come for a complete reevaluation of the various farm programs and a fresh, sober attempt to reach a solution which is fair to taxpayers as well as to farmers.

For Docks and TVA?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT E. JONES
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following very timely and valuable editorial which appeared in the Decatur Daily, Decatur, Ala., April 12:

FOR DOCKS AND TVA?

Our old friend John Temple Graves, who writes a thoughtful column in many newspapers, gave us renewed vigor the other morning in the Birmingham Post-Herald when he wrote of rainfall and streams being our greatest asset, for he wrote, "Next to lnad, the prime asset of planet earth is water. Its flow, its fall, its boil, its float, its swallow, its resistances and yieldings, all these, plus increasing relative shortage as men and operations increase, give water an ultimate price above rubies and uranium. Yet the asset has been allowed too often and too long to mean only the disaster of floods, of erosion, of topsoil washed away, of red and yellow streams that hijack a sweet land of liberty in wastage to the sea."

Having read that far, we were certain Mr. Graves was making a case for Alabama and the South and the TVA. He would certainly be backing the development of State docks on the rivers of Alabama and the further development of the great State docks at Mobile, for men are attempting to make the

most of these streams. They were given a mandate by the people of Alabama to do so with the passage of a $10 million bond issue. This precious water was not going to flow forever to the sea without serving man, providing jobs, adding payrolls, increasing the tax income of the State, the counties, and the cities of Alabama.

But shucks, Mr. Graves wasn't writing about that at all. He was just generalizing in a gentle fashion. Then he got down to the heart of the matter in praising the Alabama Power Co. for exceptional business statesmanship in conceiving a comprehensive program for the complete development, by the use of private investor capital, of the water resources of the Coosa and Warrior River systems. We wonder if there would ever have been such exceptional business statesmanship had there not been a TVA pattern drawn a long time ago now on the Tennessee River system?

Mistake us not. We are proud of the Alabama Power Co. for having taken this step which will mean so much to Alabama. The important thing is that they took it and all the lessons learned from the only controlled river system in the world, the Tennessee River system. So Mr. Graves will at least concede that splendid lessons have been taught on the Tennessee by men who knew what they were doing and where they were going. This is a lesson that has been accepted throughout the world for the good it has accomplished for millions of people in the Tennessee Valley in particular and in the United States in general.

And now comes the punchline of Mr. Graves' comments. He says, "Something else that went unsaid but has been in many minds is the oneness of our people behind the private enterprise Coosa-Warrior plan, and the near oneness for maintaining the present equitable divison between TVA and private companies. In spite of the demagogs whose dream-target it was for so long, a new day has dawned for the private companies and the Government are delineated, accepted and supported. Only a few holdover demagogs still undertake to stir up the natives."

Beautifully said once again, but alas an untrue statement of the situation as it exists today between TVA and the private power companies. A long time ago an agreement was made between the private power interests and the TVA on property lines. That agreement has been honored, at least by TVA. But we have only to refer to the Dixon-Yates attempt to know that the private power companies have not honored that agreement. Only the uncovering of the stench in back of it forced the Eisenhower administration to forego the planned invasion of TVA territory through Dixon-Yates.

Even now every private electric company in the United States, including the Alabama Power Co., is fighting with every means at hand to forestall the passage of a self-financing measure through the Congress which would allow TVA to meet at least some of its obligations to serve the people and the Federal Government in the Tennessee Valley.

The private power companies use the pretext that they cannot properly finance their own expansions unless a territorial halter is put about the neck of TVA. To this argument we would ask only one question—What is the true story of private power company financing?

So, we were all wrong. Mr. Graves was not writing about the need for developing the rivers of Alabama. He was not speaking of the great and lasting values of TVA. He was singing an old song, a song which has been heard for many years and will be heard in the years to come. He was singing a song for a purpose, the TVA self-financing bill is about due to come before the House of Representatives.

And that's why we are answering him just now, in the hope that our story from the other side of the fence will reach just as many people at this crucial time.

Statement by Hon. Cornelius E. Gallagher, of New Jersey, Before House Ways and Means Committee on Unemployment Compensation, April 15, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave, I would like to insert in the RECORD the testimony which I gave yesterday before the House Ways and Means Committee on unemployment compensation:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am grateful for the committee's kind invitation to appear here today and the opportunity afforded me to express my deep and growing concern over the serious inadequacies in the unemployment compensation programs administered by our States. I have equal concern for the failure of the Federal Government to bring about much needed improvements in this badly neglected area of our economy.

I am heartened by the studied approach the members of this committee have taken to this important problem and I am confident the fruit of its attention to unemployment compensation matters will be a vastly improved program benefiting the millions of American workers who are now, or who may be in the future listed in the unemployed column.

I suggest that the legislative vehicles that will most efficiently and most expeditiously bring about the improved program we are all seeking is H.R. 3563, a bill for which I am privileged to be a cosponsor.

Passage of this bill would not only place the Federal Government in its rightful position of leadership in the field of unemployment compensation by providing for a standardization of State programs and fiscal guarantees, but it would, in addition, eliminate the inadequate provisions of this State's programs.

Most important, passage of H.R. 3563 would bring an end to the Federal Government's patchwork approach to the serious problems stemming from programs which pay the unemployed too little for too short a period.

As you may know, when the unemployment insurance programs were conceived in the depression years of the 1930's, 3 percent of payrolls was agreed upon as a proper rate to finance benefits. Since the very inception of the programs there has been a steady decline in the percent of payroll level to finance benefits.

The unemployment insurance programs were established with a view to paying an unemployed worker approximately 50 percent of his wage loss. In the early years, following the establishment of the program, there was near attainment of this goal.

Today, as this committee well knows, the percentage of loss of income made up by unemployment insurance payments is little over one-third of income lost through unemployment.

Among other shortcomings which H.R. 3563 seeks to overcome is the decline in the benefits received by the unemployed. It stipulates, as you know, benefits of not less than 50 percent of weekly income lost. This is the same goal established in the early thirties and here we are 20 years later still seeking it. I hope, and I am confident, that this time we will make it. However, this will be only if the standard is set by the Federal Government.

I hesitate to discuss provisions of the bill with which I know the members of the committee are thoroughly familiar. I do so only for emphasis in the record of points I consider to be pertinent.

It is most distressing that in this age of jet propulsion we have moved toward improvements in so vital an area of our national economy at a horse and buggy pace. In voting the extension of the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act recently, we merely made another patchwork effort. The bill now being considered by this committee will bring an end to such crash measures as those the Congress has been compelled to enact in the past to keep our unemployed from near starvation.

We are seeking little more than the standards which were felt necessary when the unemployment compensation program was established more than 20 years ago. We are assuring a uniformity that will be fair to all of our States and work a hardship on none.

H.R. 3563 will take the tangle of State programs, with their great diversity of standards, rates levied, benefits paid, and the duration of payment, and apply a standardized program that will benefit the unemployed workers and give assurance of better protection to the worker who may someday find himself in the ranks of the unemployed.

This bill will go a long way in better equipping the Nation to combat another recession, for by providing sufficient and more realistic benefits there is stimulation of the economy through the maintenance of purchasing power at proper levels.

It is obvious to those familiar with the antiquated provisions of many State programs and the inadequacy of these programs that improvements are long past due. The changes advocated by this administration which would deny Federal leadership in this important field and leave the burden and initiative for improvement with the individual States, offer neither a solution to the problem nor the guidance and support for the States that are found in the bill presently before this committee.

There is, unfortunately, no evidence that unemployment particularly in the more distressed areas, will decline sharply enough in coming months to reach a normal level. Unless the Congress takes action to approve a standard and stabilized program of unemployment compensation, we may expect to be called upon at the next session to apply another patch in the form of further extension of the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act.

In the Newark, N.J., labor area, which encompasses my own congressional district in Hudson County, unemployment increased by 13,000 in a recent 2-month period and now stands at 8.9 percent of the total labor force. There is a 10-percent increase in unemployment over this same period last year.

These are figures that cause great concern. Ours, like so many others with which the committee is familiar, is a distressed labor market.

The committee is conscious of the interest of our State Governors in this problem. A number of these State executives have called on the Congress to set up minimum standards for all States such as are provided in the bill you are considering.

The distinguished chief executive of my State is one of those so concerned. He has

come to Washington at the invitation of the committee to discuss this very important matter. I am privileged to present to you, Mr. Chairman, and the members of the committee, Gov. Robert B. Meyner, of New Jersey.

Gettysburg's Battle of Neon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 14, 1959

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, as many of our conferees in the other Chamber know, a good many people are more interested in seeing Gettysburg preserved as a part of our historical heritage than as part of our souvenir-hunting mania. I will not say that my office has been deluged with mail, but I will say that we have received a good many copies of letters written to various Members of Congress in connection with the battle to save Gettysburg from being snowed under with postcards and custard. Most of these letters have been from outside my district, and outside the State of Pennsylvania. Not that support for the restoration of the funds for land acquisition is lacking from within our Commonwealth either, as I think Senators CLARK and SCOTT can testify. And solidly in the ranks to prevent encroachment of further commercialism upon the battlefield are all of the newspapers of the area. As a further example, I submit this fine editorial from the Harrisburg Evening News of April 11, 1959. The editorial follows:

GETTYSBURG BATTLE OF NEON LIGHTS

The second battle of Gettysburg is racing toward a decision.

And unless the U.S. Senate saves the day in a last-minute show of firmness, vision, and responsibility, the battle will be lost.

The issue is simple. Either the Government gets enough money to buy enough strategic land on the battlefield to preserve it as a national shrine of immense meaning—or commercial interests will encroach still further upon the historic grounds—with more suburban developments, more diners, more beer parlors, more trailer courts.

Already, as any visitor to the battlefield can see for himself, some of the atmosphere and dignity of the grounds has been jeopardized. The progress of the modern age is painfully evident where some of the fiercest fighting between the States took place nearly a century ago.

True the Government now owns 2,700 acres, keeping the tracts inviolate from commercial exploitation. But many crucial portions of land are privately or county owned—and may soon be developed in a manner profitable to individual interest but detrimental to America's heritage.

The battle came to a head when the House, by voice vote, approved a $1,250,000 slash in the 1960 Interior Department budget. Some $750,000 of the appropriation was to have been earmarked for the National Park Service's plan to purchase about 600 additional acres of battlefield at Gettysburg.

Representative JAMES M. QUIGLEY protested the appropriation slash by the House and then persuaded Senator JOSEPH CLARK to make possible a full-scale hearing when the item reaches the Senate.

This important hearing will be held some time after April 15.

As Representative QUIGLEY warns, this may be the last chance for the Nation to acquire historic battlefield tracts at reasonable cost. Obviously, once those areas are developed commercially, the land price will skyrocket.

"When the Nation and the world observe the 100th anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg in 1963," said QUIGLEY, "it will be discovered—too late and to our sorrow—that commercialization has destroyed much of the historic area."

The battlefield of Gettysburg stands as a timeless reminder of American values that cannot be measured in terms of money. On that field brave men fought and died for what they believed right, and a new Nation grew upon their sacrifice. On that field, Abraham Lincoln quietly spoke words that will not be forgotten so long as mankind cherishes freedom, tolerance, and respect.

The Senate—without dickering, without politicking and with regard for the future—should restore the appropriation and save Gettysburg battlefield.

To do less would place upon the American scene and character a blight that would far outlive the memory of dollars and cents that were saved in the 1st session of the 86th Congress.

Restoring the Integrity of REA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, many of the farm people of Indiana, including thousands of the citizens I have the honor to represent who live in LaPorte and Marshall Counties, depend for their electricity on the Rural Electric Membership Corporations, the REMCs.

The Rural Electrification Administration program has for many years contributed enormously to American life by bringing the blessings of electricity to the farm families of our country and by stimulating the business and industry which produces and sells the appliances, machinery and equipment needed by REA users.

Unfortunately, the rural electric systems of Indiana have been under severe attack by both the Handley administration in Indianapolis and the Eisenhower administration in Washington.

Yesterday the House of Representatives, by a margin of nearly 2 to 1, voted to uphold the integrity of the REA program by restoring to the Rural Electrification Administrator sole authority to pass on rural power and telephone loans. The bill, which has also been passed by a similar margin in the Senate, would thus reaffirm the original intent of Congress that the Administrator of REA, who is appointed to office for a term of 10 years, should be free from political influence. Since 1953, however, the Secretary of Agriculture has had the last word on the approval or disapproval of loans over $500,000.

During the 1958 campaign I stated my conviction that the REMCs should be permitted to operate without having to engage constantly in political and legislative battles merely to defend their right to exist. REMCs are nonpartisan and should be permitted to remain that way. This is the reason I was glad yesterday to join with the great majority of my colleagues in Congress in voting to restore to the Administrator of REA the full authority to pass on loans independant from the control of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, with the passage of this legislation rural America can again have confidence in the integrity of the loan procedures of the Rural Electrification Administration, and the farm families of Indiana and the Nation who use REA can continue to enjoy the benefits of modern electric service.

The U.S. Army Field Band of Washington, D.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, there are many facets to the conduct of our foreign relations, and by no means the least of these is the remarkable manner in which the serviceman overseas represents his country as a citizen-ambassador. Similarly, the commendable efforts abroad, as well as at home, of the superb musical organizations of the Armed Forces is worthy of comment. One such fine group is the United States Army Field Band, commanded and directed by Maj. Chester E. Whiting, who formerly presided over instrumental music in the public schools of Malden, Mass., and a man whom I am proud to call a friend. All the citizens of Malden, which comprises a part of my congressional district, are proud of Major Whiting. Major Whiting and his talented and disciplined bandsmen have extended the friendly hand of American culture and tradition to eager multitudes throughout the world.

Considered by music critics to be one of the most proficient and distinctive musical organizations now appearing before the public, this band has traveled more than a million miles in recent years and is internationally famous as "The Kings of the Highway."

The Army's most-traveled band is composed of more than 100 of the finest musicians in the Army. Several are bandmasters themselves, and a number have played with leading symphonies. More than a dozen have been with the band since it was organized.

The Army Field Band was organized as the Army Ground Forces Band in March 1946, by Major Whiting, commanding officer and conductor since then. Capt. Robert L. Bierly, a native of Clearfield, Pa., has been executive officer and assistant conductor for almost as long. He is a graduate of Ithaca College, New York, and was director of music in Lynchburg, Va., at one time.

The Soldiers Chorus of approximately 30 bandsmen-vocalists is featured on every program. Formed with a nucleus of six musicians in 1947, the chorus is now rated as one of the best male voice groups on the concert stage.

Specialist 7 Eugene W. Coughlin directs the Soldiers Chorus, and is also the band's principal baritone soloist. Before entering military service Coughlin performed with organizations in the Los Angeles, Hollywood and San Francisco Bay areas. He majored in music at Concordia College, Moorhead, Minn., and completed study at the Los Angeles Conservatory of Music.

Paul V. Henry, member of a family long prominent in music circles in New England, is narrator of the U.S. Army Field Band, and is the possessor of a rich baritone voice, well known to millions of concert goers in all 48 States as well as Mexico, Canada, the United Kingdom, and Europe. A native of Malden, Mass., his musical career began as a violin prodigy.

The Army Field Band has criss-crossed the United States each year for the past decade. Concerts have been given in small communities as well as in major cities, bringing the world's great music to audiences in areas never before visited by famous bands. On tour more than 6 months each year, the soldier-bandsmen have appeared in all 48 States as well as in Canada and Mexico.

The band has also made three extensive overseas tours, sponsored by the Department of the Army and the State Department, where, official reports indicate, the Army bandsmen made an important contribution to President Eisenhower's people-to-people program to foster better international good will.

Praised by high Government officials as "America's musical ambassadors," the Army musicians went overseas for the first time in the late summer of 1952. Eight countries in Europe and the United Kingdom were on the itinerary. Major concerts in Great Britain were given at the opening of the Edinburgh music festival, in Royal Festival Hall in London and in Shakespeare Memorial Park at Stratford-on-Avon. In Europe the band performed in the concert hall in Amsterdam, the Luxembourg Gardens in Paris, and the Olympic Stadium in Berlin.

Spanish bull rings, French provincial market hall, Riviera seaside parks, and Scandinavian amphitheaters were crowded with audiences totaling an estimated 350,000 during the 12,000-mile good will tour of Europe in the spring and summer of 1957. Traversing the Continent from Oslo to Seville and from Lisbon to Belgrade, "the kings of the highway" played 43 concerts in 12 countries.

It was the first full-strength U.S. service band ever to appear in Yugoslavia, Portugal, Norway, Monaco, and Denmark, and the first to play in Spain since 1929. Highlights of the tour were an audience with Pope Pius XII, a concert at the royal palace for Prince Rainier and Princess Grace of Monaco, and a special performance for the officers and men of Tito's army in Belgrade.

During the spring of 1958, the U.S. Army Field Band made its first tour of Hawaii and the Far East, the first all-airborne trip since it was organized in 1946. The field band played a total of 45 concerts in 41 days.

The 7-week tour opened in Honolulu in May and ended there in mid-June, with 11 concerts presented in the Territory en route to and from the Orient.

During the 27-day tour of Japan, Korea, and Okinawa, the band played in 34 concerts before an estimated total audience of 150,000. In addition, it was reported that upward of 4 million viewed a concert televised nationwide by Station HNK, Tokyo. The next day, in Yokohama, the band received the first standing ovation ever given a visiting musical organization, according to city officials. Following concerts at Camp Zama, the bandsmen were airlifted to Korea.

Nearly 50,000 were entertained by the band at two concerts in Seoul. President Syngman Rhee and Mrs. Rhee as well as Korean Government officials were guests. Performances were also given in Pusan, Inchon, Tongduchon, and Munsan, the last two for U.S. and U.N. troops.

Six concerts in 4 days were played in Okinawa, including performances at the Stillwell Field House and the University of Ryukyus.

Returning to Japan, concerts were presented in Fukuoka, Yawata, Hiroshima, Tokyo, and Nikko. The largest indoor concert crowd of the tour, more than 13,500, attended the Nikko concert and 12,000 had heard an indoor performance in Tokyo the previous day.

The band's repertoire ranges from classical arangements to popular tunes and novelty numbers, including a drum act which has been praised by professional jugglers as well as musicians. Vocal and instrumental solos are part of all performances. Each program is opened and closed with military marches.

The Army Field Band normally travels in a 10-vehicle motor convoy made up of four large buses, four heavy trucks and two sedans, all painted infantry blue. All equipment needed for a concert is carried and the bandsmen can set up and be ready to play within 30 minutes after arrival at a site.

The Army dress uniforms are worn for all major concerts—blue for fall and winter performances and tropical worsted for spring and summer engagements. Music critics have commented on the crisp appearance of the musicians as "befitting the perfection of the performance."

The primary mission of the Army Field Band is to tour, as directed by the Secretary of the Army, and to present free public concerts as the representative band of the Army, both in the United States and abroad. In carrying out its assignment, Major Whiting estimates the band has entertained approximately 10 million persons, including radio and television audiences, in the past decade.

Major Whiting was assigned by the Army to form the band in 1945, and has been commanding officer and conductor continuously since then. Each member is a top-caliber musician, handpicked by Major Whiting personally.

As a result of the band's outstanding performance, he is recognized as one of the most distinguished conductors in the Armed Forces.

Major Whiting studied at the New England Conservatory of Music, in his home city of Boston, and for more than 35 years has been organizing and conducting Army bands.

In 1923 he was appointed a warrant officer bandmaster by the Governor of Massachusetts to organize and conduct the 110th Cavalry Band of the National Guard. The last mounted band in the Army, it was called into Federal service before this country entered World War II. Redesignated the 180th Field Artillery Band, it was en route to the South Pacific theater when Pearl Harbor was attacked.

Under Major Whiting's leadership, the bandsmen served in the lines during the battle of Guadalcanal. He then reorganized units into the American Division Band, and took part in operations on other islands. The major served almost 3 years in the South Pacific, and was awarded the Legion of Merit and the Bronze Star Medal.

In the fall of 1944, the Army assigned him to organize and conduct the first combat infantry band. Composed of musicians, who were also combat infantrymen, it toured the Nation during war-bond drives and was known as "The Million Dollar Band." Musicians from this and other wartime bands formed the nucleus of the U.S. Army ground forces band, organized by the major in 1946. This was redesignated the U.S. Army field band in 1950.

Major Whiting is well known as a versatile composer of both military march music and popular tunes. The excellence of his concert arrangements has won the band a featured spot at a number of national band clinics. In 1956, the band was awarded the Midwest National Band Clinic's bronze plaque for "music which has been an inspiration to soldier and civilian alike."

The conductor is a member of the American Bandmasters' Association and an honorary member of Phi Beta Mu, national music fraternity. He is the second conductor to be named an honorary lifetime leader of the Zembo Temple Shrine band of Washington, D.C. This distinction is shared with John Philip Sousa. The major is also the only U.S. Army Band director to appear as guest conductor of the famous Guarde Republicaine Band of France.

Red China Proves Dulles Was Right

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave obtained, I insert in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Cleveland News on March 8 entitled "Red China Proves Dulles Was Right":

When Red China repudiated its treaty with Tibet, it lost all the good will it had earned among Asian nations and now it stands exposed as an aggressor. It also further jeopardized its chances for admission to the United Nations.

In the Korean, Quemoy, and Indochina military adventures, Peiping put out excuses that sounded plausible to the people of Asia. Even such enlightened a leader as Prime Minister Nehru of India accepted the Communist excuse that the fighting was provoked by the imperialists of the West.

Mr. Nehru probably knew better, but he was committed to a policy of neutralism, which to him meant getting along with the Reds of Russia and China. Year after year, India led the fight to get Red China into the United Nations. But Secretary of State Dulles warned that the Peiping regime could not expect to shoot its way into the U.N.

Now the Communists have not only broken their word to Tibet but have pulled the rug out from under Mr. Nehru, proving that Mr. Dulles was right and India was wrong. By its own actions, Red China has shown itself unworthy of U.N. membership, a fact that must distress Mr. Nehru, for he has been an outspoken defender of men in Peiping and Moscow.

Corrupting a Nation Through Newsstands and Mail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the problems of Congress and the executive department become more acute, more complex with each passing year. Today we are confronted with the growing Communist menace, a domestic economy afflicted with persistent unemployment, the conquest of space, radioactive fallout, and a host of other matters that can never be resolved without the assistance of a most sympathetic Providence. We must have God's help in attacking our Nation's difficulties, but we cannot expect it if we overlook considerations that should be as important to us as they are to Him.

One of our responsibilities is to make the laws needed to uphold the highest moral standards, and a vital step in that direction was made last year with the enactment of legislation designed to curb distribution of obscene literature. Law-enforcement agencies, religious leaders, and social agencies have long ago established that indecent literature is a prime influence in the corruption of adolescent character; that it leads to bestiality, perversion, and narcotic addiction. Even in the absence of professional scrutiny and statistical analysis, however, social consequences of permitting lewd photographs and printed materials to be obtainable by juveniles are apparent enough to alarm the most apathetic citizen. Whether, in fact, objectionable items of this kind are distributed for an audience that is either young or old is disgusting enough to rouse every respectable man and woman to take action against the practice.

The bill which we passed to counteract distribution of obscene literature was recently commended by the Catholic Standard, published in the Archdiocese of Washington, which observed that the "New, tougher mail indecency law is working." The newspaper pointed out that a California man and his wife has each been sentenced to 10 years in prison in the first legal action under the law. The couple was charged with sending obsence material from points in California and Oregon to Idaho. Under the new law they were arrested in California on a warrant issued by the U.S. attorney at Boise, Idaho, who previously could have taken no action against the offenders.

This development is most encouraging, yet we obviously have a long way to go to clean up our mails and newstands. The House has directed its committee to explore the situation as it now exists, and further legislation may be found necessary. The Department of Justice has advised parents and other responsible citizens to get in touch with either the local postmaster or the local FBI agents when suggestive material is found to be entering a locality. Unfortunately, there has been some reluctance on the part of individuals to report such activity, an attitude that has precluded prosecutions similar to the California-Idaho case.

It is my pleasure to report that Johnstown Post 90, Amvets, is intensifying a crusade aimed to cleanup reading material on local newstands. These fighting Americans have no fear of any attempts at retaliation on the part of offenders, and they intend to make reading material safe for youngsters regardless of the tactics of the depraved newstand operators who for personal gain are willing to corrupt their own neighbor's children. I would suggest that anyone who hesitates reporting a violation of the Federal law on obscene literature to the postmaster or to the FBI merely get in touch with Commander Tom Muldoon. You can be sure that you will get the action that is needed.

The Amvets are to be congratulated on this new patriotic activity. Their example, followed in other communities, can go a long way in wiping out one of the most vicious merchandizing abuses to which a nation can be exposed.

Bill To Exempt All Members of the Armed Forces From the Tax on Transportation of Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. BALDWIN, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced in the House of Representatives H.R. 6411 which would exempt all members of the Armed Forces from the tax on transportation of persons. This bill will amend the Internal Revenue Code to remove the discrimination which now exists against the serviceman on furlough who desires to go home by air.

In its present form section 4263(e) of the Internal Revenue Code provides an exemption from the transportation tax for furlough travel by servicemen in uniform provided that the fare paid for such travel is not more than 2.5 cents per mile. This limitation denies servicemen the use of air travel, tax free, since airline fares are higher than 2.5 cents per mile.

There are approximately 1,600,000 servicemen stationed in the United States and the average serviceman is stationed approximately 860 miles from home.. These servicemen made, during 1957, approximately 1,200,000 trips home on official leave, furlough or pass. Of this total only 450,000 of such trips were made by air. In view of the substantial distance that the average serviceman is from home, it is obvious that more servicemen would travel by air to their homes were it not for the fact that if they did so they would have to pay not only the higher fare charged by the airlines, but also the transportation tax as well. It is estimated that the average tax payment on furlough and pass travel amounts to about $8 on the round trip. In view of the limited finances of servicemen this is a serious deterrent to their use of air travel.

Since military furloughs and official leaves are frequently of short duration, to require them to travel only by ground transportation, if they are to receive tax exemption, in many cases prevents them from spending their furloughs at home. This is certainly contrary to the public interest and an unwarranted discrimination against servicemen. Many of the men in military service are away from home for the first time. Certainly everything should be done to enable them to return to their homes and spend their furlough time with their families wherever possible. My bill would accomplish this result. It does not involve a substantial amount of revenue. On the basis of the data released by the Department of Defense and studies conducted by the Air Transport Association the total revenue loss which would result from deleting from section 4263(e) of the Internal Revenue Code the 2.5 cents per mile limitation would be approximately $4 million.

Hon. John Foster Dulles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, the resignation of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles brings to an end the remarkable public career of a man dedicated to the service of his country, who, because of unusual ability and strength

of character, has made an imprint on the pages of our history that will last for all time. His service in the administrations of both political parties is a clear indication of the esteem in which he was held by those in high positions. The citizens of our great Nation will forever be in his debt for his many and positive achievements in our behalf.

What Inflation Will Do to Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, inflation is immoral. Furthermore, it steals from the people who can least afford it; from old people who have small fixed incomes based on careful saving or retirement programs; from widows who are living from fixed annuities or insurance left by their husbands; from students who have little or no income but must pay ever higher costs as they study; from teachers because their proportionate income has fallen way behind during the inflation of the last two decades; it penalizes the thrifty by stealing from the dollars saved. I would like to include the following editorial from the Deseret News, Salt Lake City, April 2, 1959:

WHAT INFLATION WILL DO TO US

The reader who is tired of worrying about the Berlin crisis and the number of Russia's missiles might try thinking a bit about America's economy instead.

Few facts of national life are more sure than that, unless we change our economic thinking and actions, we are heading for certain, very serious trouble.

Nor does there appear any promising hope that the trend will be changed soon. President Eisenhower's Budget Director, Maurice H. Stans, said yesterday he expects the fiscal 1961 budget will be $2 or $3 billion higher than the 1960 budget. And Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT predicted the other day that when Congress gets through with the 1959 budget it will be $13 or $14 billion in the red. That would be the biggest peacetime deficit in the Nation's history.

(Americans toss that word "billion" around pretty loosely these days. But can you actually visualize a billion dollars in comparison with a million? Stack crisp new $1,000 bills up a foot high, we're told, and you have a million dollars. Stack them as high as an 83-story building—12 feet to a story—and you have a billion dollars.)

This road is ruinous. Inflation is an insidious, destructive monster that feeds on many causes. But of all the causes, the one most obvious and that most stimulates other causes is Government's deficit financing. As long as the national debt continues to grow we will not stop inflation, whatever else we may do.

If we do not stop it, America's future is uncertain at best. How is the Nation's economy to survive if:

1. The industrial and business investment dollar shrinks because people lose confidence in insurance programs, bank deposits, Government bonds and other long-term savings programs?

2. The pendulum swings more and more violently between economic recessions and booms, which is inevitable as inflation gathers speed?

3. The loss of economic security by tens of millions of persons because of losses in savings, pension and insurance programs puts more and more pressure on Government to assume the obligation of caring for those millions?

4. America's world markets shrink away because inflation prices us out of them?

We are beginning to see evidence of each of these results of inflation. Perhaps none is more dramatic than the last. American industries, unable to compete on the basis of this country's high costs, are falling over each other in their rush to establish branch plants abroad. The cars manufactured abroad by American-owned plants and then shipped back to America—or into other markets where American cars used to go—is typical of the dramatic change of world markets in many other less-obvious industries.

As this trend continues—as it inevitably will unless we halt inflation—American unemployment will increase. Federal spending will rise further as a result, our balance of payments will get worse and worse, and eventually we will see a pell-mell flight of capital abroad.

What, then, are we to do? Several reforms have been suggested. Restraint by both labor and management in wages and prices has been urged. A sensible farm program ending the steady drain of tax dollars is imperative. Pressure is growing—but is still slight—for a regular, planned reduction of the national debt.

Without question, this is needed. But how are we to accomplish it when we still have a deficit-minded Congress—which represents, by and large, a Nation more concerned with immediate comforts and services than with long-range damage to the economy?

We need a nationwide education program on the dangers of inflation. We need a change in the Employment Act of 1946 stating that protection of the integrity of the dollar is a paramount national concern. We need a balanced budget—or even a surplus budget—in times of peace and prosperity.

Otherwise, America's years as the world's economic leader are numbered.

A Special Tribute to the Idlers and the U.S. Army Band for Their Wonderful Contribution to the Joint Session of Congress, February 12, 1959, Commemorating the 150th Anniversary of Abraham Lincoln's Birth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, since the joint session of Congress on February 12, to commemorate the 150th anniversary of Lincoln's birth, I have heard much praise for the quality of the musical portion of that program which did much to establish the proper mood for this historic occasion.

It is in order, therefore, under leave to extend my remarks, to better acquaint you with the artists who performed on that memorable occasion.

Most of us are familiar with the U.S. Army Band. Units of this outstanding organization appear regularly at functions of this type. Their contribution to the joint session was another one of their fine performances under Maj. Hugh Curry. The choice of selections: "Adoration," "Spirit of Independence," "Man of the Hour," and "All-American Soldier" was most appropriate. I commend them for this wonderful music.

Few of us, however, know much about the choral group, the Idlers, so I would like to make a few facts known about these young men.

The vocal portion of the joint session was presented under the supervision of Bandmaster Donald L. Janse, who led the choral program by the 21-member Idlers, as they are most familiarly known.

They are cadets at the Coast Guard Academy in New London, Conn. Their program, as you know, included a medley of Civil War songs and a special rendition of the Gettysburg Address. Peter M. Thall of New London composed the selection of the Gettysburg Address as it was set to music. He was 11 years of age at the time he began the composition.

As performed, it was not pretentious music; however, the solemnity and character of the text had been respected from its musical conception. The setting began with a short canon, which simply stated in all voices, the opening phrase of "Taps." The rendition of other Civil War songs gave additional meaning to the entire ceremony. The Idlers have also appeared on radio and television shows and plans are being made for their renditions to be broadcast this year over Radio Free-Europe as a contribution to the Lincoln Sesquicentennial. Also, a musical program similar to that presented at the joint session was given on the occasion of the Lincoln Sesquicentennial Sabbath program at the Lincoln Museum—Old Ford's Theater—on Monday, February 15, 1959.

A Tribute to Nantucket on Its 300th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HASTINGS KEITH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, Nantucket Island this year is celebrating its 300th anniversary.

This country needs, as surely as it does the physical might that research and technology continuously furnish us, the moral and spiritual revitalizing that great events in history provide.

The chronicle of Nantucket's past is a series of such events. As this island's Congressman it is my privilege, by way of paying tribute to its patriotic and hardy citizens, to recount here today some of the contributions Nantucket has made to the founding and progress of America. For this purpose may I quote from W. Ripley Nelson, chairman of the island's historic districts commission. I hope that his description of this isle will encourage you to visit Nantucket

and to take part in the festivities there this summer:

Nantucket is renowned as having been the leading whaling port of this country for many years. It had before the Revolutionary War more than 150 vessels in its fleet and in 1760 was producing more oil than all other American whaling ports combined.

It is renowned in history in other ways. Its shipmasters were explorers as well as whalers. In 1791 Capt. Paul Worth was the first to "double" Cape Horn, thus opening the Pacific. Subsequent voyages explored even the most remote parts of the Pacific, charting islands, reefs, and shoals theretofore unknown, taking them to Greenland, the Arctic, the coast of Africa, the Indian Ocean, the Red Sea, and the Japanese coast. Capt. Christopher Burdick of Nantucket is credited with having been the first person to recognize as a continent land now known as the Antarctic Continent.

Timothy Folger, a whaling master, gave to Benjamin Franklin, whose mother was a native-born Nantucketer, data which led to the charting of the course of the gulf stream. "Sunset longitude" was discovered by Owen Spooner in 1745.

Export trade was started in 1745 when a vessel from Nantucket, ladened with whale oil, was sent to England.

During the Revolutionary War some 1,600 Nantucket men were captured, killed, or lost at sea. It is doubtful if any other community of the times sacrificed one-third of its population. In addition its shipping losses were appalling, for at the beginning of the war the island had 150 vessels whereas only two or three old ships remained at the end.

Nevertheless, at the earliest moment after peace had been declared, the ship *Bedford*, under Capt. William Mooers, with 487 butts of oil was dispatched by Nantucket to London. It was the first vessel to fly the U.S. flag in any British port. From that start Nantucket ships carried the American flag to ports throughout the world.

At the outbreak of the War of 1812, Nantucket had rebuilt its whaling and export business and its fleet. The island suffered a repetition of the struggle for existence and the losses of the Revolution. The Nantucket spirit brought quick recovery, and by 1820 the fleet numbered 72 whaling ships, besides brigs, schooners, and sloops, which continued to increase in numers during the following years, known as the golden age of whaling.

The discovery of petroleum ended Nantucket's mighty industry of the sea, the last whaling ship sailing in 1869. But in 1872 Nantucket's reputation and popularity as a summer resort began. Today not only is it a leading resort but one of the most unusual. Its old rambling streets and lanes are still just as they grew, some paved with their original cobblestones. Its hundreds of homes, the majority over 100 years old and many over 200 years old, are not only perfectly preserved but truly livable.

Preservation of its antiquity is assured through the legal control exercised by the Nantucket Historic Districts Commission over the exterior architectural features of all buildings, structures, and signs in an area of over 230 acres in the center of town and a smaller section in the Siasconset area.

In World War I, Nantucket was headquarters for a large and very active Naval Reserve Force. In World War II Nantucket Airport was taken over by the Navy as an operations and training base.

The tercentenary celebration started January 5 and carries through to September 12.

Mr. Speaker, with a year-round population of only 4,000, this island is host during the summer season to more than 120,000 persons. It is my hope that my colleagues in Congress and those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will take time out from their busy schedules to visit Nantucket this summer and to join with citizens of the island in commemoration of this achievement—300 years of service to the Colonies, the Nation, and the world.

Kentucky's No. 1 City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, for the third consecutive year Franklin, Ky., is the recipient of the annual Kentucky Chamber of Commerce award for civic improvement. Presentation of this award is contingent upon two factors: The winning city must have enhanced its desirability as a place in which to live as well as become more attractive to industry and business.

The friendly city is richly deserving of this honor. Its physical accomplishments during the past year include a new junior high school building, the opening of two industrial plants, Potter & Brumfield and Kendall Polyken, the development of five residential subdivisions, and numerous stores.

In addition, the residents of Simpson County has manifested their understanding of community spirit by exceeding the goal of the United Givers Fund by $2,000 and by approving an alltime record budget for the schools.

The various civic clubs, elected officials, chamber of commerce, Franklin Favorite, radio station WFKN, and the Franklin Industrial Board have been instrumental in bringing these accomplishments to pass. These organizations set their course 4 years ago, and they have not deviated from their original goal. And as in all great achievements, the women have proved themselves indispensable. In behalf of the business and professional women's club, Miss Rowena Sullivan, president, accepted the honor and accompanying check for $1,000.

The primary motivation, the incentive which has inspired the residents of Franklin and Simpson County is not so much the desire to improve the financial standing of the county as to enhance its cultural values and make Franklin a more interesting place in which to live. The retention of her young people, especially the well educated, had become a problem of the first magnitude. In the beginning, a small group of men undertook consideration of this dilemma, but reaction to this movement was favorable, and in short time the project was community property.

Franklin, in most respects, is not unlike many other small towns in Kentucky. But her people possess an invaluable and unmeasurable commodity. They have great pride in their community, and their ambition will not tolerate anything else than the very best for Simpson County.

Mr. Speaker, being recognized as the No. 1 city in Kentucky for 3 successive years is an admirable feat. I feel deeply privileged that I am able to represent Simpson County in the Congress of the United States, and I know that her residents will work to continue Franklin's unparalleled successes.

Changes in China Policies Are Imminent and Over Due

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 14, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to ignore that which does exist. Sometimes it takes our great Nation longer than many of us feel is necessary to become aware of a blind spot.

For several years I have felt one such blind spot to be our policy of ignoring the Chinese People's Republic, both as a trading area in nonstrategic items such as now are exchanged with the U.S.S.R., and as a member of the United Nations.

Had that nation of more than 600 million people been in the U.N. it would have been a logical place for United Nations action during the Tibetan incident. Under existing circumstances, the free world watched, deplored, discussed. Tibetans fought, fell, died.

Nationally known columnist, Doris Fleeson feels the resignation of Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs Walter S. Robertson may indicate a change in State Department feeling. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include her column which appeared in the April 10, 1959, edition of the World, of Coos Bay, Oreg.

ROBERTSON'S LEAVING WAS LONG OVERDUE

WASHINGTON.—The impending departure of Assistant Secretary of State Walter S. Robertson, who has been like the boy with his finger in the hole in the dike, steadfast against either a flood or a trickle of change in our attitude toward Communist China, may portend a modicum of change in U.S. China policy.

As Assistant Secretary of Far Eastern Affairs, Robertson has come to personify the granitelike quality of American dealings with both the Formosan and Communist Chinese. Nothing was too good for Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek in his eyes. And there was nothing whatever good about the Chinese on the mainland.

Now suffering from ulcers, Robertson has a compelling reason to leave his job. In fact, however, events have been leaving him in an isolated position, the latest being the severe illness of his longtime patron, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles.

Robertson, in the first years of the Eisenhower administration, was the darling of those right wing Republican Senators who chose to lay the blame for the loss of mainland China to inept, or, as they sometimes charged, treacherous Democratic policies.

This alliance, if nothing else, was enough to lose for Robertson the favor and friendship of the new generation of Senators which moved in so spectacularly in last

November's election. The deepest blow to the effectiveness of his ideas and policies in the Congress was the decision of Senator William F. Knowland, the unfailing champion of his ideas, not to run for the Senate again.

While Robertson has been so signally identified with the Nation's inflexible China policies as to make them appear almost his personal possession, there is no question but that he was reflecting the views of his superior, Secretary Dulles. Dulles on several occasions forestalled earlier resignation attempts by his assistant. There is no such rapport between the new Herter-Dillon team currently operating the State Department and Robertson.

Robertson will be succeeded by his deputy, a career officer, J. Graham Parsons. He is by no means as well known either to Congress or the public and at the outset will carry neither Robertson's weight nor his burden of opposition.

The attention of this country and much of the world is now centered on Europe. Foreign Ministers and military leaders of NATO nations are meeting in Washington now to discuss the threat to peace in Europe and means of meeting it. But the past has proven that when the Soviet Union is stymied in one place, it seeks diversion elsewhere. The trouble over Quemoy and Matsu is quiescent at the moment, but it can be turned off and on like a light.

The Eisenhower administration has often been charged with living from crisis to crisis, devoting attention only to that immediately at hand and ignoring those crisis-prone conditions which might be changed for the better under more peaceful conditions. It is notable that nothing politically or militarily has been done in relationship to the Quemoy and Matsu position in this period of relative quiet in which hopeful changes might be made.

Mrs. Harden Pioneers High Role for Women in Postal Sphere

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent approved by the House, I am including an article that appeared on April 10, 1959, in the Washington Evening Star concerning the appointment of Mrs. Cecil M. Harden, of Indiana, to the position of Special Assistant to the Postmaster General. Mrs. Harden has an outstanding record as a Member of the House of Representatives. Mrs. Harden's experience as a member of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee will contribute greatly in her new assignment. We know she will perform her duties with credit to herself as well as to the Department. The Postmaster General used good judgment in selecting her for this important position.

The article follows:

MRS. HARDEN PIONEERS HIGH ROLE FOR WOMEN IN POSTAL SPHERE

(By Ruth Dean)

Women will have gained another foothold in high Government office with the swearing in today of former Representative Cecil M. Harden of Indiana as special assistant to Postmaster General Arthur Summerfield.

In the 4 o'clock ceremony today, Mrs. Harden will become the first woman to hold such a job in the hitherto all-male higher echelon of the Post Office Department.

Postmaster General Summerfield was to administer the oath. One of the interested witnesses expected is Mrs. Harden's husband, Mr. Frost R. Harden, himself a former postmaster in her home town of Covington, Ind., during the Hoover administration.

The Indiana Republican, who served for 6 of her 10 years in Congress on the Post Office Committee, was appointed last month to the new post which the Civil Service Commission had granted the Post Office Department but which has been vacant for over a year.

ADVISER ON WOMEN

Mrs. Harden will be principal adviser to Mr. Summerfield for the 55,000 women in career positions in the postal service. This includes the 16,000 women who serve as postmasters in the smaller offices throughout the Nation, out of a total of about 37,000 postmasters.

In announcing her appointment last month, Mr. Summerfield pointed out that "for the first time we have recognized the need for a highly capable woman executive who will make certain that adequate facilities and career encouragement are provided for the thousands of women employees in the field as well as acting for me on certain legislative liaison problems."

Hailing her qualifications, he added that "I know of no individual who enjoys more prestige and respect with her colleagues or is more ideally suited for this assignment than Mrs. Harden. Just as women are playing an increasingly important part in private business, so has their role in postal service become more significant."

The new appointee admitted yesterday that it is hoped her job "will offset discrimination by postmasters against hiring women, and that such women as can reasonably be used will be hired at the proper time."

At the same time, Mrs. Harden said she wished to correct "an impression gained by the public that men and women postal personnel were to be hired on an equal ratio."

"There has been no directive to that effect," she declared.

URGES MORE WOMEN CLERKS

Mrs. Harden explained that one of the objectives or her new job would be to implement the suggestion already made by Postmaster General Summerfield to postmasters, to give more consideration to the hiring of women clerks in the larger offices.

Selection is made from eligible registers, one containing the names of men, the other of women, who have taken an examination at a stated time and have made a passing grade, Mrs. Harden explained. The registers are issued by the Civil Service Commission to postmasters on request, she pointed out, but "it was found that in many areas the postmaster simply did not ask for the female register because he felt the work of lifting heavy packages and mail bags was not a woman's work."

"But, with mechanization," Mrs. Harden suggested, "women can be instructed in how to use the machinery now being installed in our larger offices for heavy handling. And I think they can do it more efficiently and with more patience. It has also been proved that women are more willing to do repetitious jobs than men."

Mrs. Harden said she also would seek to carry out another of the Postmaster General's suggestions to postmasters in areas where there is no female register "to encourage women to take the civil service examination and establish a female register."

"I'm always interested in qualified women, chosen and selected for these positions," she emphasized.

At the same time, Mrs. Harden promised she would also seek to remove the cause for another excuse given by postmasters for not hiring women by seeing that adequate facilities for the comfort of women employees are installed in the large postoffice buildings.

FORMER TEACHER

A former schoolteacher, Mrs. Harden began her political career in 1934 as a precinct committee official. By 1944 she had become so well known in party circles in Indiana that she was named Republican national committeewoman from the State.

Her chance to run for Congress came in a Democratic year in 1948 when a fellow Republican, the incumbent Representative Noble J. Johnson, resigned after being renominated in order to accept a judgeship. She defeated a Democrat, Jack J. O'Grady of Terre Haute, and a Prohibitionist, Ernie Beck of Noblesville, to become the Representative from the 6th district. She was defeated in the 1958 election by Democrat FRED WAMPLER.

The Hardens have one son. Dr. Murray Harden of West Lafayette, Ind., and three grandchildren. Although they had hoped he and his family might be here today, they understand why he couldn't come when he wrote them and explained he had just delivered four babies in 3 days.

And how does former postmaster Harden feel about his wife's new job? "He thinks it's a nice honor," she said.

Unity of Purpose in the Coal Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. SLACK, JR.
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, the Members of this House have heard frequent reports during this session regarding the problems of the coal industry, and we have had introduced a number of measures designed to establish a long-range program of coal research in an effort to stabilize this basic industry. The leadership of the coal industry on both the management and labor side has always been characterized by a high degree of realistic and independent thinking, and it is gratifying to note that their sense of realism has again asserted itself to bring about the formation or an organization which will give them a proper vehicle by which they can seek answers to industrywide problems. I refer to the recently formed National Coal Policy Conference created as a joint effort of the coal producers, union leaders, rail carriers and utility users. As a commentary on this new organization I would like to call your attention to the following syndicated column by the noted labor writer Victor Riesel which was published this week in several hundred newspapers:

Where blood once flowed and heads rolled in thin black dust, cabbages now roll in in truckloads, symbolic of man's ability to be decent to man after all.

It's time now to talk of those cabbages and kings, too—namely coal and John L. Lewis. It is time to talk of hunger in what once was bloody Harlan and in the other mine patches where husky men

must sit jobless and weep inwardly while their womenfolk find work.

While bus and trainloads of AFL–CIO demonstrators from the big cities poured in on Washington the other day, gift truckloads of cabbages poured in on mine-laden Harlan County, Ky. The unemployed miners needed food; not demonstrations.

While other labor leaders talked from the podium to the "March On Washington," the mine union chiefs sat around tables talking with the leaders of the coal-carrying railroads, the coal-burning utilities and the coal-digging companies. These men talked of the common good—saving their industry.

Their time to talk aloud and in public will come on April 27. That evening the venerable white-haired giant, whom I have called other things in past years, will stand on the dais amidst the men of industry. And despite his 78 thunderous years, John L. Lewis will be heard from again.

This will be the banquet of the new National Coal Policy Conference. Its director is Joseph E. Moody, head of the Southern Coal Producers Association, the man who did most to turn a gun-filled dynamite-laden, civil-war-torn industry into a vale of peace. There are other models of cooperative labor-management efforts, but this is more model than the rest.

John Lewis and his friends of mining and transport and power know they have a sick industry. But they want no subsidies, no handouts. They want to help themselves. That's why these giants, such men as George Love of the Consolidated Coal Co. and Philip Sporn of the American Electric Power Service Corp., have been conferencing with the United Mine Workers' chiefs.

Where once over 600,000 men hacked at the coal veins, now less than 185,000 go into the pits—and not each day at that.

Those were the days when no president had his morning coffee before reaching for his paper to glean whether he'd have an afternoon coal crisis. Today that industry needs to sell at least another 100 million tons a year to stay alive. In Kentucky alone, land of Old Bloody, there is a surplus of more than 40 million tons.

Yet if Old King Coal totters just a little more, what will happen to the fuel power needed by this Nation to defend itself? If the men of helmet lamps and pickaxes realize they will be working less and less and tell their sons to get the hell out of the mine patches forever, who will dig coal? There is no machine that can do it all either. Just as I have heard John L. growl that you cannot mine coal with bayonets, you cannot mine all coal with automatons

Leaders of the National Coal Policy Conference know that the industry will come into its own in two decades. Then the big atomic energy plants will guzzle the black stuff.

But how to survive through the first 20 years of the spatial age? That is why Lewis and the industry have gathered. They have been ignored by the Government—which has special commissions for natural gas, for atomic energy and for oil, but not for coal.

Dulles and the Triumph of Principle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Chicago Sun-Times of April 16, 1959:

DULLES AND THE TRIUMPH OF PRINCIPLE

The resignation of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles is a cruel blow not only to America but to the entire free world as well. It creates a void that will be difficult to fill, for men of his courage, boldness, resolve, and dedication to the cause of freedom are few and far between.

So great was the Nation's dependence upon his skill and talents that most Americans, President Eisenhower included, were hoping against hope that a miracle would spare him from the ravages of the cancer that struck him down. But the miracle did not occur. Yesterday, with tears welling in his eyes, the President sorrowfully announced the news he had prayed to avoid. Foster Dulles could no longer carry on.

In allied capitals, no less than in America, the news created consternation and a sense of almost insurmountable loss. For while honest men differed with Mr. Dulles honestly, there were none who would not give him his due for his devotion to principle over expediency. In an age when diplomatic triumphs as such are rare indeed, Mr. Dulles, with a singleness of moral purpose, was able to score one triumph of principle after another.

When other foreign ministers and their heads of state were tempted to sacrifice principle to reach an accommodation with the Communist world, it was often Mr. Dulles who pulled them back from such a suicidal course. It was this trait that brought him close to Chancellor Adenauer and to General de Gaulle who, despite personality differences with Mr. Dulles, admired him as a man of honor, which to de Gaulle is the highest human attribute.

Even those who disagreed with Mr. Dulles most had the greatest respect for his steadfastness of purpose. He will remain a highly controversial figure for many years to come, but it is a measure of his stature that when his illness laid him low earlier this year many of his critics were among first to pay tribute to him as an indispensable statesman.

The task of selecting a successor is not an enviable one for Mr. Eisenhower. He would perhaps prefer to name someone who is personally close to him, such as General Alfred Gruenther. But the President's term has less than 2 years to run and it has been pointed out that it probably would take Gruenther that long to familiarize himself with the labyrinth of foreign policy.

Moreover, the responsibility for heading the American delegation to the Geneva foreign ministers' meeting already had fallen on Acting Secretary Christian A. Herter a few hours before the matter of the Dulles resignation was finally resolved. This raises the question whether the President could name anyone other than Herter as Secretary without seriously impairing Herter's effectiveness at Geneva.

Yet, Herter is not a well man. He suffers from crippling arthritis. He might possibly disqualify himself, and thus clear the way for the President to pick someone else without damaging his prestige unduly.

Beyond any doubt—no matter who the choice is—it will have to be someone who will adhere to the basic Dulles policies. It is likewise clear that the President will have to be his own Secretary of State to a greater degree than ever before. This places a doubly heavy burden on him.

In any event, the American people will not forget the personal tragedy of Mr. Dulles. They will ask a merciful providence to spare him the great pain that is all too common to cancer. But they may be sure he will endure his lot with the tremendous inner strength that has sustained him and the Nation in many hours of the gravest crisis.

National Allergy Month

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1959

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a joint resolution authorizing the President to issue a proclamation designating the month beginning August 15 and ending September 15 as National Allergy Month. Its purpose is to urge the people of this Nation to cooperate in the fight for the prevention, treatment, and cure of allergic illness and to invite the communities of the United States to mobilize and extend their health resources to more adequately take care of the growing number of our citizens afflicted with these diseases.

The allergic diseases include both common and rare conditions. Some are so serious as to threaten life, others are no more than annoyances. But, all impair health, happiness, and productivity and many decrease longevity. While most of us are familiar, at least by the name, with bronchial asthma, hay fever, allergic eczema, allergic headaches, abnormal reactions to drugs, and the contact skin eruptions so common in industry, we are less familiar with the diseases of an allergic nature which affect the heart and circulatory system, the blood cells, the gastrointestinal tract, the kidneys, and nervous system. Among the important systemic diseases suspected of having an allergic basis are rheumatic fever, ulcerative colitis, certain types of nephritis, and that group of conditions which are know collectively as the "collagen diseases."

The allergic diseases are a leading cause of acute disease and chronic disability among individuals in every decade of life, but especially among children since the initial symptoms of allergy appear more often in the first two decades of life than at any other time. Allergic diseases are also among the leading causes of death among children.

Long neglected because they do not have the reputation of being killers, the allergic diseases are now recognized as major causes of disability, invalidism, and absenteeism from school, business, and industry. It is conservatively estimated that a minimum of 17 million Americans suffer during their lives from an allergic disease, ranging from annoying hay fever to severe, crippling and often incapacitating asthma. Minor

allergic episodes, such as isolated attacks of poison ivy dermatitis, affect more than half our total population at one time or another.

The two most common distinct allergic diseases are asthma and hay fever. So far as our civilian population is concerned, the U.S. Public Health Service ranks hay fever and asthma third in prevalence among the chronic diseases—following diseases of the heart and circulation and arthritis and rheumatism. Together, asthma and hay fever account for more than 25 million work days lost each year.

ALLERGY IN CHILDREN

The overall incidence of allergies in children is about 14 percent. In a study of 1,225 children, aged 1 to 14 years, chosen at random from a general population, no fewer than 175 children were diagnosed as definitely allergic and 220 as probably allergic. Multiple allergies were found to occur in slightly more than 3 out of 4 allergic children. Three-quarters of the patients with eczema had respiratory allergies and/or asthma.

Food allergy, especially that to cow's milk, causing gastrointestinal symptoms and infantile eczema is the most common type of allergy in early infancy. In children, respiratory allergies are the most troublesome disorders. In this group, food allergy is somewhat replaced by sensitivity to pollens, animal danders and hair, and bacterial infection. Studies show that more than 50 percent of children with eczema develop asthma. More than 40 percent with respiratory allergies eventually develop, bronchial asthma.

Prophylaxis and treatment of major allergies in early childhood may not only prevent asthma and hay fever but also reduce the frequency of recurring upper respiratory infections.

Patients under 20 have a much better prospect of obtaining marked relief from most types of allergy than do older people. Early diagnosis and competent allergic, medical, dermatologic, and sometimes psychiatric management can prevent both the troublesome complications that arise from long-standing allergy and some of the secondary changes that produce recurring disability.

ASTHMA

While asthma may begin at any age, the majority of cases begin in childhood. If neglected, the disease tends to recur and become chronic so that it may lead to serious, disabling pulmonary disease in adult life. Infants with eczema and children with hay fever are apt to develop asthma. The popular belief that the asthmatic child will outgrow his condition is a dangerous one. The asthma is neglected, it tends to persist. Even if it does subside spontaneously, it may leave its victim handicapped physically and psychologically.

Asthma is one of the more frequent causes of referral to pediatric outpatient clinics and children's hospital wards each year. It has been stated that the odds are 8 or 9 to 1 that a child with asthma will grow out of it. Unhappily, without the assistance of early preventive measures, many asthmatic children develop severe complications difficult to treat.

Perhaps the most common complication of asthma is emphysema, or overdistention of the lungs. The lungs become voluminous; they have very little mobility. Oxygenation of the blood is impaired. The patient becomes short of breath on even light exertion and, sometimes even at rest.

There is extra risk for asthmatics from surgical procedures. Medico-actuarial studies consistently show that a great part of the excess mortality among asthmatic persons is due to high death rates from respiratory complications of the disease itself and from pneumonia, heart disease, and tuberculosis. Insurance experiences would indicate that asthmatic victims are relatively less resistent to diseases involving the respiratory system then are non-asthmatics. Insurance studies indicate that the mortality rate for patients with asthma, taken as a group, is appreciably greater than for nonasthmatics and consequently their average length of life is somewhat less. The presence of asthma in an individual is not compatible with a high level of general health and efficiency.

ALLERGY IN INDUSTRY: OCCUPATIONAL ALLERGIES

In our system of free enterprise, the unimpaired health of the worker is essential to the continued growth and expansion of the national productive effort and so, to the Nation's welfare. Our national productive capacity is reduced, not only by the great killing diseases of man, but also by conditions which sap our national vitality through insidious inroads on the health of the worker, be he an executive, a craftsman, or a laborer. The allergic diseases are among the chronic conditions which lead to substandard work performance, excessive absenteeism, and a continuous demand for medical attention.

The allergic diseases reduce longevity. They kill many individuals prematurely and contribute to other deaths by predisposing to heart and lung disease. But their importance lies in the toll they exact from our working population, day by day and year after year. Where allergic conditions arise from occupational exposures, and increasingly frequent situation in this age of chemicals and synthetic products, compensation awards add to the financial losses.

The incidence of allergy among the general population exceeds 10 percent. It is double this in many industries where workers are exposed to allergens by contact or inhalation. At least 20 percent of occupational conditions are allergic, and these are largely conditions which recur again and again.

Industrial progress has intensified the problem of allergy. There is widespread evidence of sensitization to industrial chemical agents, including the constantly increasing number of new compounds used in our modern technology.

Allergic contact skin disease is one of the most common diseases in industry today. It is frequently seen, for example, among workers who handle dyes and dye intermediates, photographic developers, rubber accelerators and antioxidants, soaps, mercury solutions, plants and plant derivatives, insecticides, plastics, and antibiotics.

DRUG SENSITIVITY

Allergic reactions are provoked in sensitive individuals by many of the drugs commonly used in medical treatment, including such well-known drugs as aspirin, quinine, arsenic, the barbiturates, the bromides and iodides, and sulfa drugs. Biological products such as insulin, liver extract, other hormones, and serums, also may produce allergic reactions. The numbers of persons affected year by year is in the thousands. While many such reactions are mild and are terminated by the withdrawal of the drug, others are extremely serious and even fatal.

The problem of drug sensitivity has become increasingly important during recent years since the multiplication of new compounds used in medical treatment has led to a proportionate increase in the number of drug reactions. Among the most common offenders today are the antibiotics.

Allergic reactions to the antibiotics have increased in proportion to the extended use of these agents. Penicillin is particularly apt to produce allergic reactions and, because penicillin is the most commonly used antibiotic, reactions to it have been reported in great numbers. A survey made in 1956 revealed the thousands of reactions to penicillin annually, with deaths numbering in the hundreds.

While the antibiotics have saved thousands of lives and reduced the length and severity of infections in millions of people, allergic reactions are sufficiently frequent and serious as to pose an important medical problem.

THE ALLERGY PROBLEM TODAY

At present, large sums are being expended for research in infantile paralysis, tuberculosis, rheumatism and heart disease, cancer, multiple sclerosis, prematurity and so forth. Allergy affects as many children as do any one of these, yet there is practically no money being expended on its study. The reason for this is that death seldom results from an allergy despite its incapacitating and chronic character.

Despite the amount of disability they cause, the allergic diseases have received relatively little attention in the development of specialized facilities for treatments, in research and in medical education. Even in cities with the best of general hospitals, it is often difficult or impossible for the asthmatic patient of modest means to obtain adequate care. Severe asthma requires the most intensive medical and nursing service, yet may persist far longer than the acute stage of most other diseases. As a result, hospitals treating acute diseases are often reluctant to admit such patients and institutions offering chronic care are poorly equipped to handle them.

The number of allergy patients seen in outpatient clinics of hospitals and in the offices of physicians is sufficiently striking, but even more so is the number of patient visits. Statistics provided

by the United Hospital Fund of New York City reveal that allergy sufferers require on an average three times as many clinic or office visits per year than do those suffering from all other types of illness.

What is being done to help the millions of Americans suffering from allergic diseases? The Allergy Foundation of America, a voluntary health agency established under the sponsorship of the two national professional societies, the American Academy of Allergy and the American College of Allergists, has developed a broad program of public information and education intended to guide the allergic individual in obtaining the best possible medical care. This agency attempts to bring to the public reliable information on the latest scientific knowledge about allergy, and the management and treatment of the allergic diseases.

In order to accelerate efforts in the field of allergy, the foundation complements the expanded program of research and training of the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases by offering opportunities for specialized training for medical students, graduate physicians and research scientists in the form of scholarships, fellowships, and grants.

The Allergy Foundation of America initiated National Allergy Month 2 years ago with the purpose of disseminating as widely as possible information concerning allergy as a growing health problem. For each of the past 2 years the educational campaign conducted during this month has been highly successful and several hundred thousands of informational pamphlets have been distributed to the public in an effort to inform and educate our citizens. The Allergy Foundation of America plans to sponsor a National Allergy Month again this year, August 15–September 15. To this end, the joint resolution which I have today introduced in conjunction with Senator LISTER HILL, will seek to obtain Presidential proclamation urging Americans to support this program through voluntary gifts and services in their communities.

Westinghouse Air Brake Co. Suffered in Every Segment of Business During 1958 Except in Sales to Government—Boss Complains of U.S. Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a good deal of late from businessmen who seem to think that the Government of the United States is in the hands of enemies of the people, wild-eyed so-called spenders whose desire is to compel price inflation and throw the economy into ruin. From these sources, we also hear a great deal about how businessmen must get into politics to save the Nation.

An example of this attitude recently came to my attention in the form of a communication from the president of the Westinghouse Air Brake Co., of Pittsburgh, addressed to employees of that firm. This gentleman, one A. King McCord, explained why the company did less business, hired fewer people, and made less money in 1958 than in 1957.

You must not believe that Mr. McCord had the slightest feeling that anything might have been wrong with his direction of his company's affairs. Indeed not. He seemed convinced, from his letter, that everything was somebody else's fault. It was the fault of the Government—the "spenders," both Federal and State. It was the fault of wage and salaried employees who, he suggested, had somehow gained "arbitrary" increases that were "not compensated for by increased productivity." And it was the fault of the geniuses at the Department of the Treasury. Even in the present administration Mr. McCord of Westinghouse Air Brake Co. is not satisfied; he thinks that our Government's debt management policies are "improper" and that the Humphrey-Anderson long-time "tight money" policy has really been a loose policy designed to provide "cheap money."

There is a bitter irony embedded in the heart of this McCord letter, Mr. Speaker, and I shall call attention to that irony in a moment. But first let me talk about Mr. McCord's general approach.

I do not see the slightest objection to Mr. McCord's suggestion that the citizens employed by his company should interest themselves in public affairs. Indeed, that is their right, and I hope they will feel it is their duty.

We who are in political life could benefit from the participation of more and more Americans in the business of governing the country. I have been under the impression, from history books and the reports of campaign contributions, that businessmen of the status of Mr. McCord have been active in politics for many generations, but if the base can be broadened by getting other Westinghouse Air Brake employees active in public affairs, I think the country will be very much better off. All of us here are responsible to the people, and despite the theories of some, there is not a Member of this House who does not recognize his obligation to the people.

I think it no more than fair, however, to point out that Mr. McCord's idea of practical politics is to issue a set of shrill complaints about what he calls "spending" in general.

He does not say what programs he thinks the Government should abandon. He doesn't say whether he thinks we should cut off our Defense Establishment, or knock out our investment in defense highways, impacted school areas, hospitals, public health, cancer and cardiac research, services for veterans or interest on the public debt. He does not say we should destroy federally financed research that improves the chances of industry for service.

He echoes the gentlemen now in charge of the executive branch of the Government by being against "spending" in general. He adopts the political viewpoint of those whose attitude was repudiated by the people last November and calls for an attack on inflation.

Never once does he suggest, in his communication, that maybe the 6 million people left jobless or only partially employed by the recession are any responsibility of his or of the country's. He does not raise a question about the policies that have discouraged the full economic growth of this Nation in the past 6 years. He simply rails at spending.

Now let us get to the irony, Mr. Speaker. It is the cream of the jest. Mr. McCord acknowledges in his letter to his employees that the only way their company gained last year was in sales to the Government.

Westinghouse Air Brake Co. lost business from the railroads. It lost in every other section of its business, also, except in the one classification of sales to the Government.

I am not going to suggest that if Mr. McCord thinks all Government spending is terrible, it would be patriotic for him to stop bidding on Government contracts. I do suggest that it is peculiar for him to assail the policies decided upon by the elected representatives of the people, to suggest that all his troubles are due to these policies, and brag in the same letter that these policies saved his own company from larger losses in business.

To let the House read the communication to which I refer, I insert the full text of Mr. McCord's letter in the RECORD:

WESTINGHOUSE AIR BRAKE CO.,
Pittsburgh, Pa., March 6, 1959.

To All WABCO People:

The general business recession, experienced in the United States during 1958, adversely affected, in serious degree, employment by the company and profit from operations. We were hit hardest in sales to the railroad industry. Other segments of our business, except Government sales, also suffered, but not to the same degree. Government sales, and employment and earnings resulting therefrom, exceeded our 1957 experience.

Net profit per dollar of sales fell from 5.1 percent in 1957 to 4.3 percent in 1958, and total profit decreased 27.2 percent. Were it not for the diversity of WABCO products and markets and the increase in Government sales, our employment and profit experience in 1958 would have been much worse.

Nothing causes so many economic hardships to employees and business managers, or is more threatening to national security, than boom-and-bust gyrations of the national economy. Why is it not possible for overall general business to operate on a gradually ascending scale, with short leveling-out periods rather than abrupt and severe declines? The answers being given today are many and diverse and, in too many cases, are slanted because of special or selfish interest. We at WABCO have an answer—it's considered old fashioned—but we believe it has the support of most impartial economists.

Our answer is that inflation is the major contributing cause. An inflationary boom has always been followed by a bust—the bigger the boom the bigger the bust. In the process everyone is hurt—not only workers

and stockholders, but all who have savings accounts and those who are living on past savings or depending on insurance or pension payments.

What causes inflation? We think we know; we believe inflation is caused by:

1. Spending by Governments—Federal and State—resulting in unbalanced budgets or taxes so high that they become a contributing inflationary force.

2. Arbitrary increases in wage rates and salaries not compensated for by increased productivity, and,

3. Improper Government debt management and interest rate policies designed to provide so-called cheap money.

If this is so—and we believe it is—what can we do, as individuals associated in a mutual enterprise, to help ourselves, our neighbors and our country?

We can, by our own conduct, in personal budgeting and work standards, improve our lot and set an example for others to follow. We can support people in public life who are not advocates of high spending and high taxes and who do not support a cheap money policy. We can make our influence felt in our social, civic, and fraternal organizations; in our work and business associations, and in our governments. If we, if the people of America, do not do these things—then inflation is the forecast for the future bringing higher prices, higher taxes, and bigger booms and busts.

Those of us charged with managing WABCO's business are going to exert our best efforts to resist inflation. Your help in this approach—your understanding of the economic problems of today—is solicited because we know that by giving this help you will be helping yourself.

Sincerely,

A. KING MCCORD,
President.

United States Fails To Reward Contributors of Vital Ideas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. OLIVER
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, the following article, taken from the New Bedford, Mass., Standard-Times, goes to the very root of our Nation's problems, whether they are in oceanography or any other truly creative field. In the United States, trained scientists and technicians are not sufficiently rewarded for their contributions to our society. Too often they are not given the recognition they so richly deserve. In addition, Government spending is not directed into the most productive channel, that of basic research.

Everyone seems to recognize these facts, but too little is being done to improve our research program. Unless we shake off our apathy, unless we begin to reward creative minds commensurate with the ideas that they produce, our country faces the danger of becoming a second-class power. The United States did not become great by stifling initiative but by encouraging it. Increased spending for oceanographic research is urgently required, but expansion of our present research system is also basic to our national survival.

The article follows:

UNITED STATES FAILS TO REWARD CONTRIBUTORS OF VITAL IDEAS

(Whether it be for war or peace, the oceans of the world probably hold the secret to humanity's future. The nation that unlocks those mysteries first will direct the future course of mankind. One of the world's outstanding ocean-study centers is the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution. There and at other marine-science research centers in the East, The Standard-Times conducted a 2-month study to determine who is ahead. These stories tell the results of that research.)

(By Everett S. Allen)

In West Germany, which lost the biggest war the world has ever known and had to rebuild itself, a full professor earns three times as much as a mechanic. In the United States, generally regarded as a world leader and a land of opportunity, a full professor earns only twice as much as a mechanic.

The German professor is not happy, because before the war he earned six times as much as a mechanic. The American never occupied such a favored status.

This is one way of saying that America has succeeded in becoming a nation in which those who make and sell refrigerators, TV sets or autos make more money than the men whose original basic research made these products possible.

FOUR MILES OF OCEAN STUDY

The 10-year record of U.S. Government expenditures to advance science shows that we have spent $100 billion on production, $20 billion on development (noncreative research), and only $100 million on creative personnel.

All of the money spent by the U.S. Government last year on oceanography amounted roughly to only the cost of 4 miles of highway.

This is because, with few exceptions, top-level Washington has had a tendency to consider oceanography a "little" subject, impractical and not worthy of national interest.

With Russia forging ahead in this field—and in the light of its obvious major importance—a shift in policy at the White House level which would give marine scientists proper support is indicated.

Up to now, the American public has been given an ill-conceived picture of the true scientist, and the American Government has spent most of its money on engineering, instead of research.

SCIENTIST SELLS NOTHING

Listen to the thoughts of an oceanographer on the staff of an eastern university: "A scientist, contrary to public opinion, does not wear a white coat and appear on television to point out smoke from a certain cigarette will mess up a handkerchief.

"The real scientist isn't trying to sell anything. All he asks for is the chance of studying things that interest him. I think it is vital that for engineering advances of any kind, we maintain a backlog of information such as these thinking scientists can provide.

"Universities, which traditionally have 'pushed' science, are losing their basis of support. The purchasing power of endowments is down; enrollments are up. If a university loses money on every student, think how much worse off it's going to be when it has twice as many students.

"To some extent, universities have been subsidized by their own faculties. Without complaint, their faculties have borne the problem of salaries that just never have kept up with the rising price of hamburger.

COST SKYROCKETS

"Meanwhile, science has grown from the kind of thing you carry on in a little space next to your office to something that requires cyclotrons and other substantial equipment. As complexity increases, the size and cost of basic research grows enormously. As a consequence, many universities have given up altogether their support of science.

"Where do you go for support? Philanthropists are scarce; industry probably isn't interested unless what you're doing has some immediate bearing on their own problems—despite the fact that industry is much dependent on the results pure scientists are puting out; their engineers need them.

"Go to the Government? Most Government money is for applied science, not for research; for engineering, not ideas. So, all pure scientific effort has to scramble for funds. Maybe this isn't entirely bad, because you have to justify what you're doing, but science is difficult to do in an atmosphere full of distractions.

RESULTS UNKNOWN

"Besides, in research, you never quite know in what direction you're going; you work on hope, hunches, and things that strike your interest. You need time for undisturbed deliberation rather than being forced into the hurly-burly of battling for existence money, as most of us do.

"Why isn't it possible, in oceanography for example, to get Government support in a continuing way, so we don't have to spend so much on 'progress' reports and seeking new contracts?

"As it is, before you can get any financial support, you almost have to know the answers to begin with, and how can any research be new, if you have to know in advance what results you must come up with?

"Pure science ought to be pure investigation of the nature of the world. As it is in this country now, we have to bend our efforts in the direction of various side issues; otherwise, we won't have a salable product, which will permit us to get a renewal of contract and the necessary funds to go on.

"A scientific result comes not from a committee vote, but is the fruit of patient pioneering by an individual. The present public attitude toward this kind of thing, including much of television's presentation of science, is reprehensible, and inclined to hold scientists in low esteem."

LEARNING IS UNPOPULAR

"Long ago in this country, it became necessary to hide a love of learning if one wanted to run with the gang. Scientists today have no flashy cars. They have trouble getting a loan on a house because they don't have a stable future. What can I tell a brighteyed young man about going into science for a career when he sees the new Cadillac the bricklayer drives and compares it with my modest, 8-year-old sedan?

"How can you sell the excitement and the intellectual value of doing something you like to do in the face of a social philosophy that says such a concept is idiotic?

"You can't make heroes out of these people with whom I work (oceanographers), who take serious risks at wet, dangerous, uncomfortable work for long hours, and for long spells away from home, who forego big salaries, retirement benefits, security, comfortable living—not because they want to advance the human race or for any other great moral reason, but just because they are curious about the world.

"How can you tell anyone who doesn't know or doesn't believe it that an idea is a beautiful thing, just in itself?"

DANGEROUS TIMES

"Congressional studies, sputnik alarms—all of these things may help pure science to get some of the financial help, on a steady, long-range basis, that it needs if this Nation is to stay ahead in ideas—as I think it must.

"We live in dangerous times. To fall behind in sicentific thinking is to jeopardize

all that we have of value, including life and liberty.

"But even more than money, we need to recreate an atmosphere in this country in which men are measured by ideas, rather than the number of autos they own, and in which men are compensated for creative contribution. We need to change our goals from pursuit of money alone to the search for moral and intellectual values.

"If we want Americans to think, and think they must, if we are to survive, we have to stop penalizing economically and socially those who do think—we have to make thinking popular."

What Price Deterrence?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. BOYLE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month Gen. Thomas D. White, Chief of Staff, U.S. Air Force, appeared as the speaker before the Fifth National Military-Industrial Conference held in Chicago, Ill. General White's speech, largely unheralded at the time, has been attracting a great deal of attention. His subject was "What Price Deterrence?" There has been a large amount of discussion about the subject of deterrence—what it is, how to obtain it, what it costs, for example. General White has lucidly and succinctly defined deterrence in a military sense. Furthermore, he has pointed out with a great deal of clarity what is needed to insure that we maintain an adequate deterrent power. General White's Chicago speech is extremely significant. I feel it is one which should be brought to the attention of every thoughtful American citizen. For this reason and with your leave, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

WHAT PRICE DETERRENCE?

General Rawlings, gentlemen, I was very honored to receive your kind invitation to be here today. It is always a pleasure to come home, and I am home when I am back in Illinois. As some of you may know, I spent my boyhood days in Springfield, more years ago than I care to remember.

I particularly value this opportunity to appear before such a distinguished audience and to participate in this important military-industrial conference.

I have chosen as my subject today, "What Price Deterrence?" It seemed to me that this subject would be appropriate in view of the purpose of this year's conference, "The formulation of specific recommendations for action to strengthen the free world position."

Deterrence of the hot war and the conduct of a successful cold war have a significant and vital impact upon one another. In fact, all actions taken by this country today, whether they be diplomatic, military, economic, or political, are interdependent—each one affecting the others to a greater degree than ever before. This also applies to our actions as individuals both at home and abroad. It is true with regard to our newspapers, our periodicals and other methods of communicating the American way. Thus, the recommendations formulated by this conference could well influence military considerations as well as the economic, the political and the diplomatic.

WHAT IS DETERRENCE?

All of us are well aware that deterrence today is an expensive proposition. Further, the increasing aggressiveness of world communism and its great technological achievements can only lead to the conclusion that deterrence will continue to be expensive. What the exact dollar cost will be in the future, is difficult to say. To answer the question proposed in the title of my talk, I propose to define "deterrence" and tell you what I feel is necessary to deter the Soviets militarily. Therein will be the price and—to repeat what I said a moment ago—the price will be high.

Deterrence—in the military sense—if it is to be truly effective, must be based upon three important factors. First, substantial forces, ready and available for immediate action, are needed. We can no longer depend upon time and distance as allies. We must be prepared to meet the threat immediately. Second, we must possess the national will and determination to develop and provide these forces and to use them when required. And third, our forces and our determination must be credible in the eyes of any potential enemy. I might add that if we are to maintain solid alliances with our friends, all these things must also be apparent to our allies.

I would now like to discuss each of these factors in detail. When I use the term "substantial forces," I am talking about forces which have the undeniable ability to destroy the enemy's warmaking capacity and to prevail in case war should occur. Nothing less can be an adequate deterrent. Possession of such forces does not require matching a potential enemy, gun for gun, man for man, ship for ship, aircraft for aircraft or missile for missile. It does require the capability to apply substantial and selective firepower against decisive targets.

Because the Air Force is my particular business, I will dwell primarily on how it fulfills its share of this requirement. However, I would like to point out that the U.S. Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force comprise a defense team of over 2½ million men in uniform. Each service contributes to the team effort in its own way and their combined forces form a well coordinated, power packed military capability. Added to the strength of the U.S. defense team is the significant power of our allies on land, at sea, and in the air. In 1958, these allied forces consisted of 5 million men, 14,000 jet aircraft, and 1,700 combat vessels.

Air Force offensive strength today is available in our strategic bombing force, our tactical fighters and missiles. Initially strategic missiles are being used to augment our bombers. As we learn more about missiles and prove them out as effective dependable weapons we want them to promptly replace a portion of our piloted force. This I feel sure will appeal to the imagination of those aircrews who are training hard and standing by right now to conduct an attack if called upon to do so. Most of the aircraft commanders in the Strategic Air Command, for example, have had the experience of attacking heavily defended targets before. They didn't like it then and I doubt very much if they would like it again.

From what I have just said, you may have deduced that the Air Force is approaching the missile age with enthusiasm tempered by a certain degree of caution. This is true and for good reason. The manned systems we have in the Air Force today are dependable and we know they can do the job. One reason we know they can perform their missions is because they have an emergency system aboard called man. With this emergency system whether it be in a bomber, a fighter, a ship or a tank, equipment failures or design and production deficiencies can oftentimes be compensated for by on the spot human judgment and skill. When automatic features fail, men are there to crank the bomb bay doors open, free the jammed guns or make minor repairs. Unmanned weapon systems present an entirely different problem. They must operate perfectly to be effective—they must be completely reliable. This puts a greater burden of performance upon missile design, development and production processes. The manner in which the men behind the weapon systems—the engineers and the production workers—do their jobs, will have a greater impact upon our combat effectiveness than ever before. I cannot stress this point too strongly—particularly as increasing numbers of ballistic missiles enter our weapons inventory and represent a larger portion of our total combat capability. This is a most vital problem—one which should be understood by every man associated with our weapon systems. Every individual—civilian or military—who has anything to do with our weapon systems must recognize their individual responsibility for the ultimate performance of these systems—and assume a personal pride in their contributions to our national effort.

Assuming superior reliability in our manned systems of the future, the Air Force approach to the problem of mixed forces; i.e., missiles and aircraft, will follow the pattern already set in our choice of weapon systems over the years—mission performance. If missiles can do a job better, they will be used. On the other hand, if manned aircraft can do a better job, they will be employed. From what we can see right now, it appears that we will have to combine the best features of each system to guarantee optimum mission accomplishment. In this way we can capitalize on the strong points of each system, thereby using one to complement and fill in the weak points of the other.

The second factor of deterrence I mentioned was national will and determination. Military strength without public support—that is not backed by strong national will—cannot be fully effective. Today, when time is so critical—and decisions so far reaching—our national determination must never waiver. Just as important, it must not be hidden. Its existence in direct support of national policy must be there for all to see.

And this leads me to the third factor of deterrence, the credibility of our forces and our determination in the eyes of an enemy. The effectiveness of our forces and our determination to use them if necessary are of little value as a deterrent if an enemy does not fear the consequences to him of an aggressive move on his part. He must believe both in our capability and in our will to employ it. There must be no doubt in an enemy's mind that what we have is good, that we can and will use it if necessary, and that if we do use it we will prevail.

Any lesser deterrent capability is to all intents and purposes inadequate. A lesser capability would not, for example, accomodate for limited conflicts getting out of hand due to unforseen developments. It would not allow for mistakes or miscalculations on the part of either opponent. Neither would it prevent the brutal tradeoff of millions of casualties by those who have no regard or concern for the importance of the individual as a human being.

To define effective military deterrence then, I would say it is the capacity to wage war on a scale sufficient to prevail in event of war—backed up by the national will and determination to develop and employ this capacity in support of national policy—with

all of this recognized and believed in by friend and foe alike.

WHAT IS THE PRICE?

Now, as to costs: Like anything else, the price of our deterrent effort depends upon its quantity and quality. To match an opponent gun for gun, aircraft for aircraft or missile for missile could turn out to be a numbers game—it could turn this country into an armed camp—and would eventually undermine our economic foundation and our standard of living. I have no doubt that this country could match any opponent in quantity of materiel—that we could build forces of every conceivable kind and shape to meet every possible situation—if this were what we wanted. However, I am equally convinced that this would not only be unwise but that it is unnecessary. We can provide the deterrence we need at lesser cost, always bearing in mind what the ingredients of deterrence are.

This is how the Air Force is going about its share of this overall task. Over 90 percent of this country's retaliatory effort—the primary general war deterrent—is contained in the Air Force's Strategic Air Command and in its tactical air forces at home and abroad. Over the last 10 years, these forces have been procured, maintained, and trained for slightly over 20 percent of the annual Department of Defense budget. The sum involved has bought and maintained the aircraft and missiles, built the bases and operated the forces which have served and still serve today as the free world's primary deterrent to general war.

Contained within the primary general war deterrent is the Air Force's strength for limited war. Our tactical air forces, worldwide, are dual capability forces, with a particular adaptability to limited conflict. Of the 105 wing force, planned for the end of the current fiscal year, 35 wings will be in the tactical category. These wings and their supporting units comprise over 125 squadrons of various types including tactical fighters and bombers, reconnaissance aircraft, tactical missiles and transport and tanker aircraft. These units can, either from in place overseas bases, or after rapid deployment from domestic bases, engage in limited war without seriously detracting from the backbone of our general war strength. Their high mobility was demonstrated twice during this past year during the Lebanon and Formosan situations. In both instances, tactical aircraft were dispatched from domestic bases and arrived at the scene of the action in a relatively short period of time. In fact, in the Mideast situation, F–100's from Myrtle Beach, S.C., touched down at Adana Air Base, Turkey, after a nonstop flight of less than 13 hours.

The Strategic Air Command also plays a dual role. Although its primary purpose is the deterrence or successful conclusion of general war, it acts as the strong right arm backing up the employment of free world forces in limited conflict. Ground, naval, marine and tactical air forces can move promptly and openly into trouble areas, firm in the knowledge that their developments are covered by the invisible but ever present might of our strategic power.

Another important part of our deterrent posture is the air defense capability backing up our offensive forces—that capability which would provide the warning of incoming attack, protect our own forces and direct the aerospace battle. Approximately 75 percent of the capital outlay for the facilities and equipment currently devoted to the air defense effort of this country has been purchased with funds allocated to the Air Force at a cost of less than 10 percent of the annual Department of Defense budget over the last 10 years. This money has developed and purchased the radars, the communications, the fighter interceptors, the missiles and the control network which comprise the area air defense of this country and enables us to destroy enemy attackers at long distances from their targets on this continent.

From the figures I have given you, you can see about one-third of the Nation's overall defense budget has served to provide the great proportion of this Nation's general war deterrent posture. What the cost will be in the future, however, is difficult to estimate. Rapid technological advances are continually imposing new and expensive requirements. One of them, of course, is the necessity for better warning—that key to the speed of our reaction in case of surprise attack. Although our current warning system against air breathing missiles and aircraft is 90 percent complete, it must be continually improved to keep pace with the ever increasing performance capabilities of the newer air breathing weapons. In addition, the advent of ballistic missiles creates an urgent requirement for the development of an extensive ballistic missile early warning system—construction of which is now underway.

As you well know, however, warning is not the whole answer. Even with an effective missile early warning system we will receive less than 30 minutes' warning of an incoming ballistic missile attack. Thus we must devise other methods of protecting our own forces. A variety of such methods is being developed. In the case of Air Force weapons, for example, we can disperse and are dispersing our offensive forces. This requires the enemy to attack more targets and also has the advantage of providing additional locations from which we can launch our forces more quickly. Dispersal of our strategic bomber force is being expedited. Construction of our strategic missile sites has been programed to emphasize both dispersal and hardening. Hardening—going underground—is particularly adaptable to missile systems. However, in order to attain the earliest possible ICBM operational capability, we are not hardening our first sites. Later sites will be hardened and dispersed and thus much better protected.

In addition to affording better protection to our own forces, dispersal and hardening also have a significant impact upon an opponent's force requirements. Naturally, the accuracy, reliability, and warhead yield of an opponent's weapons all affect his capabilities. But even assuming a high degree of reliability, accuracy and yield, the degree of our target hardening comprises another factor which he must take into consideration. For example, with a given degree of accuracy and warhead yield, where 1 weapon is needed to attain a 90 percent probability of destruction against an unprotected target, approximately 4 weapons are needed to attain the same probability of destruction against targets hardened to 25 pounds per square inch and some 13 weapons are required against targets hardened to 100 pounds per square inch. Thus, our dispersal and hardening of strategic missile sites greatly compounds an enemy's attack problem. Should we be able to incorporate mobility into the system—a measure which is under serious study for the latest generation solid propellant missiles—the enemy's chances of successful attack will be further degraded.

Another course of action available to us is to increase our alert capacity. At this very moment, substantial numbers of our strategic bombers are on a 15 minute alert, that is, they can be off the ground and on their way to their targets within 15 minutes of an initial warning. Naturally, the more weapons and crews we have on alert, the better will be our reaction when warning is received. Additional facilities are now being constructed to increase our current capability.

Whenever enemy ICBM capabilities force us to counter the shorter warning time available, we also have the capacity to maintain a significant portion of our strategic bombers on airborne alert. This type of alert is made possible through employment of air-refueling operations and carefully scheduled and precisely flown flight routes which permit the strike aircraft to be diverted to their targets while in the air. Such forces would be invulnerable to surprise ballistic missile attack and capable of immediate retaliation.

The courses of action I have outlined to you will all cost money—a lot of money. There is, however, one ray of sunshine in an otherwise dark fiscal picture and that is the development and eventual deployment of the Air Force solid propellent intercontinental ballistic missile called the Minuteman. This weapon which we expect to have in an operational configuration in the early 1960's will greatly improve our strategic position. Its adaptability to hardening, the fact it can be left unattended for long periods of time and its fast reaction through remote control firing make it an excellent weapon irrespective of purely economic considerations. On the other hand, this weapon can be procured at cut rate prices as far as ballistic missiles go. Our forecast is one in the hole for a million dollars. This means that one Minuteman, hardened and underground and capable of almost instantaneous reaction will cost $1 million. This is a large sum of money, but in contrast with other ballistic missile systems and in consideration of its very reduced manpower and operating costs, the Minuteman is the cheapest yet.

CONCLUSION

In discussing the price of deterrence today, I have primarily stressed the costs of equipment and facilities. But the price will also be high in human effort and time on the job. Already, thousands of our warning radar and our fighter and bomber crews are on alert around the globe. These men and the men backing them up are putting their jobs and their country above personal convenience. So far, it isn't a shooting war—but these men know that the better they do their job, the less likely it is that there will be a shooting war. The point I want to make is that thousands of men in the military services are, at this very moment, and during every hour of every day throughout the year—on guard, many of them in remote and isolated locations. They are not getting extra pay for their minimum comforts, nor overtime for the long hours—it is part of their job and their duty to their country. If their task are to be meaningful, it occurs to me that our entire Nation must also put forth extra effort comparable to their—effort, comparable to that which built this country.

All of us know, but we sometimes forget that this wonderful country of our is the result of the effort and drive of millions of Americans before us. They succeeded in their struggles against hostile Indians, colonial masters, the elements, famine and disease—problems which, in their time, were as serious as those that we face today. They succeeded because they were determined and willing to exert additional effort to achieve their goals. If we are to continue to survive as a free Nation, this feeling, this philosophy, cannot be allowed to die.

I am confident that with resolute public support the military services can continue to provide the military security required for this Nation's survival as a member of the free world. Strong military power will continue to furnish the answer to the Community military challenge. But military security is only one part of the national task that lies ahead. If we are to overcome the total Communist threat, national determination and effort on all fronts is required. In this way we can guarantee the continuance of the principles for which this Nation stands.

Western Capitals Mourn Loss of Dulles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the tragic loss of the full-time services of former Secretary of State John Foster Dulles has been recognized the world over as one that is well nigh irreparable.

His extraordinary talents, acknowledged wisdom in international affairs, and his intense dedication to the well-being of the United States and of mankind in general cannot easily be duplicated. An inveterate traveler, a gifted statesman, and a man who loves peace above all things, Secretary Dulles' patience was tried constantly in his conferences with the leaders of other countries. Always he maintained a quiet and nobel dignity which contributed much to the stability of the world.

The testimony of world leaders is a tribute to his stature. I feel that the statements from London and Paris and other places should be incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD:

WESTERN CAPITALS MOURN LOSS OF DULLES—MACMILLAN LEADS BRITAIN IN TRIBUTE—NATO OFFICIALS FEAR EFFECT OF RESIGNATION ON COMING CONFERENCE WITH SOVIET

[From the New York Times, Apr. 16, 1959]

LONDON, April 15.—Britain's leaders, past and present, paid warm tribute today, to John Foster Dulles' contributions to Western leadership. They mourned his loss at a critical juncture in Western affairs.

Mr. Dulles often opposed British policy, notably over the Suez adventure in 1956. But praise for him was general and unstinted.

When Sir Anthony Eden resigned as Prime Minister in January 1957 Mr. Dulles' hostility was considered a major cause. Today Sir Anthony said:

"I have followed the course of Mr. Dulles' illness with the deepest sympathy and greatly admire his brave fight for health. The world will deplore the cause of his resignation and his friends regret the loss of his knowledge and counsel at a critical time."

MACMILLAN STATES REGRET

A statement issued on behalf of Prime Minister Harold Macmillan said:

"This is, indeed, sad news. President Eisenhower once referred to Mr. Dulles as a dedicated man. From my long experience of him I know how true this is."

Foreign Secretary Selwyn Lloyd said he profoundly regretted Mr. Dulles' retirement.

"Mr. Dulles brought to his office brilliant intellectual gifts, a high sense of duty and tremendous physical endurance," Mr. Lloyd said. "He has been a close friend and colleague. His retirement is a heavy loss to the West."

At the Foreign Office officials said that Mr. Dulles would be missed most during the coming weeks, when the Western Powers are alining their policy approaches for the Foreign Ministers' talks with the Soviet Union at Geneva, May 11.

British diplomats said that on Mr. Dulles' last visit to London during the first week of February they got the impression that the Secretary of State was moving toward a new appraisal of the Soviet Union not far different from that formed by the Prime Minister after his Moscow visit.

They believe that in the preparation of the Western position and in its negotiation with the Soviet Union, Mr. Dulles would have been far more flexible than he had been in the past. Moreover, it was pointed out, the Secretary of State's prestige would have won over Chancellor Konrad Adenauer of Germany and President Charles de Gaulle of France to a more flexible Western position.

Hugh Gaitskell, leader of the labor party, said that although most of the Socialist leaders disagreed with Mr. Dulles from time to time they admired his "profound knowledge of world affairs, his superb intellect, his unflagging courage and, above all, his great strength of purpose."

His resignation was a "most serious loss to the West," Mr. Gaitskell declared.

The British press, which on many occasions has been less than kind to Mr. Dulles paid warm tribute to him in editorials that will appear tomorrow.

DE GAULLE SENDS MESSAGE

PARIS, April 15.—The decision of Secretary Dulles to resign produced expressions of regret and tributes to his courage, tenacity, and lucidity here today, even from Frenchmen who often found themselves at odds with some aspects of his policies.

President de Gaulle learned of the news during a meeting of the Cabinet and immediately thereafter sent a private, personal message to Mr. Dulles.

Foreign Minister Maurice Couve de Murville, echoing less formal declarations by others in government, declared:

"The departure of Mr. Dulles is, for the Western World, a loss which will be, in present circumstances, felt in a special way."

Premier Michel Debré, often in the past a fiery critic of U.S. foreign policy epitomized by Dulles, and President de Gaulle, who has had occasion to test and admire the Secretary's strength of character while vehemently disputing some of his opinions, both expressed in the Cabinet meeting their regrets at his departure.

These regrets were all the more lively here for the fact that in the current Western debate over tactics for dealing with the Soviet Union, Mr. Dulles is regarded as a symbol of the firm line approved by France and West Germany.

Both French and North Atlantic Treaty Organizations officials agreed that the main lines of U.S. foreign policy would remain unchanged with departure of Mr. Dulles, however deeply he was identified with those policies. But there was regret that Mr. Dulles' skill as a negotiator would be missing in the tense period of negotiations about to begin.

"It is with great emotion and much regret that France receives news that Mr. John Foster Dulles has found himself forced to give up the duties of Secretary of State of the United States that he has carried on for more than 6 years with so much competence and energy," M. Couve de Murville said late today.

The news was received in Paris too late for the final editions of most afternoon newspapers. Only the mass circulation France Soir carried a headline "Dulles Has Resigned" across five columns and printed the major portions of news agency dispatches in boldface type on its front page.

LOSS TO WEST GERMANY

BONN, GERMANY, April 15.—The retirement of Secretary Dulles was a great loss to the German people, a Government spokesman said tonight.

"It is above all the Federal Republic which looks back upon many years of cooperation with Secretary Dulles, years full of understanding and confidence," the spokesman said.

Chancellor Adenauer, who is on vacation in northern Italy, was immediately notified by telephone. Official sources said he had held out little hope that Mr. Dulles, his close friend, would be able to return to the State Department.

Realization of this prospect is believed to have weighed in Dr. Adenauer's decision to abandon the chancellorship.

A spokesman of the opposition Social Democratic Party said that even though the party disagreed with Mr. Dulles' policies it recognized in his resignation "a personal tragedy."

Heinrich Krone, leader of the Christian Democratic Parliamentary faction, said successful maintenance of the interests of the free world had rested in significant measure on close association between Dr. Adenauer and Mr. Dulles.

In Berlin a spokesman said the West Berlin Government was convinced the resignation would mean no change in the attitude of the United States on Berlin.

In government quarters here there were words of confidence that Acting Secretary of State Christian A. Herter would carry on the close and trustful association between Bonn and Washington. Officials carefully avoided any expression of opinion whether they would welcome the appointment of Mr. Herter as Secretary.

France's Prospects With General de Gaulle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an objective and interpretive article in relation to the new France under the able leadership of General de Gaulle. The article has been written by Prof. Nicolas de Rochefort, of the department of political science, American University, Washington, D.C. It appeared in the spring issue, 1959, of World Affairs magazine:

FRANCE'S PROSPECTS WITH GENERAL DE GAULLE

(By Nicolas de Rochefort)

Throughout the long and dramatic history of France its political aspirations oscillated between two main, although often contradictory, goals: freedom and progress on one hand, stability and security on the other. For many centuries, the instability of the internal situation, which caused the nation to welcome and support the slow rise of a strong central power, assuring internal security and order and defending expanding frontiers, culminated in the absolutism of Louis XIV.

The great Revolution of 1789 exploded the long-restrained aspirations for freedom, but when its excesses endangered internal and external security, the sobered-up and fearful nation readily accepted Napoleon.

The violent social agitation which arose in the wake of the revolution of 1848 caused a frightened people formally to accept by a plebiscite Louis-Napoleon Bonaparte, first as President, then as Emperor of the French, thus submitting again to an authoritarian regime. The downfall of the second empire

at a time when it was developing a liberal evolution was due to its inability to live up to its very raison d'être, national security. After Sedan, the empire made no sense.

In 1914, as in 1870, the regime collapsed on the battlefield, held responsible, quite unreasonably, by public opinion for the defeat. Again the nation accepted, indeed welcomed, an authoritarian regime in whose hands the disintegrating institutions of the Republic suicidally abdicated the powers entrusted to them. That was Pétain.

Economic instability and the Parliament's impotency in the 1930's accounted for the growth of various rightist movements, whose agitation culminated in the riots of February 6, 1934. The Republic survived, but only in the indifference and contempt of many.

The Fourth Republic, envisaged by its initial planners in the resistance as a renovation of the nation, was molded in the old, loose forms of the Third. It rapidly displayed the same invertebrate impotence. The military setback and loss of Indochina in 1954, and the loss of the North African Protectorates drastically increased the feeling of insecurity which was developing at the sight of functional disorder of the institutions. The bloody and inclusive struggle in Algeria brought this feeling to a quasi-hysterical pitch.

Once again the nation veered to the right; that is, to authority even at the expense of some freedom. It would be senseless to reduce the significance of the May 1958 events to the size of an attempted putsch. The operation would not have been launched. It certainly would not have verged on success had it not contained an appeal to the masses and found a favorable climate in the nation.

As always in such cases, the craving for a strong protective government materialized in a call for an outstanding leader. This time it was the hero of the liberation, Gen. Charles de Gaulle.

The National Movement had already achieved partial success. A rebel, rightist, quasi-government was shaping in Algeria and was receiving pledges of allegiance from various parts of the metropolitan territory. If General de Gaulle had accepted the role planned for him by the plotters, France now would be under a dictatorship, possibly complicated by civil war. By refusing to come to power by a coup d'etat, and by stipulating unequivocally that he would accept power only under the due process of constitutional law, de Gaulle saved the prospects of democracy in France.

It is truly amazing how both the May plotters and France's sincere friends abroad, particularly in the United States, misjudged de Gaulle. The former expected him to become the leader of a coup. The latter at first viewed his acceptance of the Premiership as the establishment of a reactionary dictatorship. The whole past of the man, who said, "No" to the defeat in 1940, vouchsafed for his staunch attachment to republican legality and democratic process.

In his active exile and struggle for liberation De Gaulle repeatedly averred that his aim was not only the restoration of France's sovereignty and independence, but also the reestablishment of the Republic. As head of the Committee of National Liberation in Algiers, soon to evolve into the Provisional Government of the French Republic, he hastened to re-create such forms of democratic institutions as were possible under the circumstances. Thus, the Consultative Assembly, a quasi-parliament, was established.

On the provisional government's transfer to Paris, when De Gaulle's prestige and power would have permitted him to exercise dictatorial authority for as long as he wished he prompted the elections to the constituent Assembly. Although an outspoken partisan for a restoration of the Third Republic, with its constitution dating back to 1875, he let the nation choose freely between this solution and a new democratic regime. France preferred a supposedly new constitution.

After the elections, De Gaulle, now vested with executive power by a unanimous vote of the constituent Assembly, could have again forced his will on both that body and the nation. Instead, he resigned from office and returned to private life when he found himself in disagreement with the majority of the Assembly.

In refusing in May 1958, to assume the leadership of the rebellion, and thus thwarting the coup d'etat in embryo, he remained entirely consistent with his ideals and his past. The "Committee of Public Salvation" (which is a more correct translation than "Safety" for "Comité de Salut Public") made another momentous blunder in counting on de Gaulle to carry out their program when he assumed a legally proffered power. It was unrealistic for the Committee to revert unconditionally to a policy of domination in Algeria, which was considered as an integrated part of the State, and to deny any personality to this territory and its Arab population. In clamoring for "De Gaulle to power," they evidently expected him to endorse and follow these reactionary policies.

However, the liberal views of De Gaulle on colonial problems, in general, and on Algeria, in particular, were well known from his historymaking speeches in Constantine, Algeria, and Brazzaville, West Africa, in 1944. At that time he was hated in Algeria and was denounced as little less than a traitor by some of the very die-hards, like Alain de Serrigny, who launched or joined the Algerian Committee of Public Salvation and called for De Gaulle to seize power. The reorganization of the French oversea possessions to bring about an articulate association of autonomous states, which started under De Gaulle's direct inspiration and prompting, was bound to disappoint the diehards.

What is the balance sheet of De Gaulle's administration at this writing, now that he has been swept into the presidency by popular enthusiasm?

The constitution, which he proposed and which was adopted by an unprecedented majority, drastically limits the actual power of the legislative. It was the evils of legislative omnipotence which were the very cause of the near-collapse of democracy in France and which had brought the nation to the brink of political chaos. The reaction led to the strengthening of the executive in the new constitution, which was both understandable and urgently needed. Quite conceivably, there are potential dangers in the strength of the executive, but it is essential to end the abuses of an ataxic, yet all-powerful legislature.

Liberal terms of association were offered to and accepted by the oversea territories, with the single exception of Guinea, which took advantage of the offered right to secession. The main problem, Algeria, remains unsolved. However, sincere efforts are being made to bring about a solution in a manner which would have been inacceptable to the French under any other government.

The National Assembly election results are but a mixed blessing for De Gaulle. However, they had the positive effect of pulverizing the Communist Party which will be represented by a mere handful of Deputies. But contrary to De Gaulle's candidly expressed wishes, the constructive moderate Left was also trounced. The Executive might find that "la mariée est trop belle" (the bride is too beautiful) as happened to the restored Bourbon Monarchy in 1815 with its Chambre Introuvable and its majority of ultras, who were "more royalist than the King." Brandishing De Gaulle's banner, a Rightist majority was swept into the National Assembly, so strongly rightist that concern is expressed here and there lest De Gaulle be forced to withdraw from his own liberal position.

For the voters, pledges of fidelity to De Gaulle by the candidates meant and counted for more than platforms and programs. This, together with the provisions of the new constitution, such as the right of dissolution giving an upper hand to the Executive over an excessively recalcitrant legislature, will supply De Gaulle with both psychological and technical means for curbing the ultras. There is no doubt that he will permit any rightist extremism now, since he refused its patronage in May. Even later he put an end to their activities by vigorously recalling the army to its duties of servant to the civil authorities. Another indication was the decisive manner in which he ended the rabble-rousing Algerian Committee of Public Salvation. General de Gaulle is in a position to exercise a moderating influence on the legislature. This writer believes that he will do so.

Prospects of liberalism and moderation under De Gaulle offer the hoped-for chance of the French nation. Previously, when France searched for stability and security, it inevitably conjured ruthless, ambitious leaders whose character and philosophies excluded any notions of such principles of freedom, popular will, and democracy.

This time a unique historic conjuncture was made available to France at a time of dismay and quest. De Gaulle, endowed with the necessary strength of character and dedication to the mission entrusted to him, is inspired by liberal principles. Instead of leading the nation on the road to dictatorship, he will endeavor to preserve its democratic institutions and structure—possibly even despite itself.

Beyond the present accomplishments, which are still in projection and can be but speculated upon, there is a striking, hopeful psychological phenomenon brought about by De Gaulle's reappearance at the helm of state. This phenomenon is unity in confidence. Men, who yesterday refused any strength and stability to the executive, lest it open the door to some Bonaparte-like adventure, now accept a constitutionally strong executive, because they trust De Gaulle.

Moreover, men who branded as traitors statesmen who attempted the slightest liberal gesture toward Algeria, not to mention an emancipation of oversea territories, confidently followed De Gaulle when he proposed his revolutionary reform of the French Union. A Guy Mollet or a Pflimlin proposing this would have been stoned on the steps of the Palais Bourbon. The phenomenon, which made a broad national reconciliation possible, is faith—faith in a man who so well expresses the will for survival and the ideals of the nation.

In the field of international relations, De Gaulle is still probing his way. However, his fidelity to the West to which, spiritually and politically, he belongs, should not be questioned. This includes continued French participation in NATO. The first cautious probes launched by De Gaulle's government in this direction seem to indicate that he will seek more active participation in the deliberations of this body. This may produce headaches in the future and the United States may well have to exercise forbearance and restraint in dealing with De Gaulle's France.

However, is it not better to have to deal with a somewhat demanding and temperamental, yet reliable associate on whose word one can depend, than with one who reverses himself every few months or one who would be constitutionally unable to live up to his assumed obligations?

Fears have also been expressed that De Gaulle's war and resistance record might bias his attitude toward Germany and cause him to drift away from the French-German rapprochement developed by the

Fourth Republic. The two Adenauer-De Gaulle encounters and their results, whether in the economic field or on the weighty problem of West Berlin, should by now dissipate these fears.

The first moves of De Gaulle's cabinet, notably the consultation with several European governments which his Minister of Foreign Affairs undertook almost immediately upon his assumption of Premiership, would seem to indicate that this former professor of history at St. Cyr is inclined to resume the traditional policies of France; uniting and coordinating the international action of the so-called secondary powers in which France often was, and more often tried to be, the champion or spokesman. Circumstances are different. France no longer is the dominating power in Europe it was under Louis XIII of Louis XVIII; nor is she in a position to aspire to domination. Indeed, with Germany, her traditional rival, she comes close to being a secondary power herself on the new world scale. Her claim for European leadership can no longer be but a claim for spokesmanship or, at best, a role of coordinator. She can be neither tempted to seek supremacy nor even be suspected of it. This may facilitate De Gaulle's quest, and if he succeeds, he will sublimate France's role.

That the new conditions of the European situation are realistically appraised and well understood by De Gaulle's government is exemplified by its concern for achieving close cooperation with Germany. This cooperation, if it develops, will assure an era of stability and through this cooperation the unification of Europe may be achieved. Far from dimming this prospect, the restoration of France's self-confidence and self-respect with De Gaulle as her leader will remove the inferiority complex which would make the European unification policy of France hesitant and half-hearted in the future as it frequently was in the recent past.

A small picturesque detail may be significant in this respect. The French Postal Administration is circulating a stamp which displays a name new in its official use: "Europe." Thus for the first time, on French initiative, "Europe" becomes more than a geographic expression.

The sense of Western solidarity, facilitating the concept of a unified Europe and transcending it throughout the free world of Western civilization, is sharpened in De Gaulle by his stanch Catholicism, backbone of that civilization. Not by accident, for the first time in over a century, in addressing the official congratulations of the French Government to the newly elected Pope John XXIII, Charles de Gaulle assured the Sovereign Pontiff of "his filial respect."

Hiring the Handicapped in Our Town

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, each year the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped conducts a national essay contest among 11th and 12th grade students. It is a contest which has attracted wide attention. For 11 consecutive years this has been the only Government-sponsored essay contest approved by the National Association of Secondary-School Principals and the National Catholic Education Association. Any 11th or 12th grade student in public, private or parochial high school in any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia is eligible, including those students at an equivalent educational level in public or private institutions, that is, handicapped students taking separate training. The prizes are personally awarded by the President of the United States. This year, Miss Barbara Joan Zimmer of Glen Ridge, N.J., placed first in the national essay contest. Miss Zimmer is to be congratulated on having won this outstanding honor. This is a coveted and much sought after prize and as such a great distinction for Barbara Joan Zimmer—for among the many fine essays submitted in this national contest, hers has been adjudged the best of the lot. We, of the 10th Congressional District, and the people of the State of New Jersey, her schoolteachers, her classmates, her family and her friends, are proud of Miss Zimmer's achievement, and the plaudits and prizes she has won for herself are richly deserved as anyone reading her essay on "Hiring the Handicapped in Our Town" will readily recognize.

Miss Zimmer's moving and eloquent essay written in vivid story fashion dramatizes the need for a full and sympathetic understanding of the problems of the handicapped and their ability to fulfill job opportunities if given a chance. The story Miss Zimmer tells is not a unique one, except that it is uniquely told and so capably portrayed. That someone of Miss Zimmer's young age has been so capable of understanding human values is a great and significant lesson. But let Miss Zimmer tell her story, Mr. Speaker, in the following, her prize-winning essay, "Hiring the Handicapped in Our Town":

HIRING THE HANDICAPPED IN OUR TOWN

Mr. Robert Howell, of the Howell Machine Corp., wearily pushed his buzzer. "Who's next, Margaret?" he asked?

"A Mr. Sherman."

"Steve Sherman? Send him in." Howell rose to greet his visitor.

"Hello, Steve."

"How are you, Bob? How's business?"

"I'm fine, but business isn't good. It's getting harder to find workers in our town. After we train them they find other jobs. This is the beginning of a new year, and here we are with 10 vacancies. A big firm offered jobs out West and off they went. Ten of them. We can't fill our orders."

"Well, what are you doing here, Steve? I heard that you were helping a charity group or something like that. I hope you don't want a contribution. With things as they are, I can't give a penny."

"That's what I'm doing, Bob. But, the people I represent don't want charity. They want a chance to work, not a handout."

"What do you mean, 'a chance to work'? Anybody who wants a job can get one here."

"Bob, these people are from our town. They tried to get jobs, but no one will hire them."

"Look, I'll take anyone. Who are these people?"

"These willing workers are handicapped," explained Mr. Sherman. "That's why they can't get jobs. I'm a member of the Employ the Handicapped Committee."

"Now just a minute," growled Howell, "I'm not putting unfit workers in my factory. Our insurance rates are high enough now because of our type of work. We can't afford inefficient workers."

"That's where you're wrong, Bob. Insurance rates don't increase because you hire a handicapped worker. The rates depend on the type of business, the hazards, and your safety record.

"I know your next question. They can work as fast as your other workers. They would have to learn to operate your machines, but statistics show that impaired workers, as a group, produce a slightly higher pace than unimpaired workers on the same job."

Steve Sherman took pamphlets from his pockets. "I don't have time to describe all the information in these but I can prove that your company will profit by hiring the handicapped of our town. Look at these figures, 'Days lost per 100 scheduled working days, 3.8 for impaired workers, 3.4 for unimpaired workers.' Not enough difference to matter. 'Disabling injuries per million exposure-hours, 8.9 for impaired to 9.5 for unimpaired.'[1] That difference is in your favor.

"Bob, if you're still not convinced, let's take a few minutes to go into your factory. I'll show you where you could put our handicapped to work."

Mr. Howell reluctantly entered the factory with Mr. Sherman. Walking along a row of machines Mr. Sherman stopped before one which was punching out small computer parts. "Look, this operator is using only one arm and one leg. Why not hire a man who has only one arm and one leg?"

"All right," Howell replied, "but that's only one case. Here, what about this one?" The machine he pointed to was more intricate.

"I'll admit that a man with one arm couldn't work there, but not all handicapped persons are amputees. Some are deaf, blind, have arrested tuberculosis, or heart disease. There's a man with heart trouble who lives just a few blocks from you; he could do a good job on this machine. There is a man attending your church who is having a hard time finding a job. His back is deformed, but he can work sitting down. He could do that job over there. Look. Those workers sorting tabulator keys, they're all sitting down."

Bob Howell laughed. He now saw that his business could be helped by hiring the town's handicapped. To himself he said, "Just think, I thought there were no workers available."

Then he thought of something else. "You know, Steve, a disabled veteran named Paulson lives down the street from me. My little daughter said the family is having a hard time because the father can't find a real job. The Paulson girl told me her father is doing typing at home. One of my typists is leaving to get married. I'll bet Paulson could take her place."

"That's the spirit, Bob. Let's figure out how many workers you need."

They finally decided on eight workers, six men and two women. Before Sherman left, he said, "This will mean a lot to your new employees. The human factor is what counts. They will do a good job because they'll appreciate the chance you gave them."

Many changes were soon made in the Howell Corp. Machines were adjusted so that handicapped workers could control them; a ramp was built for a man who used a wheelchair; a machine part was painted red to warn a veteran with a paralyzed leg that he could be burnt without his realizing it if he leaned against it.

The morale of all employees improved. Old hands showed the new workers easier ways to run the machines. They drove their new friends to work. The wives of some of the men went to visit the others. The com-

[1] Time magazine, "Hiring the Handicapped," April 25, 1955, p. 96.

pany bowling team discovered two near-champions who helped win the community tournament. Strangers became friends by taking part in know-your-fellow-worker parties.

Not everything went along smoothly. One of the men had trouble learning to operate his machine. Parts were rejected again and again. But when he conquered a fear that his handicap had made him unfit for a job, his work improved, and there were no more rejects.

Steve Sherman returned in May. A new secretary was in the outer office, Mr. Paulson, who proudly told that he now supported his family properly. Paulson also told that he is chairman of a company picnic in June. Sherman gladly consented to attend.

A new Mr. Howell ushered Steve into his office.

He happily told Steve how his production rates had increased. "Look at these graphs—production up, injuries down, less quitting, less absenteeism. Oh, I could show you a hundred ways this place has improved."

"Yes, Bob. But there is an important something you cannot graph. Don't you remember what it is?"

"Of course, Steve, the human factor. These people are great. I never thought my old staff wanted to have picnics before, but they're out to show their handicapped friends a good time.

"Steve, you can't know how much this has done for the workers, the factory, and the whole town. News of our good record has spread; almost all the handicapped people in town are either in jobs or are in training for them."

"Bob, I know what this is like. I've seen it before. And, it can happen again—anytime an employer realizes that handicapped workers can work efficiently for his good, their good, and for the good of their town."

Planning for Tomorrow's Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PORTER HARDY, JR.
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, April 11, the Woman's Democratic Club of Norfolk held its annual Jefferson-Jackson Day luncheon. The members and guests of the club were greatly honored by the presence of our charming and able colleague the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN], who addressed the meeting.

Mrs. SULLIVAN's remarks were not only appropriate to the occasion, but extremely timely, interesting, and thought provoking. I commend the reading of them to my colleagues:

SPEECH MADE BY THE HONORABLE LEONOR K. SULLIVAN AT THE JEFFERSON-JACKSON LUNCHEON GIVEN BY THE WOMEN'S DEMOCRATIC CLUB OF NORFOLK, VA., APRIL 11, 1959

I do not guarantee that the talk you are about to hear will be anything unusual or special, although, of course, I will try to make it interesting if I can—but I cannot guarantee it will be special. On the other hand, the circumstances of my speaking here are a bit special, and you might be interested to know what makes them so.

First of all, I make it a standing rule not to accept speaking invitations of this nature so far removed from my own home district in Missouri. It is not that I am opposed to speaking outside of my district—or outside the House of Representatives. I enjoy occasions of this kind, joining with fellow citizens from other sections of the country to celebrate our mutual admiration for the Democratic Party. But the invitations cascade down upon us in such volume that it is impossible to accept them all and thus the better part of wisdom is to attempt as gracefully as possible to regret them all. And, frankly, my working schedule is so heavy that I almost have no choice in the matter.

In the 7 years I have been in the Congress I could probably count on one hand the number of such appearances I have made outside my district at other than Democratic national conventions or regional Democratic affairs, including Missouri.

As to this particular weekend, my being here is special in another way: I just returned to Washington a few days ago after 2 weeks in St. Louis. Naturally, I found my desk piled high with urgent problems—including things I could not have worked on while I was in St. Louis even if they had been mailed to me, and other things which I would have worked on in St. Louis except that they arose after it was too late for my office to get them to me by mail. In other words, even though the congressional recess was by no means a vacation—far from it—I returned to Washington to find as many pending problems there for me as if I had been on vacation. You all know what a vacation does to your work schedule—it ruins it. And in my case I'm having all of the headaches of coming back from a vacation without having had the vacation.

Much of that mass of stuff which was smirking up at me from my heaped-up desk is still there and what I have cleared out and taken care of in these last 3 days has more than been replaced by new crises and problems and assignments and urgent pleas of one kind or another. I represent a problem district, you see. Everyone seems to have problems, and most of them seem to think I have a magic wand to solve them all.

All of this is to say that under normal circumstances I would not normally consider coming down to Norfolk, and under the abnormal circumstances of the moment, with such a deskload of postrecess headaches facing me in Washington, I could not possibly consider coming here.

There are two explanations for the special circumstances of my being here, then. One is the high regard in which all of us in the House of Representatives hold your outstanding Congressman, PORTER HARDY—he is one of the most highly respected and effective Members of the House—and one of the most persuasive, too. And when he made a particular point of urging me to attend your Jefferson-Jackson luncheon, I found it extremely difficult to insist it was impossible for me to come. That was reason No. 1.

The other reason involves an even more illustrious Virginian—yes, even more illustrious than PORTER HARDY. I refer to your Thomas Jefferson, whom you join in honoring today along with the man I think of as the Harry Truman of the 1820's, Andy Jackson. I am sure Andy would be pleased if he were alive today to be likened to Harry Truman of my own State of Missouri in attitude and outlook and fierce devotion to the public good, and I know I couldn't say anything more flattering to Mr. Truman than to tell him I had compared him to his own idol of democracy, Jackson.

But Thomas Jefferson is particularly meaningful to us in St. Louis because, frankly, we owe our existence as Americans to him. Your ancestors here in the East fought for your freedom and they had a lot of help from ancestors of present-day midwesterners fighting alongside them. But, unless Jefferson had shown the kind of imagination and boldness we want and expect in our Chief Executives, there is no telling what flag would be flying today over St. Louis, and the whole vast area west of the Mississippi River.

In our most valuable downtown area bordering the Mississippi in what will be our most spectacular river vista—we in St. Louis, with the cooperation of the National Park Service, are building a dramatic memorial to Thomas Jefferson and to the territorial expansion of the United States accomplished through his Louisiana Purchase. This spectacular river park, overlooking the Father of Waters, near the point where Lewis and Clark began their heroic trek through the wilderness vastness, will be one of the truly impressive scenes of our Nation's many breathtaking views when present plans for the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial are completed in 1964, on the 150th anniversary of United States acquisition of the land. Dominating the park will be a huge stainless-steel arch designed by the world-famous architect Saarinen, symbolizing the role of my city as the entrance way to the west, an arc matching in concept the splendor of an America stretching majestically from sea to sea.

We are understandably proud of this joint Federal-local parks program in St. Louis; we are proud to dedicate it to the memory of one of our greatest of all Americans, your fellow Virginian, Thomas Jefferson. For we, too, also revere him. And I feel that in coming to Norfolk to participate in a good Democratic celebration of Jefferson's 216th birthday 2 days early—I think I'm right in my arithmetic that it's 216 years as of next Sunday when Jefferson was born—in any event, in coming into Virginia to talk Democratic politics to Democratic women I feel I am making an appropriate pilgrimage for a St. Louisan.

These, then, are some of the reasons why I have set aside my usual practice and have accepted your warm invitation to come here today. And, now that I am here, I am glad the circumstances were special enough to get me here. For I am enjoying my visit tremendously.

The reference I made a few moments ago to Jefferson's action in acquiring for the United States the vast territories west of the Mississippi is as good a point of reference as any to contrast the difference between political philosophies as represented by our two great political parties.

I understand that here in this area of Virginia the Republican Party is not unknown—although I am sure it is quite ineffective—but at least you do see an occasional Republican and you do have to contend with Republican arguments and Republican propaganda in your campaigns. Therefore, I know you will agree out of personal experience in politics that there are differences—and major ones—between the parties.

Undoubtedly, Jefferson's courage in committing the infant American Republic to an expenditure of such magnitude as $15 million—in a day when a million meant far, far more than billions mean today—was one of the great political decisions of our entire history. I can think of one or two Republican Presidents who might, in similar circumstances, have made a similar decision—but no Republican President that we have known in our time, certainly. How long can a great political party continue to go along without, at least once in 50 years, coming forward with a single political leader to match the political skill and courage of a Teddy Roosevelt? And poor Teddy, as you recall, finally had to give up on the Republican Party himself and start his own third party nearly a half-century ago. Since his day as Chief Executive, the Republicans have elected a number of Presidents—but not a single one of them has made a single

dramatic decision of such far-reaching significance to America's future and the world's advancement as almost every Democratic President, at some time in his administration, has made at least once.

Going back—not to ancient history, but to the recent past—we have the examples on the one hand of a Truman galvanizing a disorganized and fearful world into a solid stand against Communist expansion which saved first, Greece and Turkey, and then all of free Europe, and served notice that freedom would not be bargained away or surrendered. No political project in all history has been of more significance than the Truman doctrine and the Marshall plan—the latter conceived by your illustrious Virginia soldier-statesman and put into effect by a courageous President from my State.

Think of the Roosevelt years—of the great decisions—bold, dramatic, incomparable in imagination and in effectiveness. Tomorrow it will be 14 years since Franklin Delano Roosevelt laid down his life for his country and for freedom. As long as any of us shall live who remember that day and that era, we will mourn for and revere him—and feel fortunate in our hearts that we had the privilege to be Americans at a time when his inspiring leadership restored our faith in our country, in our economic system, and, most important, in ourselves.

Woodrow Wilson's widow still lives and thus reminds us—in her occasional participation in Washington in ceremonial or social events—of the Democratic Party's saint-like political philosopher of 1913–20, also a Virginian, who breathed new life into Jeffersonian concepts and who dreamed the dream and saw the vision which today guides free nations everywhere in the pursuit of a secure world in which free peoples can live with their conscience and, yet, with each other.

On the other hand, we have had some Republican Presidents, too, in that period since Teddy Roosevelt left office in 1909. We had a Taft, a Harding, a Coolidge, a Hoover, and now Mr. Eisenhower. Except for the sorry choice out of the smoke-filled room of the Republican Convention of 1920, when Harding was selected, these men have all been regarded as conscientious Presidents, if perhaps inept in the demanding role of the Presidency, that is in the role of leading a dynamic Nation to new greatness.

As Republicans, these men regarded themselves as Presidents in the classic Republican mold of conservatives. And that's all right. But they—including Mr. Eisenhower, practiced their conservatism in the role of conservators—that is, to try to hold tight not only to that of the past which is good but to the status quo, to change nothing, to cling to the past no matter how moth eaten, to trod no new paths or pioneer no new concepts in government.

There are times when the American people think they need that kind of President as a sort of breathing spell from dynamic, dramatic, imaginative government. And of course 1952 and 1956 reflected the yearning for calm, for complacency, after the stress and noisy clashing of the political battles of 20 years and the horror of war.

Consequently, for 6 years we have had a don't rock the boat, don't do anything new, don't worry, don't experiment kind of National Government, and we have stagnated. The American people have now had enough of it—and have repeatedly said so—the most dramatic reiteration coming last November in that simply incredible Democratic sweep. And next year, well, the die is cast.

I have mentioned the Louisiana Purchase several times. Let me ask this—and I believe it is a fair question. Can you imagine our present Republican President and his present and former stand-pat advisers having the decision Jefferson made? I can just imagine the discussion which would have gone on in an Eisenhower Cabinet of 1803.

Mr. Benson would have said that we already had all the farmland we needed on this side of the Mississippi, much of it wild and uninhabited. Who could possibly eat the food grown in the new territories? Mr. HUMPHREY would have said it cost too much to buy the millions of acres of land and would cause inflation which would curl everybody's hair. Mrs. Hobby would have said that the whole idea was just socialism—and who could possibly foresee the use of any such vast territories as the Louisiana Purchase? We remember her as the lady who could not foresee the almost hysterical demand for Salk vaccine—although now that we have all of it we need, there are still mothers in this country who expose healthy little children to a crippling future by neglect in getting their children inoculated. This is criminal negligence, and a public whipping would hardly be overly severe punishment for any mother who neglects this important duty of protecting her children against polio.

But I digress—I didn't mean to go off on that tangent. But the original fiasco of vaccine distribution under Mrs. Hobby, plus the criminal negligence of those mothers who do not today take advantage of the present availability of the vaccine make me boil in indignation each time I think of it—and nothing reminds me of it so much as mention of the name of our first Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. A woman in politics should bring to political life the warmth and humanity which are the greatest contribution to political thinking and governmental affairs that women can make.

In any event, to go back to 1803, I think you will agree with me that if the Eisenhower administration had been in office at the time and had been faced with the decision which confronted Thomas Jefferson, there would have been no Louisiana Purchase. This thought might cause you to lose little sleep, but to us in St. Louis, believe me, the idea is quite intolerable.

Seriously, though, the analogy is politically important, I believe. Under Republican administrations, as we have known them in our lifetimes, our country has been led always on a policy of drift—avoiding hard decisions—floating on a tide of circumstances which seem inevitably to have resulted in economic hardship verging 30 years ago on national bankruptcy. Even today, with so many enthusiastic statistics pouring out of the White House and Commerce Department on production, profits of big corporations, declining unemployment, and so on, the fact remains that we are still deep in an unemployment recession, and the outlook for millions of Americans—particularly for middle-aged workers and for those approaching retirement age—is so grim as to be alarming.

Yet Mr. Eisenhower announces he is very happy over a slightly more than seasonal decline in unemployment, while more than 4 million remain on the unemployment list. And we are told that by October, the number of unemployed might even be down to around 3 million. That is put forward as a statistic to cheer. Actually, it is one to fear.

For we are now turning out everything people want and can afford to buy. We are producing in abundance. Which member of the Eisenhower administration was it who commented during the 1954 recession that freedom is also the right not to have a job—you know, take the bad with the good, keep a stiff-upper-lip and so on. This is Republican dogma, as long as it affects somebody else.

No Democratic administration worthy of the political party label would stand by as complacently and idly as this one is doing in the face of a serious national crisis in employment and in purchasing power.

This Congress, believe me, is not going to accept such supercilious complacency from an administration charged with governing for the good of all Americans.

Congress, under our system, cannot administer national affairs. We cannot name any of the Cabinet officials or administrators; we cannot force the President to do much of anything if he refuses to see the need or act on it. We can provide the tools, we can provide the funds. We can point to the need. We can alert the public to the danger. We can even hobble the administration to keep it from doing terribly wrong things—if we hear about them soon enough. But we cannot as a Congress force affirmative action.

But as a people, we can—all of us insisting on action and making our voices heard. And that must be the role of every forward-looking American—particularly all of us who regard ourselves as Democrats—more particularly all of us who pride ourselves on being Democratic women.

Be a Patricia Henry—and demand that our leaders meet our problems head on. Old Patrick called for liberty; you, his descendants, must call for leadership from a weary and unimaginative national administration.

Mr. Eisenhower could easily find good administrators who can do the job if he wants it done. We have plenty of experienced Democrats who served magnificently in the Roosevelt and Truman administrations who could, with Ike's backing, get our economy off dead center—get Norfolk booming again—and St. Louis—and restore America's greatness and promise.

Mr. Eisenhower has only a little over a year-and-a-half to get things back into shape—or at least to get a good start on restoring real prosperity and confidence to the American economy—before the job will no longer be his.

After that, the problem will be ours. Whether it is handled by an Adlai Stevenson, or a Hubert Humphrey, or a Jack Kennedy, or a Pat Brown, or a Missourian I think a whole lot of, named Stuart Symington—or whoever our nominee is next year—I think I can assure you good Democrats of this fact:

The problems he faces will be met forthrightly and courageously—whatever they are. They will be tackled as a challenge to devise effective solutions, not to merely avoid rocking the boat.

The boat has been rocking—violently at times—in these past 6 years, largely because of the reluctance of the helmsman and the rest of the crew to head into the deep waves and plough through them.

What might have been mere swells on our economic sea have done us irreparable harm year after year because our national administration tried more to avoid them than to overcome them.

Let us look our national problems straight in the eye, whatever they are, size them up, analyze them, and overcome them. Only in that direction lies the progress we seek for our country, and for the free world.

Our party has always—since the days Thomas Jefferson conceived of it and gave it meaning—our party has always stood upright and unafraid against any challenge to America's progress. Our leaders have neither panicked in the face of nor hidden from, challenge. It's true that we do a lot of fighting among ourselves, we Democrats, and for what we often consider good cause. But when it comes to facing unafraid the challenge of tomorrow, we unite and close ranks and move ahead full speed into the thickest of the political fray.

Progress can come to America only in proportion to the willingness of our national leaders to stick their necks out for principle. Jefferson was maligned, abused, despised by

the standpatters of his day. Jackson's name was anathema to the same group. Roosevelt was "That man in the White House"—a term spoken with venom and hate. Truman was ridiculed, as no national figure in our time has ever been depreciated and laughed at.

Our next president—whichever Democrat he may be—probably faces similar abuse such as was heaped on the men I have mentioned. That is because he will—whoever he is—if he is a true Democrat, insist on planning for tomorrow's needs rather than yesterday's.

Supported by people like you—by Democrats who want our country to continue to grow and not stagnate—the next president, whichever Democrat he may be out of our abundance of outstanding candidates—will have the opportunity to be a great president.

For that's the only kind we Democrats are used to.

Went to a Mighty Fine Fellow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT E. JONES
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the Decatur Daily, Decatur, Ala., on April 13.

I know this editorial will be applauded by the people of Alabama for there is no one more dedicated to the public good than Mr. Marc Ray Clement. He is deserving of this high award, and both he and the Alabama Medical Association are to be congratulated:

WENT TO A MIGHTY FINE FELLOW

The second annual William Crawford Gorgas award goes to Attorney Marc Ray Clement, of Tuscaloosa, and from personal knowledge we can testify that the award, made annually by the Medical Association of the State of Alabama, went to a mighty fine fellow who has done more as a layman for the general health improvement of Alabamians than any other citizen. Here are just a few of the things done for people and done without any thought on the part of Mr. Clement other than to serve his fellowman:

He served four 1-year terms as chairman of the legislative committee of the Alabama Tuberculosis Association. He undertook this work because of knowledge that hundreds of Alabama people were dying each year for lack of hospitalization and proper medical attention after being admitted to hospital and sanitoria.

Mr. Clements realized that the answer to this problem began with educating our people. He set out to organize Christmas Seal Associations in every Alabama county.

When this work was started, Alabama was authorizing $1.50 per day for tuberculosis patients in our hospitals, but was appropriating only 75 cents a day.

Evidence of success in selling an urgent need is indicated by the fact that in recent years the Alabama State appropriation for maintenance of TB hospital patients has been raised from 75 cents per patient day to $6.25 per patient day.

In addition to many days of travel all over the State in organizing Christmas Seal Associations, Mr. Clement has spent many other days in Montgomery promoting health programs with the legislature.

Mr. Clement became aware that the Mental Health Association was raising each year only about $15,000 and that more than half of this was used in expenses of the campaign. As State fund drive chairman for fiscal year 1954–55, he succeeded in raising $100,000 for the Association. The fund, under the leadership of others, has increased gradually since that time, and it is anticipated that future drives will produce even larger gains for the Association. At the present time he is honorary vice president of the Alabama Mental Health Association.

During the one year in which Mr. Clement was State fund drive chairman, he visited 47 counties in the State and talked to more than 100 different groups in every section of Alabama. All of this was done at his own expense.

Mr. Clement has worked closely with university officials and the State advisory board to the Medical College of Alabama. He is now serving on a steering committee whose duty it is to work out programs, legislative and otherwise.

He is capable, he is thorough, he is dedicated, he may know more key folks in every county in Alabama than any other man. He won't call on anyone for a task in which he won't do 10 times as much. The Gorgas award couldn't have gone to a nicer fellow, a man who we think of as Alabama's No. 1 citizen.

Prayer of Dr. Frederick Brown Harris at Dedication Ceremony of the Taft Memorial Tower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the following prayer of Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, the Chaplain of the U.S. Senate, at the dedication ceremony of the Taft Memorial Tower, on Tuesday, April 14, 1959. It was an inspiration to all of us who loved Robert Taft:

God of our fathers and of their succeeding race, in this National City abounding with monumental symbols of heroic yesterdays, we come to offer thanks for the life and service of one whose name shines in the annals of the Republic among those renowned for their power, leaders of the people who gave counsel by their understanding; who were richly furnished with ability and who were the glory of their times—men who have left a name behind them that their praises may be reported. Their bodies are buried in peace but their names liveth forever more.

O Thou Master of all good workmen, give us we pray in this high hour a sense of history, and of destiny, as we dedicate to its ministry of memory this towering white shaft, so close to the glistening dome of the Capitol, in this city which belongs to every American, that it may henceforth speak to the multitudes of a statesman lofty in character, diligent in the Nation's business, tenacious in his convictions, scornfully heedless of expediency. As from its pinnacle from generation to generation, like bells at evening pealing, dulcet tones chime out the cadences of a patriotism pure and undefiled, may it ever speak of the deep concern for the Republic's welfare of the one who will be here held in sacramental remembrance.

May the sculptured likeness of a valiant servant of the Nation—Robert A. Taft—standing here, within sight of the Senatorial Chamber which he so passionately loved, symbolize to the millions who gaze with understanding upon his form, the qualities and principles which, in any public servant, make for greatness.

We beseech Thee that the America he loved and served may be more and more a Nation which Thou canst bless, and canst make a channel of blessing, for this distraught world, as on this hallowed ground we this day raise an altar dedicated to fidelity, sincerity, integrity, and liberty.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

Cleveland Again Host to International Youth Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, once again the city of Cleveland is proud to be sponsor and host to an exchange group of foreign youth leaders and social workers. Under this year's program 71 young people from 18 countries in Europe, the Middle East, and Latin America will be brought to the United States for 4 months of study, work, and participation in American family life.

First initiated in 1956 the program is conducted under the auspices of the Cleveland International Program for Youth Leaders and Social Workers, Inc., a voluntary citizens' group dedicated to the promotion of international understanding. As in previous years, the people of Cleveland have generously contributed to the cost of the program and volunteered their free hospitality. During their 6 weeks in Cleveland the visitors will attend classes at Western Reserve University, where lectures will be especially designed to provide an insight into the dynamics of American group work.

Believing that the operation of this unique program will be of wide interest, I include a statement from the State Department press release of April 13, 1959, in the RECORD with my remarks:

SEVENTY FOREIGN YOUTH LEADERS AND SOCIAL WORKERS TO BE GUESTS OF CITY OF CLEVELAND UNDER JOINTLY SPONSORED EXCHANGE PROGRAM

For the fourth consecutive year, the citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, are sponsoring a unique international exchange program that will bring a group of foreign youth leaders and social workers to the United States for 4 months of study, work and participation in American family life.

This year's group of 70 participants from 17 countries in Europe and the Middle East is scheduled to arrive in New York City on April 22 to begin their visit under the auspices of the Cleveland International Program for Youth Leaders and Social Workers, Inc., a voluntary citizens' enterprise devoted to the promotion of mutual understanding between the people of the United States and the peoples of other countries.

Through its International Educational Exchange Program, the Department of State is cooperating in the Cleveland program by providing for the international travel for most of the participants as well as tuition for a special 6-week course at Western Reserve University.

The citizens of Cleveland have made financial contributions to support their program and have volunteered free hospitality, room and board for the participants during their stay in Cleveland. The Governments of Germany and Belgium are paying for the round-trip transportation of seven of the participants.

After a 2-day stay in New York City, the visitors will travel to Cleveland to spend 6 weeks attending classes at the School of Applied Social Sciences at Western Reserve University. The lectures will be designed to give the visitors an introduction into the dynamics of American group work with special emphasis on the diversity of cultural factors.

While attending school in Cleveland, each visitor will live in three different private homes. The host families will represent a cross-section of the different social, racial and religious groups of the United States.

After their 6 weeks of study, the youth leaders and social workers will disperse to different cities in the Middle West to work as camp counselors or group workers in social agencies, community centers and children's camps. These assignments are designed to provide the visitors with close personal and professional contacts with American college students, youth leaders, and social workers, and to give them working experiences in group leadership with American children and adults.

At the end of August, the group will be reunited in Washington, D.C., at the invitation of the State Department for 2 days of discussions of their experiences and visits to Federal agencies prior to their return home.

The Cleveland International Program was initiated in 1956 with 25 youth leaders from West Germany. In 1957 the program was enlarged to include 52 youth leaders from 8 European countries, and last year, there were 61 participants from 9 European and 3 Middle Eastern countries. This year, one visitor from Brazil will bring Latin America into the program for the first time.

The American Embassies and the United States Educational Commissions and Foundations in the participating countries cooperated with the Cleveland International Program in the selection and orientation of the grantees.

A Monument to Senator Taft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Peoria Journal Star of April 14, 1959:

A MONUMENT TO SENATOR TAFT

A most unusual event is taking place in Washington today.

A bell tower on the grounds of the Capitol is being dedicated to the memory of the late Senator Robert A. Taft. This is unusual because Senator Taft has been dead less than 6 years. Ordinarily statesmen are not honored with memorials of the type of the Taft tower for many years after passing from the scene.

The location of the memorial also is unusual. There have been only three memorials, besides the Taft tower, on the Capitol lawns and none of them pay honor to a Senator or Representative.

One is the Naval or Tripoli monument; another was a statue of George Washington which is now in the Smithsonian Institution, and the third is a seated statue of Chief Justice John Marshall. Further indicating the unusualness of the Taft tribute is the fact that the Marshall statue weighs 2 tons. The largest of the 27 bells in the 115-foot Taft tower weighs 6½ tons.

It is no wonder, therefore, that some Members of Congress have had reservations about the Taft memorial. Senator GREEN of Rhode Island brought out the fact in 1955, when the memorial was authorized, that the Capitol Grounds could be saturated with monuments if every State were permitted to memorialize its favored sons as has been done in Statuary Hall inside the Capitol.

Despite these reservations, however, no vote was cast against the Taft memorial. The Ohio Senator also recently has been honored by being included among the five outstanding Senators whose portraits were hung in a Senate hall of fame last March 12.

We must recognize that here was an unusual, an outstanding man whose colleagues did not hesitate to set aside precedent to pay him honor. We should have appreciated him more when he still was with us.

Maine Will Be Host to First International Medical Conference on Mental Retardation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK M. COFFIN
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. COFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to a conference of worldwide importance to be held at Portland, Maine, from July 27 through July 31, 1959. The First International Medical Conference on Mental Retardation will take place during those 5 days and I take deep pride in the fact that leaders in the field of medicine and welfare in the State of Maine have initiated, organized and sponsored this significant meeting which is the first of its kind. I believe it is worthy of the widest possible attention.

Although I have no expert knowledge in this field, I am informed that within the last few years various important conclusions have been reached through research and informal observations of retarded children. The primary objective of the conference is to focus attention on problems that can be attacked scientifically. The participants will be eminent physicians from various parts of the United States, Canada, and Europe. The sponsoring committee, recognizing that the challenge surmounts international differences, is attempting also through proper channels to extend invitations to physicians beyond the Iron Curtain.

Those who are interested in this forthcoming conference may request information from the conference secretary, division of maternal and child health, Statehouse, Augusta, Maine. It is being organized by the Maine chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics, Pineland Hospital and Training Center, Pownal, Maine; the division of maternal and child health, State department of health and welfare, and the Maine Medical Association.

Peter W. Bowman, M.D., Pownal, Maine is serving as general chairman of the conference. Edmund N. Ervin, M.D., Waterville, is chairman of the liaison committee. He is assisted by C. E. Benda, M.D., Arlington, Mass.; George Stevenson, M.D., New York, N.Y.; J. Rees, M.D., London, England; P. Plum, M.D., Copenhagen, Denmark; G. Frontali, M.D., Rome, Italy; Richard Maseland, M.D., Bethesda, Md. Ella Langer, M.D., Augusta, Maine, is chairman of arrangements and finance.

The program committee, of which Hans V. Mautner, M.D., Pownal, Maine is chairman, comprises Malcolm J. Farrell, M.D., Boston, Mass.; Howard V. Bair, M.D., Parsons, Kans., and Ella Langer, M.D., Augusta, Maine.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to me, I am inserting in the RECORD an article from the April 11, 1959, issue of Business Week, relating to the St. Lawrence Seaway and the impact its opening will have upon inland cities and towns.

My own 17th District of Ohio, whose citizens never dreamed years ago that the time might come when freighters and passenger steamships from far-off countries might dock virtually at their front door, are extremely interested in the St. Lawrence Seaway and how it will affect them economically and culturally. I believe that this recent article in Business Week is a very thorough account of what the impact of the seaway's opening likely will be on the late region.

The article is as follows:

WHO GAINS, WHO LOSES AS SEAWAY OPENS?

On April 20—unless the ice acts up—the first large ocean-going cargo ships will steam up the St. Lawrence River headed for the ports of the Middle West. The St. Lawrence Seaway, built after long years of wrangling and the spending of vast sums, will have opened up an alternate route linking the markets of the world to the American heartland. The Great Lakes will have become the fourth U.S. seacoast.

It's a stupendous project that's reaching its climax. The 27-foot navigation from Montreal to Lake Erie has cost $471 million, of which Canada spent $340 million. Channels have been widened and deepened, new canals cut, the number of time-consuming locks boosting ships up the 551-foot rise has been reduced to 14 from 25.

In 3 more years, 27-foot navigation will have extended to the head of the lakes.

Army Engineers have been working since 1957 on the $141 million job of deepening the uplake channels.

Smoke clears

Now that the seaway has become a fact, some of the smoke is clearing away from the long battle for and against it. Passionate supporters are beginning to tone down their estimates of the boons it will confer. The railroads, which fought it every step of the way, are preparing to live with it and threatening dire competitive rate cuts. Those other heated foes, the Atlantic and gulf ports, are returning more to the old sport of competing with each other, rather than with the lakes.

Many factors contributed to the crumbling resistance to the seaway, with two of them standing out sharply:

The discovery of iron ore in Quebec and Labrador.

The building by New York and Ontario of a $650-million power project. This provided facilities that would otherwise have had to be built by seaway agencies, at a cost of higher tolls.

Guesses on how heavy the seaway traffic will be are still on the variable side. The old 14-foot St. Lawrence canals carried 13 million tons in smallish ships last year. With the seaway now able to accommodate general cargo carriers with 5 times greater capacity and with bulk cargo carriers that can carry 10 times as much, the sky was the limit on some early estimates. Originally, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation—the U.S. agency for seaway affairs—predicted that 1959 traffic would be 36.5 million tons. More recently, the agency has toned this down to 25 million tons, but many critics still say it is too high. The same critics are even more skeptical of the agency's 1968 projection of 50 million tons for the seaway and 60 million tons for the older, Canadian-owned Welland Canal linking Lakes Erie and Ontario. They claim that Welland would have to double its facilities to handle that much.

Bulk cargo

Whatever the seaway total, it will probably show 85–90 percent of bulk cargo, according to SLSD figures. United States and Canadian grain will provide the biggest share. Hitherto, grain has been shipped down lake to ports at the eastern end for transfer to ocean-going ships or to railroads linked to Atlantic ports. Now, big bulk carriers from Duluth-Superior will be able to go the whole way—though they may be discouraged by the possibility of traveling empty one way.

Iron ore will run a good second to grain, making up perhaps a third of the total. Since the Quebec-Labrador development, carriers have been bringing ore up the St. Lawrence to the steel mills. The rest of the bulk cargo will be a miscellany of coal, coke, petroleum products, nonferrous ores, and pulp.

If you accept the 25-million-ton estimate, that leaves 3 million tons for general cargo. For it, all the ports will be scrambling; it's more valuable than bulk, provides more jobs.

I. WINNERS, BIG AND LITTLE

The U.S. lake ports that will be fighting for the new cargo are no strangers to handling big tonnages. For years they have shipped huge loads to one another—iron ore downbound, coal and limestone both up and down—engaged in general trade with Canadian ports.

It's the overseas trade that will be new—million of tons of it, compared with today's annual total of around 800,000 tons for United States and Canadian ports combined.

The lake ports won't share equally in the new bonanza. Ship operators won't find it worthwhile to stop at every port, what with the $1,500-a-day cost of operating an 8,000-ton vessel. Some ports just haven't gotten ready to handle the new trade, some shippers will be slow to shake off old routine patterns.

Big five

It's generally agreed, though, that five U.S. cities—Chicago, Milwaukee, Detroit, Toledo, and Cleveland—will pick up more foreign trade than their rivals. These five, with Green Bay, already account for 80 percent of the overseas trade to lake ports. The ship lines have already scheduled them as ports of call. Here's a rundown on the prospects of the five and what they have done to get ready:

Chicago seems certain to get the bulk of seaway traffic, thanks to its industry and the vast hinterland it serves with ample rail and truck connections. The port should be heavy on general cargo, both imports and exports, with plenty of bulk cargo in grain and oils.

To welcome the business the regional port district has invested $26 million from revenue bonds at Lake Calumet Harbor, southeast of the city. Two 6.5 million-bushel grain elevators were built, along with four transit sheds and docks. The city itself is investing $4 million in refurbishing the old navy pier north of the Loop.

Milwaukee, mainly a general cargo port with many of the locational advantages of Chicago, has been getting ready for the seaway for years. Just since 1955, it has spent $11 million on a general-cargo pier, a passenger terminal and pier, 20 acres of land fill for later development, and a new highway approach. It plans to buy five more cargo cranes in 5 years.

Detroit has been stymied in setting up public facilities by voter rejection of bond issues, but private handlers say they have excess capacity for general cargo. Chrysler expects a 3–4 percent saving in the seaway; so it plans to use it more for exporting cars and trucks, along with machines and machine tools for its assembly plants abroad.

Toledo, mainly a coal port in the past, is counting on some general cargo to supplement the predominant bulk. The Toledo-Lucas County Port Authority plans a 5-million-bushel elevator for Buffalo's Continental Grain Co., while the Andersons of Toledo this week announced a 10-million-bushel elevator. Cargill, Inc., of Minneapolis has bought land for a second elevator. Industrial Molasses Corp. has broken ground for a $500,000 storage tank project. For general cargo, the port authority plans a new terminal, has already awarded a contract for a transit shed. Toledo Marine Terminals, Inc., is expanding the only existing general cargo terminal.

Toledo hopes—and other ports fear—that it will get a big share of military and aid shipments, thanks to its selection by the Army as headquarters for the Great Lakes Terminal Detachment.

Cleveland will have a city-built passenger and cargo terminal and enlarged private facilities, but some people feel it will not be enough.

As for other ports on the U.S. side of the lakes, their prospects are diverse. Buffalo is considered too near the Atlantic—by both train and barge—to profit much. But the city has dropped its early antiseaway stand, and its Niagara Frontier Port Authority is using a State loan to take over waterfront buildings and dredge the harbor. Duluth-Superior, at the far end, is considered too remote for what would have to be predominantly one-way traffic, since the area has little to import. Still, Duluth has built a $10 million terminal, and private investors have picked up 135 acres for possible development.

On the Canadian side, Toronto should profit substantially from the seaway, especially since inbound goods will no longer have to be transshipped at Montreal. But the city has less to export and has scant prospects as a bulk port, though it will be getting sugar for a new Canada & Dominion refinery.

Montreal, the last port on the ocean side of the seaway and the end of 35-foot navigation, stands to both gain and lose. It expects larger loads of bulk to make up some of the expected lost transshipment business. And the biggest ships will still have to stop at Montreal to lighten cargo on the way in and to stop off on the way out to deeper water. The National Harbors Board has recognized the importance of Montreal's stake by spending $66 million, half of it for grain facilities. But the city itself had dragged its feet, doing nothing to improve street access to the port.

II. SOMEBODY HAS TO LOSE

Whatever gains are made by the seaway ports will have to be at the expense of other coastal ports, with the cities on the Atlantic probably hit harder than those on the Gulf of Mexico.

The North Atlantic ports are used to losing business. For years their business has been drained off to South Atlantic and gulf ports simply by the shift of the Nation's economy. But loss to the seaway will hurt more because it's closer to home. Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Hampton Roads are certain to lose in bulk, while New York will be the big loser in general cargo.

In New York, the port authority concedes that ultimately it will lose upwards of 1 million tons—partly such exports as autos and farm implements, partly such imports as autos, bauxite, rubber, sugar, coffee, steel, glass, and liquors. Philadelphia is little worried about losing general cargo, for 73 percent of its volume originates at or is destined for points within 50 miles of the port.

Baltimore feels quite chipper, expecting to hold its huge volume of iron ore imports, mostly from Venezuela, and even talks of "cornering" the market for imported cars.

These ports have substantial improvement programs underway, but they are aimed at one another, rather than at the seaway menace.

III. THE FINAL ARBITER

In the final analysis, it's the shipper who will decide what the seaway will do to U.S. ports. What route will the Belgian glassmaker pick to send his products to Illinois? What route will the Minnesota wheat exporter choose to get his grain to Germany?

Compartive cost

For the shipper, of course, cost will be the deciding factor. He must make complex comparisons of steamship rates from lake, Atlantic, or gulf ports, matching them up with overland rates and with combinations of all methods. He also must figure on seaway tolls, which will be levied to carry the $28 million annual burden of operation and service.

With few exceptions, all-water rates from the lakes will be higher than from the Atlantic even when actual distances to foreign ports may be shorter.

There are "open" rates on some high-volume items such as grain, but most commodities are covered by conferences of shipping lines, which are supposed to charge uniform rates. The picture is expected to hold true, regardless of how many lines stay in the seaway business. Some 20 foreign lines are expected this summer. Last year, with few lines and bitter competition, there was some talk of chiseling on the conference rates, but he industry expects this to disappear—if it ever existed—when the shippers' "varsity" takes the field this summer.

Rail rates

A more important factor in the cost picture is the overland haul. Rail rates still have not jelled. Arthur E. Baylis, a New York Central vice-president, has cited four ways that the rails can approach rate cutting:

Low rates during the seaway's navigation

season—on bulk commodities—but higher rates in winter.

Year-round rates made in contract with shippers who will agree to give railroads their business.

Spot adjustments covering a particular commodity such as autos, from a particular spot such as Detroit.

Short-haul adjustments to lake ports. Once the railroads have lost the long haul to the Atlantic, they want to keep the short haul to lake ports away from trucks.

So far the roads have talked specifically of only one cut—20 percent on grain during the navigation season. They are considering others on petroleum, coal, iron ore, and general cargo. By July 1, they may have made cuts in unison or individually.

Baylis figures there is no sense in competing with every spot nuisance, but he is determined to make effective cuts. At a time such as now, when the ship charter market is soft, he would force the ships to leave the lakes empty. When the market is tighter, and ships are less inclined to meet railroad competition, he supposes they'll be less eager to ply the lakes.

Other factors

The undecided shipper must weigh other factors as well as the all-important costs:

Time. Although the seaway's new locks may cut the old lake turn-around time by 3 days, the seaway trip will be 6 days or more longer than a combination overland-ocean haul.

Sailings. A shipper wishing to scatter his goods among a wide assortment of ports may find that the seaway sailings are not inclusive enough.

Service. Factors of waterfront skills and of racketeering and pilferage must be weighed, along with such factors as credit facilities and marine insurance.

Facilities. Does the lake port have the equipment to handle a particular type of cargo?

Winter. Unless some utopian defrosting system is developed the shipper will always have to abandon the lake ports during the winter, which means a radical shifting of business patterns. (Cargill is trying to beat the freeze by building a huge elevator below Montreal.)

Foreign flag

The shipper who does decide on the seaway is likely to find himself using foreign bottoms, simply because a smaller percentage of U.S. ships can use the 27-foot navigation. So far, seven U.S. lines have asked the Maritime Board for the subsidy contracts that would let them engage in the trade. The only one yet to receive an O.K. is the Grace Line, for sailings to Caribbean ports.

Although its application is still pending, American Export Lines has a ship coming up the St. Lawrence from the Mediterranean. Actually, without a subsidy, this ship can come and go as it pleases. Once the Maritime Board grants a subsidy, the line must carry out scheduled sailings, whether or not it has any cargo.

J. C. Penney's Interest in Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, as most of us realize, James Cash Penney, who is more familiarly known to millions of shoppers as "J. C. Penney," is a great merchant, with stores in every part of the United States. His chain has become one of the 25 companies with the greatest volume of sales in the United States today.

But Mr. Penney has been a man with many interests. Noted as a religious person, he has addressed many laymen's groups in all parts of the Nation.

Not so well known as the fact that he has had an abiding interest in agriculture, and it seems to me, in reading a little booklet entitled "My Interest in Agriculture," which Mr. Penney wrote, that there are several statements which my colleagues and constituents also would like to see.

I wish to underscore what Mr. Penney says about prosperity for the farmer meaning prosperity for all of us; as well as his remarks pointing up the importance of preserving our soil and the improvement of the various breeds of livestock.

Under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD quotations, which were copied from J. C. Penney's little booklet on agriculture.

The quotations are as follows:

Agriculture and the rearing of livestock as a means of livelihood are coexistent with the human race. Adam, having been thrust from the Garden of Eden under the stern decree to earn his keep "by the sweat of his face," engaged in both. What he learned about these pursuits he taught his son, Abel, who became a keeper of sheep.

Back in the days when the world was young, and for a long time afterward, a man's position in life was determined by the size of his flocks and herds. This was because cattle, sheep, camels, and horses represented wealth and were the universally accepted medium of exchange.

Also, the people of those early ages were, in the main, pastoral in their mode of life and dependent upon cattle and other animals for daily sustenance. Always the life of man has been so closely associated with domestic creatures of various kinds that one may well say he cannot live without them.

My own interest in agriculture and livestock dates from my earliest years upon the Missouri farm where I was born. I cannot remember when it first began. At a tender age I shared the ordinary chores and the care of animals. My father, James Cash Penney, was an old-school, or Primitive Baptist minister, who preached without pay and earned his livelihood upon a farm of 400 acres 2 miles east of Hamilton, Mo. My father, being a Kentuckian, loved fine horses and cattle. My love for the same kind of animals is therefore a natural heritage.

* * * * *

Although I wholeheartedly devoted myself for many years to the task of building a business which became nationwide in its scope, my interest in agriculture, livestock, and the farmer's way of life never abated. One reason was that my business, with stores located in small towns, was, and is today, dependent in great measure upon rural people. I had not been in business long before I discovered that prosperity for the farmer meant prosperity for us. The farmer's problems were, in the last analysis, our problems also. Some 1,600 stores, located in every State of the Union, provided a unique vantage point from which to view agriculture in all its phases.

* * * * *

I believe that too much emphasis cannot be put on the necessity for saving our soil. We have done quite a job of terracing on all of my farms, including 320 acres on the Hereford division at Breckenridge. Terracing this land enables us to raise more of our own feed and roughage, which could not be done on such rolling land without a good water-management program. We are in an era of good land usages and productive pastures, and all who would succeed must realize it. We must be interested in our communities and in the Nation in the development of good citizenship, and good citizenship cannot possibly be developed on poor and sterile land.

Ten miles north of Gallatin, Mo., on gravel road K, is my Pre-Eminent Guernsey farm operated by Harold Appley, under the supervision of William A. Rhea, former county agent for Ralls County, Mo. Mr. Rhea has charge of the construction work in building terraces on the several J. C. Penney Missouri farms.

* * * * *

The three commercial farms are run on a partnership basis, with the managers receiving no salary. They pay for all the help and are equal owners in the livestock, machinery, and products of the farms.

When speaking of my farms I always try to make it clear that farming is not a hobby with me, even in the remotest sense. It is a business, and I am in earnest about it. The ideal my partners, managers and I bear in mind is that each farm must not only stand upon its own feet financially—it must also make money for us. Where my purebred Guernsey, Aberdeen-Angus, and the Hereford interests are concerned, I constantly feel the challenge of creating better livestock. Of course I wish to make money out of my investments and work. What sane man does not? But money for its own sake was never my primary object. I always aimed at making what I did a benefit to others and today I rejoice over the fact that to some degree I have attained that aim. If through my efforts my fellowmen have better animals with which to work, I am content.

I should say that the challenge which inspired me to undertake the breeding of pure-bred cattle was the creative one of producing better livestock. And, it is creative in the highest sense. I wanted to plan, to work, and to accomplish results which would be both permanent and beneficial. As Ignace Jan Paderewski, the great pianist, said, "Creative work, take it where you will, is the only thing in life that gives supreme satisfaction." This, I think, is the challenge to which every breeder of any kind of pure-bred creature responds.

In this he is akin to the sculptor, who, being thrilled by an ideal of perfection in his mind, seeks to materialize it in stone. Likewise, the breeder of pure-bred animals envisions a perfect animal and blends his efforts toward producing it. Although he knows full well that at this stage of the process he will not fully succeed, his solace and encouragement lie in the fact that he can make some tangible contribution toward that end.

* * * * *

Still another encouraging factor is the inspiring thought that whatever progress the breeder makes is a benefit to mankind. This lifts him above the sordid level of selfish greed and endows him with the qualities of a philanthropist. It is a matter of vast encouragement for a man to know that when he has produced a better cow, horse, sheep or any other creature, he has made as substantial a contribution to human welfare as though he had endowed a hospital or built a library.

It has been my observation that men engaged in this work, especially if they have stuck to it over a long period of time, are incurable optimists.

* * * * *

In addition to being optimists, men working in this field are possessed of dogged, indomitable patience.

* * * * *

Best of all, men who labor in this field are imbued with a desire to share their success with others. In this business there are no copyrights, exclusive patents or trade secrets. The great end toward which all bend their efforts is not simply the improvement of their own herds but the grading up of that breed throughout the Nation and the world.

* * * * *

I say with firm conviction, born of many years of experience and observation, that the only sane basis for good human relations is the Christian religion. My faith in God, taught me by Christian parents, convinces me that justice, fair dealing and right are His will for men, that prayer is a means of power and guidance, and that the twin laws, love for God and love for one's neighbor, will always lead men in the right way. Humble obedience to these assures in the abundant life Christ promised and fills the heart with deep, abiding spiritual satisfaction.

Too Many Out of Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from Life magazine of April 13, 1959, which points up the vital need for passage of the Flood-Douglas area development bill which is now before the Congress:

TOO MANY OUT OF WORK

The paradox shown on the preceding pages—unemployment in the midst of plenty—is darkening the otherwise sunny slopes of a broad and growing recovery.

As Secretary of Labor Mitchell points out, unemployment may be expected to diminish soon and steadily. With industrial production close to its 1956 alltime peak, employers have just about reached the limit of stretching the workweek of employed workers, and will soon have to start hiring others in order to keep pace with the recovery. Mitchell may be overoptimistic in predicting a drop to as low as 3 million (or about 4 percent, the 1955 level when the auto industry turned out a record 9 million units), but if 4 percent could be achieved that would be tolerable in a country this huge—provided the unemployment is chiefly "frictional" (men moving, or changing jobs) rather than chronic, like the permanent disemployment of the mountain miners.

Walter Reuther, as might be expected, overstates the case for big-spending remedies, just as Industrialist Sligh may be underrating the case for Government concern. Promoting full employment is the official policy of the U.S. Government, and has been since the Full Employment Act of 1946 created a standing committee of Congress to help effectuate it. It is the Government's proper role to do whatever it can to keep the economy expanding and fully employed.

There is certainly room for debate on what measures are needed. Since the recovery is already strong, no pump-priming public works seem called for, save the new schools, hospitals, and urban renewal which are justified on grounds of social neglect. Since the chronic unemployment is so pinpointed, equally pinpointed measures are called for to attack it. The shifting of Government contracts and extension of unemployment assistance will help. But to a large extent many of the unemployed have lost their jobs forever, don't have the skills now needed to change, and often can't afford to move. Moreover, it would be a social waste to make ghost towns out of existing communities with their established schools, plants, roads, and other facilities. The real answer is to get new industries into these communities, and to retrain their unemployed workers in skills that are needed.

Such a program is the objective of two bills (by Democrat DOUGLAS and Republican DIRKSEN) now before Congress, which differ principally as to the amounts to be spent and to the extent of Federal participation with State and local area development programs.

Although this type of program should have had top priority when the recession was at its worst, it was aborted last year because the Democratic Congress authorized more than President Eisenhower was willing to allocate to it, so he vetoed the measure. Since action is needed, and pronto, the President ought to exercise his own leadership on the No. 1 domestic problem confronting him, and make good his 1952 promise in New England that any threat of major unemployment would be met by the full power of government, instantly marshaled, instantly concentrated and localized. Let him get the opposing sides together to work out some compromise that he would be willing to sign if passed. Much can be accomplished by such programs, as trailblazing efforts by groups like the New England Council have already proved, and could be greatly increased by the availability of assistance loans for new development.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer, plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*.....Carroll Arms
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*.....Cleveland House
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*—6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*.....1718 33d Pl. SE.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*.....
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*.....
Bible, Alan, *Nev*.....
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*.....
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*.....
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*.....
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*.....The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*.....
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev*.....
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*.....The Westchester
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*.....Sheraton-Park
Carroll, John A., *Colo*.....
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*.....
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*.....4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*.....2525 P St.
Church, Frank, *Idaho*.....
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa*.....
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky*.....
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*.....
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*.....
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*.....
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*.....
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*.....
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*.....
Eastland, James O., *Miss*.....5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*.....
Engle, Clair, *Calif*.....3840 Lorcom Lane, Arlington, Va.
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*.....
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*.....
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*.....
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*.....
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*.....
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*—University Club
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*.....
Hart, Philip A., *Mich*.....
Hartke, Vance, *Ind*.....
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*.....
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa*.—5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*.....
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*.....Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*.....
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*.....
Javits, Jacob K., *N. Y*.....
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*.....
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*.....
Jordan, B. Everett, *N. C*.....
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*.....3509 M St.
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*.....4929 Hillbrook Lane
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*.....
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*.....
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*.....
Langer, William, *N. Dak*.....2101 Conn. Ave.
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*.....
Long, Russell B., *La*.....
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn*.....2930 Chesapeake St.
McClellan, John L., *Ark*.....
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo*.....
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*.....
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*—The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*.....
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*.....4501 Conn. Ave.
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*.....4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky*.....
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*.....
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*.....122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*.....The Shoreham
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*.....
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*—Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*.....
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*.....
Proxmire, William, *Wis*.....
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va*.....
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*.....
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*.....
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*.—2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*.....
Smathers, George A., *Fla*.....
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John, *Ala*.....4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*.....
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*.....
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga*.....
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C*.....
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*.....2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J.*
Williams, John J., *Del*.....
Yarborough, Ralph W., *Tex*.....
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*.....Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*.....

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Johnson of Texas (chairman), Russell, Magnuson, Anderson, Kerr, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Bridges, Wiley, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Martin, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Humphrey, Symington, Talmadge, Proxmire, Jordan, Young of Ohio, Hart, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams of Delaware, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Johnson of Texas, Pastore, Kefauver, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, Dodd, McGee, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Dworshak, Kuchel, Hruska, and Allott.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd of Virginia, Johnson of Texas, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Thurmond, Engle, Bartlett, Cannon, Saltonstall, Bridges, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Bush, and Beall.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Fulbright, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Clark, Proxmire, Byrd of West Virginia, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Capehart, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Javits.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, Frear, Hartke, Beall, Case of South Dakota, and Prouty.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Butler, Cotton, and Curtis.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Green, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long, Kennedy, Gore, Lausche, Church, Wiley, Hickenlooper, Langer, Aiken, Capehart, and Carlson.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Humphrey, Gruening, Muskie, Mundt, Curtis, and Capehart.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Neuberger, Carroll, Church, Gruening, Moss, Dworshak, Kuchel, Goldwater, Allott, and Martin.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Thurmond, Lausche, Yarborough, Engle, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Schoeppel, Butler, Cotton, Case of New Jersey, Morton, and Scott.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, O'Mahoney, Ervin, Carroll, Dodd, Hart, Wiley, Langer, Dirksen, Hruska, and Keating.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Kennedy, McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Goldwater, Cooper, Dirksen, Case of New Jersey, Javits, and Prouty.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Monroney, Neuberger, Yarborough, Clark, Jordan, Carlson, Langer, and Morton.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, McNamara, Neuberger, Randolph, McCarthy, Young, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Case of South Dakota, Martin, Cooper, Scott, and Prouty.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Hennings (chairman), Hayden, Green, Mansfield, Jordan, Cannon, Curtis, Morton, and Keating.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Whittaker, of Missouri, 5000 Van Ness St.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, Fairfax Hotel.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—James R. Browning, 454 New Jersey Ave. SE.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Richard J. Blanchard, 427 St. Lawrence Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS
JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.
First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.
Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.
Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.
Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.
Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.
Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.
Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.
Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.
Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.
Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

Appendix

Address by Hon. Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee, Before the National Independent Dairy Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 17, 1959

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech which I delivered last Tuesday before the National Independent Dairy Association, at its meeting in Washington, D.C.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF SENATOR ESTES KEFAUVER, DEMOCRAT, OF TENNESSEE, BEFORE NATIONAL INDEPENDENT DAIRY ASSOCIATION, WASHINGTON, D.C., APRIL 14, 1959

In asking me to come here today and talk to you, Mr. Daniel, your executive seceretary and general counsel, told me that the meeting would mark the second birthday of the National Independent Dairy Association. I eagerly accepted because, as I told him, I had always liked lusty and growing youngsters and that I had also always liked birthday parties.

Mr. Daniel is an old friend of mine. He is a native Tennessean, an excellent lawyer, and well qualified by education and experience to serve you. He is a real fighter, and small businessmen need real fighters.

I want to congratulate all of you on the magnificent progress you have made in such a short time. It speaks volumes for the management of independent dairies, for their objectives, and for their leaders. In the true spirit of the occasion, I most sincerely wish for you many happy returns of the day.

That this day will return most happily many, many times seems almost certain. Small businessmen in your industry, as in others, need to speak with the full power of all of their voices. You are that voice. That voice must speak not only with power but also with knowledge, with dignity, and with the public interest as a guide. Your voice has spoken in such a way. Continue as you have begun, and the years will not only add to your age but also to the respect in which you are held.

The unfair methods of competition and monopolistic practices prevalent in your industry which you so diligently strive to remove, are fairly representative of those which continue to undermine the structure of the competitive system generally.

Such methods and practices, both as they prevail in your industry and in industry generally are, therefore, the concern of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, of which I have the honor of being chairman.

This subcommittee operates under a Senate resolution which authorizes it "to make a complete, comprehensive, and continuing study and investigation of the antitrust and antimonopoly laws of the United States and their administration, interpretation, operation, enforcement, and effect, and to determine and from time to time redetermine the nature and extent of any legislation which may be necessary or desirable for (1) clarification of existing law to eliminate conflicts and uncertainties where necessary; (2) improvement of the administration and enforcemetn of existing laws; (3) supplementation of existing law to provide any additional substantive, procedural, or organizational legislation which may be needed for the attainment of the fundamental objects of the laws and the efficient administration and enforcement thereof."

It was under this charter that in March 1958 the Antitrust Subcommittee made an investigation of milk marketing by the Adams Dairies in Missouri, Illinois, and Kentucky. The results of that investigation are contained in a report of the subcommittee dated November 15, 1958, entitled "Case Study of Incipient Monopoly in Milk distribution."

The Adams companies sell milk to Safeway Stores, Inc., the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co., and Kroger Co., and in concert with these three great chain organizations, Adams worked in various communities to capture the market.

The five main characteristics which made the Adams scheme of operation profitable to the two dairy companies and which were ardently supported by the chains were listed as follows:

1. An enforced differential between home delivery and chainstore sale.
2. A guaranteed markup to the chains.
3. The use of promotions to reduce the price.
4. The preference given to Adams by chains in display space and promotions.
5. Promotional allowances given to the chains.

The effect of these practices was to relegate the local dairies to supplying the ever-diminishing home delivery market and serving as secondary suppliers to those retailers which still suffered them.

The subcommittee noted that the effects of the Adams program "may have been to restrain trade or tend to monopoly and should be considered in the light of the Sherman Act, the Federal Trade Commission Act, and the Clayton Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act."

Regarding the Sherman Act, the subcommittee stated that the evidence leaves the impression that Adams and the chains, acting in concert, used their position to impose on local markets by such area price discriminations a price structure injurious to competition and affording a continuing market advantage over others. In this connection, the applicability of section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act should also be considered as well as the Clayton Act because of price discriminations and payments for promotional service involved in the Adams operations.

Stating that the record was being sent to both the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice, the report concluded that a failure by these agencies to find any violation of existing laws would suggest that such laws are ineffective. Neither agency has yet reported that it has found any violation.

I am satisfied that many small-business men, including some of you, are convinced that existing antitrust laws are inadequate both from the point of view of their coverage or interpretation and of their enforcement. The Antitrust Subcommittee is trying to do something about both of these aspects of the problem. As an example, I should like to tell you briefly what it is trying to do about price discriminations, one of the monopolistic practices present in the Adams case and which I know you are trying to destroy.

I refer, of course, to S. 11 which I introduced in the 84th and 85th Congresses and which I have again introduced in this, the 86th Congress, on behalf of myself and several colleagues.

This bill would amend the Robinson-Patman Act, enacted in 1936 to amend section 2 of the Clayton Antitrust Act which became law in 1914. In each of these three Congresses Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, coauthor of the Robinson-Patman Act and a life-long friend of small business, introduced a similar bill (H.R. 11) in the House of Representatives. By a special provision in the bill the existing law applicable to freight absorption is not altered or affected.

Briefly, the bill would change the statute as interpreted by the Supreme Court by providing that meeting in good faith the equally low price of a competitor is not a defense to price discriminations which are affirmatively proved by the Government to have the probable effect in any line of commerce of substantially lessening competition or tending to create a monopoly. Such meeting of a competitor's price would, however, continue to be an absolute defense to any price discrimination which was proved to have only the probable effect of injuring competition among competitors. The basic thought underlying the bill is that price discriminations which substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly are as detrimental to the public interest when accomplished in good faith as they are when done in bad faith.

The problem of price discrimination is not new, but on the contrary is quite old. In economic theory and in observed business conduct, price discrimination is evidence of the existence and exercise of some degree of monopoly power. Prohibition of price discrimination in rate making was one of the necessary basic provisions of the first railroad regulatory statutes in 1887. Price discrimination was also a favorite weapon of the early trusts at which the Sherman Antitrust Act of 1890 was directed. The Sherman Act only became operative, however, when monopoly had been attained, and for that reason in 1914 Congress passed the Clayton Act, in section 2 of which it was sought to outlaw price discrimination before its anticompetitive effects were so serious as to bring the practice within the Sherman Act.

Section 2 of the Clayton Act prohibited discriminations in price in interstate sales of like goods where the probable effect in any line of commerce was (1) substantially to lessen competition, or (2) to tend to create a monopoly. The same section, however, provided that certain price discriminations were not prohibited and among them were these made in good faith to meet competition and those on account of differences in quantity.

Efforts of the Federal Trade Commission to enforce section 2 of the Clayton Act turned out to be almost wholly ineffectual. One difficulty was that price discriminations

which hurt only one or a few competing purchasers were held not to threaten substantial lessening of competition in a line of commerce. A second was that any difference in quantity was held to justify any difference in price even though there was no corresponding difference in the seller's costs. Finally, and of paramount importance, meeting of competition in good faith was so broadly interpreted as to be readily demonstrable, with the result that the exemption it provided was virtually as broad as the prohibition.

With an antiprice discrimination statute full of loopholes, the practice of price discrimination thrived as did its beneficiaries. Investigations by both the Federal Trade Commission and congressional committees showed, for example, that large chains not only paid prices materially lower than their small retail competitors but sometimes even lower than wholesalers. As a result the giant retailers prospered at the expense of their smaller rivals to the extent that during a relatively few years their sales increased from less than 2 percent to more than 25 percent of total retail sales.

The public interest demanded that something be done, and in response Congress in 1936 enacted the Robinson-Patman amendment to eliminate the defects in the antiprice discrimination section of the Clayton Act. The amended statute retained, of course, the prohibition of price discriminations where the effect in any line of commerce may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly, but it went further and also condemned price discriminations where the effect may be to injure competition with the seller, or the favored buyer, or the customers of either of them. Thus the law was amended so that individual competitors as component elements of a line of commerce were protected as well as the line of commerce itself. The old provision which wholly exempted discriminations on account of quantity was changed so as to permit differentials on account of quantity to the extent of the actual savings in cost to the seller. In this manner efficiency properly became the basis of quantity differentials.

Most importantly relevant to this discussion, section 2 of the Clayton Act as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act no longer exempted discriminations in price made in good faith to meet competition. The amendment introduced a new subsection 2(b) which provided that the seller could show that his lower price was made in good faith to meet the equally low price of a competitor merely for the purpose of rebutting the preliminary or prima facie case made against the seller by the Commission.

The meaning and effect of this change with respect to meeting competition is made clear by its legislative history. The Robinson-Patman Act was the product of a conference committee of the Senate and the House which reconciled the differences between the Robinson bill as passed by the Senate and the Patman bill as passed by the House. When introduced, neither of these bills even made any reference to meeting competition, but as passed by the Senate the Robinson bill contained the old exemption, and as passed by the House the Patman bill contained a section similar to the one finally adopted. In conference, the old exemption in the Senate bill was rejected, and the House version was approved in the language in which it was finally enacted. Referring to the old exemption incorporated in the Senate bill, the report of the House conferees stated:

"This language is found in existing law, and in the opinion of the conferees is one of the obstacles to enforcement of the present Clayton Act. The Senate receded and the language is stricken. A provision relating to the question of meeting competition, intended to operate only as a rule of evidence in a proceeding before the Federal Trade Commission, is included in subsection (b)."

Referring to the new language, a report submitted by the chairman of the House conferees stated:

"It is to be noted, however, that this does not set up meeting of competition as an absolute bar to a charge of discrimination under the bill. It merely permits it to be shown in evidence. This provision is entirely procedural. It does not determine substantive rights, liabilities, and duties. They are fixed in the other provisions of the bill. * * * If this proviso were construed to permit the showing of a competing offer as an absolute bar to liability for discrimination, then it would nullify the act entirely at the very inception of its enforcement."

In 1945 the Supreme Court in the well-known Staley case had its first opportunity to interpret the meeting-competition proviso of the Robinson-Patman Act. In that case the Court affirmed a decision of the Federal Trade Commission which rejected the defense of meeting competition, and in doing so seemed quite clearly to indicate that the amendment had secured the results which Congress intended. This is the language the Court used:

"It will be noted that the defense that the pricing discriminations were made in order to meet competition, is under the statute, a matter of rebutting 'the Commission's prima facie case.' Prior to the Robinson-Patman amendments, section 2 of the Clayton Act provided that nothing contained in it 'shall prevent' discriminations in price 'made in good faith to meet competition.' The change in language of this exception was for the purpose of making the defense a matter of evidence in each case, raising a question of fact as to whether the competition justified the discrimination."

Despite this encouraging development in 1945, the law with respect to meeting competition as a defense to price discrimination is now back where it was prior to the enactment of the Robinson-Patman Act. For in 1951 the Supreme Court held in the Standard of Indiana case that the Federal Trade Commission was wrong in rejecting Standard's defense of meeting competition even where it had been shown that the discriminations had a substantially adverse competitive effect among distributors. Once again, then, meeting competition became an absolute defense to discriminations in price regardless of the magnitude of their anticompetitive effects among retailers and wholesalers. Moreover, the doctrine of the Standard of Indiana case seems to have been extended in subsequent decisions by lower Federal courts to the extent that it now appears likely that even the limitations indicated by the Supreme Court are of little if any substance.

As a result of these decisions, the Robinson-Patman Act has been seriously weakened. It now affords no real protection to competition at the wholesaler or retailer levels. The public interest in protecting competition at all levels has been subordinated to the individual manufacturer's or seller's private interest. The act has become largely a declaration of the right of sellers to discriminate in price to accommodate large buyers even though the injury to small buyers is so serious that competition in their line of commerce may be substantially lessened.

The public interest again demands that something be done to repair the damage. S. 11 is a moderate effort to do just that. The bill restricts but does not eliminate the availability of the defense of meeting in good faith the equally low price of a competitor. Where it is shown that the discriminations may merely injure competition between individual competitors, the defense continues to be absolute. Where, however, it is shown that the discriminations are so serious that their effect in any line of commerce may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly, the defense is eliminated.

Hence, if S. 11 becomes law a seller who finds it desirable to lower his price to one customer in order to meet in good faith the equally low price of a competitor may not have to lower his price to all competing customers or even to any of them in order to avoid an unlawful price discrimination. It is enough that he lower his price only to the extent necessary to prevent substantial lessening of competition or tendency to create a monopoly and not to the extent necessary to prevent injury to competition. The significance of this difference is that, under the bill, such a seller would not be obliged to lower his price to a customer like the one who sought damages from his supplier in a recent case. In that case the court held that the small discrimination complained of could not have substantially lessened competition or tended to create a monopoly, as was alleged, but at most could only have injured competition between the complaining customers and his competitors, as was not alleged.

S. 11 should be especially welcomed by manafacturers who see a threat to themselves in the establishment and growth of large and powerful buyers. Without the bill, suppliers, under the guise of meeting competition, will continue to vie with each other to satisfy the voracious and insatiable demands of large buyers for preferential prices. This implies not only the sacrifice of the many small buyers but the suppliers dependence upon the few mass buyers.

Much has been said both by and on behalf of management about the difficulties of making decisions to comply with S. 11. I am confident that any such difficulties have been magnified by posing hypothetical situations which include imaginary horrors. True, S. 11 does not define with mathematical precision the white area in which meeting competition is a defense and the black area in which it is not, for precision of that kind is not possible in a moderate approach. It can exist only where there is either complete prohibition or unrestrained permission.

Being moderate in its approach, S. 11 naturally contains a small gray area where the white meets the black. To businessmen who are heedless, if there are any, this gray area will present no problem—they will view it as white and assume unnecessary risks. To businessmen who are timid, if there are any, this gray area will likewise present no problem—they will see it as black and accept needless restrictions. To businessmen who are prudent, as if there are any who are not, the shaded area will also present no problem—in the light of the facts in each case they will see a line running through it which will be drawn by their willingness to resolve any doubt by what they know to be the public interest. Just as it is easy to distinguish between being stumbled over and being kicked, so it should not be difficult to differentiate a price discrimination which may economically maim the many small merchants from one which will clearly fall short of having that result.

In the 84th Congress the measure passed the House by a vote of 393 to 3 but was not considered by the Senate because it was caught in the rush of the closing days of the session when unanimous consent was required to bring it up.

In the 85th Congress the bill was reported to the Senate in modified form, but the Senate adjourned without having taken any action.

In the present Congress hearings have again been held on the bill, and the record is being prepared for the printer. We were fortunate in having your counsel, Mr. Dan-

iel, testify on your behalf at these hearings in favor of the bill. The support of this organization was indeed welcome, and your position was forcibly presented by Mr. Daniel.

Above all else, we must not get discouraged in this battle for the preservation of our free competitive system, for it surely will be a never-ending one. With your help and support, and the assistance of all of the other good people in all industries and in all parts of the country, much can be accomplished.

Thank you for being so kind as to let me be your guest.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 17, 1959

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on Monday, April 13, my distinguished colleague, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], appeared before the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of which I have the privilege of serving as chairman. Although I was unable to be present at that session, I have had the opportunity to read his statement; and I believe it is one of the best and most eloquent arguments for Federal aid to education which has been presented.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the Senator's statement be printed in the RECORD, so that all my colleagues will have the opportunity to read it. I congratulate my colleague from West Virginia on the cogency and eloquence of his presentation.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH, DEMOCRAT, OF WEST VIRGINIA, BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, UNITED STATES SENATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE, ON S. 2, A BILL TO PROVIDE FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE SUPPORT OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS BY APPROPRIATING FUNDS TO THE STATES TO BE USED FOR CONSTRUCTING SCHOOL FACILITIES AND FOR TEACHERS' SALARIES

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to come before you and your subcommittee to testify on the school support bill. You are to be commended, sir, for your persistent and devoted efforts in introducing this measure, and I am pleased to have been one of its early cosponsors.

Before discussing the evidence which substantiates the critical need for this legislation, I would like, Mr. Chairman, to address my comment to a point which has been raised by its opponents.

I refer to the often-voiced fear of Federal control, which follows inevitably—it is supposed—upon Federal aid to education. We are all aware of the importance of the American custom of local responsibility and control of public education. But let us at least be clear in our understanding of the origins and the reasons for this tradition. Let us not be confused by the invocations of the rhetoric of the Founding Fathers, or raising the spectre of an omnivorous and power-hungry Federal police state.

Without going into historical detail we can acknowledge that the practice of local support for public education has been one of the fundamental marks of the American system from its outset. But let us also acknowledge that this practice was not based upon any hallowed principle of democratic idealism, but rather on the simple and understandable resistance of the citizens of one community to paying taxes for the education of the children of another.

The struggle for universal public education in America was not won overnight. The merchant and propertied classes resisted strongly the economic, political, and social ferment we associate with the Jacksonian period, and the chief tribute they won from the champions of public education was the principle of local support of the schools. The principle was thus motivated by self-interest as well as idealism.

But this is not to condemn it. Within the context of an agrarian society, a loose Federal structure, and the sectional jealousies and rivalries of the individual States, such a point of view is easily understandable. But, Mr. Chairman, it is important, when we listen today to the critics of Federal aid to public schools invoke some supposedly time-honored American tradition, to know that that tradition has nothing to do with the fear of Federal control.

On the contrary, in the field of higher education the practice of Federal support is almost as old as our tax-supported universities themselves. Three years from now the great land-grant colleges and universities of America will celebrate the centennial of the Morrill Act, which set aside Federal lands for the support of agricultural and engineering colleges. In 1862 Congress passed this epoch-making act, which for the first time established the policy of Federal aid, not only to the newer States but to the older ones as well—offering each State the proceeds from the sale of 30,000 acres of Federal land for each Member of its congressional delegation. The sole measure of Federal control in these colleges has been the supervision of the Reserve Officers' training corps established therein—hardly an example of a burgeoning police power of the national state.

In recent decades the Federal Government has entered the field of education in a variety of ways—the public schools built by the WPA in the 1930's, the tuition-payment program of the GI bill, and the grants-in-aid and the underwriting of research programs at many of our colleges and universities—in none of these has the Federal Government encroached upon the control of local authorities.

The threat of Federal control, Mr. Chairman, is a myth, and the fear of it is spun from fantasy and a misreading of our history.

The question, therefore, is not whether or not we shall have Federal control—but whether we shall have Federal aid—and if so, how much, what direction it will take, and how best to utilize it in a coherent manner to lift our public school system to the level that a thriving democracy demands and one that our young people deserve.

Senate bill 2 offers a significant contribution in alleviating two of the most critical problems in the educational scene—the inadequacy of teachers' salaries and the shortage of classroom space.

Let me refer first to the long-range problem of the shortage of classroom space. The figure of 142,000—reperesenting our present classroom shortage—has been repeated so frequently in recent discussions that we are likely to overlook the more enduring features of our problem.

For example, from 1780 to 1955 our population grew from 40 million to 165 million. During this same period, while our general population increased 4 times, our public school population increased approximately 80 times.

Under our present rate of population development the bulge of the future will press even more heavily on our already burdened facilities. The elementary school enrollment of 22 million of last year will rise to about 34 million by 1960–61. By 1969 our high schools will be flooded with 50 to 70 percent more students than they can now handle. By 1975 our colleges and universities will face a doubling and in some cases a tripling of enrollment. Now these are only the bare bones of statistics that comprise one aspect of the problem. There are others.

For one, there is the problem borne of the mobility of our society. We are a people on the go—34 million of us change our address every year, and there are long-term currents of movement to the North and West. Thus, the effects of education offered in a given school may be registered in a State far removed from where the education was acquired.

The quality of education in the United States is therefore a national issue, rather than a merely local one. And yet it is the only national problem that we have not attempted to solve on a national basis.

Let us turn now to a consideration of the shortage and recruitment of teachers. It is authoritatively estimated that in order to maintain the present student-teacher ratio, between one-third and one-half of all 4-year college graduates would have to enter school teaching in the next decade. Since only one out of five college graduates customarily enters school teaching, one can appreciate the magnitude of the problem involved.

Not only is the number of teachers inadequate, but the preparation of many of the present teachers is in need of improvement. According to the National Education Association, 33 precent of our elementary schoolteachers do not hold A.B. degrees, and more than 21 percent of all public schoolteachers have less than 4 years of college. A similar condition prevails, according to the NEA, at the college and university level, with the holders of doctor's degrees among full-time teachers having decreased by 25 percent since 1953–54.

The reasons are apparent: business industry, and government are out-bidding the teaching profession for the talents of many of its best qualified and most able men and women. Nor is it small wonder, when one observes that the average State salary of classroom teachers ranges from a high of $6,400 to a low of $3,070 per year. While in my own State of West Virginia the beginning salary for a teacher with a master's degree is $3,060.

Now admittedly, we cannot reward, and I do not believe the American teacher expects to be rewarded, with the chauffeur and summer homes that we are told some of his and her Russian counterparts have at present. But we can and we must reward our teachers with salaries more consistent with their professional status and their dedication of purpose. The necessity for many of our teachers to have part-time supplementary jobs is, to put it in its mildest terms, inconsistent with the responsibility that a democratic society has placed upon them. Our teachers' salaries can and must be raised immediately and substantially if we are to attract able young men and women and retain those we have.

According to the Rockefeller Report, we spent, in 1955, a total of just under $14 billion for public and private education at all levels—slightly more than we spent last year on alcohol and cosmetics. Against a gross national product of $391 billion for that year our expenditures for formal education amounted to 3.6 percent. The same source estimates that by 1967 the increased

demands that I referred to earlier will require an expenditure of $30 billion, or 5 percent of an estimated gross national product of $600 billion.

Such a sharp rise in expenditures calls for a determined departure from traditional methods of school financing. Historically, Americans have preferred to finance their schools at the local and State levels. But there has already been a shift of responsibility from the local and to the State level; in 1930 under 17 percent of the cost was borne by the State, in 1954 this had more than doubled to over 37 percent.

However, local and State tax systems in many instances are not adequate to the tasks, partly because they depend so heavily on the real property tax—where everywhere lags behind rising incomes and the increased cost of education, and partly because local and State governments are reluctant to raise taxes and thereby place their communities in an unfavorable competitive position with other States.

The problem is especially acute in such a State as West Virginia and some of the Southern States where great inequalities exist in the income of different school districts. And the same condition exists on a higher level in terms of the difference between the States in per capita income and the relative proportion of the tax dollar spent on education.

West Virginia, for example, with a per capita income in 1957 of only $1,480, was spending $218 a year for every child in school. From the total State revenues of $285,996,653 the school received over 36 percent, leaving less than two thirds of every tax dollar for all the other State governmental services combined. Thus, if we were to try to match the per capita dollar expenditures of such States as New York or California we would more than exhaust our total revenue on schools alone.

According to figures compiled by the National Education Association, the average per pupil expenditure among the individual States ranges from a high of $535 a year to a low of $164, with a national average of $340 per pupil.

This gross disparity in expenditure between our richest and our poorest States can be rectified only with Federal aid. For, to illustrate again by reference to my own State of West Virginia—even with proposed new tax levies and a statewide reappraisal of property, our school revenue per pupil would still be more than $60 below the national average and approximately $175 below that of New York State. Mr. Chairman, I reiterate, these inequities can be redressed only with Federal assistance. Let us not be deluded by the ideas of a century ago—ideas which at that time had some validity. For we are no longer a loose federation of quasi-independent States. We are a Nation of highly mobile people, a Nation in which the welfare of one section is inextricably involved with that of all. And as a Nation we have only one future—a future that will in substantial measure be determined by the degree of our devotion to the cause of strengthening our system of public education.

None of us is so naive as to believe that money alone will solve a deepseated and pervasive cultural problem such as this. But the extent to which we will apply our financial resources is in part a measure of our purpose in other respects as well.

It is not encouraging, therefore, to note that we spend almost as much on alcohol and cosmetics and more than twice as much on advertising as we do on education.

Such a disparity would indicate that as a society we are in need of fundamental and soul-searching reevaluation of our aims and values. And it is one of the sadder ironies of our time that this reexamination of education in a democracy has gained national support largely because of the educational achievements of a police state. As Dr. Robert Hutchins recently stated:

"History will smile sardonically at the spectacle of this great country getting interested, slightly and temporarily, in education only because of the technical achievements of Russia, and then being able to act as a nation by assimilating education to the cold war and calling an education bill a defense act.

"We might as well make up our minds to it. If our hopes of democracy are to be realized, every citizen of this country is going to have to be educated to the limit of his capacity. And I don't mean trained, amused, exercised, accommodated, or adjusted. I mean that his intellectual power must be developed."

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest—in keeping with the tenor of Dr. Hutchins' remarks—that we approach our duty here, not in the spirit of a cold war with Russia, but in the spirit of fulfilling our own destiny as a democracy.

This means that the fundamental issue in education as in government today is no less than the assessment of the basic values of a democratic society. The making of the image of what we want to be, the determination of the kind of greatness we hope to achieve—these are the choices that confront us now.

The kind of greatness that we produce in the years ahead will be nurtured by the values that we as a society cherish and transmit, in large measure, through our formal education system. And if we fail now, Mr. Chairman, to supply the means for the best system possible our children and grandchildren will have little cause to be grateful to us.

At the foundation of our values is the principle which more than any other distinguishes American culture from the older cultures of Europe and from the new totalitarian societies; that is, the extent to which we are guided by our faith in the dignity and integrity of the individual. This is the faith which states that man should live in the light of reason, be free to exercise his own moral choice, and develop to the full the latent possibilities within him.

As this faith is translated into the practical problems of our school system it presents a double-barreled challenge—the challenge of maintaining equality of opportunity for all while, at the same time, stressing the achievement of excellence for those capable of it. The challenge is to maintain both quantity and quality in education—to expand the one and improve the other.

Many people of late—laymen as well as professional educators—have posed the problem in terms of a choice between quantity and quality, a choice between equality and excellence.

I say that we have no choice. We must, if we would survive, have both.

We must have a generally informed citizenry capable of making intelligent decisions on matters of the public good. And we must have the highly trained specialists as well as the men and women of broad gage learning that our modern, complex society demands. This is the chief problem in the field of education before us.

The early and unanimous endorsement of S. 2 by this subcommittee, Mr. Chairman, will help significantly in providing the means to solve this problem. We must have an educational program to match our times.

Federal Encroachment on State Water Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 17, 1959

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, an excellent address on "Federal Encroachment on State Water Rights" was delivered by Mr. Clarence A. Davis, an attorney of Washington, D.C., and Nebraska, former Solicitor and Under Secretary of the Department of the Interior, before the section of mineral and natural resources law of the American Bar Association. This address relates to a problem now pending before the Congress, and notwithstanding the fact that the Public Printer informs me the cost of publication would be $384.75, I ask unanimous consent that the address by Mr. Davis be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL ENCROACHMENT ON STATE WATER RIGHTS

(Address of Mr. Clarence A. Davis, attorney, Washington, D.C., former Solicitor and Under Secretary of the Interior, before the section of mineral and natural resources law of the American Bar Association, August 25, 1958)

This is the most controversial subject in the field of natural resource law. The feeling about it is so intense that some people will say that even the title of this address is stated prejudicially, for it should be "State Interference With Federal Water Rights."

This controversy is only one segment of the great conflict in basic political philosophy regarding the respective rights and responsibilities of the States and the Federal Government, which is dividing both of our political parties, and by many is regarded as evidence of the continuing drift toward the centralization of power in Washington and the erosion of State and individual rights—except some kinds—for the benefit of asserted national needs or the "general welfare"—whatever that undefinable term may mean.

We used to say that a man's house was his castle, that he owned the land from the center of the earth to the roof of the skies, but we are far past that. We have already determined that he does not own to the roof of the skies, and that the air above him is not his but is an artery of commerce. Is the same thing to happen to the water under his land?

We are now debating whether we may drain the moat around his castle, without compensation, in the name of Federal constitutional powers, of which the landowner has never heard.

Our view on the question of whether the title is an honest statement of the problem probably depends a great deal on our individual background, the sections of the country from which we come, and the problems which confront us in our individual lives. The view of the rancher or the farmer in the West with reference to the right of the Fed-

eral Government to interfere with his water right is apt to be quite different from the view of the village along the Atlantic seaboard when the town wells are dry, the municipality which wants "free" money to improve its water system, or the viewpoint of an industrial community compelled to live alongside a badly polluted stream.

All this illustrates, if nothing more, the fact that this is a very large country; that each area, if not each community, has separate problems regarding water; and that its views of the rights of the Federal Government and of the States respectively are colored by these local conditions.

When I promised the chairman to make this address, I made it clear that I would not undertake a detailed analysis of the cases, but would confine myself to the consequences, as I see them, that flow from the various legal theories under consideration. As a matter of fact, there have been several most excellent bibliographies prepared on this subject, which include the citations which are the background of this address.[1]

Furthermore, I am a little embarrassed, because my friend Clifford Fix just 2 years ago, before this same section, discussed substantially this same problem, in a most comprehensive and authoritative manner, and raised most of the unanswered questions which I shall attempt to discuss.

It requires great temerity to discuss this water question in California, where water is the basis of the economy of the region, and before western lawyers who know more of the detailed case history of this problem than I shall ever learn; but I am convinced that the answer will depend in the long run upon the social, economic and political views of the Congress, and, perhaps we might add, of the Supreme Court.

The problem falls into two phases, first, the economic effect upon the owners of land and particularly those in the western States; and, second, our philosophy of government, which must underlie the interpretations of some of the Federal constitutional clauses about which the controversy rages.

The decisions with reference to many of the questions of Federal control of water will have a profound effect upon the future economic life of our country, and even upon the governmental structure of the United States. In at least half the geographical area of our country the control of water means the direct control of land, for the land without the water is useless; it means the control of the location of industry, which in turn means the control of the location of population; it means the power to replace an existing economy with a new economy; to sound the death knell of settled areas and to raise up new areas—all by the manner in which we administer this water resource.

We have built the tremendous industrial and agricultural strength of this country upon the principle of the individual ownership and control of land and water and of complete freedom of industrial opportunity. We built it upon the theory that every man has the right to engage in any business his fancy chooses and to sink or swim, live or die, by his own foresight, ingenuity and effort.

To me it was a shocking thing in the Department of the Interior to have people come from those areas in which there is practical Federal control of water and say, in substance, "Please, Mister, can I have X kilowatts of energy from Government-controlled water with which to start myself in a little manufacturing business?" And yet that is the point we reach when we follow the doctrine of Government control of such a basic resource as water, and let us realize that is exactly the situation in which we put every landowner, every municipality, and every industry in the country, if we are not careful of the length to which we extend governmental control of this basic natural resource, regardless of what constitutional powers may exist.

So much for the practical consequences that flow from an undue extension of Federal control over the waters in the United States.

But the controversy which I shall primarily discuss is really a controversy over Federal constitutional law. Certain powers enumerated in the Constitution of the United States were delegated to the Federal Government, and it is by what many believe to be exaggerated claims for the undue extension of those powers that this controversy has arisen. These powers may be enumerated as follows:

The power to regulate interstate commerce (Constitution, art. I, sec. 8):

"The Congress shall have power * * * to regulate commerce * * * among the several States."

The war power (Constitution, art. I, sec. 8):

"The Congress shall have power * * * to raise and support armies."

The property clause (Constitution, art. IV, sec. 3):

"The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States."

The General welfare clause (Constitution, art. I, sec. 8):

"The Congress shall have power * * * to pay the debts and provide for the common defence and general welfare of the United States."

The treaty power (Constitution, art. VI):

"This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land."

It is the implication of some court decisions and the arguments propounded in several cases by the Justice Department that have alarmed the West as to the validity of its water rights, as much or more than what has actually been decided. These alarms were intensified and given more substance by the Pelton Dam decision in 1955[2] and some implications from the Ivanhoe decision in 1958.[3]

As to the Pelton case, a very brief background may be recited:

Beginning more than a hundred years ago, the rule of appropriation of water, as applied in the West, grew by common usage of the settlers and later by court decision into a law of waters. He who first applied the waters of a stream to beneficial use, whether his land bordered the stream or no, acquired a property right in the use of the water—restricted somewhat in some States (including California) by a limited application of the older English doctrine of riparian rights.

Such was the situation at the close of the Civil War, when the passage of the Homestead Acts and other acts were designed to open up the West to settlement and to give encouragement to the development of western lands.

In 1877 Congress passed the Desert Land Act (19 Stat. 377), which provides:

"All surplus water over and above such actual appropriation and use, together with the water of all lakes, rivers and other sources of water supply upon the public lands and not navigable, shall remain and be held free for the approproation and use of the public for irrigation, mining and manufacturing purposes, subject to the existing rights."

This, so most lawyers supposed, was clearly settled by the opinion of Mr. Justice Sutherland in *California Oregon Power Co.* v. *Beaver Portland Cement Co.*, 295 U.S. 142, in 1935, when the Justice—a native, by the way, of Utah and an acknowledged authority on western land law—said, at pages 162–164:

"As the owner of the public domain, the Government possessed the power to dispose of land and water thereon together, or to dispose of them separatively. * * * The fair construction of the provision now under review is that Congress intended to establish the rule that for the future the land should be patented separately; and that all nonnavigable waters thereon should be reserved for the use of the public under the laws of the States and Territories named. The words that the water of all sources of water supply upon the public lands and not navigable 'shall remain and be held free for the appropriation and use of the public' are not susceptible of any other construction. The only exception made is that in favor of existing rights; and the only rule spoken of is that of appropriation. * * * What we hold is that following the act of 1877, if not before, all nonnavigable waters then a part of the public domain because publici juris, subject to the plenary control of the designated States."

However, when the Pelton case arose in which a proposed dam was between a Government reservation of public lands for power sites on the one side of the river and an Indian reservation on the other, the court held that the Desert Land Act did not apply to waters on Government reservations, and that the Federal Power Commission had exclusive jurisdiction to grant a license for the use of such water and the State of Oregon had no rights therein.

Many of us question whether the Congress in 1877 gave any thought to the niceties of distinction between public lands and reserved lands. Most of the reservations have been made since that time. Can the Government make reservations now and hence eliminate future enlargements of the appropriation of water?

The effect of this decision is momentous. What are the reservations referred to? How large are the areas affected? No one knows the exact acreage of the numerous power site withdrawals in the West, which were made in large part during the Theodore Roosevelt era, at a time when it was currently believed that cheap hydroelectric power was all one word, just like "damnyankee."

At any rate, such power site withdrawals constitute millions of acres. There are approximately 145 million acres of forest reserves. Are they included in such reservations? The Government position is that they are.[4] There are other millions of acres of Indian lands, some of whose water rights are vested by treaty, but others by the doctrine of implied transfer of reasonable amounts of water with the land (the Winters doctrine).[5] There are other large withdrawals under the Small Tracts Act[6] and various mineral laws. The Taylor Grazing Act[7] provides for the

---

[1] One which will be extremely helpful is a "Digest of Certain Supreme Court Decisions Pertinent to Western Water Rights, Etc.," prepared by Mr. Elmer F. Bennett, Solicitor of the Department of the Interior, for the benefit of the Senate Interior Committee, committee print, June 20, 1957.

[2] *Federal Power Commission* v. *Oregon*, 349 U.S. 435.

[3] *Ivanhoe Irrigation District* v. *McCracken*, 357 U.S. 275.

[4] But see the act establishing forest reserves in the appendix.

[5] *Winters* v. *United States*, 207 U.S. 564.

[6] Act of June 1, 1938, 52 Stat. 35, 43 USCA 682.

[7] Act of June 28, 1934, 48 Stat. 1269, 43 USCA 315.

formation of grazing districts. There are also substantial recreational and wilderness areas set aside. Are all these within the scope of the Pelton opinion?

It is easy to understand the terror that gripped the Western States, where most of these reservations are located, when it was realized that hundreds of water rights of farmers, miners, and municipalities which were acquired under the State laws of appropriation, but some of whose water comes from Government reservations, might, therefore, be held void as against a future Government use of that part of the water because of this overriding Government right, never before known or believed to exist.

The opinion is ventured that very few of the major water rights of the larger irrigation districts and water developments of the West are not materially contributed to by the water from some type of Government reservation. Does this mean that there is the possibility that at least a portion of such water rights may be ultimately held to be under Federal control instead of under the control of the appropriator under the laws of the States? What rights downstream from such Federal reservations are firm.

This potential cloud upon the title to water rights may rather obviously have some effect upon the credit of the districts. There is a widespread feeling of instability resulting.

These fears were not lulled by the actions of the Government in the well-known Hawthorne case[8] in Nevada. Here a Government installation using underground water had complied with the laws of Nevada by making application for apropriation of this underground water. Just as the applications were about to be allowed by the State Engineer of Nevada, the Pelton decision came down, and immediately thereafter these applications under State law were withdrawn on the theory that there was no further need for compliance with the laws of the State.

There is controversy in this litigation about the facts, both as to historical background, involving cession of jurisdiction by Nevada, dispute as to the vested rights of the Navy prior to the Nevada act relating to underground water, and numerous other controversies. But the principle which the State of Nevada believes to be involved is this same principle of Federal immunity from the laws of the State.

Substantially the same situation applies to the Blue River case in Colorado, affecting the water supply of the city of Denver, where, despite the investment of millions of dollars by the city for a water supply in the mountains, the Government took the position that the water belonged to the Government and was not subject to normal appropriations by the city of Denver. Fortunately, this one was resolved by compromise.

The situation has caused widespread intensive study of the Federal powers and of the viewpoint of the Federal Government, as expressed from time to time by the Supreme Court, by the Justice Department, and by congressional action.

It is asserted by the States that their water rights are vested property rights under State law, and that the States under the American system are the repository of all real property law—to which, of course, answer is made that no State can adjudicate the rights of the Government of the United States, and that those rights arise under the Constitution and laws of the United States.

It is asserted that all of the land and the water of the western streams were owned by the United States, having been acquired by purchase (Louisiana, Gadsden, etc.), or by conquest or by treaty, and that unless conveyed away, such land and water rights are still U.S. property, and any such conveyance must have been by an act of the Congress under the property clause.

The position of the Government with reference to title to the waters on these reservations is well expressed by the answer of the Government to interrogatories in the Fallbrook[9] case, to one of which interrogatories the Government replied:

"The United States of America claims that the title to the rights to the use of water upon the reserved lands of the United States of America resides in it and has never been conveyed away. Those rights are part of the land and may be administered by the United States of America independent of the laws of the several States. They are in some regard similar to State-recognized riparian rights, as use does not create them and nonuse does not cause their loss; yet to the extent they are required to meet the beneficial uses for which they were reserved they are not subject to diminution by appropriative or riparian rights which vested subsequent to the reservation. They differ from appropriative rights as they exist as parcel to the land and require no act on the part of the United States of America to initiate or maintain them. These rights have been reserved by Executive orders and statutes."

Upon this same theory it has been asserted by the Justice Department that the United States is still the owner of all the unappropriated water in nonnavigable western streams. The most recent assertion of this claim was made in *Nebraska* v. *Wyoming* (325 U.S. 611), where the question was bypassed by the Court, which found that there had been actual compliance with State law by the agency utilizing the water right. But the same position is still taken.

The States point out several State constitutions that provide either for State ownership or State plenary power over all water within the State; that such constitutions were ratified by the Congress when the States were admitted to the Union; and such action constitutes in substance, if not an actual conveyance by the Congress, at least a compact with the admitted State.

This argument is answered by the statement that we are dealing with real property when we deal with water rights, and that there is no semblance of any ordinary instrument of real property conveyancing present. This is unquestionably true, but are such instruments essential to an agreement between a sovereign State and the National Union?

The States also contend that a long line of congressional acts recognizing the State laws of water are further confirmation of the intention of Congress to treat the waters of nonnavigable streams as being under State jurisdiction.

As a result of this total confusion, it was only natural that clarifying congressional legislation should be offered, and Senator Frank Barrett, of Wyoming, together with 16 other Senators, joined in proposed legislation (S. 863, 84th and 85th Congs.) to correct the situation, to repeal the effects of the Pelton decision, and to settle supposedly vested water rights in the West as they have been commonly considered by the bar for three-quarters of a century.

Under the property clause, which says that "the Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States," it seemed a relatively simple matter to say, as did the original Barrett bill:

That all the navigable and unnavigable water in the States * * * are hereby declared free for appropriations under the jurisdiction of the State, and thereafter subject to the laws of that State with respect to control, use, and distribution of such appropriated waters for all beneficial uses."

And:

"Federal officers, employees, agencies, and instrumentalities the same as private persons shall proceed in conformity with the laws of the State in which the appropriation has been or shall be instituted or perfected, and that each of them shall be governed by the laws of such State in respect to the control, use, and distribution of the appropriated water."

Extensive hearings on the subject, however, conducted by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs during March of 1956, disclose that the problem is not a simple one, and in those hearings the Department of Justice, I believe for the first time, rather fully and completely explained its views with regard to all of the constitutional questions which from time to time have raised.

From these hearings the views of the Department of Justice (and I should make clear they are long-standing views of previous, as well as the present, administrations) are apparent.

First, it is asserted that no State delineated from former public lands, as such, owns any water. This is on the theory of original Government ownership and failure to convey, which I have discussed; that only individuals have acquired property rights in the use of water; and that those rights have been acquired directly from the Federal Government by reason of permissive Federal statutes (the Desert Land Act, among others), which provide that they may be acquired by complying with the laws of the States. This, of course, is a denial of any validity in the argument that ratification by Congress of State constitutions is acquiescence in the States' rights asserted therein.

Second, that the water rights of individuals acquired from the United States through compliance with State laws are vested property rights and cannot be impaired without compensation.

Third, with reference to the rights of the Federal Government under the commerce clause, it is asserted, and quite properly I believe, that there can be no vested rights in the appropriation of water from navigable streams; that they are subject to the power of the Federal Government under the commerce clause to impair such rights for navigational purposes, as may be later determined.

How far the navigation power may be extended in the years to come, no one can foretell. In the Appalachian Power Co. case[10] the Court held that the New River, a tributary of the Kanawha in the mountains of West Virginia, was a navigable stream (based on historic facts), but used very interesting language:

"To appraise the evidence of navigability on the natural condition only of the waterway is erroneous. Its availability for navigation must also be considered. * * * A waterway, otherwise suitable for navigation, is not barred from that classification merely because artificial aids must make the highway suitable for use before commercial navigation may be undertaken. * * * Nor is it necessary that the improvement should be actually completed or even authorized."

With suggestions not too far distant that the Missouri River should be made navigable to Fort Peck, Mont.; that the Arkansas should be made navigable through Oklahoma and Kansas; and with a hundred other schemes throughout the country to make navigable channels where none, in fact, have ever existed; it would be a hardy soul indeed who would prophesy the extent of the Fed-

[8] *Nevada ex. rel. Shamberger, State Engineer* v. *United States*, U.S. District Court, Nevada, No. 1247.

[9] *Santa Margarita Water Co.* v. *United States* (numerous citations).

[10] *United States* v. *Appalachian Electric Power Co.*, 311 U.S. 377, 407, 408.

eral power to control inland waters under the commerce clause.

Fourth, the war clause—here again no one can define the outer limits of the powers of Congress to raise and support defense forces, which implies, of course, the construction of military reservations, the attendant necessity for water, etc. Certainly we must concede the importance of the Federal Government in this rather limited but sometimes highly controversial area. Whether such power can be used for the taking without compensation of water already appropriated is something else again—depending on the facts.

I shall not discuss the notorious Santa Margarita case, still pending, other than to say I am told that Justice is now claiming only such rights as were accrued and vested in the purchased land, plus a "reasonable" right to exercise riparian rights, and that the Military Establishment is a "beneficial use" of a riparian landowner.

Fifth, the property clause—it is to what are alleged to be implied restrictions on the property clause that the Justice Department has given the most minute attention. It is said that the property clause, while permitting the Congress to dispose of Federal property, i.e., water rights, does not permit the Congress to subordinate the control of such Federal property to the laws of the States, and, therefore, laws which undertake to subject such water, or Federal officials managing water, to the laws of the respective States are an unconstitutional delegation of legislative power.[11]

Some of the Senators had difficulty in understanding why it was unconstitutional under the property clause to vest the management of Federal water rights in the control of the States, when at the same time it is conceded that valid title might be acquired from the Federal Government by congressional delegation under the laws of the States.

In this connection it is interesting to note that the Supreme Court, as long ago as 1914 in the Midwest Oil case,[12] said:

"For it must be borne in mind that Congress not only has a legislative power over the public domain, but it also exercises the powers of the proprietor therein. Congress 'may deal with such lands precisely as an ordinary individual may deal with farming property.' Like any other owner it may provide when, how, and to whom its land can be sold. It can permit it to be withdrawn from sale. Like any other owner, it can waive its strict rights."

And in the more recent second *Tidelands* case[13] the Court, after quoting from the *Midwest Oil* case and others, said:

"The power over the public land thus entrusted to Congress is without limitations. 'And it is not for the courts to say how that trust shall be administered. That is for Congress to determine.' "

This language was again quoted with approval in the Ivanhoe case, but it is interesting to note that the opinion in Ivanhoe does not deal with the language of section 8 of the Reclamation Act, namely, "The Secretary of the Interior in carrying out the provisions of this chapter shall proceed in conformity with such laws."

This position, that there are restrictions on the power of Congress with reference to subjecting public lands to State law, goes to the heart of the matter and brings in question the constitutionality of several laws which have been on the statute books for many, many years. The most conspicuous of these is section 8 of the Reclamation Act (32 Stat. 390), which since 1902 has provided that nothing done under the said act in the reclamation program "shall be construed as affecting or intended to affect or to in any way interfere with the laws of any State or Territory relating to the control, appropriation, use or distribution of water used in irrigation, or any vested right acquired thereunder, and the Secretary of the Interior, in carrying out the provisions of this chapter, shall proceed in conformity with such laws." Incidentally, the Bureau of Reclamation has been able to proceed through the years, complying in large part with this statute, albeit sometimes grudgingly.

But there are numerous other acts of the Congress whose constitutionality is seriously questioned by this argument of unconstitutional delegation. Perhaps we should briefly review what Congress has said on the matter of the supremacy of State laws in the last century.

In the act of July 26, 1866 (14 Stat. 253), the Congress said that water rights for mining, agricultural, manufacturing, and other purposes which had vested and accrued under the laws of the States on the public domain should be maintained and protected.

Thereafter follows a long line of Federal statutes which say substantially the same thing, and the pertinent sections of these statutes are attached as an appendix to this paper. Briefly, they are:

The act of July 9, 1870 (16 Stat. 218), further expanded and confirmed the act of 1866.

The Desert Land Act of March 8, 1877 (19 Stat. 377), we have already referred to.

Section 8 of the Reclamation Act of 1902 (32 Stat. 390) we have already referred to.

The act of June 4, 1897 (30 Stat. 36), establishing the national forests apparently confirmed the right to appropriate waters from the national forest lands.

Sections 9(b) and 27 of the Federal Power Act of 1920 (41 Stat. 1077) make clear that nothing in that act "shall be construed as affecting or intending to affect or in any way interfere with the laws of the respective States relating to the control, appropriation, use, or distribution of water."

Section 18 of the Boulder Canyon Project Act of December 21, 1928 (45 Stat. 1057), clearly provides that nothing shall be construed as interfering with water rights which the States now have to the waters within their boundaries.

Section 3 of the Taylor Grazing Act of 1934 (48 Stat. 1269) says that nothing shall be construed as diminishing or impairing any State water rights.

The Great Plains Water Conservation and Utilization Projects Act of October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1119), reiterates the same principle.

The Water Conservation Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1419) provides that the Secretary shall only proceed as the water rights have been acquired under State law.

Section 1 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887), acknowledges State law and in addition provides (the O'Mahoney-Milliken amendment) that the uses of water for navigation west of the 97th meridian shall be subordinate to consumptive uses (under State law).

The Mexican Water Treaty, U.S. Treaty Serial No. 994 (59 Stat. 1219 (1945)) provides that nothing shall be done to control the distribution of water contrary to the uses within individual States.

The National Parks Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 885) requires "establishment of water rights in accordance with local custom, laws, and decisions of courts."

Section 208 of the act of July 10, 1952 (66 Stat. 560), consents that the United States be joined as a defendant in the course of acquiring or contesting water rights secured under State law.

Subsection 3(e) of the Submerged Lands Act of May 22, 1953 (67 Stat. 31), says that it shall not "be construed as affecting or intended to affect or in any way interfere with or modify the laws of the States * * * relating to the ownership and control of ground and surface waters" which shall continue in accordance with State law.

The act of July 28, 1954 (68 Stat. 577), authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to "construct facilities for the Santa Margarita River project" and provides that "the basis, measure, and limit of all rights of the United States of America shall be the laws of the State of California."

The act of July 23, 1955 (the multiple use of lands) (69 Stat. 368), provides that it shall not "be construed as affecting or intended to affect or in any way interfere with or modify the laws of the States * * * relating to the ownership, control, appropriation, use and distribution of ground and surface waters."

These statutes all evidence a century of congressional action regarding water law, in which the Congress has consistently made provision for the following of the laws of the States. Is it possible that they may all be held unconstitutional, as constituting an illegal delegation of power over Federal water rights by the Congress to the States?

How does this square with the facts that admittedly valid water rights have been secured from the Federal Government by following the laws of the States? And are not these statutes reasonable "regulations respecting * * * other property belonging to the United States?"

What right does the Congress have to adopt or recognize the laws of the States as governing a situation with reference to which Congress itself is silent? How far can it "incorporate State law by reference?"

This question has arisen in numerous other cases, quite apart from water rights. The Lands Division of the Department of Justice, under the direction of my friend Perry Morton, has compiled a monumental work closely related to this subject, entitled "Report of the Interdepartmental Committee for the Study of Jurisdiction Over Federal Areas Within the States."

In that connection attention is directed to the very recent *Sharpnack* case.[14] In that case the court held that the Assimilative Crimes Act of 1948 (18 U.S.C.A. 13),[15] which makes applicable the criminal code of the State, whether enacted now or hereafter, to persons on Federal lands within the State, is a proper and not an unlawful delegation of power by Congress.

Are we to say that the Congress may constitutionally subject the thousands of citizens on Federal areas to the criminal code of the States but lacks power to subject Federal lands to the water code of the States?

Prior to the *Sharpnack* case the argument regarding unlawful delegation of power was effective enough that substitute language for the Barrett bill, tendered by the Interior Department and approved by Justice, Defense, and Agriculture, is being considered. This latest version says:

---

[11] Hearings before the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, 84th Cong., on S. 863 (March 1956).

[12] *United States* v. *Midwest Oil Co.*, 236 U.S. 459, 474.

[13] *Alabama* v. *Texas*, 347 U.S. 272, 273.

[14] *United States* v. *Sharpnack*, 355 U.S. —, 2 L. ed. 2d 282 (1958).

[15] "Whoever within or upon any of the places now existing or hereafter reserved or acquired as provided in sec. 7 of this title [Any lands reserved or acquired for the use of the United States, and under the exclusive or concurrent jurisdiction thereof], is guilty of any act or omission which, although not punishable by any enactment of Congress, would be punishable if committed or omitted within the jurisdiction of the State, Territory, possession, or District in which such place is situated, by the laws thereof in force at the time of such act or omission, shall be guilty of a like offense and subject to a like punishment."

"SECTION. 1. The withdrawal or reservation of surveyed or unsurveyed public lands, heretofore or hereafter established, shall not affect any right to the use of water acquired pursuant to State law either before or after the establishment of such withdrawal or reservation.

"SEC. 2. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as:

"(a) Modifying or repealing any provision of any existing Act of Congress requiring that rights of the United States to the use of water be acquired pursuant to State law, to the extent that such provisions are otherwise applicable.

"(b) Permitting appropriations of water under State law which interfere with the provisions of international treaties of the United States.

"(c) Affecting, impairing, diminishing, subordinating or enlarging (1) the rights of the United States or any State to waters under any interstate compact or existing judicial decree; (2) the obligations of the United States to Indians or Indian tribes, or any right owned or held by or for Indians or Indian tribes; (3) any water right heretofore acquired by others than the United States under Federal or State law; (4) any right to any quantity of water used for governmental purposes or programs of the United States at any time from January 1, 1940, to the effective date of this act; or (5) any right of the United States to use water hereafter lawfully initiated in the exercise of the express or necessarily implied authority of any present or future act of Congress or State law when such right is initiated prior to the acquisition by others of any right to use water pursuant to State law."

An examination of this language will disclose that section 1 is designed to allay the fears raised by the Pelton decision. There seems to be a general agreement that for the future stability of the appropriative water rights of the West, the Government should dispel the cloud which the numerous Government reservation may create over downstream rights.

As a possible alternative, it has been suggested that, without affirming or denying all of the claimed Federal powers, Congress simply pass an act declaring that the exercise of Federal powers relating to waters shall only be exercised when authorized by Congress. Naturally, in view of the long history of Congress in protecting State rights, some such provision would meet State approval.

But to this it is answered that such a statute will tie the hands of the President and is unconstitutional, because it infringes upon the supremacy clause and the duty of the President that (Constitution, art. II, sec. 3) "he shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed." It is asserted that the laws in that clause include these alleged constitutional rights of the United States. If I can judge from the brochures which reach my desk, there are at least two views of what constitute the laws of the United States, which the President should see are executed.

There are two other factors in this situation which exert a powerful pressure toward the extension of the Federal control of waters on nonnavigable streams:

The first of these is the tremendous and nationwide urge for the utilization of the Federal function of flood control, for the actual purpose of providing storage reservoirs to provide municipal water supplies.

The authorization in the recent flood-control acts for structures to be enlarged where feasible, to provide municipal storage water, is an evidence of the ultimate drawing of the Federal Government, under the flood-control aspects of navigation, into being the rich uncle for municipalities. This is a policy and a political issue, but it will create an increasing pressure for the liberal construction of the commerce clause to control presently nonnavigable waters.

Another great force urging in the same direction is stream pollution. This is not the time or place to discuss pollution, other than to say that many of our larger streams are badly polluted—the Potomac is a terrible example.

There is a widespread feeling that stream pollution is completely beyond the control of State and local authorities. Much of this arises because of the interstate character of so many of our streams. More of it arises because of the impossibility of making acceptable allocation of responsibility for pollution. In any event, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare estimates that if the United States undertakes a national program for the control of pollution of streams, we are talking about at least a billion dollars a year.

Naturally, to avoid unpopular local bond issues and considering the other problems just mentioned, there is here also a great force clamoring for further extension of the Federal Government into the field of water control. Here we also get on the fringe of the welfare clause.

I have tried to point out the legal problems involved in this controversy between the States and the Federal Government. I have tried to outline the claims of the contending forces. Your conclusions as to the outcome of the controversy will have to be drawn from the past decisions of the courts and your best guess on the future political climate.

APPENDIX

PROVISIONS OF FEDERAL STATUTES IN RECOGNITION OF STATE LAW AS GOVERNING WATER RIGHTS

1. The act of July 26, 1866 (14 Stat. 253):

"Whenever, by priority of possession, rights to the use of water for mining, agricultural, manufacturing, or other purposes have vested and accrued, and the same are recognized and acknowledged by the local customs, laws, and the decisions of courts, the posessors and owners of such vested rights shall be maintained and protected in the same; and the right-of-way for the construction of ditches and canals for the purposes herein specified is acknowledged and confirmed; but whenever any person, in the construction of any ditch or canal, injures or damages the possession of any settler on the public domain, the party committing such injury or damage shall be liable to the party injured for such injury or damage" (R. S., sec. 2339) (30 U.S.C.A., sec. 51).

2. The act of July 9, 1870 (16 Stat. 218):

"Whenever, by priority of possession, rights to the use of water for mining, agricultural, manufacturing, or other purposes, have vested and accrued, and the same are recognized and acknowledged by the local customs, laws, and the decisions of courts, the posessors and owners of such vested rights shall be maintained and protected in the same; and the right-of-way for the construction of ditches and canals for the purposes herein specified is acknowledged and confirmed; but whenever any person, in the construction of any ditch or canal, injures or damages the possession of any settler on the public domain, the party committing such injury or damage shall be liable to the party injured for such injury or damage.

"All patents granted, or preemption or homesteads allowed, shall be subject to any vested and accrued water rights, or rights to ditches and reservoirs used in connection with such water rights, as may have been acquired under or recognized by this section" (R. S., secs. 2339, 2340) (43 U.S.C.A., sec. 661).

3. The Desert Land Act of March 3, 1877 (19 Stat. 377):

"All surplus water over and above such actual appropriation and use, together with the water of all lakes, rivers, and other sources of water supply upon the public lands and not navigable, shall remain and be held free for the appropriation and use of the public for irrigation, mining and manufacturing purposes subject to existing rights" (43 U.S.C.A., sec. 321).

4. The act of June 4, 1897 (c. 2, sec. 1 (30 Stat. 36)):

"All waters within the boundaries of national forests may be used for domestic, mining, milling, or irrigation purposes, under the laws of the State wherein such national forests are situated, or under the laws of the United States and the rules and regulations established thereunder" (16 U.S.C.A., sec. 481).

5. Section 8 of the Reclamation Act of 1902 (32 Stat. 390):

"Nothing in this chapter shall be construed as affecting or intended to affect or to in any way interfere with the laws of any State or Territory relating to the control, appropriation, use, or distribution of water used in irrigation, or any vested right acquired thereunder, and the Secretary of the Interior, in carrying out the provisions of this chapter, shall proceed in conformity with such laws, and nothing herein shall in any way affect any right of any State or of the Federal Government, or of any landowner, appropriator, or user of water in, to, or from any interstate stream or the waters thereof" (June 17, 1902, c. 1093, sec. 8, 32 Stat. 390) (43 U.S.C.A., sec. 383).

6. Sections 9(b) and 27 of the Federal Power Act of 1920 (41 Stat. 1077):

"(b) Satisfactory evidence that the applicant has complied with the requirements of the laws of the State or States within which the proposed project is to be located with respect to bed and banks and to the appropriation, diversion, and use of water for power purposes and with respect to the right to engage in the business of developing, transmitting, and distributing power, and in any other business necessary to effect the purposes of a license under this chapter" (16 U.S.C.A., sec. 802(b)).

"Nothing contained in this chapter shall be construed as effecting or intending to affect or in any way to interfere with the laws of the respective States relating to the control, appropriation, use, or distribution of water used in irrigation or for municipal or other uses, or any vested right acquired therein (June 10, 1920, c. 285, sec. 27, 41 Stat. 1077)" (16 U.S.C.A., sec. 821).

7. Section 18 of the Boulder Canyon Project Act of December 21, 1928 (45 Stat. 1057):

"Nothing herein shall be construed as interfering with such rights as the States now have either to the waters within their borders or to adopt such policies and enact such laws as they may deem necessary with respect to the appropriation, control, and use of waters within their borders, except as modified by the Colorado River Compact or other interstate agreement" (43 U.S.C.A., sec. 617q).

8. Section 3 of the Taylor Grazing Act of 1934 (48 Stat. 1269):

"Provided further, That nothing in this chapter shall be construed or administered in any way to diminish or impair any right to the possession and use of water for mining, agriculture, manufacture, or other purposes which has heretofore vested or accrued under existing law validly affecting the public lands or which may be hereafter initiated or acquired and maintained in accordance with such law" (43 U.S.C.A., sec. 315b).

9. The Great Plains Water Conservation and Utilization Projects Act of October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1119):

"As a condition to extending benefits under sections 590r–590x of this title to any lands not owned or controlled by the United States or any of its agencies, the Secretary of Agriculture may, insofar as he may deem

necessary for the purposes of sections 590r–590x of this title, require—

"(1) The enactment of State and local laws providing for soil conserving land uses and practices, and the storage, conservation, and equitable utilization of waters" (16 U.S.C.A., sec. 590u).

10. The Water Conservation Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1419):

"(2) the Secretary has found (i) that water rights adequate for the purposes of the project have been acquired with titles and at prices satisfactory to him, or have been initiated and can be perfected in conformity with State law and any applicable interstate agreements and in a manner satisfactory to him; and (ii) that such water rights can be utilized for the purposes of the project in conformity with State law and any applicable interstate agreements and in a manner satisfactory to him" (Aug. 11, 1939, c. 717, sec. 3, 53 Stat. 1419; Oct. 14, 1940, c. 861, 54 Stat. 1120) (16 U.S.C.A., sec. 590z–1 (b)(2)).

11. Section 1 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887):

"In connection with the exercise of jurisdiction over the rivers of the Nation through the construction of works of improvement, for navigation or flood control, as herein authorized, it is declared to be the policy of the Congress to recognize the interests and rights of the States in determining the development of the watersheds within their borders and likewise their interests and rights in water utilization and control, as herein authorized to preserve and protect to the fullest possible extent established and potential uses, for all purposes, of the waters of the Nation's rivers; to facilitate the consideration of projects on a basis of comprehensive and coordinated development; and to limit the authorization and construction of navigation works to those in which a substantial benefit to navigation will be realized therefrom and which can be operated consistently with appropriate and economic use of the waters of such rivers by other users.

"In conformity with this policy:

* * * * *

"(b) The use for navigation, in connection with the operation and maintenance of such works herein authorized for construction, of waters arising in States lying wholly or partly west of the 98th meridian shall be only such use as does not conflict with any beneficial consumptive use, present or future, in States lying wholly or partly west of the 98th meridian, of such waters for domestic, municipal, stock water, irrigation, mining, or industrial purposes (33 U.S.C.A., sec. 701–1).

12. Reservation (c) to the Mexican Water Treaty, United States Treaty Serial No. 994 (59 Stat. 1219 (1945)):

"That nothing contained in the treaty or protocol shall be construed as authorizing the Secretary of State of the United States, the commissioner of the United States section of the International Boundary and Water Commission, or the United States section of said commission, directly or indirectly to alter or control the distribution of water to users within the territorial limits of any of the individual States."

13. The National Parks Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 885):

Appropriations for the National Park Service are authorized for "investigation and establishment of water rights in accordance with local custom, laws, and decisions of courts, including the acquisition of water rights or of lands or interests in lands or rights-of-way for use and protection of water rights necessary or beneficial in the administration and public use of the national parks and monuments" (16 U.S.C.A., sec. 17j–2(g).

14. Section 208 of the act of July 10, 1952, authorizing suits against the United States in State courts for the adjudication of water rights (66 Stat. 560):

"Consent is given to join the United States as a defendant in any suit (1) for the adjudication of rights to the use of water of a river system or other source or (2) for the administration of such rights, where it appears that the United States is the owner of or is in the process of acquiring water rights by appropriation under State law, by purchase, by exchange, or otherwise, and the United States is a necessary party to such suit. The United States, when a party to any such suit, shall (1) be deemed to have waived any right to plead that the State laws are inapplicable or that the United States is not amenable thereto by reason of its sovereignty, and (2) shall be subject to the judgments, orders, and decrees of the court having jurisdiction, and may obtain review thereof, in the same manner and to the same extent as a private individual under like circumstances: *Provided*, That no judgment for costs shall be entered against the United States in any such suit" (43 U.S.C.A., sec. 666(a)).

15. Subsection 3(e) of the Submerged Lands Act of May 22, 1953 (67 Stat. 31):

"Nothing in this chapter shall be construed as affecting or intended to affect or in any way interfere with or modify the laws of the States which lie wholly or in part westward of the 98th meridian, relating to the ownership and control of ground and surface waters; and the control, appropriation, use, and distribution of such waters shall continue to be in accordance with the laws of such States" (May 22, 1953, ch. 65, title II, sec. 3, 67 Stat. 30) (43 U.S.C.A., sec. 1311(e)).

16. Subsection 3(c) of the act of July 28, 1954, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct facilities for the Santa Margarita River project, California (68 Stat. 577):

"For the purposes of this act the basis, measure, and limit of all rights of the United States of America pertaining to the use of water shall be the laws of the State of California: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be construed as a grant or a relinquishment by the United States of America of any of its rights to the use of water which it acquired according to the laws of the State of California either as a result of its acquisition of the lands comprising Camp Joseph H. Pendleton and adjoining naval installations, and the rights to the use of water as a part of said acquisition, or through actual use or prescription or both since the date of that acquisition, if any, or to create any legal obligation to store any water in De Luz Reservoir, to the use of which it has such rights, or to require the division under this act of water to which it has such rights."

17. The act of July 23, 1955 (being sec. 4(b) of Public Law 167, 84th Cong.), the act providing for multiple-use of the surface of tracts of public land (69 Stat. 368):

"*Provided further*, That nothing in sections 601, 603, and 611–615 of this title shall be construed as affecting or intended to affect or in any way interfere with or modify the laws of the States which lie wholly or in part westward of the 98th meridian relating to the ownership, control, appropriation, use, and distribution of ground or surface waters within any unpatented mining claim" (30 U.S.C.A., sec. 612(b)).

Tribute to the Late Barrow Lyons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 17, 1959

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I have prepared in tribute to the late Barrow Lyons, who passed away on April 5 at his home.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

When Barrow Lyons passed away in his home at 3 a.m., April 5, the people of this country and the Capitol Hill community lost a selfless crusader for humanity and democracy. He was an effective crusader without fanaticism, a fighter without hate.

A rounded man with interests in literature, music, and philosophy, Barrow Lyons in recent years devoted himself especially to the conservation of the natural resources of the United States. He believed unshakably that the natural resources of the United States should belong to all the people of this Nation rather than to a self-appointed few. His book, "Tomorrow's Birthright," published in 1955, remains one of the outstanding studies of the resource problem.

Mr. Lyons had a long and distinguished career as a newspaperman. He worked on such great dailies as the New York Times, the Christian Science Monitor, the Baltimore Sun, and many others. As a science reporter for the Associated Press, as financial editor of the New York World Telegram, as business editor of Newsweek, and as a writer for many other magazines, he brought to bear a scholarly interest in fact with the quick perception of the reporter and the ability to analyze and describe in crisp, concise prose.

In 1938 he came to Washington as a financial economist for the Securities and Exchange Commission to prepare a massive study of the financing of small business from the time of the Revolution to the present century. He served also with the Temporary National Economic Committee.

Later Mr. Lyons became an information specialist with the War Production Board. In 1944 he moved over to become the chief of information for the Bureau of Reclamation. It was in this position that his interest in and knowledge of "tomorrow's birthright" deepened. He retired from Government service in 1952, but continued to write voluminously on economic, political, and resource affairs.

Throughout his years in Washington, Barrow Lyons was well known to dozens of Senators and Congressmen, many of whom sought his advice. He was respected and liked by his newspaper colleagues. He was also known widely in the cooperative movement throughout the Nation. He was an active, effective member of many organizations, ranging from the Cosmos Club and the National Press Club to the National Grange, the Cooperative Forum, the Electric Consumers' Information Committee, and American Newspaper Guild.

Although he had been suffering from heart trouble for several years, Mr. Lyons remained always ready to lend his amazingly youthful vigor to a humane cause, large or small. Typically, during the last few weeks of his

life, he was spearheading an effort to organize a memorial service for his friend, the late Tom Stokes, the renowned columnist who, like Mr. Lyons, was concerned over the depletion of our natural wealth.

The world has no shortage of cause supporters. It was Barrow Lyons' quiet distinction that he remained doggedly independent and courageous without bluster, bluff, or sham. He never let his interest in one goal blind him to the significance of others. Thus, although he is most closely identified with conservation and public power, Barrow Lyons also worked without fanfare for election reform, for aid to small business, for decent unionism. He never made a nickel out of his services; he never sought remuneration. He was sophisticated, but in 69 years he never grew cynical.

Beyond this, Barrow Lyons never grew inconsiderate of human beings because of a preoccupation with humanity. His generosity of spirit, his twinkling humor, his thoughtfulness, and his literal love for his fellow men affected—and bettered—all those who knew him. More than anything else, this is the birthright he leaves to tomorrow.

Friends and Enemies—Book Review of Adlai Stevenson's Report on Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 17, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in addition to my remarks on the article by Mr. Bowles I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a book review I was privileged to write on the book entitled "Friends and Enemies," written by Adlai Stevenson, the review being entitled "Stevenson on Russia: The Great Battle May Be Economic," published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 22, 1959.

There being no objection, the book review was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STEVENSON ON RUSSIA: THE GREAT BATTLE MAY BE ECONOMIC

(Reviewed by HUBERT H. HUMPHREY)

(Senator HUMPHREY's own visit to Russia, and his interview with Khrushchev, made news last December.)

("Friends and Enemies: What I Learned in Russia," by Adlai Stevenson; Harper.)

Any report from Governor Stevenson of his visit to the Soviet Union is to be welcomed. This slim volume summarizing a series of articles which appeared immediately following Governor Stevenson's return to the United States should be must reading—especially for those of us with responsibility in the field of American foreign policy. I read the original articles with keen interest and am delighted that they are now available in this permanent form.

Mr. Stevenson's book stresses the warmth and friendliness of the Soviet people and the startling paradox of the Soviet leaders who exhibit public wrath against the United States and private cordiality to visitors from America.

In his introduction, Mr. Stevenson raises some important questions: Why shouldn't we trade with the Soviets? Why shouldn't we help them to improve their living standards? The inferred answer is that a Soviet nation with a high living standard may be a more peacfully inclined power.

These questions also reflect his conviction that it is the economic battlefield that may well be decisive in the world struggle. He dramatically underlines the success of the Soviet economic-political offensive in the underdeveloped countries.

Russian, he says, has a great attraction for other poor nations, because as a poor nation it has pulled itself up by its own bootstraps. He points out that the Russian offensive in these decisive areas employs many techniques: cutting prices to get foreign exchange and to capture markets, bartering, purchasing commodities which other countries desperately want to sell, lending money at long-term, low-interest rates, and constructing industrial plants. And—this is important—providing technicians who speak the languages and live humbly like the local people.

Every thoughtful American should reflect on Governor Stevenson's conclusion that the West could go the way of the Athenian democracy in its long struggle with Sparta when an infinitely superior civilization went under, because it lacked the self-discipline to survive. Is the United States today, asks Stevenson, so preoccupied with the military struggle that we have forgotten the values upon which our country is founded?

Stevenson hopes that we will be willing to change our habits, our political behavior and to replace our complacency with a new sense of urgency. And, so do I. Stevenson's book should be of great help in convincing the leadership of America that the time is very late, the adversary is formidable, and things are not going to get better automatically. His wise and humane approach to the problems of foreign policy is a good example of what American leadership should be.

He believes, and I believe, that our leadership must learn more understanding of the deep human suffering and the vigorous human aspirations that underlie the social and political unheavals now rocking the world—as well as more understanding of the truly magnificent human and economic resources of our Nation which could be employed in more constructive and meaningful policies in the have-not areas in the world.

Tribute to Gerald Cullinan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 17, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a tribute recently paid to Gerald Cullinan, of Dallas, who has just left Government service and returned to private business.

Mr. Cullinan came to Washington 5 years ago as Assistant to the Postmaster General. He became Deputy Postmaster General and established a nationwide reputation among postmasters and postal supervisors for his fairness and willingness to be of assistance regardless of the political affiliations of the individual who needed help.

The article I am asking to have printed in the RECORD appeared recently in the Mountaineer Postmaster, official publication of the West Virginia branch of the National Association of Postmasters. It was written by F. Alvin Webb, postmaster of Keystone, W. Va., a member of the executive committee of the National Association of Postmasters, and the immediate past president of the West Virginia chapter of that organization.

The fact that Mr. Webb was appointed postmaster by a Democratic administration while Mr. Cullinan served as an appointee of the present administration lends special interest to this well-deserved tribute.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CULLINAN QUITS AS SPECIAL ASSISTANT, TAKES PRIVATE POST

(By F. Alvin Webb)

West Virginia postmasters will be saddened to learn that their stanch friend, Gerry Cullinan, Special Assistant to the Deputy Postmaster General, has resigned from Government service. He has accepted the position of senior associate in the well-known public relations firm of Edward K. Moss, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C. He will engage in the practice of domestic and foreign public relations and Government relations. The Moss firm also has offices in New York, Paris, and Rome.

However, as could be expected, Gerry, as he is known to thousands of postmasters over the country, has no intention of deserting his old friends and he has been asked to assist in the NAPUS public relations program on a consultant basis and he has accepted the offer. So at least some of his time will be spent working for and with postmasters.

Rarely has a postal official caught the imagination of postmasters or earned their affection to the degree that Gerry Cullinan did during his 5½ years of devoted service. His brilliant oratory, his burning devotion to the Postmaster General and to the postal service, his unflagging energy and good humor and his tremendous talent for friendship all contributed to the total of affection and respect in which postmasters in every corner of the United States held him.

He was so unsparing of his strength and unstinting of his talents that on two occasions his health broke through sheer exhaustion. No one knows how many members of our association were helped out of serious trouble through his efforts. Gerry Cullinan never let it be known who had been in difficulty or whom he had helped.

Aside from his work for and with postmasters, his permanent achievements have been many. But his crowning achievement was his swan song at the national convention at Cinoinnati when he wrote and produced "The Summerfield Story" which thrilled the entire overflow audience in the Taft Auditorium.

In a letter to me afterward he said, "Since I knew that the necessity of planning for the future would force me to return to civilian life right after the convention, I tried to pour into that presentation all that I felt about that great and courageous human being who serves as our Postmaster General as well as all that I felt about the greatest group of men and women I have ever known, the postmasters of the national association." He kept his plans for retirement secret during the convention lest it dampen anyone's spirits or lessen anyone's enjoyment.

West Virignia postmasters feel especially close to Gerry Cullinan because he always responded to our requests and desires. He first came here in 1954 for our convention at Martinsburg. He returned to Beckley in 1957 and to Parkersburg in 1958. And last March he came to Charleston to deliver the address at the Dave Blackwood testimonial banquet.

His departure leaves a void that will be all but impossible to fill. It is good to know that he will be in our corner in his new career. Our thoughts and hopes and prayers go with him.

NATO in the Years Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 17, 1959

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the fact that the Hon Paul-Henri Spaak, Secretary General of NATO, is at the present time visiting our country. Mr. Spaak has done much to make possible the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and more solidarity in the Atlantic Community. This is his 10th anniversary of NATO.

A very thoughtful editorial in regard to what is ahead and what is in store for NATO appeared in the Christian Science Monitor of April 6. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATO IN THE YEARS AHEAD

The 10th anniversary of NATO passed with due celebrations. But it also was blessed with what is more nourishing for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. That is, stern reminders from the Communist world in 1959 as to why most of the free nations of the West found it possible and necessary in 1949 to harness their vigorous individualism to a concept of long-term unity.

The speech that President Eisenhower delivered to the Council meeting last week, though unfortunately lacking in freshness of approach to the subject, did serve to underscore a fact that is still too little appreciated among people who are longing for the outlawry of war and for the end of national reliance on arms for security. This is that the West must be prepared to "live in a world in which tension and bickering between the free nations and the Soviet Union will be daily experiences." And that the main strength which NATO brings to the Western world for this test is not a strength of armaments so much as the strength of a moral and mental element—the element of unity.

One other important thing the President's speech did was call attention to the highly creative contribution the Secretary-General of NATO, Belgium's Paul-Henri Spaak, is making to NATO's civilian development.

Of all NATO leaders, Mr. Spaak has seemed to see at once and most clearly the contrast between NATO's vast possibilities and the outlooks of the key governments on which its development mainly depends. As he has said in a recent statement:

"Fortunately, NATO is not, as some people think, in a state of crisis. On the contrary, it is flourishing. * * * Nevertheless * * * commonsense solutions seem to be running head on into stubborn forces of nationalism and individualism within the alliance.

"Yet is it not contradictory to say to an ally, 'I insist on sharing all your secrets, knowing your innermost thoughts, but I intend to keep my own freedom of action; I agree to consult with you, but I retain all my rights to do as I see fit'? Here we are faced with the real weakness of the Atlantic alliance in every sphere—the lack of unity."

Now, the attitudes the Eisenhower speech and the Spaak statement disclose are not so contradictory as they may seem. The unity is there, as against threatened or actual aggression. It is inadequate, however, as against the problems Mr. Spaak cites as scientific research, armaments production, aid to underdeveloped countries, military organization, or the conduct of diplomacy. It is also inadequate as regards economic, social, and even cultural and educational relations within the Atlantic community.

The alliance, Mr. Spaak correctly declares, deserves to be served "with the same energy, love, and pride that for centuries have been put at the service of each individual country." He knows that at present this is "a dream." Yet he says, "The dream must become a reality, for it is on this reality that our future depends. Of that I am convinced."

If this sense of unity once permeates the attitudes of peoples it will be reflected in the attitudes of governments. But this does not excuse the governments—especially the bigger ones—from providing more vigorous leadership toward unity than they have yet offered.

PTA's History Called a Prelude

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 17, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we recognize that today we face serious problems in the field of education.

To meet these challenges demands the coordinated efforts of all our citizens.

Over the years, the parents and teachers associations throughout the country have made a significant contribution not only toward resolving problems for individual students and schools but also in developing ideas and planning for an overall better educational system.

This week, the Wisconsin Congress of Parents and Teachers met in Eau Claire, Wis. The theme of the meeting was "A Half Century of United Effort—Toward Meeting Each Individual's Needs for Tomorrow's World." This theme, indeed, embodies the essence of an educational philosophy by which we must meet the challenges of the future.

Recognizing the tremendous contributions which our PTA's, not only in Wisconsin but across the country, have made to bettering our educational programs I welcome this opportunity to pay tribute to these splendid organizations.

A recent issue of the Milwaukee Journal carried two articles touching upon the highlights of the recent PTA Congress in Eau Claire, Wis. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PTA'S HISTORY CALLED A PRELUDE—GROUP MUST EXPAND IN APPLYING IDEALS, NATIONAL PRESIDENT SAYS AT EAU CLAIRE

(By Louise Cattoi)

EAU CLAIRE, WIS.—"A Half Century of United Effort—Toward Meeting Each Individual's Need for Tomorrow's World," is the theme of the golden jubilee convention of the Wisconsin Congress of Parents and Teachers, which opened a 2-day session here Monday.

Keynoting the theme at the opening session was Mrs. James C. Parker, Grand Rapids, Mich., president of the national PTA, who observed that "this half century (of PTA achievement), is but the prelude for that which is to come."

Mrs. Parker pointed to the need for "ever expanding application of all the discoveries and knowledge and experience that has been ours."

IS ACTION TOO CASUAL?

She said that "we have talked rather philosophically in the past about developing the individual child," but she wondered if "we have been rather casual and uncommitted in our devotion."

"I do not like to think so," she went on, "but I am convinced that the fact that we can no longer coast along in our general concepts of the rights of the individual is because we are faced with a big, strong, young pioneering nation which declares that the individual no longer matters.

"It is a nation that says the individual belongs to the state, not as a contributing citizen, but because the state says, 'you are mine. I shall take your talents, your inborn capacities, your skills, your ability to learn, and direct and develop it as I see the need and the place to use it.'"

PHILOSOPHY DIFFERS

This is very different from the philosophy we hold, which in a large measure thinks of man in relation to God, and of free will to choose his pathway, she commented.

"You know how the PTA works in Russia?" she asked. "Parents are required to have conferences at stated intervals with their children's teachers."

Although the PTA, as the largest volunteer organization in the country, has much to its credit for the welfare of the school child, the home and the community, she said, the next 50 years should show a more potent achievement.

In her final formal message to the convention Monday, Mrs. James Lohr, Sheboygan, whose term as State president ends in June, paid tribute to PTA work of the last 50 years, but urged greater efforts in the future.

Mrs. Lohr observed that "the love of children is the seed of greatness in parent-teacher workers. * * * Properly nourished, the seed will bear good fruit."

EXPLAINS LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

She told of having looked over some of the early histories of the National and State PTA congresses, and noted that in "the area of legislation, more than in any other, the women were ridiculed in newspapers, magazines, cartoons, and in speeches."

"This (legislation) was not supposed to be the business of the female," she commented. "But the ridicule did not stop the women. They kept right on reporting the glaring social evils, enlisted the support of their husbands and teachers until they developed the pressure arts—ringing doorbells and sending telegrams until the legislators just had to listen."

The PTA congress, he went on, in the last 50 years has helped bring about educational and social progress, and has recognized that more than children's physical environment is important—moral and spiritual values and habit development are important.

LEGISLATION STUDIED

Mrs. Lohr reported that 7 of the 11 PTA districts in the State prepared legislative programs for the current session of the legislature. Recently, district legislative chairmen came to Madison for a meeting planned and financed by the State PTA congress. This included intensive study of pending legislation and a visit to the capitol to see the legislature in action.

Mrs. Lohr reported that 5,500 new members came into the PTA in the last year. Official figures have not yet been compiled, but the total State membership is now about 145,000 in some 950 PTA units.

Mrs. Willis Van Horn, Appleton, was nominated for president, Monday. Nominees for other offices were Mrs. Howard Thomas, Wisconsin Rapids, vice president; Mrs. George Gregg, 7710 Stickney Avenue, Wauwatosa, vice president, and Mrs. Marden Phillips, Madison, secretary. Other officers hold over. The election will be Tuesday.

FOUR PTA LEADERS, WRITER GET AWARDS

EAU CLAIRE, WIS.—Life memberships in honor of outstanding activities were awarded to four leaders at the golden jubilee luncheon of the Wisconsin Congress of Parents and Teachers, Tuesday, at the American Legion auditorium here.

The winners are: T. J. Kuemmerlein, Milwaukee, a State PTA vice president and director of the department of pupil personnel in the Milwaukee public schools; Mrs. Caroline Hartl Allen, Marshfield, and Dean Lindley Stiles of the University of Wisconsin, and Philip H. Falk, both of Madison.

A fifth life membership was awarded Monday night to Miss Louise Cattoi, club editor of the Milwaukee Journal. The award was a surprise for Miss Cattoi, who described herself as "neither a parent nor a teacher."

The citation said that the life membership was given her in appreciation of long years of press relationship and service.

OFFICERS ELECTED

Officers elected Tuesday morning and installed at the luncheon were:

Mrs. Willis Van Horn, Appleton, president, to succeed Mrs. James Lohr of Sheboygan, whose term expires in June; Mrs. George Gregg, 7701 Stickney Avenue, Wauwatosa, vice president; Mrs. Howard Thomas, Wisconsin Rapids, vice president, and Mrs. Marden Phillips, Madison, secretary. Other officers hold over.

PLATFORM ADOPTED

The platform adopted Tuesday morning dealt with four areas.

1. Concern for the individual: By seeing that the educational program be for each child and that it is adequate for his needs and capabilities.

2. Concern for the family: By supporting statewide programs which would increase the knowledge of the family regarding children and increase family life education programs; by supporting programs which help prevent mental illness and preserve the mental health of all members of the family; by encouraging family participation in group recreational activities.

3. Concern for the community: By promoting and supporting an expanding educational program; by helping the general public in understanding the program of the schools; by supporting programs which will give to each child a well-rounded program of education.

BEST QUALIFIED TEACHERS

By supporting efforts which would protect communities from forces harmful to children and adults; by helping provide adequate services in all communities to meet the needs of the mentally ill, and physically and emotionally disturbed children and youth.

By continuing to support efforts of the State to train and secure the best qualified teachers; by supporting appropriate legislation at the State level to bring about these programs.

HELP CIVIL DEFENSE

4. Concern for the world community: By securing desired legislation for youth which would provide adequate financial support for schools and equalization of educational opportunities for all.

By coordinating with civil defense authorities; by cooperating with those agencies which foster world understanding with the ultimate goal of world peace; by propounding democratic ideas.

Gettysburg Our Gettysburg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1959

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, it just so happens that Gettysburg Battlefield is located in the 19th Congressional District of Pennsylvania which I have the honor to represent. But the issue of preserving the battlefield in a manner fitting to the honor of the men who fought there and the living who visit this hallowed ground is of more than regional interest. Gettysburg is a national shrine. Its 2,500 monuments and markers will be outnumbered by custard stands and beer parlors unless the Congress of the United States takes action now to wipe out the eyesores already surrounded by the national park boundaries. I have introduced into the RECORD articles and editorials from a half dozen sources outside of my district. I would like to introduce still another and commend it to my fellow Members as further evidence of the scope of this issue. The following editorial is from the Columbus, Ohio, dispatch of April 11, 1959:

Unless the U.S. Senate restores the request of the National Park Service for $750,000 for fiscal 1960 to preserve portions of the Gettysburg battlefield threatened by commercialization, one of the great focal points of American history and sentiment interest will be irrevocably damaged if not destroyed.

The House of Representatives, piously practicing an "economy" for which it has shown no great regard in other areas of Federal finance, has cut from the NPS appropriations bill every penny designated for acquisition of Civil War battlefield sites next year.

Under consideration is a plan to reproduce the Battle of Gettysburg 4 years from now, as a patriotic spectacle of profound historic interest, on the 100th anniversary of the engagement.

Unless the NPS gets the additional 691 acres it needs to preserve the approximate battle area intact (it now owns 2,762 acres) spectators of the restaged conflict may see Pickett's men charging around hot dog and ice cream stands.

Some of the first-day's fighting may lose some of its authenticity by being carried out on the front lawns of a new ranchhouse subdivision.

Total cost of the land needed, and scheduled for acquisition over a 3-year period by NPS—if it can pry the money loose from a suddenly tight-fisted Congress—is $2.4 million.

This isn't exactly small change, even in these days of huge Federal budgets and extravagant spending. But it is little indeed when it represents the preservation or loss of what is perhaps the most meaningful of all the Nation's historic shrines.

The Civil War is recognized as the most significant single event in American annals, a genuine great divide in human history. The Battle of Gettysburg decided that war. It would be unthinkable to go as far as the Nation already has gone to commemorate this mighty event for posterity without going the full way to keep it intact.

Much of the terrain the NPS wants to acquire is now being farmed under lease, and the same is true of a goodly part of the battlefield it now owns, including the famous Peach Orchard, thus duplicating its appearance as it was in July 1863. The new acreage would be put to productive use in the same manner.

Present owners of the land still needed to preserve the whole battlefield, however, say they can't afford to pass up attractive offers from all sorts of commercial enterprises and real estate interests.

Apparently the only way to protect the hallowed ground of Lincoln's immortal address from desecration by the incongruous presence of motels, miniature golf courses, taverns, candy shops and an amusement park, is to add the additional 691 acres to the NPS holdings.

It is greatly to be hoped that the Senate may reverse the House's almost scandalously shortsighted and insensitive action.

Senator Smathers a Friend of the Latin American Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 17, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in the Miami Herald concerning one of our able and distinguished colleagues, the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS].

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN A POSITION TO SERVE

Florida's Senator GEORGE SMATHERS, as true a friend of the Latin American countries as there is in Congress, will soon be in a position to give point to his oft-expressed good will.

The Senate Commerce Committee will undertake a searching study of our declining world trade. Senator SMATHERS, as a ranking Democratic Member, is expected to head the Latin American subcommittee.

In that spot Florida's junior Senator will try to discover why U.S. trade with Latin America, our best customer after Europe, is plunging downward at a time when our neighbors are most hungry for American goods.

Nearly every country to the south is embarked on some kind of program to raise living standards. To South and Central Americans, as to North Americans, a better life is visualized in terms of American automobiles, refrigerators, washing machines and goods of all kinds.

Yet in the first 8 months of 1958 these countries cut their U.S. purchases by 10 percent. It was an alarming drop. And it is continuing.

The reasons are not hard to find. Most of our neighbors are plagued with inflation and unemployment. They lack the purchasing power to satisfy the needs of the people.

The stake of the United States is more than economic. Never in history have there been so many democratic regimes in office in Latin America. In Mexico, Chile, Venezuela, Colombia, Argentina, and Brazil there are leaders who place public welfare ahead of personal power. But some of them are sore beset. Political signs are favorable for freedom if only the economic roadblocks can be hurdled. American aid is needed for that.

Senator SMATHERS understands this well. His knowledge of Latin American people and needs is intimate and broad. That is why his assignment to head the Commerce subcommittee would be a happy one. He would be able to serve in practice the closer hemispheric relations he so often preaches.

Tribute to the Late Rodney McLean, of Naples, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 17, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the late Rodney F. McLean, of Naples, Tex., was a friend of the people.

Judge McLean came from a pioneer family of lawyers and leaders in Texas. He was continually busy at projects to help his neighbors.

He was disabled serving his country in war, but that did not slow him. He labored zealously for the people.

Rodney McLean showed great personal and physical courage. He also exhibited a highly commendable interest in the welfare of his neighborhood and his State. He managed five campaigns for us in the Naples area in our campaign for good government in Texas.

Last November, the people of Naples elected him to serve as justice of the peace. But he passed away shortly after.

Mr. President, in memory of Judge Rodney McLean, and as a mark of respect for his family, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of his obituary which was published in the Naples (Tex.) Monitor under the heading: "Rodney McLean, Justice of the Peace-Elect, Dies at Shreveport."

There being no objection, the obituary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RODNEY MCLEAN, JUSTICE OF THE PEACE-ELECT, DIES AT SHREVEPORT

Rodney F. McLean, a longtime resident of Naples, died at the Veterans' hospital at Shreveport at 6:10 p.m. Sunday.

He suffered a stroke at his home here last Wednesday and, after treatment at the local hospital, was transferred to the Shreveport hospital Thursday.

Mr. McLean was born at Gilmer, but had spent almost all of his life in Naples. He worked for many years as a traveling salesman and was elected justice of the peace here in the November 4 election.

Survivors include his wife, Mrs. Leona McLean of Naples; one son, Flippen McLean, of Lake Charles, La.; a brother, L. L. McLean, of Hot Springs, Ark.; one sister, Mrs. J. W. Martin, of Naples; and three grandchildren.

Funeral services were held at 10 a.m. Tuesday at the First Methodist Church here with the Reverend Frank Richardson officiating, assisted by the Reverend Morris Hill. Burial was in the Naples cemetery under the direction of the Hanner Funeral Home.

Pallbearers were Kennard Fleming, Dick Lowery, Homer Cole, Lynn Moore, E. E. Shirey, Vesta McMichael, Leon Garrett, and J. W. Spencer.

A Long Look at China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 17, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, there is a great deal of concern in this country about the Communist economic offensive. Sometimes we think of Communist economic power exclusively in terms of the Soviet Union. Any calculations which leave out the tremendous actual and potential economic power of Red China are misleading and can be dangerous.

This point is well brought out in an excellent article by Representative CHESTER BOWLES, entitled "A Long Look at China," which appeared in the April 4, 1959, issue of the Saturday Evening Post.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A LONG LOOK AT CHINA
(By CHESTER BOWLES)

"China—there lies a sleeping giant. Let him sleep for when he wakes he shall shake the world."—Napoleon Bonaparte.

On April 20, 1958, in the province of Hunan, the Communist Chinese Government launched the world's first effort to establish pure communism on a nationwide scale.

The commune that was established there was to be the first of many similar organizations which would harness the energies of every man, woman, and child in rural China to the total service of the state.

It was named Weihsing, the Chinese word for sputnik, and Mao Tse-tung, chairman of the Chinese People's Republic, confidently stated that it carried potentialities for tomorrow's world as explosive as the Soviet thrust into outer space.

Four months later, on August 6, Radio Peiping announced that the first stage of this extraordinary program had been completed. More than 500 million individuals belonging to 120 million households and representing 99 percent of the population of rural China had been organized into 26,000 communes.

"The attainment of communism in China," the announcement triumphantly concluded "is no longer a remote future event."

But in China, as elsewhere, old ways die slowly. On December 18, Radio Peking admitted that orders had been given to slow down the pace of rural regimentation. A breathing spell was needed, it was said, so that "alien class elements" could be purged, "skeptics and doubters" convinced, and local party leaders rid of their tendency to see "only things, not men."

The announcement added that Mao Tse-tung had asked to be freed from his post of national chairman so that he could "concentrate his energies on dealing with the direction of policy" and devote more time to his writings on Communist theory. His request had been granted. Mao would, of course, continue in his key post as head of the Chinese Communist Party.

This succession of announcements set off a whirl of speculation in the world capitals. Belgrade wondered if Mao's resignation might be due to differences with Khrushchev. New Delhi hoped that the slowdown in rural regimentation might indicate a new moderation in Peking. Nationalist leaders in Taipei even suggested that civil war on the mainland might be in the offing.

But those who study Chinese Communist economic and political policy most objectively were inclined to dismiss such explanations as products of wishful thinking. In their view the two central questions posed by recent swings of the political pendulum inside China go far deeper:

1. Can Communist economics, which forged Russia into a modern industrial state in two generations, succeed in Asia, or do the totally different conditions which exist there doom Asian communism to failure?

2. Whether or not this program succeeds, what role is the "New China" likely to play in our future and Asia's?

These questions deserve urgent and thoughtful consideration by American policy makers of both parties. On their answers may depend in large measure the nature of tomorrow's world.

The one-fourth of mankind who live in China are among the toughest, hardest-working people on earth. By the time this years' American high-school graduates reach their thirtieth birthdays, China's population will have soared to 900 million men, women, and children.

Since the 1920's, most Americans have tended consistently to misjudge the strength, competence, and durability of the Chinese Communist leaders who now rule this vast expanse of land and people, an error which may be explained by our bitter disapproval of their policies.

In the first years following Chiang Kai-shek's retreat to Formosa in 1949 we looked on the new government in Peking as no more and no less than one more backward satellite of the Soviet Union.

When Red China began to merge as a world force in its own right, our official pronouncements patronizingly promoted its government to the rank of junior partner in the Communist hierarchy.

Recently some American observers have veered to the other extreme. When reports indicated that it was Mao's influence, in 1958, that caused Nikita Khrushchev to take a tougher position in foreign affairs, they insisted that here was proof positive that the Chinese tail was now wagging the Soviet dog.

The actual relationship between Moscow and Peking remains obscure. We can assume that the balance of influence between the two is in flux, with each partner forced in various ways to accommodate itself somewhat to the ambitions and fears of the other.

But here is the important point: Moscow and Peking view our fast-changing world from rather different perspectives, and these differences may grow.

The men in the Kremlin rule a nation blessed with plenty of living space, plenty of natural as well as human resources and—they think—plenty of time.

Their military might, industrial power, and political influence have been growing with spectacular speed. They assume that Soviet power plus Communist ideology will ultimately add up to world domination.

Their task, as they see it, is to ride and exploit the revolutionary wave which they believe constitutes the future. They have Lenin's assurance that history is on their side, and they can see no reason to take chances.

In contrast, the Chinese Communists face appalling problems, which are now testing

their political and economic theories under the most difficult conceivable conditions.

If the Peking government goes through with its present plan for rapid industrialization on the Soviet model, it may place an impossible burden on the rural Chinese economy, which must feed 650 million people and provide surplus agricultural products to help pay for critically needed imports.

If it seeks to encourage increased food production by appeasing the peasants, it will almost certainly be forced to abandon its Communist political objectives.

This, in a nutshell, is Peking's ultimate dilemma.

The system of pulling a whole nation up by its bootstraps, which worked in Russia at such heavy cost, may fail in China because the conditions there are almost totally different. The most inportant of these differences relate to land, food, and people.

The Soviet Union sprawls for nearly 10,000 miles across two continents. Like our American West, the vast, rich expanse beyond the Urals was opened up only in the last 200 years. It is still largely underdeloped.

Before the coming of the Communists the Russian people had rarely known hunger. Indeed, before the outbreak of World War I Czarist Russia exported some 10 million tons of wheat each year.

Yet, even with this massive, built-in agricultural advantage, the Soviet experiment nearly collapsed during the 1930's for lack of food. If we are to understand the problems now facing the Communist regime in China, we must understand the reasons for this narrowly averted disaster.

During his early struggle for full control of the Kremlin, Stalin continued Lenin's relatively benevolent policies toward the peasants. With total political power securely in his hands, Stalin then turned to the speedy industrialization of the Soviet Union. This, he saw, would require the diversion of enormous quantities of food to the cities to feed the growing industrial population.

In a non-Communist country as potentially rich as Russia, this extra food production could be secured by offering the incentive of higher prices for agricultural produce and a corresponding improvement in rural living standards. But Stalin knew that he could not offer the Russian peasants this special measure of economic freedom without undermining the iron political discipline demanded by the revolution.

He responded to this dilemma with characteristic ruthlessness. Boldly scrapping Lenin's promises of independent land ownership and increasing opportunity for each peasant family, Stalin moved to mobilize all of rural Russia along tightly regimented political lines.

By the late 1930's almost every peasant family in Russia had been pressed into collective farms. All farm machinery was pooled. The number of dairy and meat animals was drastically reduced to save more grain for human consumption. Tightly administered controls forced the shipment of more and more agricultural produce to the cities. Although total farm production declined, the percentage reaching the industrial workers increased.

The short-term result of Stalin's rural program was an eruption into violence and repression without precedent in human history. The peasants resisted and were brutally crushed. Apparently reliable reports indicated that nearly 10 million died and millions more were shipped to Siberia. In a land with an unlimited agricultural potential, food production dwindled and the already meager living standards dropped abruptly.

For more than 20 years the Russian peasants were badgered and terrorized to increase their production. By setting low prices on agricultural products at the farm and charging high prices in the government-owned retail stores, huge profits were extracted from the peasants to produce more and still more capital for the rapid growth of industry.

Only a very small investment was made in rural development, and consumer goods were almost nonexistent. The Soviet Union lived precariously on its built-in food surplus, created not by communism but by nature.

In long-term results, however, this fantastic gamble paid off. Although the cost in human misery was staggering, Stalin's determination and the limitless potential of the Russian land enabled the Soviet Government to create a powerful industrial state in less than two generations.

Since World War II the annual rate of Soviet economic growth has been double our own. Only now, after 30 years of ruthless exploitation, are the first economic benefits beginning to trickle down to the patient Soviet peasants whose forced sacrifices made industrialization possible.

Now it is this Stalinist program that the Peking Government adopted as a blueprint for China's development. In doing so, under the infinitely more difficult Chinese conditions, it embarked on what is by all odds the most daring economic and political gamble of all time.

Mao, like Lenin, had based his revolution on the most dramatic promise that can be offered to any peasant people: "Down with the landlords. Land to the tiller." But when the time was ripe, Mao, like Stalin, did not hesitate to repudiate this promise and to press China's peasants into an economic and political system that had no place for private land ownership.

In 1954, after long, careful preparation, a program of complete rural collectivization was announced. By 1957 practically all Chinese rural families had been organized into 740,000 collectives.

Then, in 1958, Mao, as we have seen, went one giant step further. Henceforth all farm collectives, rural industry and local militia would be consolidated into communes. This was a step so breathtakingly radical and ruthless that even Stalin had not dared to attempt it.

The objective was the total mobilization of 500 million villagers into a massive human work force, the destruction of the family as a social unit and the substitution of a new disciplined loyalty to the Communist state.

Every able-bodied man and woman worker was assigned to the fields, to irrigation projects, to the small decentralized factories and blast furnaces. The organization was along military lines so that work squads, platoons, companies and battalions could be transformed overnight into military cadres.

Every hour of each individual's day was rigidly supervised. Children were to be brought up in common nurseries, workers fed in great central messhalls and the old and infirm assigned to what are described as "happiness homes."

Previous to its December 18 announcement of a slowdown in the organization of this fantastic program, the Peking Government had credited it with huge increases in agricultural production and rural development.

The 1958 cotton crop and the early rice crop are said to be double that of 1957. The wheat crop is up 67 percent. Hundreds of thousands of work teams laboring from dawn to dusk were reported to have opened up 69 million acres to new irrigation. This is fifty times the irrigated areas of America's biggest river project, Grand Coulee, and six times that of India's spectacular Bhakra-Nangal on the Sutlej River in the Punjab.

This, boasted Peking, is only the beginning of an irrigation program that will set the stage for further enormous increases in agricultural production in the next few years. Next on the development agenda is the harnessing of the wild, wasted waters of the Yangtze itself.

To what extent can we separate fact from propaganda? Does the December 18 announcement indicate that the system of tightly organized communes will be abandoned? Or does it suggest no more than a cautious pause for breath-catching in the "great leap forward" toward the total regimentation of Chinese society?

No one can doubt that the 10,000-word announcement, which took 4 hours and 10 minutes to read over Radio Peking, indicates formidable opposition among China's 500,000,000 villagers.

Although it was stoutly maintained that there is to be no reversal in the program itself, some wage incentives were admitted to be necessary to encourage "labor enthusiasm." Fears that all private property was to be immediately surrendered must, it was said, be dispelled.

Every worker should be assured 8 hours' sleep, with 4 hours' freedom for relaxation and meals, leaving 12 hours for work and study except at times of harvest.

Henceforth communal mess halls and children's nurseries must be better run. Parents should be allowed to take their children home occasionally. In building "residential quarters," space should be provided "suited to the living together of men and women and the aged and young of each family."

Although this suggests that the Peking Government has run into difficulty, it would be wishful thinking to assume that a change of direction is in the making. The goals of the commune program have been sturdily reemphasized. The stress is on the need for a somewhat slower pace to educate the laggards and to restrain certain overeager comrades.

The leaders of Communist China know that the success or failure of their efforts will be determined largely in the villages. Although the difficulties are admittedly great, they may argue persuasively that here at least they are far more experienced than were their Soviet counterparts.

The Russian Revolution was made by only 200,000 party members. They were mostly intellectuals and workers with their roots in the cities. Lenin's announcement of "all land to the tiller," skillfully timed to climax the revolutionary upheaval in Moscow and Leningrad, secured the cooperation of the Russian peasants. But they were never made to feel a part of the movement itself.

The Chinese Revolution, on the other hand, has always been deeply rooted in the villages. The 5 million party members who organized the countryside as a prelude to the advance of the Red armies have now grown to 13 million, and most of them are of peasant stock. Under the direction of this rural-oriented Communist leadership and subleadership, many of China's 1 million villages have already known two decades of evolving discipline.

Out of this intensive rural experience have evolved certain strong social and political appeals which have been tested and perfected under varying conditions. With these techniques the Communist leaders believe they can maintain a revolutionary enthusiasm which will carry China through this perilous period of development and create the capital for rapid industrialization.

In place of the uncertain but highly personal security rooted in close family relationships and ancient religious dogma, they have substituted a system that provides a dreary day-to-day sustenance in, return for unswerving subservience to the will of the central government.

In place of the traditional economic incentive of increased consumer goods, they have substituted festivals, complete with booming brass gongs and sputtering firecrackers, dances, parades and mass condemnation of "enemies of the people."

Millions of official loudspeakers, supplemented by constant "study meetings," goad

the people to greater effort, often by fanning the flames of external conflict. In this process the United States serves as a special target for vituperation unmatched even in this age of international mudslinging.

When the occasion calls for it, the Kremlin can muster thousands of angry demonstrators against the West. But the Peking government can produce millions, as the Middle East and Quemoy crises demonstrated.

"All of China boils with wrath," proclaimed Radio Peking when the U.S. Marines landed in Lebanon.

"I will send all my six sons to the front again," a ——— "democratic mother" is reported to have said.

"Americans take care," warned a scientist in Canton, "or you will have your brains bashed out."

In Fukien, the province directly across the Formosa Strait from the Nationalist-held island, the peasants are said to have "pledged themselves to outstrip last year's production as a concrete contribution to helping our army units liberate Formosa."

A successful revolution generates its own initial enthusiasm. Through the expert use of radio, the printed word and mass organization the Chinese Revolution has surpassed most others. But the Chinese Communist leaders face an infinitely greater task, and human nature being what it is, a diet of promises, parades and propaganda, no matter how skillfully administered, ultimately may prove inadequate.

What then can be said about Chinese claims of record-breaking crops already achieved through China's "4-year campaign of suffering to build a glorious future"?

Agricultural experts who know Asia best reject the 1958 production figures as substantially beyond agricultural experience anywhere in the world. Sizable increases have undoubtedly been achieved, and more will follow.

But even with the most favorable weather and the near-total mobilization of human energies, food production in China, as elsewhere, faces certain harsh realities which cannot be exorcised by Communist slogans. The chief obstacle to the success of her effort is China's vast population, growing at the rate of 16 million souls each year and crowded into her enormous but limited land area.

The present average is less than 2 acres for each rural family. With the exception of a few western areas, most of China's readily arable land is now under intensive cultivation. New acreage even there can be brought under cultivation only at a very high cost.

The fact that the people are already living largely on rice, wheat, and vegetables means that there is little grain to be saved by reducing livestock consumption, as Stalin did. Furthermore, output per acre is already high. Long before China succumbed to communism the peasants were using better seeds, more abundant natural fertilizers, and more skilled planting and harvesting techniques than in almost any other underdeveloped country except Egypt.

Although Japanese output per acre has been almost twice as great, these levels appear beyond China's reach in the foreseeable future. Each Japanese peasant family has the incentive of working its own small farm. Equally important, the Japanese peasant can buy ample supplies of commercial fertilizers on easy credit.

If the Chinese peasants could match the Japanese use of nearly half a ton of fertilizer per acre annually, they could boost their output substantially. The massive Hwai and Yangtze River irrigation programs could increase it still further. But the building of a chemical industry that could provide fertilizer in any such quantity does not appear in the cards, even with substantial help from the U.S.S.R.

These, then, are the harsh social and economic realities of China's rural economy which must be considered side by side with Peiping's boasts of a steel industry that will soon outproduce that of the United Kingdom, of endlessly expanding coal production, booming hydroelectric development, and fast-spreading new railroad systems.

If this extraordinary totalitarian experiment succeeds in spite of these obstacles, the world Communist movement will almost certainly be centered in a vital new China, with one-fourth the world's population on a rapidly developing industrial base. Unless there is an unforseen change in Chinese attitudes toward the people of America and Europe such a development would be ominous.

But what is the most likely course of events in Asia if this breathtaking gamble fails to pay off? There are at least three possibilities on which we may speculate.

First, under such circumstances it is barely conceivable that the Peiping Government would modify its external policies and become gradually easier to live with. It is not essential that each country produce all its own food. Britain, the Netherlands, and Japan are among the many crowded nations with high living standards which import a major part of their food requirements. A more moderate Chinese leadership, confronted with increasing difficulty in feeding its people and eager for a period of peace, could trade its manufactured goods for rice and wheat grown elsewhere.

But such a change appears unlikely. The "New China" is driven by a doctrinaire nationalism, fiercely intent on economic self-sufficiency. As her leaders consider China's vast and rapidly growing population insecurely based on limited land resources, they may be expected to look beyond China's borders for new areas which can be brought under their control.

Second, a possible solution lies in the Soviet Union itself. With a population one-third that of China, the U.S.S.R. has twice her land area. In theory, a decision by the Kremlin to allow the comradely sharing of her eastern lands with Chinese colonizers would allow China's rapid industrialization to proceed on schedule. The resulting economic, political, and military colossus would include nearly one-third of the world's populatiion. Stretching in one unbroken, tightly controlled Communist federation from Berlin to Canton, it offers a chilling prospect.

Fortunately, there are some formidable physical, nationalistic, and human obstacles in the way of its fulfillment. The limitations of climate and water, for instance, make Siberian agriculture a season-to-season gamble. An even greater barrier is the national pride and security of the Soviet Union itself. Economic and political integration on a scale sufficient to solve China's land hunger would be a giant step toward Chinese domination of the Soviet Union, the Communist movement, and, ultimately, of the world itself. The men in the Kremlin could scarcely be expected to welcome such a development.

Finally, there remains a third possibility. The Chinese Communist leaders may look increasingly toward Southeast Asia as the solution to their economic and political dilemma. In terms of China's long cultural history, most of this area is newly colonized land and relatively underdeveloped. It is also fertile land, blessed, by and large, with rich soil, ample rainfall, and a warm, year-round sun that normally assures two crops annually.

Although some areas, such as Java, are greatly overpopulated, nearby Sumatra could absorb 40 million to 50 million more people. Burma could support far more than its present population. So could the Philippines, South Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, Thailand, and Malaya.

If the Chinese leadership decides further to increase its pressure into these lush lands to the south, it will be a case of history repeating itself. Down through the centuries Chinese dynasties in their glittering imperial court in Peking sent their emissaries to demand tribute from southeast Asian princes.

In periods of aggressive strength, Chinese emperors sometimes sought to buttress this big-brother relationship both by extensive trade relations and military expeditions southward. Chinese influence was particularly strong in Vietnam, where Chinese-satellite states existed for centuries. If the Ming emperors in the mid-15th century had not pulled back from the beginnings of an unprecedented national program of naval and maritime expansion, southeast Asia might today be part of China.

Meanwhile, modern China appears already to be on the move. The Communist successors to the emperors of Peking are reasserting their traditional role in this area. Chinese trade to southeast Asia is being increased substantially. In 1949, Chinese exports were almost nonexistent. By 1955 they had risen to $209 million. In 1958 they were $309 million.

India's trade in southeast Asia has been cut nearly 40 percent by these new Chinese exports. Great Britain's has also been seriously hurt. Japanese goods are being undersold 10 to 15 percent in countries on which Tokyo has been counting as an essential market and source of raw materials.

Ironically, most Chinese exports into southeast Asia are the very consumer goods which the Peking Government denies its own people. A British bicycle in Kuala Lumpur costs $35. The Chinese equivalent, which sells for $70 in Peking—more than a year's average income—costs the Malayans only $14.

Although these exports fell abruptly early this year, it seems likely that the flow will again be resumed. Some observers speculate that the interruption was due to the need to meet overdue payments to the Soviet Government for heavy machinery delivered to China early in 1958.

At the same time, Peking has been stepping up its effort to win the political allegiance of the 13 million Chinese who live in the larger southeast Asian cities and who retain close cultural and linguistic ties with the Chinese heartland. Chinese maps, inherited, so Peking says, from Chiang Kai-shek, still proclaim Chinese sovereignty over sizable border sections of Burma, Bhutan, and India. Radio Peking regularly asserts Chinese superiority over all foreign barbarians.

Regardless of the success or failure of China's experiment in pure communism, it is apparent that an explosive new force is being generated in Asia which will exert increasing influence on the world power balance.

The means by which we can help blunt this force and lay the basis for orderly and peaceful relationships are beyond the scope of this article. A few brief observations, however, may be in order:

1. Communist China will be with us for the foreseeable future. It is wishful thinking to assume that it will vanish conveniently in a peasant uprising.

2. Although the entrance of this dynamic new element into the world stage creates profound difficulties for us, it also constitutes a potential threat to the Soviet Union. The ultimate effect on relations between Moscow and Peking is impossible to foresee.

3. In order to cope effectively with the challenge, we Americans sorely need a long-term perspective and long-term plans to go with it. These plans should be rooted in the realities of Asian attitudes, economics, politics, and geography. Expedient, crisis-to-crisis moves based on the illusion of American military omnipotence will almost certainly fail.

4. The principles and techniques which will work best in Southeast Asia should be fundamental to American policy throughout the underdeveloped continents. These may include a more careful selection of the men and women to represent us abroad, a revamped economic-aid program, less emphasis on regimes and more on people, some such device as a World Food Bank to distribute surplus food more effectively and a program to help stabilize the prices of raw materials.

5. Although most Southeastern Asian governments are frail and uncertain, they are increasingly aware of the danger of Chinese aggression and the brutality of Communist techniques. It is particularly reassuring that this awareness is spreading to India, which centuries ago provided the principal counterforce to Chinese expansion into Southeast Asia and may conceivably play this role in the future.

6. Once we begin to act positively within the economic and political framework of the American revolutionary tradition, we will elicit a heart-warming response from non-Communist peoples throughout the world.

In these next decisive years an awakened America, prepared to look the facts about modern Asia squarely in the face, can play a vital role in stopping the spread of communism without war. Thoughtful men in Asia, Africa, Latin America, and Europe fervently hope that we will play it.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer, plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Sand Dunes Seashore Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, all new ideas evoke some negative response, so I have not been surprised that a degree of opposition has resulted over the proposal for establishment of the Oregon Dunes national seashore area. This National Park Service development would dedicate portions of a 23-mile stretch of Oregon's scenic coastline to recreational use of the Nation. Many of the newspapers in my home State have recognized this long-term value of the seashore area, both to Oregon and the Nation, and have endorsed the idea in varying degrees of support. I ask consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD thoughtful editorials on the Oregon Dunes seashore area from the Oregon Journal, the Eugene Register-Guard, and the Astorian-Budget.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follow:

[From the Oregon Journal, Apr. 14, 1959]

SEASHORE CREATION TAKES TIME

If a national seashore recreation area is to be created in the dunes between Florence and Reedsport, it will not become full-blown overnight. The process will be slow and gradual. It will take into account the needs and desires of local interests. There will be time for adjustment from whatever dislocation is caused. The plan is not to be "crammed down the throats" of local people. No final boundaries have been fixed. They may be adjusted to avoid undue conflicts with other interests.

These are some of the essential facts told by National Park Service representatives at meetings in Reedsport and Florence, southern and northern terminal cities for the proposed area.

They may have allayed some of the apprehensions felt by local residents. If they have not, there will be plenty of further opportunity to ask questions and voice objections.

Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, author of the bill which would establish the recreation area, has assured the people that public hearings will be held. Passage of the bill itself would not determine the boundaries. These would be decided after negotiations by the Park Service with other agencies and with local interests. And acquisitions of the land itself would take a period of years, depending on the availability of funds. All this lends weight to a word of advice given by William E. Walsh, Coos Bay attorney who presided at the Reedsport meeting, to the effect that if we are going to have such an area set aside, the sooner we get started the better, for the longer we wait the more difficult and costly it will be.

The history of all such developments is that they spark local opposition. Nobody knows for sure how strong the opposition really is on the Oregon coast. Some voices have been heard, but they do not necessarily represent the feelings of all the people. Some have expressed the belief that, with the exception of Florence, opinion on the coast is more favorable than unfavorable. And many persons just want to learn more facts before making a final judgment.

Park Service people now are doing the best job they can to give the facts. They have paid our coast a high compliment in telling us that we have here "a very great thing, perhaps greater than you yourselves realize."

The establishment of any such area is usually a painful and difficult process. If Oregon people are willing to take the long view and not let immediate interests determine their thinking, they will avoid making it any more difficult than it has to be.

[From the Eugene Register-Guard, Apr. 14, 1959]

PARK IDEA WORTH PURSUING FURTHER

Residents of the Florence-Reedsport area should be able to relax a little now, after Sunday's information session on the proposal for a National Park Service reserve between the two cities. They have facts now that they did not have before. And they realize, as they perhaps did not before, that the proposal is highly tentative, with its details to be worked out by negotiation and after more intensive studies of park values and the local economy.

Two questions are of apparently legitimate concern to the people who live in the vicinity of the proposed national preserve. How much of the land east of the highway, especially the lakeshore land, must the Park Service acquire? And how will this proposal bear upon the financial plight of the nearby communities?

Park Service spokesmen made it clear that some land east of the highway would have to be acquired. This is reasonable. The territory would be needed to provide camp sites, to complete the natural borders of the park area, and, perhaps most important, to serve as a buffer between the scenic shorelands and industrial development. It would not be in the National Park Service tradition to permit there being a sawmill next to a picnic area. Thus the Park Service must have some buffer land. But it also appears likely that the Government would not insist on all the land around all those lakes. Cannot a reasonable agreement be worked out? Would it be essential, for example, that the Crown Zellerbach tree farm at Tahkenitch be included in the park?

How about the tax base? How about present bonded indebtedness? Answers here must be highly speculative. The Park Service contends that experience in other parks has shown that the cities on the edges of parks profit tremendously from such developments. Land on the edges of the parks becomes more valuable, business booms, and the general economy is enriched, far more than it would have been enriched if the park had not been established. A detailed study of this type was carried out on the edges of Great Smoky Mountains Park. A copy of this study is coming, and we'll report on it as soon as we get it. Those who are worried about such matters should take comfort in the knowledge that a park area is not born full blown overnight. These things grow. With the growth will come the other readjustments, not suddenly, but gradually.

The proposal, of course, will find no favor with those who dream of a great industrial city spanning the Siuslaw. Industry can exist side by side with a park, but the presence of the park is a drag on industrial development. The park uses land and trees and water, the same things industries use. Moreover, the idea will find little favor with those who hope to speculate in land values inside the proposed park area. These objections are valid, from the points of view of those who make them. However, they should be recognized for what they are—objections from special interest groups for special reasons.

More broadly, of course, the Park Service is interested in this area as a national park, not a local park. The national interest will weigh heavily. While the people of the Florence-Reedsport area need not fear being trod upon, they must also recognize that in the long run broader interests than theirs will determine the character and shape of the park—if one is established.

As we listened to the discussion in Reedsport Sunday, we saw a few drawbacks to the idea and much to recommend it. We urge now that plans go forward, that more specific details be worked out, and that all parties remain calm as they seek a solution that will bring the many benefits of a park and that at the same time will do the least violence to the varied development of the community.

[From the Evening-Astorian Budget, Apr. 15, 1959]

COMPROMISE OUGHT TO BE POSSIBLE

Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER'S proposal for a 35,000-acre national park to include dunelands south of Florence and the Sea Lion Caves seems to be meeting opposition in the area affected. This newspaper has received a letter from a taxpayers' association there citing several granges, the Florence City Council, and the chamber of commerce as opposed to the plan.

The reason given is that several hundred homes would be taken over and destroyed in converting the area into a park.

This seems to be a situation amenable to compromise. If the basic idea of a park to include the dunelands is good, as it seems to be, some adjustment of boundaries ought to be possible to prevent undue acquisition of private property in other uses.

The idea of a Federal park seems good. The Oregon coast has a potentially fine future in the tourist business, and for the furtherance of the business the maximum possible number of public park facilities is needed in scenic spots or areas unsuitable for other use.

The State of Oregon has many parks, almost more than it can take care of, so it seems a good idea to have the Federal Government share the task.

We have no information as to the value of the homes and farms which lie inside the proposed park boundaries, but some of them may be property of more potential recreational than agricultural value.

Ike's Strange Behavior

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT GORE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appears in the Washington Daily News of today.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IKE'S STRANGE BEHAVIOR

The strangely unenthusiastic elevation of Christian Archibald Herter to be Secretary of State is cause for grave concern.

Even in quiet times, it is an exacting job. Mr. Herter assumes it in an hour of crisis with war or peace in the eventual balance.

To maintain the influence of the United States in rapidly approaching international conferences he needs every bit of prestige and authority the President can give him. There should be no question in the minds of foreign diplomats that he speaks for Mr. Eisenhower—has his complete approval and confidence.

And yet the President's announcement of the nomination, when it finally came Saturday, did not include a word of praise. After a couple of routine sentences—which made no mention of Mr. Herter's qualifications or special apprenticeship—the President walked out of the room, leaving Mr. Herter to explain as best he could the 3-day delay in naming him to succeed John Foster Dulles. And, in the process, Mr. Herter had to cope with repeated interruptions by Presidential Press Secretary Jim Hagerty while trying to answer reporters' questions.

This awkward session was the climax of a week in which event after event conspired, if only inadvertently, to get the new Secretary off to a bad start.

There was the major foreign policy speech of Vice President NIXON, under the circumstances ill timed; and the announcement of Mr. NIXON's mission to Moscow this summer for a frank discussion with Soviet leaders. Also the last-minute health examination of Mr. Herter, despite the fact he has been in training for the last 2 years to act for Mr. Dulles in an emergency, and despite the fact that he has been Acting Secretary for 2 months with succession inevitable for several weeks.

If all this is according to plan and not just clumsy accident, there is cause to wonder if Mr. Herter is going to be something considerably less than principal adviser to the President in determination and execution of foreign policy—cause to wonder whether it is planned that Mr. NIXON may play a major role—even the major role—as spokesman and negotiator for the President in foreign affairs.

RICHARD NIXON is a man of considerable abilities, and we cast no reflections upon them. But this is a system that won't work. We recall that other Presidents have bypassed their Secretaries of State and leaned heavily on the advice of their Colonel Houses, Harry Hopkinses, and Joe Davises. The historical record of those periods is not pleasant reading.

Mr. Herter is an able man—the best available by long public experience and by recent training as Under Secretary of State to succeed Mr. Dulles. The Senate will confirm him promptly this week and next week he will fly to Europe to speak for America.

We hope the impression produced by last week's events is false. If so, the President should speak up promptly.

He should dispel even the slightest doubt that Chris Herter is Secretary of State in fact as well as in name.

New Atom Smasher at the University of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, Wisconsin is extremely proud of its splendid record of valuable contributions to development and progress in science, as well as in other fields.

Today I should like to call attention to a new development at the University of Wisconsin—the scheduled installation of a 10-million-electron-volt atom smasher. This machine is the second of its kind, and the first to be located in the United States. The other has been installed at the Atomic Energy Laboratory in Ontario, Canada.

Two years ago, the Atomic Energy Commission awarded the $1,050,000 machine to the university's physics department. According to reports, the atom smasher is now undergoing final factory testing and will be assembled on the campus this summer.

We recall that two earlier atom smashers developed at the university, under the direction of its highly qualified staff, made an important contribution to the development of the atomic bomb.

As this new machine goes into action—in coordination with advanced work now underway—I believe it will better enable our Wisconsin scientists to continue making their constructive contributions toward development in the field of atomic energy.

To call attention to this forward step in the university's work in atomic science, as well as to pay tribute to the scientists who are performing so outstandingly in this field, I ask unanimous consent to have a brief article from a recent issue of the Janesville Gazette printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW ATOM SMASHER TO BE INSTALLED AT UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN IS FIRST OF ITS KIND IN THE UNITED STATES

MADISON.—A $1,050,000 atom smasher awarded to the University of Wisconsin physics department 2 years ago by the Atomic Energy Commission will be delivered and assembled here this summer.

The 10 million electron volt (Mev) machine known as a tandem-style Van de Graaff, will occupy new underground quarters on the compus between Sterling and Birge Halls.

Final laboratory tests are now being completed by the manufacturer, High Voltage Engineering Corp., Burlington, Mass. Shortly the machine will be dismantled and shipped to Madison.

The Wisconsin smasher is the second of its kind, and the first to be located in the United States. The other was installed this winter at the Atomic Energy of Canada laboratory near Chalk River, Ontario, Canada.

Allocation of this much-sought machine to the university recognizes previous work by nuclear experimenters Profs. Raymond Herb H. H. Barschall, Willy Waeberli, and Hugh T. Richards.

USED AT LOS ALAMOS

Professor Herb who designed and built two other atom-smashing machines now operating in Sterling Hall, also contributed to development of the new machine.

He was the first to achieve a high yield negative ion source and to demonstrate the practicability of stripping electrons from negative ions with a gas. Both these developments are incorporated in the new model.

Two earlier Wisconsin atom smashers played an important role in the development of the atomic bomb. They were shipped to Los Alamos for top-secret research in the early 1940's, and one was returned here after the war.

The new machine is basically a two-headed version of the earlier models.

Negative charged ions are accelerated from ground potential by a positive electrode in the middle of the machine's 34-foot vacuum tube. This step boosts particle energies to 5 to 7 Mev—the electric potential of the electrode.

LEAVES POSITIVE CHARGE

These particles then collide with the cloud of electrons surrounding gas molecules which are fed into the machine at this stage. In the collision, electrons—negative units of electricity—are stripped away leaving particles with a positive charge.

Since the accelerated particles have far greater momentum than the electron cloud, they continue undeviated after the collision. They receive a second 5- to 7-million-electron-volt energy boost in moving from the electrode to ground potential at the opposite end of the tank.

This second step in acceleration is why the machine is referred to as a two-headed Van de Graaff. Older machines are to a rough approximation just the first stage of the new system.

For protons, which have a single negative charge when they leave the negative ion source and unit positive charge after collision, the total energy gain is 1,014 million-electron volts.

PRECISION WORK POSSIBLE

Oxygen negative ions contain nine electrons. If they lose five electrons in collision—the greatest probability—peak energy after acceleration may be more than 30 million-electron volts.

Some exploration in this 10- to 30-million-electron-volt range has already been done in the United States with cyclotrons, a circular design atom smasher. But in these machines precision work is difficult since particle energies are not homogeneous and since the energy cannot be varied easily.

Wisconsin physicists have done precision work in the 1- to 4-million-electron-volt range with their present machines.

The new machine may make possible experiments with polarized particles, that is, particles whose spins are alined in the same direction. This experiment is of particular interest to university researchers because it will give much better information about particle disintegration in the atom-smashing process than has previously been available.

DOORS 2 FEET THICK

The underground facility to house the atom smasher has been built with funds from the Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation (WARF).

Three large underground rooms occupy nearly the entire distance between Sterling and Birge Halls.

The machine's ion source will be housed in one room along with the 34-foot main tank which is 8 feet in diameter. Coming out of the tank the beams of particles will be bent 90° into a second room by magnets.

This is the target area, where beams will come off into three experimental stations.

A third room, shielded with a 4-foot thickness of iron-ore concrete to protect against radiation, will house the equipment for taking data. Doors to the rooms are of solid steel, 2 feet thick.

Treatment of Cancer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Washington Post of April 18, 1959, by Mr. Drew Pearson, entitled "Bills on Cancer Defeated in Past."

Mr. President, I agree heartily with Mr. Pearson that we should continue research and testing of anything that might produce a cure or relief from any dreadful disease, whether it be discovered accidentally by a layman or by a highly technical expert.

On March 25, 1959, I introduced a bill, S. 1540, providing for simple research and a testing program on burns using a product made from a vegetable base known as B–N–G solution. I hope very much that this bill will be reported by the Armed Services Committee as soon as possible.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BILLS ON CANCER DEFEATED IN PAST

(By Drew Pearson)

MIAMI.—News that the inexorable spread of cancer had finally forced the resignation of John Foster Dulles as Secretary of State came to Miami as the author of the cancer bill was eating lunch in a little restaurant.

"It was over 20 years ago that we introduced the bill creating the National Cancer Institute," said former Senator Claude Pepper, now an attorney in Florida. "That was in 1937. The bill passed and carried an appropriation of $500,000. But although the Cancer Institute was established, it did not seem to have enough money to operate. So in 1946 Matt Neely, of West Virginia, and I introduced another bill appropriating $100 million to be spent until used up, to fight cancer.

"Our bill never passed," Pepper recalled, "and since then Senator after Senator has died of cancer. Now John Foster Dulles is suffering tragically.

"Matt Neely himself died of the disease he tried of eradicate. Senator Taft introduced a bill to appropriate $75 million to fight cancer. It did not pass and he died of the disease he tried to stamp out. So did Senator Wherry of Nebraska, Senator Vandenberg, of Michigan, Senator Brien McMahon, of Connecticut. The march of death continues.

"What I wanted to do," said Senator Pepper, "was to call together scientists from all over the world to fight cancer. Just as we got scientists from Italy, Hungary, Germany, and Denmark to help devise the atom bomb, so we should use scientists to fight cancer. This is one field where we and Russia can heartily cooperate."

DULLES WANTED TO QUIT

Some people had the impression that John Foster Dulles was trying to cling to his job as Secretary of State until the very last minute. But during the last 2 weeks, nothing could have been further from the truth.

Repeatedly during that period, Secretary Dulles urged the President to accept his resignation. Just as frequently the President refused. Dulles argued that it was only fair to the man who would be his successor that he be given time to prepare for the series of foreign ministers conferences.

Finally after Dulles had gone to the Air Force hospital in Palm Beach, Fla., and found that cancer cells probably had spread to his neck, he phoned the President in Augusta and sadly told him he didn't think he had much time to live.

Even then Eisenhower refused to listen. He told Dulles to return to Washington for further treatments. Independently, however, Eisenhower checked with the medical authorities and found it was true that Dulles' condition had worsened.

Despite this, the President wouldn't give up. So he returned to Augusta from Washington determined to hold off any announcement of Dulles' resignation until the weekend.

Later that afternoon Dulles called him to say that the newspapers were making it appear he was determined to hang on to the job with his last dying breath. So he virtually demanded that the resignation be announced immediately.

Eisenhower asked him to sleep on the decision, and when Dulles insisted the next morning that his mind was made up, the President called a hasty press conference and made the long-awaited announcement.

TWO UNBUDGEABLES

It will take some time for historians to evaluate the happenings of the past 2 weeks. But in rapid succession two of the most unbudgeable leaders of the Western World have dropped out of current history. First, Chancellor Konrad Adenauer, the incorrigible, unflinching foe of appeasing Russia, decided to retire for old age. Second, John Foster Dulles, Adenauer's close friend and supporter of a rigid stand for the reunification of Germany on Western terms, was forced to the sidelines by the spread of cancer.

What will this mean to future history?

As of today allied diplomats are hopeful. They say that the old stand of the unbudgeables was getting us nowhere. Since conditions could have been no worse, they believe they can get better.

Area Redevelopment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from an outstanding weekly newspaper in my State, the Exeter News-Letter, complimenting my colleague in the Senate, NORRIS COTTON.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Exeter News-Letter, Apr. 9, 1959]

KEEP FIGHTING

U.S. Senator NORRIS COTTON appears to have his eye on the ball in calling the attention of his constituents back home to the massive area redevelopment bill which recently passed the Senate.

Under the provisions of the $400 million piece of "pork," COTTON points out the fact New Hampshire tax money would help bail out once wealthy but now nearly bankrupt States like Michigan.

Granite Staters who have tightened their belts and shortened sail when the economic horizon darkened, would not qualify for a penny of this Federal handout for the simple reason they lack the required degree of unemployment.

"Self reliance and frugality will go out the window and the floodgates will be opened for a vast tide of expenditures with all kinds of discrimination and favoritism," COTTON said, if the bill becomes law.

Michigan, he said, had dissipated its wealth on lush vote-getting welfare programs, and the bill would have the effect of using New Hampshire tax money to provide Michigan with new industry.

Although New Hampshire has a relatively small representation in Congress, we hope this will not be a deterrent to their creating a storm of protest over such an immoral bill.

While conservatives in Congress are badly outnumbered they should bear in mind there are millions of unorganized people throughout the country who are frugal, thrifty, and dependent on a sound dollar for a respectable existence. The continuing erosion of the fruits of their labor is a national scandal.

The Administration Move Toward Private Financing for REA—A Darkening Outlook for Lighting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, President, the Rural Electricification Administration was originally set up in 1935 to bring light, and it has accomplished a fine result of bringing electric power to the farms and small communities of this Nation.

Yet, in spite of the great strides accomplished in illumination, the outlook for REA during this administriation is dark. REA has tamed the mighty Tennessee and other large rivers to provide electrical power, but now it finds itself up against a different type of power. This is not the type of power generated by rushing water, it is the type produced by the rushing self-interest of a nationwide business that wants REA, too.

I feel that the effort to drive rural electric co-ops to private financing to obtain their loans for operation is poorly advised. I call the attention of my colleagues to the word loans—not grants

from the Government, but loans to help the family-sized farmer and others who otherwise perhaps could not afford it, to help themselves to have the power and lights which REA can bring. The money is loaned and must be paid back with interest.

We are all familiar with the benefits which power from a rural electric co-op brings to a farm or small rural community. The economic boost which REA has given has benefited not only agricultural economy, but the related fields of our farm machinery, home appliances, and other lines.

The word interest is a very important one in this discussion. This move toward private financing for REA projects is in the self-interest of those who want REA out of the cheap power field. I need not say that these interest rates would skyrocket for rural electric co-ops if the administration's plan were adopted.

REA has proved its worth and has shown it can work well if it is unmolested. It needs to continue its work for the benefit of our agricultural economy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Jay Richter which apepared in Texas Co-op Power magazine for April 1959, under the heading "Down the Chute to Wall Street?"

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOWN THE CHUTE TO WALL STREET?

(By Jay Richter)

White-haired Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN has a typical New Englander's way of economizing on words. When he read President Eisenhower's budget message proposals on farm policy, the veteran Vermont Republican delivered himself of one of the understatements of the year.

Some of these proposals, AIKEN commented drily, will be controversial.

One of these controversial proposals would affect every farmer, suburb dweller, and businessman served by a rural electric system. It is a revival of last year's Eisenhower plan to send rural electrics into the private money market for part of their financing; the big brother of the companion plan to raise interest rates to all REA borrowers.

NO BILL YET

The President's plan stirred up so little enthusiasm on Capitol Hill last year that no Member of Congress bothered to introduce it as a bill. But the administration has made it clear that this Wall Street legislation will be proposed again this year.

This private financing scheme poses a real threat to America's rural electric consumers. At least that's the considered opinion of their elected officials, who didn't hesitate to speak out on the subject at the recent annual meeting of National Rural Electric Cooperative Association in Washington.

There they unanimously adopted a resolution urging Congress "to oppose any and all proposals which would increase the REA interest rate and/or send the rural electric systems into the private money market for their financing."

In his message to Congress, the President uses language that sounds sweet and reasonable. He wants to strengthen the REA program, he says, and to help rural electrics meet their growing needs. The lawmakers weren't taken in by this soft talk. They spotted the bitter pill under the sugar coating. Here's how they reacted:

"The proposal on REA co-ops won't get anywhere," AIKEN said briefly. "It's an opening wedge toward forcing the co-ops to go to commercial banks for money."

Another Republican Senator, THOMAS H. KUCHEL, of California, went on record at the NRECA meeting that "The aspersions on REA interest and loan policies are a threat to the magnificently successful rural electrification program."

Senator Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON, Democrat, of Texas, had harsh words to say about the administration's financing proposals. "They want to send you down the chute * * * but we're not going to raise your interest rates, or send you to Wall Street." He warned meeting delegates, though, "You'll have to fight."

"If fighting and common sense will do the job," said House Speaker SAM RAYBURN, "we'll keep rural electrification on the track it has been running on for nearly 25 years."

WHY BE CONCERNED?

If these are attitudes that most Members of Congress are apt to share, why are rural electric leaders so concerned? If members of both parties in Congress agree that private financing would bring only harm, why should the rural electric consumers be concerned?

The answer lies in the fact that the administration is clearly hoping to build up public backing for its plan, with the idea of eventually winning the war even if it loses the battle this year.

Rural electric leaders see two dangers—either of which they believe could be fatal to many electric systems—in the idea of raising funds in the private money market.

First, if the systems have to approach Wall Street, they may not get the money they need. Bankers who lend money on this scale don't like to deal with borrowers who can't show substantial ownership in their business. And even today, most rural electrics don't have what bankers consider substantial equity.

By the end of 1957, only 48 out of 948 rural systems had a net worth of more than 50 percent. Average for all systems was under 16 percent. Suppose these systems were turned loose to find the capital they need to serve the growing needs of their consumers?

They probably would be told to run along and come back when they could show a better balance sheet—exactly as farmers were advised to get along with kerosene lamps, before REA.

The second danger rural electric leaders see in private financing is cost.

BOUND TO COST MORE

Not even the administration spokesmen pretend that interest rates on funds raised from private sources would be anywhere near as low as REA's rate.

So—the argument is not whether the cost of running the nonprofit systems would go up. It's how big the increase would be—and how much of this increase would have to be passed along to consumers in their monthly light bills.

Let's see what the men who manage the rural electrics think about the effect of higher interest rates on their systems. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association surveyed them to find out. Forty-one percent replied.

Thirty-five percent of the electric systems replying say that if there is any increase at all in the interest they pay on new construction loans, they will have to raise rates at once.

Eighty-five percent of the systems replying say they would have to raise rates if the interest goes as high as 4 percent.

Almost all said higher interest rates would force them to cut down many of their present services and construction activities. And good service is increasingly important, both to farmers and nonfarm consumers on the rural lines.

Eventually, rural electric leaders believe, private financing and higher interest rates could kill off the nonprofit, rural electric systems—force them to sell out to the commercial power companies. If this happened, those rural consumers fortunate enough to keep their electric service at all, probably would have to pay a good deal more for it.

This is because the rural electrics carry a burden that the profit companies don't have—the obligation to serve everyone in thinly populated, high-cost areas. If the nonprofit systems are forced to do this high-cost job with high-cost money, their leaders say they will eventually go under.

Administration officials have no similar surveys to back up their argument that many electric cooperatives are now strong enough to pay higher interest rates and begin to get their feet soaked in the private money market. Who's right? You decide.

Unity of Purpose in the Coal Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. SLACK, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, the Members of this House have heard frequent reports during this session regarding the problems of the coal industry, and we have had introduced a number of measures designed to establish a long-range program of coal research in an effort to stabilize this basic industry. The leadership of the coal industry on both the management and labor side has always been characterized by a high degree of realistic and independent thinking, and it is gratifying to note that their sense of realism has again asserted itself to bring about the formation of an organization which will give them a proper vehicle by which they can seek answers to industrywide problems. I refer to the recently formed National Coal Policy Conference created as a joint effort of the coal producers, union leaders, rail carriers, and utility users. As a commentary on this new organization I would like to call your attention to the following syndicated column by the noted labor writer, Victor Riesel, which was published this week in several hundred newspapers:

While blood once flowed and heads rolled in thin black dust, cabbages now roll in truckloads, symbolic of man's ability to be decent to man after all.

It's time now to talk of those cabbages and kings, too; namely, coal and John L. Lewis. It is time to talk of hunger in what once was bloody Harlan and in the other mine patches where hunky men must sit jobless and weep inwardly while their womenfolk find work.

While bus and train loads of AFL–CIO demonstrators from the big cities poured in on Washington the other day, gift truckloads of cabbages poured in on mine-laden Harlan County, Ky. The unemployed miners needed food; not demonstrations.

While other labor leaders talked from the podium to the march on Washington, the

mine union chiefs sat around tables talking with the leaders of the coal-carrying railroads, the coal-burning utilities, and the coal-digging companies. These men talked of the common good—saving their industry.

Their time to talk aloud and in public will come on April 27. That evening the venerable white-haired giant, whom I have called other things in past years, will stand on the dais amidst the men of industry. And despite his 78 thunderous years, John L. Lewis will be heard from again.

This will be the banquet of the new National Coal Policy Conference. Its director is Joseph E. Moody, head of the Southern Coal Producers Association, the man who did most to turn a gun-filled dynamite-laden, civil-war-torn industry into a vale of peace. There are other models of cooperative labor-management efforts, but this is more model than the rest.

John Lewis and his friends of mining and transport and power know they have a sick industry. But they want no subsidies, no handouts. They want to help themselves. That's why these giants, such men as George Love of the Consolidated Coal Co. and Philip Sporn of the American Electric Power Service Corp., have been conferencing with the United Mine Workers' chiefs.

Where once over 600,000 men hacked at the coal veins, now less than 185,000 go into the pits—and not each day at that.

Those were the days when no President had his morning coffee before reaching for his paper to glean whether he'd have an afternoon coal crisis. Today that industry needs to sell at least another 100 million tons a year to stay live. In Kentucky alone, land of Old Bloody, there is a surplus of more than 40 million tons.

Yet if Old King Coal totters just a little more, what will happen to the fuel power needed by this Nation to defend itself? If the men of helmet lamps and pickaxes realize they will be working less and less and tell their sons to get the hell out of the mine patches forever, who will dig coal? There is no machine that can do it all either. Just as I have heard John L. growl that you cannot mine coal with bayonets, you cannot mine all coal with automatons.

Leaders of the National Coal Policy Conference know that the industry will come into its own in two decades. Then the big atomic energy plants will guzzle the black stuff.

But how to survive through the first 20 years of the spatial age? That is why Lewis and the industry have gathered. They have been ignored by the Government—which has special commissions for natural gas, for atomic energy and for oil, but not for coal.

People Are Not Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Peoria Journal Star of April 15, 1959:

PEOPLE ARE NOT PROPERTY

A totalitarian concept has been infiltrating American thinking. It is a concept that should be rooted out.

In its most dangerous form, it is the idea that people are assets of the state. But we see it also in the form of the belief that an executive is an asset of the corporation for which he works; or the belief that a corporation may meddle in an employee's family affairs, on the theory that they affect the value of its assets.

A few days ago, Dr. Dael Wolfle, executive officer of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, said that men and women of higher education are national rather than local assets and, therefore, the Federal Government should pay for their education.

Undoubtedly the Nation needs men and women of ability and education. In a sense, they are assets. But when we regard them as assets in which the Federal Government must invest money, we get to thinking of them as property of the state. It is a short step from that concept to the idea that the Federal Government should regiment people according to their ability, direct their training, and assign them to work where they are most needed by the Government.

A similar concept has infiltrated business and industrial thinking. When management says to an employee, "We have invested a lot of money in you," it is implying that the employee has become an asset (or the property) of the company. It is but a short step then to the concept of giving that man (and his wife, too) psychological tests, since the company has a right to know about its assets.

The idea of being an asset, in this sense, is abhorrent to any person who has real understanding of the dignity of human personality. Only under collectivism do people surrender themselves to the state and become assets or liabilities. Only where totalitarian ideas have infected business do employees and their families become business assets.

People are individuals. They must have liberty and freedom of choice. Great souls will not tolerate regimentation.

Collectivism has infected our thinking more than we realize. We need a strong, new infusion of the philosophy of individualism, the kind of thinking expressed in Ralph Waldo Emerson's essay, "Self-Reliance."

Our Liberties Versus Our Responsibilities in a Free Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, each year the American Legion of Ohio promotes an essay contest among the high school students in Ohio.

The subject assigned always has some connection with civic or governmental responsibility.

This year, the subject assigned was "Our Liberties Versus Our Responsibilities in a Free Society."

Three winning essays are selected from each class group. I am proud of the fact that out of the 12 Ohio winners, one is from the Fourth Congressional district.

Miss Virginia Etter of Piqua, Ohio, is one of the 10th grade winners. Her prize-winning essay is as follows:

OUR LIBERTIES VERSUS OUR RESPONSIBILITIES IN A FREE SOCIETY

Like the recurrent theme in a great symphony, the concern for personal liberty runs through and through the Constitution. The world has never had a good definition for the word "liberty." We all declare ourselves in favor of liberty, but in using the word we do not all mean the same thing. From one viewpoint, it is the individual on the one hand and the powers of government and society on the other. From another viewpoint, it is the preservation of property rights against predatory demands of a multitude of forces. From still another viewpoint, in the context of the American scene, it is the freedom from external restraint or compulsion, the rights and immunities of all the citizens guaranteed by the Bill of Rights. Our Bill of Rights which looks so simple when we first read it, is a dynamic, flexible, ever-expanding and growing definition of our fundamental rights and responsibilities.

When we consider the citizen's responsibility in relation to his liberty we are discussing our daily duties as citizens of a unique democratic system, and we are discussing what should be the fundamental knowledge of many people. The duties involved can be stated in one simple sentence: Active participation in all the actions of governments on all levels. Actually, liberty demands responsibility: the two are so interwoven that it is impossible to have one without the other. With this thought in mind, that liberty and responsibility are inseparable, let us consider briefly the Bill of Rights.

The first amendment guarantees the freedom of religion, speech, press, assembly, and petition. The second and third, of less importance today, uphold the citizen's right to bear and enjoin the quartering of soldiers in private homes. The fourth amendment restricts searches and seizures in a citizen's home without warrant. Amendments five, six, and eight constitute a bill of rights for accused persons. The 7th and 10th amendments restrict the power of the Supreme Court of the United States and limits the power of the Federal Government.

What a heritage is ours. But certainly one cannot accept such liberty without realizing the responsibility that comes with it. It has rightly been said a man has no more or fewer liberties than responsibilities. We should be careful to remember that liberty is made up of the personal duty of the individual. The supreme need today is for a greater number of men who have an understanding of liberty, its rights and obligations, and who will by their speech and conduct, influence their neighbors to acquire a like state of mind.

The protection of liberty, which the Bill of Rights weaves into the fabric of our governmental obligations, is one of the most basic responsibilities of a democratic society. Despite the difficulty of drawing an unwavering line between the privileges of liberty and the necessity for responsibility, Government in America has fostered and helped maintain a free and open society. Whatever faults may be found with Government in America, the fact remains that our political expectation—and the spiritual and moral values which underlie those expectations—have, on the whole, been well served by the democratic instruments at our disposal. The rights of a free people are the rich dividends of the willingness of men to invest time, energy, money, and sometimes life itself, to meet their obligations as citizens.

If we today practice and insist upon free discussion, respect the laws and institutions which surround us, participate in the common life of our local, State, National, and international community—then we can say our responsibilities are truly our liberties.

Resolutions of Dairyland Power Cooperative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we recognize that over the years the cooperative movement has assumed a tremendously important role in our economy.

Over the years, co-ops have helped communities, particularly our farmers, to meet and resolve serious problems.

Although co-ops cannot solve the whole problem, they have made a real contribution toward enabling farmers to better weather the economic storms.

Recently I received a copy of a composite resolution with reference to current legislation adopted by the board of directors of the Dairyland Power Cooperative of La Crosse, Wis. Dairyland represents 27 member distribution cooperatives, serving in excess of 100,000 farm homes and rural establishments.

Recognizing the outstanding way in which this fine cooperative, as well as others, is serving its patrons, the farm economy, and bettering life in many communities, these resolutions, I believe, merit the attention of the Congress, particularly as they relate to problems in agriculture. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DAIRYLAND POWER COOPERATIVE,
La Crosse, Wis., April 15, 1959.

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Our board of directors at its last regular meeting passed a more or less composite resolution with reference to current legislation that has come or will be coming to your attention in the immediate future.

I know you have a sincere interest in our program and I felt getting this resolution into your hands would be helpful to you. We sincerely appreciate your interest and efforts in our behalf.

Thanks for all past favors and I hope to see you one day in the near future. Best personal regards.

Yours sincerely,
DAIRYLAND POWER COOPERATIVE,
JOHN P. MADGETT,
General Manager.

EXCERPT FROM THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF DAIRYLAND POWER COOPERATIVE OF MARCH 20, 1959

The board of directors of Dairyland Power Cooperative, representing 27 member distribution cooperatives, serving in excess of 100,000 farm homes and rural establishments, does hereby go on record in support of and in opposition to certain measures now pending in Congress as follows:

"In support of:

"(a) Senate Resolution 21, introduced by Senator AIKEN and others, to show congressional intention for the construction of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 as it was construed prior to the ruling of the Comptroller General of July 1958, which ruling was adverse to the interests of rural electric cooperative borrowers and their consumers.

"(b) Senate bill 144 and House of Representatives bill 1321 known as the Humphrey-Price bill, to restore to the REA Administrator the loanmaking authority which the Secretary of Agriculture took away from him.

"(c) Senate bill 931 and House of Representatives bill 3460 to give Tennessee Valley Authority the right to issue revenue bonds to finance needed power generating capacity. The passage of this bill is important to the many rural electric cooperatives served with wholesale power by TVA and is based on sound principle.

"(d) The House of Representatives bills 8289 and 1591, introduced by Congressmen TRIMBLE and MILLS, for natural resource development, and to reestablish Congress as a predominant policymaking body in determining feasibility and cost allocations of multipurpose development river projects.

"(e) Senate bill 683, introduced by Senator GORE, providing an accelerated power program of vital concern and benefit to all of the citizens of our country.

"The board of directors of Dairyland Power Cooperative is unalterably opposed to the REA interest rate increase bills, including House of Representatives bills 372 and 1781, and other bills which may be introduced of a similar nature. Retention of the present REA interest rate is essential if the rural electrification program being carried on by rural electric cooperatives the country over is not to be seriously endangered. Vigorous opposition is also justified against proposals to eliminate loan financing by Rural Electrification Administration in favor of Wall Street financing, and to those bills introduced by Congressmen MASON (H.R. 198), CURTIS (H.R. 3150), and DAVIS (H.R. 3848) designed to put a punitive and discriminatory tax on cooperatives. Even though these bills as introduced might not apply to rural electric cooperatives they are based upon faulty premise and have the very obvious purpose of hampering and injuring agricultural cooperatives.

"It is further resolved that copies of this resolution stating the position of the board of directors of Dairyland Power Cooperative be sent to all Senators and Congressmen in the areas served by Dairyland and its members."

A Solid, United Hemisphere

SPEECH
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 14, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, when a person goes to a foreign land, either for a visit or to live, the first impression is of the things that are different. Customs are different, languages are different, traditions are different, sometimes the color of the skin is different. These are the things that stand out.

During the 10 years I lived in a foreign country, the biggest lesson I learned was that "different" is not the same as "worse." I looked the two words up one time in the dictionary and they are not synonymous. A thing can be different without necessarily being worse. Sometimes I think the English word that causes more trouble in the world than any other is the four-letter word "only." "This is our way—ergo, it is the only way." Now, it is a good way, we like it, we are proud of it, but it is not necessarily the only good way. Sometimes we create animosity around the world or alienate others largely because, with all good intentions, we are so sure of our way being the best or the only way that we give the impression of failing to appreciate that other folks are just as justifiably and properly proud of their way as we are of ours.

But as one continues to live in the other country, what one becomes more and more conscious of are not the things that are different, but the things that are alike; the deep things, the love of home and of family and of country, pride of culture, and the desire that things will be better for their children tomorrow than they are today. These are the same all around the world.

There is no better demonstration of this than here in the Western Hemisphere. The things on which we agree and the interests that unite us far outweigh the differences and the things that divide. There is no better example of the capacity of peoples with different backgrounds and cultures and traditions to live together in good will and mutual respect and cooperaton for the benefit of all. The unities are deeper and broader based than the difficulties that arise from time to time. There is more to be happy about in the relations between our countries than there is to be embarrassed or upset about.

Actually, we can be proud of the behavior of both sides. First, we can be proud of the overall record of our country in the Western Hemisphere.

We could have seized control or imposed our will on the hemisphere at almost any time in the last 150 years, but we never did. We declared a policy that guaranteed the independence of the American States from external domination, including our own domination, and we stuck to it. It was not a Democratic or a Republican policy; it was a U.S. policy. No matter what party was in power, Latin America knew, and the whole world knew, that the United States would not permit any European systems or sovereignties to establish themselves in the Western Hemisphere.

With all the mistakes that we freely admit have been made, mistakes due more to oversight or neglect than to action or to intent, the basic record of the United States is one in which we can take satisfaction.

Equally we can pay tribute to and be proud of the record of the Latin American countries. It is much harder to be the smaller brother than to be the bigger one. On the whole, these countries have exhibited great maturity and understanding, sometimes under difficult circumstances and despite irritating provocations. This demonstration of giving first importance to the fundamental likenesses and common concerns is the best assurance of steadily improving relations in the future—deeper understanding and greater cooperation in working for the things that are in the best interests of all of us.

I commend my colleague on the Committee on Foreign Affairs for the fine

leadership which, as has already been said here, he has been giving to his Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere. When it has sometimes been neglected by us a bit, it was not deliberate, but in a sense constituted a compliment to the Latin American nations. It evidenced that we had every confidence in their friendship and understanding and steadfastness, just as we expected them to have confidence also in ours. But even in your own family things go better if you do not take your loved ones too much for granted. They know that you are loyal and devoted to them, but they like it better if you take pains to reaffirm your attitude every once in a while.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to take advantage of Pan American Day and every occasion that comes along to speak out in behalf of the good things that stand out in our hemisphere—the unbreakable ties of common interest, of loyalty, and of common dedication to the basic values of freedom and democracy. Those are the things that we can rightly emphasize. They are even stronger today than in the past. The very fact that more of the smaller countries will speak up right to our face about matters where they believe we are in the wrong, is a sign of better relations, not of deteriorating relations.

I look forward to the next decade as the best in the history of our hemisphere. We are going to try our best to achieve that, and I know the wonderful group of fine people most of us have been privileged to meet from Latin America are going to try their best. Together we will continue to make headway toward this goal of a really solid, united hemisphere.

Verrazzano Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, 435 years ago, on April 17, 1524, the first white man entered New York Bay and discovered Manhattan Island.

This man was the great Italian navigator and explorer, Giovanni da Verrazzano; a man whose name should rank with those of Columbus, Vespucci, and Magellan, but who instead, has been largely forgotten and ignored. He is rarely, if ever, mentioned in the textbooks and his history is only known to a few scholars. Yet, the fact remains that, 85 years before Henry Hudson and 96 years before the *Mayflower* pilgrims, Verrazzano had come to these shores, explored them carefully, and told Europe about them.

Giovanni da Verrazzano was born near Florence about 1485. His family was engaged in the trading of spices, silk, and other precious commodities from the Orient. Quite early in life Giovanni acquired his geographical and nautical knowledge in Egypt and Syria. He made his first trip to the New World in 1508 at the age of 23. Some years later he attracted the attention of the King of France who decided to send Verrazzano to discover a northwest passage to Asia. In January 1524, therefore, the navigator set sail on the 100-ton, 3-masted *Dauphine*. More than 3 months later he landed on the coast of North Carolina and named the new continent Francesca, after the King. He then proceeded northward as far as Newfoundland. En route the *Dauphine* anchored in New York Bay and was greeted by a group of surprised Indians whom Verrazzano described as agreeable, friendly, and pleasant. Unfortunately, the stay was cut short by an unfavorable wind, but not before New York was given its first name of Angoulgeme. A few years after this historic expedition Verrazzano, while exploring new lands, was captured by the natives and killed.

The contributions of Verrazzano to American history are many. He was the first man to chart and name the harbors, bays, capes, and islands that he discovered, thus opening the path to other voyagers who have come to these shores in ever-growing numbers since then. The principal merit of this great Italian, however, stems from the fact that he was the first European to sail to our shores with the express purpose of exploring them. His voyage has been called one of the most scientific and purposeful of all those made in the 16th century and his report of the voyage one of the most accurate of those written at that time.

Thus Verrazzano Day should serve to keep awake the appreciation and knowledge of our great historical heritage and as a reminder of the cultural relations between the Old and New Worlds that had their beginnings with the famous Florentine explorer, Giovanni da Verrazzano. It should also serve as just one more reminder of the great contributions made by the Italians to these United States.

From Verrazzano and Columbus down through the ages to LaGuardia and Fermi the Italians have left their mark on American history and culture.

Toll Charges for the St. Lawrence Seaway Are Grossly Inadequate and Once Again the American Taxpayer Is Headed for Another Multi-Million-Dollar Ride

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, recently, it was announced that the United States and Canada had formally set the tolls which ships will be charged to use the St. Lawrence Seaway when it opens late in April. The tolls as announced for from Montreal to Lake Erie will be 6 cents on each ton of a ship's official weightplus 42 cents for each ton of bulk cargo or 95 cents a ton on general cargo.

In my opinion, these tolls will prove to be grossly inadequate and once again the poor taxpayer will be taken for another multi-million-dollar ride. The public who today pays for practically all of the costs of maintaining our entire system of inland waterways, is probably getting used to paying and paying for facilities which benefit only a handful. But that doesn't make it right.

It is inconceivable how the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the American principal in drafting the tolls, can accomplish with the announced tolls the mandate of the Congress which is self-liquidation within 50 years of the $128 million cost. It is going to be utterly impossible to follow this mandate with inadequate toll charges which are based on highly speculative volumes and an estimate of prospective traffic volume which exceeds the practical capacity of the facilities soon to be opened.

In addition to the provisions of law regarding self-liquidation through toll revenues, there were important economic considerations which Congress must have certainly recognized when it was decided that tolls would be charged. One of the most important of these considerations was the seaway's effect on the overall costs and adequacy of the Nation's transportation system. Unless the seaway is fully self-supporting, with no element of subsidy to the users, it cannot possibly contribute to the true economy of the whole transportation picture. In a competitive transportation situation, inadequate tolls are going to create uneconomic transportation patterns by shifting traffic from less costly methods to the more costly, subsidized method.

These inadequate toll charges which will not cover full costs place the railroads on a standby basis. This consequence will be all the more serious and disruptive because the seaway is only a part-time transportation facility, whereas the Nation for its commerce and defense requires dependable transportation services in both summer and winter. The Nation's transportation requirements for defense obviously do not cease with the close of the navigation season, nor does its commerce hibernate.

Subsidizing the seaway, through inadequate tolls, further aggravate these factors of instability, with seasonal disturbances of employment. This is in direct conflict with existing aims of national policy to encourage stability of employment conditions in the United States and in its several industries, including the railroads.

To arrive at the charges just announced, the Seaway Corporation, in estimating the annual tonnage that the seaway could handle, is as far off first base as were the cost estimates presented in 1954 to the Congress to gain approval of the project. The cost estimates have now proven to be unrealistic and it is just a matter of time before

there will be two outs. The official estimate of the annual capacity of the seaway has been for sometime 50 million tons—and now a seaway official has said that it may reach 75 million tons. All I can say about both of these estimates is: fantastic. And I will tell you why.

The main purpose in deepening the St. Lawrence was to encourage oceangoing vessels having a draft of 27 feet or less to serve inland ports on the Great Lakes. In order to reach those ports, these ships must pass through the only connecting link between Lake Ontario and Lake Erie, the Welland Canal.

The capacity of the Welland Canal has generally been recognized as the critical limiting factor governing the volume of traffic that can move through the seaway. It is amazing to me why the U.S. Tolls Committee in its report of last June said nothing about this very vital matter although a press release accompanying the report mentioned a maximum tonnage of cargo of 60 million tons at Welland. There was absolutely no explanation of how the figure, which of course is totally unrealistic, was picked out of thin air.

The records show that the peak traffic volume through the Welland Canal was 23 million tons in 1956. While I realize that the deepening of the canal and the seaway to allow passage of ships having drafts up to 27 feet will mean that ships with greater tonnage capacity will use the facilities, it is utterly ridiculous to assume that the tonnage capacity at Welland will ever within the forseeable future reach 60 million tons a year. This, believe it or not, is more than 2½ times the traffic which has ever passed through the canal in 1 year.

Gentlemen you must understand that the agreed-upon tolls were set using this fantastic tonnage capacity as a starting point and I am sure you are wondering how the Government is ever going to recoup its investment. You can stop wondering because there is not one chance in a thousand that it will.

How am I going to tell my friends back in Altoona, Pa., where the only water we have is Brush Run, which is deep enough for canoes after the rainy season, that they are going to help pay for the deficit which the Government faces because of inadequate tolls for the seaway? They already know they are helping to contribute close to $40 million each year just to maintain navigation on our inland waterways system and many more millions to improve it. Soon they will be asked to help defray the costs of the seaway.

And what about the Great Lakes, the nearest of which is almost 200 miles from my district. In a recent statement, commenting on the fact that the imposition of any tolls on the seaway constituted a distinct threat to the economic well being of the Great Lakes area, Adm. Lyndon Spencer, president of the Lake Carriers' Association, said:

> The Gerat Lakes are a natural highway for moving grain from western growing centers to eastern consuming centers.

Certainly the Great Lakes are a natural highway that no ships could use unless harbors were deepened, locks maintained, and channels dredged. Do you know how much the Government has spent to date on this natural highway—more than $500 million of your money and mine.

Many people have said that the recession caused most of the unemployment in the railroad industry that exists today. Perhaps it caused some layoffs, but to me a principal cause has and will continue to be the Government's subsidizing the water carriers. This must be curtailed.

But let us get back to the Welland Canal and its capacity. I wonder if the Development Corporation when it suggested the tolls which are supposed to cover the costs of the seaway understood what the workable capacity of Welland meant. Certainly much more is involved than figuring the maximum number of lockages that can be performed per day and multiplying by the number of days in the navigation season to obtain a total of physical capacity in lockages. If they made this kind of mathematical caper, we are in for trouble.

In determining tonnage capacity, allowances should have been made for interruptions because of adverse weather and accidents. More important still is the fact that the traffic will not flow with uniform regularity all hours of the day, in all days of the peak month, in all months of the navigation season, or from one navigation season to another. These variations of traffic have a pronounced downward effect upon the practical capacity of the canal and should have been used as a basis in formulating toll levels to cover costs.

Available data clearly show that traffic at Welland is not evenly spaced throughout the navigation season, but starts off slowly, rises to a summer peak, and tapers off with the approach of cold weather. Therefore, any calculation of Welland's capacity that treats every day or month of the navigation season as equivalent is certain to involve substantial error and cannot represent the effective capacity.

So it is also with respect to year-to-year variations in traffic resulting from fluctuations in the general economy. This simply means that the top capacity of Welland, whatever it may be, will not be used every year, owing to business fluctuations affecting such major commodities as ore, grain, coal, as well as others. On the average, over a period of years, it is unlikely for this reason that the full annual capacity of Welland would be used to a greater extent than 90 percent, since the capacity cannot be exceeded but utilization will frequently fall below it. Over the 10 years from 1948 through 1957, for example, the volume of bulk freight on the Great Lakes ranged from a high of 200 million tons in 1953 to a low of 151 million tons in 1954. A realistic determination of toll levels should have taken these cyclical fluctuations into account.

Summing up all of these pertinent considerations, and giving them a realistic evaluation, points out clearly that the effective capacity of Welland cannot exceed 40 million tons and will be less than that year in and year out. This would allow for a maximum of 7,200 transits, with more large vessels than have used the canal up to now and fewer possibilities than in the past for multiple transits. It also allows for greater average cargo tonnage per vessel transited, but there appears to be no reason to assume that the average cargo tons per transit will exceed 5,500 tons at any time in the foreseeable future, which is more than twice as great as the average in recent years. There will be very probably some larger vessels, but there will also continue to be many small ones and empty ones to keep the average size of the vessels from soaring as the unrestrained optimists have led us to believe.

I am sure that if you agree with my analysis of the cargo tonnage capacity of Welland, which I think is very realistic, it goes without saying that the 40 million ton figure provides the top limit of tonnage that should have been taken as a basis for determining appropriate tolls for the St. Lawrence Seaway and for Welland.

Unfortunately for the taxpayer, the Tolls Committee in recognition of the functional relationship between the St. Lawrence and the Welland Canal has set the maximum seaway traffic at 50 million tons compared with 60 million tons for Welland. The difference of 10 million tons is principally accounted for by interlake traffic which does not use the St. Lawrence River. Very probably this interlake traffic will expand and further reduce the remaining seaway traffic potential as affected by Welland.

Since my analysis shows that the Tolls Committee has overestimated the Welland capacity by at least 20 million tons, it has likewise overestimated the available traffic potential of the seaway in the St. Lawrence by at least the same amount. Hence, the maximum traffic for the seaway will be no more than 30 million tons instead of 50 million tons. This means that the seaway revenues as calculated by the Tolls Committee on the basis of the agreed upon tolls will suffice to cover only 60 percent of the seaway costs, thus falling far short of the requirements of law with respect to self-liquidation.

It is indeed unfortunate that those responsible for setting the tolls did not fully take into account a realistic tonnage capacity for Welland. If they had it would have been clear that considerably higher tolls were necessary to effect self-liquidation within the required period. I am sure the higher tolls would not have discouraged ships from using the seaway because traffic that will become firmly attached to this route as the most advantageous means of transportation can afford to pay full-cost tolls. I can see no need to offer a bargain variety of tolls for traffic which can be realistically expected to develop for the seaway on an economic basis. And yet, this is what has been done as the seaway prepares to open for its navigation season.

Although the law states that a review of the situation must be made before July 1, 1964, this is much too long to wait if we are ever going to rectify the mistakes that have already been made. I therefore strongly urge that the St.

Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation should insist that, after the close of the navigation season in 1960, a review of the toll charges be made to determine how much the tolls should be raised. After two full seasons, sufficient statistics should have been developed which will show whether we are collecting enough to cover our costs. I am sure these figures when they are made public, will show the absolute necessity for making an upward readjustment of tolls for the seaway and the canal.

Outdoors Unlimited Program of Conservation of Natural Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the preservation and sound use of our water, forests, soil, mineral, wildlife, and other aspects of our outdoor heritage is, indeed, a real challenge confronting our Nation.

This is particularly true, since, in many regions, the expansion of urban areas and industrial activities overflows onto the countryside and often wipes out many natural out-of-door areas.

Consequently, we face a real challenge in the need for vigilant protection, preservation, conservation, and proper utilization of the remaining natural heritage.

Today I should like to call attention to a program in Wisconsin, Outdoors Unlimited, aimed at uniting conservation-minded individuals, clubs, and businesses in a coordinated effort for intelligent and frugal use of our natural resources and the perpetuation of our wholesome and traditional outdoor forms of recreation.

Through the years too much of our Nation's priceless top soil has already been lost to erosion. Many of our streams have been polluted and other irreplaceable resources have been dissipated or lost completely.

The program, Outdoors Unlimited, is undertaking a constructive approach to the preservation of our outdoor areas. I ask unanimous consent to have a résumé of its objectives printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the résumé was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Natural resources: Outdoors Unlimited will actively promote judicious, long-range planning of natural resource utilization.

Wildlife: Outdoors Unlimited will strive for the preservation and improvement of our remaining wildlife habitat, and will seek to restore all possible habitat areas that have already been destroyed.

Outdoor recreation: Outdoors Unlimited will defend and seek to enhance our public heritage of outdoor recreation, promote advanced farmer-hunter cooperation programs, etc.

Legislation: Outdoors Unlimited will provide an organized medium with which to oppose legislation contrary to the interests of conservation, and will promote favorable legislation.

Watersheds: Outdoors Unlimited will work for and promote a greatly accelerated upstream watershed improvement program that will reduce flooding, minimize siltation, conserve topsoil, advance water utilization, and improve wildlife habitat.

Research: Science is our hope for the future. Outdoors Unlimited will promote continued and increased conservation research so that improving resource utilization and development may keep pace with our advancing population.

Education: Statutory laws and hnman policies and techniques are not permanent. They are merely a fluid part of our "passing parade." Permanent victory in conservation cannot be achieved without a broad anti continuing program of education. Outdoors Unlimited will work to promote public conservation education.

Public rights: Outdoors Unlimited will work to stop private exploitation of public wildlife and other natural resources.

Safety: Outdoors Unlimited will formulate programs of hunter education, gun and boat safety, and otherwise promote public freedom to enjoy our great out of doors.

Unity: While individual sportsmen, conservationists and conservation groups have minor differences relating to hunting and fishing, regulations, etc., they virtually all agree on the fundamental principles of conservation. We must not allow petty differences to disunite us and frustrate the cause of conservation. Outdoors Unlimited will work to promote unity among our various outdoor groups.

District Home Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, in his famous Cataline oration, that great Roman statesman, Cicero, spoke seven words which legions of schoolboys over the intervening centuries have committed to memory. These words are:

Quo usque tandem abutere, Catalina, patientia nostra.

How long, oh Cataline, will you abuse our patience?

The sense of frustration which Cicero expressed in the Roman Senate is one that we experience from time to time in this modern forum of representative government.

It is one that aptly describes my personal sentiments when I contemplate the situation of home-rule legislation in this body today. After years of study and despite the broad support for this bill, we have, at this hour, gotten exactly nowhere in obtaining consideration of the bill by the District Committee.

It is not as if this legislation were new or revolutionary. This home-rule bill has passed the Senate four times in the last five Congresses. It is presently being heard by the Senate District Committee.

It is not that there is no interest in the bill. Twenty-three members of this House, of both parties, have introduced the legislation.

It is not that the bill has no urgency attached to it. The president of the District Commissioners has characterized it as the most important piece of legislation affecting the District before the Congress.

Nor can one say that there is little sentiment in favor of home rule in the District itself. In the District Democratic primary of 1956, nearly 80 percent of he voters expressed their support. Similarly, in a recent Republican mail poll, two-thirds were for it.

No, it is not lack of support, lack of interest or lack of importance that have stalled action. It is because there is wide support and interest—because the majority of the Members of this House are anxious to vote in favor of home-rule legislation—that the legislative process has been obstructed. Such obstructionism abuses our patience. How long will it last?

What Price Steel?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT GORE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which appears on the editorial page of the Washington Post of today.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT PRICE STEEL?

The exchanage of letters between the 12 steel companies and David McDonald, the leader of the steel union, shows that both parties want to hold the line at the expense of the other.

There is little hope for a common platform regarding the gains of productivity either, unless there is third party intervention in the public interest.

With steel wages well above the national average it is not in the public interest to raise them. The gain of the increased productivity should be passed on to the consumer in the form of lower prices, just as it was recently done by the soft coal and the can industries.

Slince the unions are primarily interested in getting something for their members, and the leaders of the industry only in their stockholders, it is time for a new approach to get for the consumer his due, and stop inflation.

Whether the public notice proposed by Senator O'MAHONEY would suffice or a utility-type regulation envisaged by Senator GORE would be necessary depends on the outcome of the forthcoming steel contract negotiations. In the past 10 years the steel contract became a pattern for the rest of the industry, and a lot of our economic and financial problems are caused by the unduly high steel profits which made it impossible for the industry to deny wage increases which the rest of the economy could not afford.

Besides raising the wages to a level which is too high for the less concentrated and protected sectors of our economy, the steel industry proceeded to levy an extra toll on the consumer amounting to about $1 billion per annum. Thus, in the postwar

years the steel industry could rebuild and expand its facilities to the tune of about $10 billion, not by raising funds in the market, but by charging its customers not only for its products but for its plants.

It also increased dividends far beyond the increase granted to its workers, and gave its executives substantial extra benefits in stock options. These stock options feed on inflation because the executives have a vested interest in higher stock prices.

Some of the already published preliminary reports indicate, and Wall Street analysts estimate, that steel profits will exceed in 1959 all previous earning records, and will be about 50 percent higher than in 1958. The substantial rise in profits is due to increased productivity and to a 15-percent cut in the labor force.

The real issue in the present steel contract negotiation is the future of the 200,000 unemployed steelworkers who lost their jobs to the increased use of labor-saving machinery. There is no hope for reemployment for them in the steel industry, and neither a shorter workweek nor a 3-month vacation every 5 years would solve the problem.

The victims of automation in the steel and automobile industries must be relocated to other jobs, and judging from the preliminary skirmishes between the representatives of the industry and the unions there is little inclination by either party to face this and act accordingly. The burden of providing for the unemployed is left to the community. The high profits of the industry and the high wages of the steelworkers thus present a problem of public interest.

With profits for the leader of the steel industry, rising from $7.47 per ton in 1953 to $20 at present, it is clear that there is ample room for a cutback in prices. A reduction of 5 percent would leave profits of about $12.50 per ton for the United States Steel Corp. and would assure net profits of about $6 per common stock, more than twice the average earnings of 1946–54, and about the same as in the highly prosperous 1955–58 period.

A 5-percent cut in steel prices would be less than the cut announced by the can companies paying the same wages as the steel industry, and it would save the consumer more than a billion dollars a year.

This could change public psychology from inflationary expectations to confidence in steady growth assisted by a sound dollar. It could help to restore the disturbed balances of our economy and could absorb the laid-off workers in the steel and automobile industries.

EUGENE HAVAS.

WASHINGTON

A High School Student's Faith in America Lives on After Her Untimely Death

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following essay which won the district VI competition in New York State in the national Good Citizens Essay Contest sponsored by the Daughters of the American Revolution. Miss Cynthia Maurer of Franklin, N.Y., a high school senior submitted the essay, and shortly thereafter was killed in an automobile accident. The judges were not advised of the tragic interim death, and Miss Maurer's essay won the district prize. Though the author has met an untimely death, her words, symbolic of the faith of young Americans in their Government, live on:

THE DIGNITY OF MAN UNDER OUR REPUBLIC

Our great American Republic was founded upon the concept of the dignity of man—the belief that every individual, however, humble, is of infinite worth in the eyes of God, and the firm conviction that his sacred rights ought not to be infringed upon.

Our forefathers were aware that they were not being treated as creatures of worth. They were denied representation in the Government which made the laws under which they had to live. Their legislatures had no voice with which to speak out against injustice. So these men came together and began the task of establishing a Republic where tyranny would not rob man of his God-given dignity. And one of them, Thomas Jefferson, took up his pen and wrote a most perfect summation of the dignity of man:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

In these words, the cornerstone of a mighty nation was laid.

Innumerable changes have been wrought in our country since the days of Thomas Jefferson. Technological progress has eased man's burdens by creating devices to do a large share of his work. Agricultural advances have made possible the production of a vast bounty of life-giving food.

We Americans can be justly proud of our great Republic, for in it we see the realization of the dream that men have cherished since time began. A way of life where the dignity of man cannot be crushed under the brutal heel of tyranny.

Let us ever hold fast to our great American ideal, so that in a world where totalitarianism is constantly seeking to enslave human minds we may stand as a shining example, pointing the way to a new age when all men everywhere shall live with all the rights and privileges accorded to them by their Creator when He bestowed upon them the unspeakable gift of dignity.

Anniversary of Lincoln's West Virginia Statehood Proclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, today is an important date in the history of my home State of West Virginia. On this date 96 years ago, the Great Emancipator, President Abraham Lincoln, signed the proclamation that designated West Virginia a new State.

The actual admission of West Virginia into the Union came 60 days later, on June 20, 1863, under the terms of President Lincoln's proclamation. This latter date is celebrated as West Virginia Day in our State, but the confirmation of its entry into the Union occurred on April 20.

President Lincoln, sorely beset by the crushing burden of wartime leadership, probably had little time to reflect on the consequences and importance of his action. But there is little doubt that the formation of this new State was widely acclaimed. The courageous stand against slavery—and particularly against being drawn into war with the indissoluble Union—which the hardy and independent mountain folk had taken was thus rewarded with status as a free and equal State, and deservedly so.

It is an oversimplification, however, to say that the western counties broke away from the mother State over the issue of slavery alone. This was a contributing factor, but not the only one by any means.

There had long been sentiment for the creation of a separate State west of the crest of the Appalachians.

Geographically, the mountaineers who settled the slopes and valleys of West Virginia were much closer to their neighbors in the Ohio Valley than to other sections.

By sentiment, too, the Western Virginian belonged with his hardy counterparts in Kentucky and Ohio. The mountaineer, struggling to forge a better life for his family amid the towering, forbidding mountains, felt that the voice of the mountain dweller—then as today—was not always heard.

Thus, we can see that in many respects—in fact, in almost all respects—the stage was set for West Virginia statehood long before the slave issue set the Nation aflame. There had been repeated efforts to form a separate State long before the war triggered the final break.

West Virginia has come a long way since then. Vast deposits of untold mineral wealth have poured from her mountains, particularly in the unbelievably rich coalfields to the south. Chemical, glass and steel manufacturers have chosen the many resources of the State in the manufacture of their products. Her forests are still undepleted, although millions of feet of timber have been taken from her majestic hills.

This growth might have been slowed, might possibly never have attained its present stature at all, had not President Lincoln determined to permit this economic entity to become a separate State 96 years ago today.

Today, the State of West Virginia already is making forward-looking plans for its centennial, 4 years hence in 1963. Already, elaborate preparations are being made to pay fitting tribute to a great State entering its second century. Realistic and thoughtful planning is being done in regard to West Virginia's future, in an attempt to assure that the second century will be even greater in achievement than the first.

It is only fitting that we pause, as these many preparations gain momentum, to pay tribute to the great American who affixed his signature to the document that proclaimed West Virginia's birth, during the year that marks the 150th anniversary of his birth.

Under unanimous consent I at this point insert the text of Abraham Lincoln's proclamation of April 20, 1863:

PROCLAMATION ADMITTING WEST VIRGINIA INTO THE UNION, APRIL 20, 1863, BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Whereas by the act of Congress approved the 31st day of December last, the State of West Virginia was declared to be one of the United States of America, and was admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States in all respects whatever, upon the condition that certain changes should be duly made in the proposed constitution for that State; and

Whereas proof of a compliance with that condition, as required by the second section of the act aforesaid, has been submitted to me:

Now, therefore, be it known that I, Abraham Lincoln, President of the United States, do hereby, in pursuance of the act of Congress aforesaid, declare and proclaim that the said act shall take effect and be in force from and after 60 days from the date hereof.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set by hand, and caused the seal of the United States to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington, this 20th day of April, in the year of our Lord, one thousand eight hundred and sixty-three, and of the independence of the United States the 87th.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN.

By the President:

WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Statement by Korean Finance Minister Song on the Occasion of an Award to William E. Warne, for Service as United Nations Command Economic Coordinator in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, the effectiveness of American representation abroad has been the subject of a variety of reports, factual or fictional, in recent months. I should like to offer some direct evidence on the issue, in the form of a statement by Finance Minister Song In Sang of the Republic of Korea. Minister Song's statement is directed in particular to the work of America's Economic Coordinator for Korea, William E. Warne, who is from my State. After 9 years abroad, including the past 2½ in Korea, Mr. Warne now has returned to California to accept appointment by Governor Pat Brown as our new State director of fish and game.

The U.S. aid program in Korea, the largest we have abroad, has been coordinated in Seoul by the Combined Economic Board on which Mr. Warne was the chief American representative and Minister Song the chief Korean representative. The regular weekly Board meetings were attended by Korean cabinet officers, U.S. Embassy officials, representatives of the United States 8th Army, and others. It seems to have been a particularly efficient binational coordination device. At the meeting of the Board on March 25, the last attended by Mr. Warne, Minister Song observed that his Government had intended to present a medal to Mr. Warne but had been prevented from doing so by regulations of the U.S. Government. In lieu thereof, he offered a personal tribute. It is a remarkable testimonial, not only to Mr. Warne, but also to the positive effectiveness of our foreign assistance program in this important country. I ask unanimous consent that Minister Song's comments be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT MADE BY MINISTER SONG AT THE 148TH COMBINED ECONOMIC BOARD MEETING HELD ON MARCH 25, 1959

I have long known that this day must come. The fact that this day has come at last finds me no more prepared to meet it than I would have been 6 months or a year ago—and no better prepared were it a year, or 10 years, from now.

This is the 148th meeting of the Combined Economic Board and the last to be conducted by my esteemed and respected cochairman, the United Nations Command Economic Coordinator for Korea. Between Combined Economic Board meeting No. 16, when Mr. Warne took charge of the United Nations Command side of this operation, and today's 132d meeting under his leadership, a whole new chapter has been written in Korea's long and ageless history.

It is needless, I feel, for me to go into detail concerning the strong impetus that my cochairman has exerted in the Combined Economic Board. I would, however, like to give you a few figures from the Combined Economic Board record. During the 4½ years of Combined Economic Board operations—from the original meeting in 1952 until the 16th meeting on August 1, 1956, when Mr. Warne first presided as Economic Coordinator—a total of 1,313 Combined Economic Board actions were finalized. At that time the Board met infrequently—an average of about once every 3 months. Usually not more than a half dozen men attended representing each side.

Since then the Combined Economic Board has met every week and sometimes more often. In 2 years and 9 months under Mr. Warne the Combined Economic Board has finalized 1,574 actions. We have had to move several times to accommodate more and more representatives of our governments who have wanted to see this showcase of democracy.

My purpose in mentioning these figures is not to emphasize the volume of action but to illustrate the massive effort that has gone into the Combined Economic Board. More important to me, and to the Republic of Korea side, than the great number of finalized actions taken by the Combined Economic Board is the manner in which the actions were taken.

The primary function of the Combined Economic Board, under the agreement on Economic Coordination signed by our governments on May 24, 1952, is to promote effective economic coordination through the means of consultation and recommendation.

We are all aware, of course, that Korea has been the recipient of large material benefits and has, at no time, been in a position—had it been desirable from our point of view—to take a strong negative stand. But, with Mr. Warne, I am happy to say we never were forced into humiliating positions, either as individuals or as representatives of the Korea Government. Through consultation and recommendation we have been able to proudly hold up our heads. We have been able to face our Government, our people and our own hearts knowing that our actions were taken in honesty and full accord. For this we are profoundly grateful.

Many major issues on which my Government has depended have been taken by the Combined Economic Board and hundreds of minor actions, likewise, have been fitted into the effort that has restored my country and placed it in a higher position than it ever before held in the free world. No single action ever taken by the Combined Economic Board is as important as the approval of the stabilization program, now in its third year. The stabilization program, wisely guiding the financial and fiscal policy of our Government, has been significant in the development of Korea's economy. While I am proud that Korea stands with the very few nations of the world that have avoided inflation, I am happier about other, more human evidences, of the effectiveness of the stabilization program.

Everywhere one can see what stabilization means to Korea. There is a new radiance in the faces of Korean people: in the fat, warm babies; in the faces of the schoolchildren, now decently clothed and seriously working over their studies undisturbed by empty stomachs. One can see the stabilization program in many ways—in the spirit of Korea's music and art; in the untiring effort of the farmers serenely working their fields; you feel it in the air, like spring.

The stabilization program is the result of consultation and recommendation. It is the result of discussion, compromise and mutual determination as negotiated within the organization of the Combined Economic Board.

This has great meaning to us and the credit for this and a multitude of other evidences of progress is due to one thing: the superb leadership of Mr. Warne.

Mr. Warne has been virtually a one-man technical assistance program. Through his dignified example he has shown me, and my associates, techniques which have given us new confidence and new determination.

The Government would like to decorate Mr. Warne with one of the medals of the highest order of our nation to commend his outstanding contribution to the rehabilitation of our wartorn economy, as well as the betterment of the relationship between our two countries, were it not for U.S. Government regulations. Our people, as well, would share this feeling with the Government in recognizing Mr. Warne's achievements in our country.

It is with deep regret that we are together today for our final meeting. Except for a few brief periods when one or the other of us has been absent, there has hardly been a day when Mr. Warne's true genius has not been felt by me and by my associates assembled here.

It is my desire that my words be incorporated in the permanent documents of the Combined Economic Board as an expression of our sentiments toward the UNC economic coordinator, William E. Warne.

It is my feeling that Mr. Warne is Korea's greatest peacetime hero and that a thousand monuments to this great and sincere effort will forever mark my homeland.

As Mr. Warne flies over our land, he will see the long plumes of smoke rising from industrial plants that did not exist until he helped create them. He will see bridges and highways; railroad and communication lines. He will see the now peaceful fields where for two consecutive seasons our farmers have produced bumper crops. He will see new hospitals and schools. He will see the lights

generated by the powerplants he helped to build. They are his monuments.

He will not see, as he flies above us, the new spirit in the Korean heart, the stimulated minds of our new, young leaders; the determination that is a part of nearly 23 million of my countrymen. But I want him to know that these qualities are there—thanks, thanks to him.

United Nations Emergency Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 20, 1959

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, when I was in the Near East in 1958 I spent several weeks in the Palestine refugee area including the Gaza strip. One of the highlights was the peaceful atmosphere which had developed almost immediately upon the arrival of the United Nations Emergency Force. Border depradations stopped and everyone breathed more easily. Having seen at first hand what is done by the mere presence of these soldiers from many lands, and under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I insert herewith the testimony relative to UNEF presented last week to the Committee on Foreign Affairs by Francis O. Wilcox, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs:

U.N. FORCE IN GAZA

(Statement of Francis O. Wilcox, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, before the House Foreign Affairs Committee in support of the mutual security program for fiscal year 1960, April 16, 1959)

I appreciate this opportunity to present the request for $3,500,000 of mutual security funds to enable the United States to make a voluntary contribution to the United Nations Emergency Force (UNEF) for calendar year 1959. I have already testified before the Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, chaired by Mr. THOMAS, in support of our request for $4,943,146, which is the U.S. assessment for UNEF expenses in calendar year 1959.

As you will recall, following the outbreak of hostilities in Egypt in October 1956, at the time of the Suez crisis, the United Nations was faced with the problem of restoring peace in the area. First it was successful in obtaining a cease fire, and, then, in order to facilitate the withdrawal of foreign troops it resolved to establish a United Nations Emergency Force.

According to the terms of the resolution of November 5, 1956, the mandate of the Force was "to secure and supervise the cessation of hostilities on Egyptian territory." The mandate was later elaborated by a resolution of February 2, 1957, which stated that "scrupulous maintenance of the armistice agreement requires the placing of the UNEF on the Egyptian-Israeli demarcation line."

The Force was originally composed of troop contingents from 10 countries, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Canada, Colombia, Brazil, Finland, Yugoslavia, India and Indonesia. These countries—which do not include any of the great powers—represent every region of the world. At first the force consisted of about 6,000 men. It now consists of some 5,000 men from 7 countries and is stationed in positions between Egypt and Israel, as well as near the entrance to the Gulf of Aqaba. Since its inception the contingents of three countries—Colombia, Finland, and Indonesia—have been withdrawn primarily for financial reasons.

The creation of the Force represents one of the outstanding achievements of the United Nations, and has demonstrated that Organization's capacity for effective action. The success of UNEF can be attributable to many persons and many nations, high on the list being the Secretary General, Mr. Dag Hammarskjold, and his staff, whose drive and administrative talents translated a resolution of the General Assembly into a force in being on the spot in a matter of only eight days.

The existence of UNEF has contributed greatly toward maintaining a considerable measure of stability in the area of its responsibility. In his report of August 27, 1958, the Secretary General of the United Nations notes that "the operation of UNEF through this year, in all respects of its task, has continued to produce the same favorable results described in previous report," and that "during the period covered in this report, virtually unbroken quiet has prevailed along the entire line between Egypt and Israel." This situation is all the more noteworthy when one considers the heightened tensions in certain other aspects of Middle East affairs.

The United States wants a stable situation in which there can be orderly growth and development in the area. We therefore fully support the UNEF undertaking, which, together with other UN initiatives, has contributed toward that goal.

UNEF costs during the first calendar year of its existence were $30 million; during the second year (1958) they were $25 million. For calendar year 1959, a sum of $19 million has been authorized by the U.N. General Assembly. Although there is no specific terminal date on the existence of UNEF, it may well continue during calendar year 1960.

Despite the substantial decrease in UNEF costs, the sums involved represent a large additional burden on an Organization whose regular budget has been about $55 million annually. Hence additional assistance in the form of vouuntary contributions has been required in order for the U.N. membership as a whole to be in a position to shoulder this additional budgetary load. For its part, the United States granted special assistance totaling approximately $13 million to UNEF during its first 2 years, using funds appropriated under the mutual security program. When added to the United States assessment for the same period also about $13 million), the United States has thus paid about 47 percent of the authorized UNEF appropriations of $55 million. Our support of UNEF in this respect contrasts sharply with the negative attitude of the Soviet bloc, which has continuously maintained that these costs should be borne by what they called "the aggressor nations," i.e., Israel, France, and the United Kingdom.

In line with our previous policy and taking account of the extra costs of the United Nations observer group in Lebanon which had to be added to the U.N. budget, the United States has pledged a special voluntary contribution of $3.5 million of UNEF for calendar year 1959, subject to appropriation of the necessary mutual security funds. This amount, when added to the U.S. assessment of $4,943,146 for the same period, would mean that our support of the authorized UNEF expenses of $19 million would be at a level of about 44.5 percent, i.e., a somewhat smaller percentage than the 47 percent which we paid for the first 2 calendar years.

When account is taken of the possible consequences of an outbreak of hostilities in the Near East area, it becomes evident that the stabilizing presence of the U.N. Emergency Force constitutes a great benefit both to the free world in general and to the United States in particular. I am convinced that the contribution which UNEF has made to peace in the Middle East—if it could be measured in financial terms—is worth many times the amount we have contributed toward its existence.

France's Prospects With General De Gaulle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article titled "France's Prospects With General De Gaulle," by Dr. Nicolas de Rochefort, of the faculty of American University, which appeared in the spring 1959 issue of the publication World Affairs. The article emphasizes the new friendship between the political leaders of West Germany and the Fifth French Republic.

The article was called to my attention by an associate editor of the publication in which it appeared, Rev. Joseph F. Thorning, of Frederick, Md., who is an esteemed friend of mine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FRANCE'S PROSPECTS WITH GENERAL DE GAULLE

(By Dr. Nicolas de Rochefort, department of political science, American University, Washington, D.C.)

Throughout the long and dramatic history of France its political aspirations oscillated between two main, although often contradictory, goals: Freedom and progress on one hand, stability and security on the other. For many centuries, the instability of the internal situation, which caused the nation to welcome and support the slow rise of a strong central power, assuring internal security and order and defending expanding frontiers, culminated in the absolutism of Louis XIV.

The Great Revolution of 1789 exploded the long-restrained aspirations for freedom, but when its excesses endangered internal and external security, the sobered-up and fearful nation readily accepted Napoleon.

The violent social agitation which arose in the wake of the revolution of 1848 caused a frightened people formally to accept by a plebiscite Louis-Napoleon Bonaparte, first as President, then as "Emperor of the French," thus submitting again to an authoritarian regime. The downfall of the Second Empire at a time when it was developing a liberal evolution was due to its inability to live up to its very raison d'être, national security. After Sedan, the Empire made no sense.

In 1914, as in 1870, the regime collapsed on the battlefield, held responsible, quite unreasonably, by public opinion for the defeat. Again the nation accepted, indeed welcomed, an authoritarian regime in whose hands the disintegrating institutions of the

Republic suicidally abdicated the powers entrusted to them. That was Pétain.

Economic instability and the Parliament's impotency in the 1930's accounted for the growth of various rightist movements, whose agitation culminated in the riots of February 6, 1934. The Republic suvived, but only in the indifference and contempt of many.

The Fourth Republic, envisaged by its initial planners in the resistance as a renovation of the nation, was molded in the old, loose forms of the Third. It rapidly displayed the same invertebrate impotence. The military setback and loss of Indochina in 1954, and the loss of the north African protectorates drastically increased the feeling of insecurity which was developing at the sight of functional disorder of the institutions. The bloody and inclusive struggle in Algeria brought this feeling to a quasi-hysterical pitch.

Once again the nation veered to the "right"; that is, to authority even at the expense of some freedom. It would be senseless to reduce the significance of the May 1958 events to the size of an attempted "putsch." The operation would not have been launched. It certainly would not have verged on success had it not contained an appeal to the masses and found a favorable climate in the nation.

As always in such cases, the craving for a strong protective government materialized in a call for an outstanding leader. This time it was the hero of the Liberation, Gen. Charles de Gaulle.

The National Movement had already achieved partial success. A rebel, rightist, quasi-government was shaping in Algeria and was receiving pledges of allegiance from various parts of the metropolitan territory. If General de Gaulle had accepted the role planned for him by the plotters, France now would be under a dictatorship, possibly complicated by civil war. By refusing to come to power by a coup d'état, and by stipulating unequivocally that he would accept power only under the due process of constitutional law, De Gaulle saved the prospects of democracy in France.

It is truly amazing how both the May plotters and France's sincere friends abroad, particularly in the United States, misjudged De Gaulle. The former expected him to become the leader of a coup. The latter at first viewed his acceptance of the Premiership as the establishment of a reactionary dictatorship. The whole past of the man, who said, "No" to the defeat in 1940, vouchsafed for his stanch attachment to republican legality and democratic process.

In his active exile and struggle for liberation De Gaulle repeatedly averred that his aim was not only the restoration of France's sovereignty and independence, but also the reestablishment of the Republic. As head of the Committee on National Liberation in Algiers, soon to evolve into the Provisional Government of the French Republic, he hastened to recreate such forms of democratic institutions as were possible under the circumstances. Thus, the Consultative Assembly, a quasi-parliament, was established.

On the Provisional Government's transfer to Paris, when De Gaulle's prestige and power would have permitted him to exercise dictatorial authority for as long as he wished, he prompted the elections to the Constituent Assembly. Although an outspoken partisan for a restoration of the Third Republic, with its constitution dating back to 1875, he let the nation choose freely between this solution and a new democratic regime. France preferred a supposedly new constitution.

After the elections, De Gaulle, now vested with executive power by a unanimous vote of the Constituent Assembly, could have again forced his will on both that body and the nation. Instead, he resigned from office and returned to private life when he found himself in disagreement with the majority of the Assembly.

In refusing in May 1958, to assume the leadership of the rebellion, and thus thwarting the coup d'etat in embryo, he remained entirely consistent with his ideals and his past. The Committee of Public Salvation (which is a more correct translation than "Safety" for Comité de Salut Public) made another momentous blunder in counting on De Gaulle to carry out their program when he assumed a legally proferred power. It was unrealistic for the committee to revert unconditionally to a policy of domination in Algeria, which was considered as an integrated part of the state, and to deny any personality to this territory and its Arab population. In clamoring for De Gaulle to power, they evidently expected him to endorse and follow these reactionary policies.

However, the liberal views of De Gaulle on colonial problems, in general, and on Algeria, in particular, were well known from his history-making speeches in Constantine, Algeria, and Brazzaville, West Africa in 1944. At that time he was hated in Algeria and was denounced as little less than a traitor by some of the very diehards, like Alain de Serrigny, who launched or joined the Algeria Committee of Public Salvation and called for De Gaulle to seize power. The reorganization of the French overseas possessions to bring about an articulate associatoin of autonomous states, which started under De Gaulle's direct inspiration and prompting, was bound to disappoint the diehards.

What is the balance sheet of De Gaulle's administration at this writing, now that he has been swept into the presidency by popular enthusiasm?

The constitution, which he proposed and which was adopted by an unprecedented majority, drastically limits the actual power of the legislative. It was the evils of legislative omnipotence which were the very cause of the near collapse of democracy in France and which had brought the nation to the brink of political chaos. The reaction led to the strengthening of the executive in the new constitution, which was both understandable and urgently needed. Quite conceivably, there are potential dangers in the strength of the executive, but it is essential to end the abuses of an ataxic, yet all-powerful legislature.

Liberal terms of association were offered to and accepted by the overseas territories, with the single exception of Guinea which took advantage of the offered right to secession. The main problem, Algeria, remains unsolved. However, sincere efforts are being made to bring about a solution in a manner which would have been inacceptable to the French under any other government.

The National Assembly election results are but a mixed blessing for de Gaulle. However, they had the positive effect of pulverizing the Communist Party which will be represented by a mere handful of Deputies. But contrary to de Gaulle's candidly expressed wishes, the constructive moderate left was also trounced. The executive might find that la marié est trop belle (the bride is too beautiful) as happened to the restored Bourbon monarchy in 1815 with its chambre introuvable and its majority of ultras, who were more royalist than the king. Brandishing de Gaulle's banner, a rightist majority was swept into the National Assembly, so strongly rightist that concern is expressed here and there lest de Gaulle be forced to withdraw from his own liberal position.

For the voters, pledges of fidelity to de Gaulle by the candidates meant and counted for more than platforms and programs. This, together with the provisions of the new constitution, such as the right of dissolution giving an upper hand to the executive over an excessively recalcitrant legislature, will supply de Gaulle with both psychological and technical means for curbing the ultras. There is no doubt that he will permit any rightist extremism now, since he refused its patronage in May. Even later he put an end to their activities by vigorously recalling the army to its duties of servant to the civil authorities. Another indication was the decisive manner in which he ended the rabble-rousing Algerian Committee of Public Salvation. General de Gaulle is in a position to exercise a moderating influence on the legislature. This writer believes that he will do so.

Prospects of liberalism and moderation under De Gaulle offer the hoped-for chance of the Frence nation. Previously, when France searched for stability and security, it inevitably conjured ruthless, ambitious leaders whose character and philosophies escluded any notions of such principles of freedom, popular will, and democracy.

This time a unique historic conjuncture was made available to France at a time of dismay and quest. De Gaulle, endowed with the necessary strength of character and dedication to the mission entrusted to him, is inspired by liberal principles. Instead of leading the nation on the road to dictatorship, he will endeavor to preserve its democratic institutions and structure, possibly even despite itself.

Beyond the present accomplishments, which are still in projection and can be but speculated upon, there is a striking, hopeful psychological phenomenon brought about by De Gaulle's reappearance at the helm of state. This phenomenon is unity in confidence. Men who yesterday refused any strength and stability to the executive, lest it open the door to some Bonaparte-like adventure, now accept a constitutionally strong executive, because they trust De Gaulle.

Moreover, men who branded as traitors statesmen who attempted the slightest liberal gesture toward Algeria, not to mention an emancipation of overseas territories, confidently followed De Gaulle when he proposed his revolutionary reform of the French Union. A Guy Mollet or a Pflimlin proposing this would have been stoned on the steps of the Palais Bourbon. The phenomenon, which made a broad national reconciliation possible—is faith, faith in a man who so well expresses the will for survival and the ideals of the nation.

In the field of international relations, De Gaulle is still probing his way. However, his fidelity to the West to which, spiriutally and politically, he belongs, should not be questioned. This includes continued French participation in NATO. The first cautious probes launched by De Gaulle's government in this direction seem to indicate that he will seek more active participation in the deliberations of this body. This may produce headaches in the future and the United States may well have to exercise forbearance and restraint in dealing with De Gaulle's France.

However, is it not better to have to deal with a somewhat demanding and temperamental, yet reliable associate on whose word one can depend, than with one who reverses himself every few months or one who would be constitutionally unable to live up to his assumed obligations?

Fears have also been expressed that De Gaulle's war and resistance record might bias his attitude toward Germany and cause him to drift away from the French-German rapprochement developed by the Fourth Republic. The two Adenauer-De Gaulle encounters and their results, whether in the economic field or on the weighty problem of West Berlin, should by now dissipate these fears.

The first moves of De Gaulle's cabinet, notably the consultation with several Euro-

pean governments which his Minister of Foreign Affairs undertook almost immediately upon his assumption of premiership, would seem to indicate that this former professor history at Saint Cyr is inclined to resume the traditional policies of France: uniting and coordinating the international action of the so-called secondary powers in which France often was, and more often tried to be, the champion or spokesman. Circumstances are different. France no longer is the dominating power in Europe it was under Louis XIII or Louis XVIII, nor is she in a position to aspire to domination. Indeed, with Germany, her traditional rival, she comes close to being a secondary power herself on the new world scale. Her claim for European leadership can no longer be but a claim for spokesmanship or, at best, a role of coordinator. She can be neither tempted to seek supremacy nor even be suspected of it. This may facilitate De Gaulle's quest, and if he succeeds, he will sublimate France's role.

That the new conditions of the European situation are realistically appraised and well understood by De Gaulle's government is exemplified by its concern for achieving close cooperation with Germany. This cooperation, if it develops, will assure an era of stability and through this cooperation the unification of Europe may be achieved. Far from dimming this prospect, the restoration of France's self-confidence and self-respect with De Gaulle as her leader will remove the inferiority complex which would make the European unification policy of France hesitant and half-hearted in the future as it frequently was in the recent past.

A small picturesque detail may be significant in this respect. The French Postal Administration is circulating a stamp which displays a name new in its official use: Europe. Thus for the first time, on French initiative, "Europe" becomes more than a geographic expression.

The sense of Western solidarity, facilitating the concept of a unified Europe and transcending it throughout the free world of Western civilization, is sharpened in De Gaulle by his stanch catholicism, backbone of that civilization. Not by accident, for the first time in over a century, in addressing the official congratulations of the French Government to the newly elected pope, John XXIII, Charles de Gaulle assured the sovereign pontiff of his filial respect.

Rural Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, Washington County in my district is participating in the new rural development program. With its great potential for balancing and strengthening the economies of our rural regions, this program can be of considerable help in solving the farm problem. To date, however, the rural development program has received neither the attention nor the support it deserves.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD a brief report from Washington County summarizing the work of our very active county rural development committee.

[From a news story by Lloyd G. Rozelle, Washington County extension agent assigned to rural development program]

The Washington County rural development committee, a group of farm and business leaders in the county, have been working since the start of the program to develop industry based on the large acreage of unused hardwoods in the area. Their long-term efforts are beginning to pay dividends.

Expansion of the lumber business in Washington County is beginning to look encouraging. There's been a larger demand for softwood logs than can be met by the supply. However, hardwood logs have been in surplus. What to do with the abundance of hardwood in the county was one of the first problems tackled by the rural development committee.

They first assembled concrete, accurate information on forest resources from the Maine Forest Service, large companies, and county people who knew the woodlands. Meetings were sponsored by the committee on forest produce development. State and Federal agency representatives were called in, as well as those of companies with large timber acreage in Washington County. One major company agreed to make available large supplies of hardwood to encourage small industries. Recently a new mill utilizing this hardwood went into operation, assisted by committee members. Some 50 new jobs have been created as a result.

The county rural development group is also pushing timber-working facilities, so that more finished lumber and products will be produced in the county.

A Constituent Salutes the Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter from a constituent of mine, Miss Alma Madden, of Bellingham, Wash.

In her letter, Miss Madden reminisces about her Congressman back home in Illinois, the distinguished former Speaker of this House, "Uncle Joe" Cannon, of the 17th Congressional District of Illinois.

During these days when a Congressman seems to be beset from all sides, it is refreshing to read this tribute to Congress and to a great Congressman.

Miss Madden's letter follows:

BELLINGHAM, WASH., *April 5, 1959.*

Hon. JACK WESTLAND,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JACK WESTLAND: Thank you very much for the directory which came so promptly. I cannot say that all the information in it overwhelmed me with joy. There was too much evidence of the shellacking we took last election. But I was quite proud of the way our Washington Republican delegation resisted the onslaught.

I want to thank you, too, for the inquiry after my health, which is now quite improved. I cannot recall any Congressman before who ever inquired about my health. From that and other indications of your constant interest in your district convinces me you are worthy of the toga worn by our Congressman back home.

Let me tell you about him. He was like an older brother or a benevolent uncle to his constituents. No trouble was too much, no worry too small if the matter concerned one of his folks back home. It was said there was hardly a rail fence in his district on which he had not sat discussing matters with the farmers. If Johnny wanted to be in the Army, our Congressman got him in. If later Johnny wanted out, maybe to help Pa with the spring plowing, our Congressman got him out. His "folks" wrote him about their wants and he sent them packages of seeds and agriculture reports. When we went to the county seat, we passed our Congressman's house, an imposing brick structure that looked a little like a medieval castle, we were as proud of that house as if we had owned it. In those days we didn't think a man was necessarily a rascal because he lived in a fine house. It was right and proper for a man, especially if he was a big man, to have been born in a log cabin, but it was equally right and proper to get out of the log cabin and into something better at an early stage. In spite of his big house, our Congressman was all linsey-woolsey. He boasted that he never paid more than $13 for an overcoat and it was remarkable what fine garments he got for that price, until it was discovered there was an understanding between the tailor and the Congressman's daughter, who paid the difference. Our Congressman liked big black cigars, which the tradesmen in his hometown gave him for free. Maybe because he came from the tall-corn country, his favorite food in season was roasting ears, which he ate with the hearty gusto of our Saxon ancestors. All of these things and many others like them were related by his people with humor and affection. His colleagues sometimes called him a tyrant—"czar" was the word they used then—but to the homefolks he was a kind and trusted friend.

In those halcyon days, Government was not the ever-present, all pervading omniscient thing it is today. Bureaus were marble-topped affairs which were handed down from grandma. The only supervisors we knew were those who cared for our few poor, and the first time we ever heard of foreign aid was when our boys went over the water to save the world for democracy. Washington was a real, but distant place, which comparatively few of us had visited. The Government was personified by the one man whom we knew represented us at the Capitol; the man who interpreted the acts of Government to us. By comparison even the President, whose office, though vastly respected, remained an awesome and distant figure. For these reasons we didn't favor changing Congressmen. We liked to keep the same one as we liked to keep the same family doctor and the store where we traded. And in that era of blessed memory this was easy for we were mainly a one-party district. (We were not then a long line of lonely men. It was the opposition then, who was lonely, only the line in our district was very short. We knew most of them by name.)

Our Congressman, in his day, was a power not only in his district but in the Congress as well. Some chafed at this until finally when he was an old man they revised the rules and clipped his wings. It was in these last years of his tenure that I took some of my first school-teaching money and went to Washington to attend some conventions and see the sights. I looked in on the House and Senate Chambers—marvelling at their near emptiness, it was near the end of the session, viewed Trumbull's famous pictures in the rotunda, looked with awe at the declaration in its glass case. Then I visited the House Office Building and stood a few faltering moments outside the door of our Congressman's office. I wanted to tell him something I thought he might have liked—

that I shared the same given name with his Quaker mother, that his forebears and mine had come out of Pennsylvania and down the river valleys into Virginia together—but some awe of his office made this seem a little foolish. So I left, something I have regretted ever since. I went instead to the Lincoln Memorial and looked upon that brooding face. I visited Mount Vernon and sat in Washington's pew in the church at Alexandria. I stood on the veranda at Mount Vernon and looked out on the Potomac and wondered if the river looked as it did in Washington's day.

Every American citizen should before he dies make a pilgrimage to Washington, not to ask favors, not merely to see the sights; but to gain a sense of history which is there perhaps to remember far back when representative government was a group of men sitting on the ground, gathered there at certain times to discuss the affairs in their districts. From the Saxon folk mote or witanagemot has come this most important national parliament in the world. So important has our Capitol become that a recent magazine article said the next President of the United States would hold the history of the world in the hollow of his hand. God grant that he may be a very good man and as wise as he is good.

As you may already have guessed our Congressman was Uncle Joe Cannon from what is now the 17th Illinois District. A salute to his memory and a salute to all good Congressmen who obey their God and serve their constituents faithfully.

Yours loyally,

ALMA MADDEN.

Pat Boone—Idol and Model for the Younger Generation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the State of Tennessee is proud of its native son, Pat Boone. We are proud of him not only because of the success he has achieved in the field of entertainment, which has made him an idol of his own generation, but even more we are proud of him because his life and deportment have been a credit to his Christian upbringing. Mr. Boone recently has written a book entitled, "Twixt Twelve and Twenty," an autobiography addressed largely to young people of his own generation. In this connection, the magazine Partners, in its March issue, published a review of this book. Because this book deserves wide reading, I request unanimous consent to have the review inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD. The review follows:

"'TWIXT TWELVE AND TWENTY"—A PAT FOR THE BOONE BOY'S WELL-AIMED VALEDICTORY

(By Jenny Lee)

Not every book on the bestseller list has sufficient intrinsic merit to warrant its popularity. A fair number of bestsellers catch on for reasons less solidly grounded.

This isn't true of Pat Boone's book. "Twixt Twelve and Twenty," it seems to me, fully deserves its tumultuous sales. For it is an unusually effective communication, the mind it communicates is both wholesome and positive, and the message it conveys is steeped in practical wisdom.

Pat Boone, himself but recently out of his teens, has graduated with top honors and, through his accomplishments both academic and professional, has become the idol not only of his own generation and his juniors but of countless elders as well. His school, in the larger sense, was the school of developing adolescence, in a modern world not too happily balanced and seething with crosscurrents of opportunity and temptation, hope and disillusionment, clean beauty and its sloppy degradation. In that larger school of life, as in the formal institutions wherein he studied, he applied himself, took hold of the healthy side of things and came through as a master of this world, not as another sordid slave. He won the right to become valedictorian of his "class"—through preserving, developing, and presenting his talents for the good of all. His book, in a way of speaking, is his valedictory—and in all ways worthy of him it is.

His 176-page address is, in form, his autobiography—conceived not in pride of personal accomplishment or youthful vainglory but in humble gratitude to the millions who granted and encouraged his authority; and it is delivered not as a smart aleck tour de force but as a charming and positive service to all who can profit by his experience.

Pat's aim is to chart the route to maturity as he found it, for the benefit of the young who are still headed in its direction. If at every turn he is at pains to point out the main roads and distinguish these from a complex of incrowding byways, he is equally careful to utter no stern commands. Instead, he offers full individual choice to the youthful pilgrims, making sure only that the effect of such choice is fully understood.

His technique is one of humble suggestion, and the suggestion, honestly carved from personal experience, is that the mature happiness all youth is seeking is to be found only by sound minds in healthy bodies at peace with moral principle.

His address is directed on a straight line to American kids, in words they can and want to understand—in the good-naturedly humorous slang they learn at school and quickly learn to use among themselves. Throughout his text, Pat's thoughts and always powerful advice are thus translated and effectively conveyed, with no echo of pontification. He is Big Brother, class president, school hero and singing star all rolled into one who is their pen pal. As such, his authority is enhanced by self-confession, and no need ever arises to "lecture." By letting his countless young readers into his life to share in his glory, he establishes full and perfect rapport usually found only in the innocent exchange of a "bull session." Pat Boone is thus, intuitively, an extremely effective psychologist.

WHAT THE BOY COMMUNICATES

And what are the details of the message the good-looking Boone boy, as Big Brother to all teenagers, so effectively communicates?

They are the simple guideposts to decent, effective growing up which conscientious parents in every meaningful home are at this very moment endeavoring in a variety of ways for all they are worth to plant in the lives of their young. Boone, speaking "from the inside" rather than "from on top," offers significant patterns for spiritual, mental, physical, social, and economic growth—based on Christian faith and principle, on filial devotion, on warmth of feeling for one's fellows, on rational confidence in oneself, on the importance of work as honest effort. By means of personal anecdote and sharp illustration, Pat points out that of the 7 teen-age years "'twist 12 and 20" can be a grand adventure during which the individual youngster's growth toward maturity is determined by what he personally does to fulfill his responsibility to the family circle and the world he lives in, either with or against the tide.

Being both religiously inclined and deeply awakened, he speaks knowingly of God as Lord and Shepherd, as "the realest real" in his life; of the Bible as the source of all truth and majesty; of Christianity as "a way of life, not a weekend hobby." Though he unfolds his religious life with boyish simplicity and disarming fortrightness, he nevertheless holds himself broadly responsible to his faith. As a baptized member of the Church of Christ, he had to earn his admission to the fold. He had to prove himself ripe and ready and confesses that even today, through faithful practice of Christian principle, he must continue to deserve the title of even a "trying Christian," as he defines himself.

Without indulging in high-pressure preaching or in any way departing from common sense, he effectively tells why he personally doesn't smoke or drink or use foul words. "Bad language," he writes, "is a dead giveaway that the user is covering up ignorance * * * or is pretty lazy * * * or, worst of all, that he thinks he's pretty smart.

THE GAME OF LIFE

Pat offers sound points on how to be a friend, a good junior citizen, a contributing member of society; on school and education and the ways of taking advantage of every scholastic opportunity. He covers physical and mental hygiene and such homely matters as dress and personal cleanliness. To the fair sex he has this simple bit of brotherly advice to offer: "If you want to be attractive to boys, always look your best. Let the other gals wear dad's shirts and sloppy blue jeans—you'll have the guys all to yourself."

He speaks knowingly of dating, dancing, kissing, going steady, "April love" and "Romance with a capital R."

On the subject of parents, he recognizes the several types—the normal, the over-indulgent, the too-strict—and offers kindly advice as to how to get along with what he calls "problem parents." Of them all, he says this: "Most of the rules parents make, whether we think them right or wrong, don't stem from meanness or narrow-mindedness or wanting to spoil our fun. They are made because our parents care what happens to us."

Every problem encountered from 12 to 20 is approached from the standpoint of empathy, which Pat defines, first academically as "imaginative projection of one's own consciousness into another's, then in good plain talk as putting yourself in the other guy's shoes and trying to see and feel as he does in order to understand him better."

The Golden Rule is Pat's yardstick for measuring every problem, and his discussion of marriage as an institution and the "Happy Home Corporation" as its finest expression could be read with profit by old and new couples alike.

His gentle advice, so in line with that of responsible parents, gains weight and significance when stated by one who is living proof of the effectiveness of the rules laid down. Such advice is hard to resist when uttered by one who, 'twixt 12 and 20, achieved happiness, fame and fortune—by one who in the process of growing up has become a national idol with his feet planted squarely on the ground and who meanwhile has aroused not even a breath of public suspicion that even so much as one toe of those feet might be of clay.

A Republican Editor Brands His Party as the Wasters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NEWELL A. GEORGE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the editor and publisher of the Moran Sentinel—Moran, Allen County, Kans.—the Honorable R. L. Thompson, has never failed through the years to express himself clearly, distinctly, and forcibly on all political issues. A good, sound Republican newspaper editor, Colonel Thompson always says what he thinks in his editorial columns.

Despite the attempt of the Republican administration to brand the Democratic Party as the "spenders," the fact remains it is the executive department now controlled by the GOP which spends all of the funds made available by Congress. That these expenditures are made in a wasteful and extravagant manner cannot be rebutted.

Although Colonel Thompson and I do not always agree politically, I have always admired him for his courage and frankness. Colonel Thompson took cognizance of the administration's extravaganse and waste in an editorial in the Moran Sentinel on April 9 and makes it clear that the Republican Party is the party of the "wasters."

Under leave to extend my remarks, the editorial of Colonel Thompson is included:

UNEXAMPLED WASTE

The entire Eisenhower administration may be briefly and accurately described with two simple word "unexampled waste." No President in the long and wasteful history of this incomparable Republic has ever remotely equaled him in squandering public money. His 6 years in office have made spendthrift Harry Truman and spendthrift Franklin Roosevelt look like the anchoretic curmudgeons one frequently encounters in the hills of Arkansas.

While bleating vociferously for economy in all departments of Government, the President has carried extravagance even in the White House itself to a point that has never been matched in the history of that revered domicile.

During the current fiscal year he will spend $5,013,750 to keep Mamie and the kid and his family comfortable. This is more than double the amount Harry Truman spent during his last year in office. And let us not forget that Harry's wife, Bess, ordinarily a sensible woman, never washed a dish or made a bed during his last year in office and that Margaret never did anything around the house except sing.

The White House budget includes such upkeep as servants, gardening, and the office staff, but it does not include the expense of helicopters, airplanes, and two yachts. All of this is included in the budget for the executive establishment. Instead of reducing White House expenses, the President is seeking to increase them. In the budget for the coming fiscal year, he is asking for an increase of $322,000.

The total Eisenhower budget for the executive offices is now $52,736,350. This includes money for the National Security Council, the Budget Bureau, and the countless other offices operating under the White House. During his last year in office Harry Truman got along very well with a budget of $6,703,000 for the executive offices.

Frenzied Search for Taxes Shows Reform Closer Here

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CARLTON LOSER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am enclosing an editorial which appeared in the Nashville Tennessean on April 13, 1959, with regard to the frantic search of intergovernmental relationships for taxes and the higher and higher tax rates piled on a tax structure set up years ago.

I hope every Member of Congress will read this thought-provoking editorial. It follows:

FRENZIED SEARCH FOR TAXES SHOWS REFORM CLOSER HERE

The frantic search for taxes is playing merry hob with intergovernmental relationships these days.

In New York City the council has voted with "utmost seriousness" to study the possibility of seceding from the State of New York. The reason, in essence, is taxes.

The Governor of New Hampshire is feuding with the Governor of Massachusetts over income tax laws of the latter State. A New Hampshire man has been jailed because he failed to pay income tax to Massachusetts, where he works.

There are rumblings of anger from New York workers who live in New Jersey or other States and commute.

All of these things have a disturbing undertone. If the cases of cross-taxation and double-taxation grow, the result could very well be the opening of a veritable Pandora's box of troubles. It is but a step to gross receipts taxes and then severance taxes—both of which affect intra-State relationships. It is but another step to taxation fights between local governments such as cities and counties.

The big trouble is the growing cost of government on every level and subsequent efforts to tap new sources of revenue or to squeeze more from old sources. There is never enough.

Many local governments, for example, are committed to try to provide a volume of services for which they can't raise enough revenue, no matter if every conceivable tax source were used.

For these, supplementary aids will be necessary—the easiest being Federal grants in aid. But the danger here is obvious. If domestic demands of local governments on Federal sources keep growing, then the Federal system grabs off more and more of the available revenue. One might even visualize the frightening image of a single taxing power—the Federal Government—collecting all the taxes and paying all the bills.

This would end the quarrels over what tax sources rightfully belong to what level of government. Certainly no one wants that kind of a solution. But unless American people wake to the realization that the whole system of tax structures must be examined and reforms provided, there is a chaotic road ahead.

Each year, higher and higher tax rates have been piled on obsolescent tax structures set up decades and even centuries ago.

In 20 years the Federal tax bill has grown 15 times. State and local taxes have quadrupled. The last major innovation in the Federal tax system was the pay-as-you-go plan of 1943. But most State and local systems go back to the turn of the century or further without any major change.

Solutions will not be found in adding accessories and new weight on the old vehicle. The chassis must be reinforced. Federal tax reforms must be brought about and tax sources that can be, must be left to States. Then, State and local structures must be revised. Finally, there must be a program aimed at greater effort in tax coordination between governments on all levels.

There are no long-range solutions in merely decrying taxes, looking with horror on rewriting out-dated State constitutions which close tax sources, or submitting to the inequities of apportionment as purely rural versus urban. The alternatives to action are stagnation, bankruptcy, or a crushing tax burden that pales past loads.

Oregon Trail Caravan Gets Truman Sendoff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a newspaper clipping from the Washington Post and Times Herald dated April 20, 1959 entitled, "Oregon Trail Caravan Gets Truman Sendoff":

OREGON TRAIL CARAVAN GETS TRUMAN SENDOFF

INDEPENDENCE, MO., April 19.—Everything went smoothly except one mixed-up mule as seven covered wagons headed out of here for Oregon today in a reenactment of one of the epics of the West.

Several hundred people gathered to watch the start from Independence Square, the some place from which pioneers left in the great overland migration of more than a century ago. The trip over the Oregon Trail is part of the celebration of Oregon's Statehood Centennial.

The morning was chilly under low clouds and water stood in puddles from the night's rain.

On foot at the head of the train was former President Harry S. Truman, honorary wagonmaster. He held up his hand, then dropped it and cried, "Forward, start 'em."

One of the lead mules tried to head back instead of forward but was quickly straightened out, and the trek began.

The 21 persons in the wagontrain planned to camp the first night at a farm south of Kansas City—only a few miles from Independence Square.

A brief prayer service preceded the start.

The Reverend Donald McKay, of the First Christian Church of Independence, asked God's guidance for this modern caravan. He said it served as a reminder of the quest for freedom, righteousness, and truth that took the original settlers west.

Questions Dictator Castro Did Not Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following questions not answered by Fidel Castro:

First. You said that in case of war between the United States and Communist Russia, Cuba should remain neutral. Do you not think that such an attitude would work in Russia's favor?

Second. The Communist newspaper, Hoy, is now being printed in Havana on presses that you confiscated from their legal owners. Is your Government leasing these presses to the Communists, or did you sell them outright, or did you maybe give them to them?

Third. Former President Figuero, of Costa Rica, said in a speech in Cuba, that in the event of war, Latin American countries should support the United States. Why did you disagree publicly with Figuero on this point?

Fourth. People of the United States have always been friendly toward Cuba. The U.S. Government made absolutely no effort to intervene in your revolution. Why did you say you were ready to kill 200,000 gringos if the United States stepped in to protect American lives and property they own in Cuba?

Fifth. You have said publicly that news agencies, newspapers, and magazines have lied about you and your Government publicly. Would you be specific just who lied?

Sixth. Is it true that unemployment has increased to an alarming degree since you took over the Government in Cuba? Unemployment in private enterprise as well as government agency unemployment?

Seventh. By the way, why did you recently suspend 2,500 schoolteachers?

Eighth. When you attacked army barracks in Santa Ana and were captured and then sentenced to 15 years in prison, Batista, then the head of the Cuban Government, let you out in about a year and a half. Since you have become President of Cuba, why do you not follow the same policies? Or do you find it easier to shoot your prisoners? Is it probably cheaper?

Ninth. You have been looked upon as a fighter in favor of a democracy, and antidictatorship man. Why then do you give orders to your courts, and even ask reversals of decisions from "not guilty" to the "death sentence"? Is that democratic?

Tenth. In the famous trial of the 43 Air Force pilots which took place in Santiago, is it true that they were acquitted and that you showed your disapproval, and that therefore the attorneys were expelled from the courtroom and detained? Among them a lawyer who once defended you?

Is it not a fact that as a result of your orders, a new tribunal was formed under the supervision of your brother, Raul, and that he took the position of the district attorney, as well as the defense minister, and that he then accused his lawyers of being Batista sympathizers?

Eleventh. Is it not also true that these acquitted persons were tried all over again and the majority of them sentenced to 30 years at hard labor?

Twelfth. During the dictatorship which you fought against, the embassies in Havana had no trouble whatsoever in getting out of the country, those persons who took refuge in them? Why is there such a great contrast between what went on under Batista and what goes on today, regarding the right of refuge and asylum?

Thirteenth. You have said that the executions in Cuba would not exceed more than 400—yet there are well over 500 already, and 5,000 are still awaiting trial? Do you think such blood baths, and such purges are becoming to a democratic government that professes love for humanity?

Fourteenth. Is it not true that your mother, Mrs. Lina Ruz Castro—your own mother—has said that during the Batista government she not only had personal guaranty of safety, but that her home and family properties were also protected? Would this policy not be better than the one your government presently engages in?

Railroad Retirement and Unemployment Compensation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANCHER NELSEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a letter from M. J. Galvin, of Minnesota, with some comments relative to a resolution adopted by the Minnesota House of Representatives having to do with the Railroad Retirement Act. Mr. Galvin's request is that as a member of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee I insert his comments in the RECORD and I ask consent to include this with my statement:

MINNESOTA RAILROADS,
St. Paul, Minn., April 6, 1959.

Re railroad retirement and unemployment compensation

Hon. ANCHER NELSEN,
House of Representatives House Office Building Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. NELSEN: You will note that on March 6, 1959, the House of Representatives in the Minnesota Legislature passed their Resolution 8 purporting to endorse the provisions of the above bills.

This resolution was offered on the floor under motions and resolutions without having been printed and without anyone seeing it. When one of the members of the house gave notice of debate which would have laid it over until the following day when those who were interested in the subject might have had a chance to see it, the proponents conferred with the questioning legislator and agreed to accept language to be put in the resolution to read as follows:

"Whereas we are informed that the retirement fund for railroad employees is actuarially sound and that the increase in retirement benefit proposed in H.R. 1012 would not adversely affect that fund and would not result in increased cost to the railroads or their employees"—

That language was accepted by the authors and then the resolution was passed.

I know that you are somewhat familiar with this subject, being a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee before which it was considered and you must have concluded for yourself that the statement contained in the resolution was not true. However, knowing you as well as I have for so many years and having served with you in the legislature, I wish to call your particular attention to some of the matters in connection with this bill; and, as long as the resolution appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I thought I might prevail upon you to have my letter explaining this matter and correcting any misinterpretation that may exist with reference to the contents of the above bills also inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. If you could do that, I would appreciate it.

You will note that the rosolution, which I have referred to above, refers, among other things, to the fact that the fund is actuarially sound. The report of the Railroad Retirement Board, which I believe is available to you, states there is an actuarial deficiency in the fund of $219 million per year.

You will note that the resolution also states that the bill would not result in increased costs to the railroads or their employees. This same report of the Railroad Retirement Board, I believe, states that the cost to the railroad industry and its employees for the increased retirement benefits would be as follows: 1959, $114 million; 1960, $115 million; 1961, $117 million; 1962, $175 million.

These costs would be borne equally by the industry and by the employees.

My information also is that the increased unemployment compensation benefits would cost the railroad industry additional amounts as follows: 1959, $40 million; 1960, $41 million; 1961, $42 million; 1962, $43 million.

The progressive tax features of the bill, I think, would ultimately increase the costs to the railroads in excess of $225 million.

It is my contention that our industry is not in a position to assume this load; so, any consideration that you can give us in connection with the matter will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

M. J. GALVIN.

Poison in Your Water—No. 60

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 14, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the RECORD an article appearing in the San Francisco (Calif.) Examiner on February 17, 1959. That article goes to show the kind of job which is being done in many States for the protection

and preservation of our people by control of pollution. In a word, California's Dickey Act for the control, so called, of pollution has done little if anything. One reason it has been unsuccessful has been the action of lobbyists and the built-in inherent weaknesses of that legislation partly due to special interest inference in its legislative history.

This is just one more reason why a strong Federal pollution control law is requested.

That article is followed by an article appearing in the San Francisco (Calif.) Examiner on February 15, 1959, chronicling how growing water pollution in San Francisco Bay is killing fish and making dangerous areas once useful for swimming and other water recreation.

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Examiner, Feb. 17, 1959]

WATER POLLUTION: 1949 DICKEY BILL CALLED MEANINGLESS, FULL OF MORE HOLES THAN A FISH NET—NO PROGRESS IN 10 YEARS

(By John McDonald)

Former Governor Earl Warren was generally regarded as a mild and patient man during his term in Sacramento.

But when he read the Dickey water pollution control bill in 1949, he blew his top.

"This bill," thundered the Governor, "would allow the polluters to control pollution. It would complicate government to the point where it couldn't act."

Warren fought the bill's passage. But in the end he was forced to swallow a compromise with more loopholes than a fish net.

LOBBIES ACTIVE

It was no secret that behind the bill were powerful lobbies for mining, oil, lumber, cannery and other industries. And it was no secret that industry representatives closely advised the Dickey committee while it drafted the bill.

The act set up the State water control board and nine regional boards, handled them a set of fuzzy criteria with no real guiding policy and told them to go to work in cleaning up California's waterways.

That was 10 years ago. Have they done the job?

Officials of five State departments close to the water picture—public health, natural resources, agriculture, water resources and fish and game—answer emphatically "No."

ALLOWS POLLUTION

Strange as it may sound, pollution has actually been permitted under the Dickey Act as a "beneficial use of water."

In 10 years there has been exactly one case of pollution abatement by invoking the act's cumbersome procedures.

"I can hardly believe that abatement has not been needed in numerous other cases," says Seth Gordon, State fish and game commissioner, "especially in view of the fact that many of the requirements set down by the regional boards, according to our information, have been violated."

One of the law's basic defects is in its definition of pollution.

Legally it is "an impairment of the quality of waters of the State by sewage or industrial waste to a degree which does adversely and unreasonably affect such waters for domestic, industrial, agricultural, navigational, recreational or other uses."

LEGITIMATE USE

Obviously there is room for a wide range of interpretation of just "adverse" and "unreasonable" mean.

Says State Water Projects Coordinator J. C. Fraser:

"A stream or an area of water can become a stinking septic mess, incapable of supporting any aquatic life. But if this is considered 'reasonable' in the interests of providing an industry or community with an economical means of waste disposal, then it is not pollution under the law.

"Instead it is looked upon as a legitimate use of the State's waters."

No one would argue that the State and regional control boards have stood still for the past 10 years.

Their approach has been toward more and better facilities for treatment of municipal sewage.

And in the bay region alone, which is generally acknowledged to have one of the weakest control boards, more than 25 communities that had no treatment facilities 10 years ago, either have now or are well on their way. Others have improved the degree of treatment.

But the facilities often have been outstripped by mushrooming population.

Even where boards have tackled the problem vigorously, their enforcement powers are weak and their prevention powers almost nonexistent.

From the health standpoint, this means that waters must pass beyond the pollution stage to outright contamination before public health agencies can step in.

BURDEN OF PROOF

"There is little we can do to prevent pollution," complains Frank Stead, chief of the State Department of Public Health's division of environmental sanitation.

"And if the population experts are right and you crowd more millions of people into California, we could be in real trouble."

What frustrates Stead and other officials is that under the Dickey Act, the burden of proof is on them to show not only that pollution exists, but that it has an adverse effect and that this adverse effect is "unreasonable."

The polluter is required to prove nothing, justify nothing.

"Unless we are unfortunate enough to have dramatic kills of fish," says Gordon, "it is virtually impossible to point the finger conclusively at pollution.

"It is my belief that persons desiring to use the public waters for waste disposal should be allowed to do so only if they can demonstrate that such use does not destroy existing resources or other proper uses of water."

The failures of the Dickey Act are many. But they boil down to these:

The act's lack of guiding policy and vague definition of pollution, its cumbersome abatement procedures and its lack of realistic powers to police or prevent.

So for 10 years the tendency has been to drift in muddled seas, left poorly charted by the legislature and with sometimes weak hands at the tiller, unable or unwilling to steer a safe course.

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Examiner, Feb. 15, 1959]

GROWING WATER POLLUTION IN BAY REVEALED—FISHERIES HARD HIT BY INDUSTRIAL POISONS

(By John McDonald)

It was a beautiful spring day for fishing.

A fisherman in a small boat pushed off from the Richmond shore at dawn through the waters of the slate-smooth bay.

A few hundred yards offshore he sighted a dead striped bass floating on the surface.

Then another. Then 10 more.

He counted hundreds that day.

In the next 48 hours the count of dead fish ran into the thousands. Their carcasses rode the swells in clumps and choked the beaches.

ACIDS DUMPED

When all the evidence was in, the State fish and game commission could document the death of 2,007 striped bass. And it estimated that more than 10,000 fish in all may have been killed on what has come to be called the day of the big kill.

What killed the fish?

After a lengthy investigation, the commission fixed the blame on a chemical firm that has been allowed to dump into the bay caustic, untreated acids that erode the gills of fish.

BIG LOSS TOLD

This was in May 1957, and it was a spectacular kill. But it was only one indication of a mounting pollution problem.

Conservationists maintain there have been many more fish kills that went undetected because the dead fish were dispersed by the tide or because their carcasses never came to the surface.

They say that for every fish that is caught by a private fisherman, a thousand are killed by pollution.

That for every salmon that succeeds in the long swim up the Sacramento River to spawn, many more are killed by pollution along the way.

That much of the shoreline around the bay, the richest area for marine life, and the entire sourthern end of the bay from the Dumbarton Bridge to the mud flats has become so polluted it will not support fish life.

AREAS USELESS

That substantial areas of northern California's waterways once suitable for boating, swimming, and general recreation, have been rendered useless by pollution.

They point to the closing of beaches, the decline and death of once great fishing industries.

What is the reason for this invisible death in the water and the despoiling of potential recreation areas?

Part of the reason lies in progress and its inevitable price. Northern California has expanded so rapidly in industry and in population that sewage and waste disposal have never quite caught up.

But beyond this, California has been hamstrung in the period of its greatest growth by a weak water pollution control law that makes effective control virtually impossible.

The Dickey Water Pollution Control Act, passed by the legislature in 1949, most conservationists agree, simply has not done the job.

It set up a series of regional control boards with limited powers and forced them to work with criteria so fuzzily worded as to preclude sensible administration.

Seth Gordon, director of the Department of Fish and Game, says bluntly the Dickey Act has permitted "maximum degration of water supplies short of public indignations."

CREEPING PLAGUE

The philosophy behind the act says J. C. Fraser, State water projects coordinator, has encouraged a "creeping plague of pollution."

The outcry to amend or replace the act has been so great that Assemblyman Charles W. Meyers, head of the State subcommittee on bay and water pollution, says "the law must be changed * * * we must have enforcement."

Until there is action, the opponents of the Dickey Act say, the same conditions responsible for the dramatic fish kill of May 1957 will continue.

The southern end of San Francisco Bay is likely to remain a virtual cesspool, fed by cannery and other industrial and domestic wastes, eddying in the tides and unable to escape the Dumbarton bottleneck.

Communities with ambitious plans for small boat harbors and shoreline recreation will be frustrated by pollution.

Decaying wastes producing hydrogen sulfide in such areas as Candlestick Cove and the San Jose-Sunnyvale area will continue to give off the familiar "rotten egg" stench.

Seepage from abandoned copper mines as well as silt and industrial wastes on north-

ern California rivers will continue to kill salmon, smother their eggs, and ruin spawning grounds.

There is even the possibility of a "total river block," a concentration of pollution extending from bank to bank that would be 100 percent effective in decimating spawning salmon and could conceivably wipe out the entire salmon population.

Such blocks have occurred in Oregon and Washington rivers.

That is the bleak picture painted by conservationists and officials in the State departments of public health, fish and game, water resources, and others close to the pollution picture.

The Dickey Act, they charge, is a jellyfish. What it needs is spine, muscle, and teeth.

The Politics of Sentimentality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Nathaniel Peffer, professor emeritus of international relations at Columbia University, is widely respected as an expert on Far Eastern affairs. His extensive writings on this subject as well as his travels in the area have given him the background needed for setting forth a critique of our Far Eastern foreign policies.

The winter 1959 issue of the Columbia University Forum contains an excellent article by Dr. Peffer, entitled "The Politics of Sentimentality." I think it will be of interest to all Members of Congress as I agree with Dr. Peffer that we can no longer afford the luxury of basing our Far Eastern policies on sentimentality:

THE POLITICS OF SENTIMENTALITY
(By Nathaniel Peffer)

The distinction between sentiment and sentimentality is one of which most Americans have generally been unaware. The unawareness has often had consequences in acts. In most situations and relations the consequences are not particularly serious, if sometimes rather foolish; but in political relations, especially international relations, they can be not only serious but dangerous. The most conspicuous example of our sentimentality as guiding political motive is in our relations with the Far East, especially during the last generation; our situation as a result is just now definitely, frighteningly dangerous.

Now, let me make clear what I mean. I understand sentiment to denote genuine feeling genuinely induced by the reaction of something within us to something without; by sentimentality I mean a superficial feeling, whipped up for some inner satisfaction which is not very deep or real. And by such a feeling I think we have been guided in our attitude, policy, and action toward China in recent times. Result: Formosa, Quemoy, Matsu, a vendetta with Communist China and the menace of a war, world war. Consider as a revealing fact how much more harsh is our feeling toward Communist China than toward Communist Russia. In light of all the forces at work in the contemporary world—military, economic, social, ideological—how can one explain this? As rationality? At best, the feeling is symptomatic.

Let there be no oversimplification. America's role in the Far East has been a complicated one since the founding of this Republic, and historians and students of international relations have never been able to come to agreement on the qualities of that role; almost every motive has been ascribed to it. But clearly we have been involved in the Far East—in China particularly—in varying degrees throughout America's history; paradoxically, ours is the country which resolutely foreswore political entanglement with Europe, the Continent from which it sprang and with which it was affiliated by blood, institutions, and traditions.

That it has been so involved is evidenced by declarations, acts, and events in its diplomatic history. It competed actively with England for the China trade in the first half of the 19th century. Immediately after England forced China open to Western trade, America followed with demands for a treaty by which it received the same trade rights and the assurance that it would always enjoy any right in China granted to any other country. In the same decade—the 1840's—America raised vigorous and successful resistance to English and French efforts to annex the Hawaiian Islands, the explicitly stated ground for resistance being that the islands lay on the route to the trade of the Asian coast. With Japan the United States took the initiative and forced it to abandon seclusion. She also played an active part in the opening of Korea. Then, as an incident to the Spanish-American War, the Philippines were annexed and in the debate on the treaty providing annexation the treaty's proponents used as their strongest argument that the Philippines would constitute a base for trade with China.

The most direct and overt intervention in Chinese affairs, however, came in 1899, the year after the European powers began stripping off pieces of Chinese territory, presumably as a prelude to partition. Secretary of State Hay then circulated what were known as the open door notes, in which he asked the powers for assurance of equality of opportunity for American trade in whatever parts of China they controlled. Since this was manifestly impractical if the expanding powers were to establish quasi-colonial areas in China for their own profit, Hay then sent a new series of notes asking for a guarantee of the maintenance of China's integrity. At first a request for a joint pledge, this measure in time became a unilateral American commitment. It was asserted against Russia, which was expelled from China in the Russo-Japanese War, and then over the years against Japan; the Japanese replied at Pearl Harbor.

What should be observed is that this proprietary intervention was without precedent in American history except in our relation to Latin America through the Monroe Doctrine. Throughout the 19th century new states had been created in Europe, old ones extinguished, and others bartered around among powerful nations. The United States had remained unmoved. It had urged no self-denying ordinances. It had asked no pledges of integrity for any European territory. It was undisturbed, for instance, by the cutting up of Africa. Why solicitude only for China, then, which 9 out of 10 Americans knew only as a remote, exotic, and faintly distasteful heathen land?

The commitment became something more than a diplomatic formula in the years after 1900. The race for empire was nearing its climax and China was the last and most valuable prize to be won. Russia tried to capture her and after defeat by Japan was succeeded in the attempt by Japan itself. The Japanese had come close to conquest when the First World War took Europe out of the race. Europe was out but America was left in, and by virtue of the war was richer and stronger than ever before, a world power for the first time. It withdrew from Europe, reverting to its historic principle, but it did not withdraw from Asia. Quite the contrary, it became the sole formidable obstruction to Japan's ambition to absorb China, the protector and sponsor of China's independence. The commitment had become a hostage.

THE SEEDS OF WAR WITH JAPAN

From the Washington Conference in 1921, at which Japan was compelled to renounce the gains it had made in China while the West had been preoccupied by war, the mutual antagonism sharpened. Japan unremittingly strove toward mastery over China. America sometimes wavered but never waived. In 1937 Japan, in confident expectation of another European war which would give it a free hand, invaded China, plainly intending to remain there. America bided its time but did not yield. On the contrary, it imposed penalties on Japan which at length amounted to economic sanctions and blockade. Compromise and evasion were no longer possible and Japan elected to put the issue to the test of war. It bombed Pearl Harbor.

Japan was crushed, almost exclusively by American arms. China was saved. But it should be observed that there was at no time great debate in this country over whether to "let nature take its course" and allow Japan to keep China as a colony. The debate was over letting nature take its course in Europe and whether to allow Hitler to have that continent. This, too, is significant. Without understanding the distinction one really cannot understand American history.

Can the distinction be explained? In the years before the war Japan's generally aggressive stance aroused fear, it is true, but the statement of China's integrity antedated that. The acquisition of the Philippines did draw America to that part of the world, but America took the Philippines because it was already involved in the Far East rather than in order to become so. The zeal of missionaries had some effect, but it is difficult to believe that a few thousand missionaries, most of them from places and classes with little influence, could induce a government to maintain a policy that risked war. There is above all the economic motive to be considered, the appeal of the potential Chinese market, perhaps as an extension of manifest destiny, an appeal that exercised force throughout the 19th century and that acquired more force after the United States became industrially developed.

Any or all of these considerations hardly seem enough to account for what became a truly fateful position, bringing on one major war and now threatening another. However tempting the potential market may have been—it has always been potential rather than actual—it obviously did not matter enough to America's well-being to warrant the risks our policy invoked. Unlike Great Britain, the United States need not export in order to eat. Certainly at no time was there a serious and sustained effort to measure coolly and precisely what the open door for trade in China meant to the American economy and how much was worth sacrificing to preserve it. No doubt a position once taken by a country in its foreign relations is likely to be maintained, if only out of the brummagem consideration of prestige. Abandonment or modification can be construed as confession of past error, something no men in government like to make, especially those concercned with foreign relations.

AMERICA AS GREAT WHITE UNCLE

But there was more to America's fidelity to China than that. There was a curious, inexplicable distortion of thought and feeling. There was an assumption of avuncular, if not paternal benevolence. We were China's protectors, its benefactors. We were the friend of China as the Chinese called us in flattering words and accents. And we laid unction to ourselves, fed the national ego, and found it satisfying. This role may be inexplicable; it was also superficial if not meretricious. At best it betrayed what I call sentimentality, which grew with time.

In the nature of things the feelings behind our China policy could not have been genuine. They could not have been what I call sentiment. There was little or no basis for sentiment, and, insofar as there was, it was scarcely enough to warrant staking the country's future. There seldom exists enough sentiment between governments to warrant a country's risking a dangerous war without the existence of other and more compelling considerations—physical or economic survival; such considerations, for example, as led to Great Britain's undeviating stand on protection of the Low Countries. There has clearly been a genuine popular feeling for England in this country, especially in the South and on the Atlantic seaboard. Kinship, community of language, traditions, and institutions are the obvious grounds. And yet we have not flown to arms even when England was in dire peril and, as in 1940, seemed about to be submerged. Through 1940 and nearly all of 1941 we moved slowly and with deliberation. We did not rise when the Nazi hordes were at the English gate. Many thought we ought never to do so. Even up to our entrance into World War II, a war precipitated by Japan over our protection of China, many thought that it was enough to give England arms and let her save herself.

What analogy is there between our responses to the two situations? Few said, "Let the Far East stew in its own juice." Indeed, many who were resolutely against actively helping England were hardly less resolutely for actively helping China against Japan. Was there a widespread feeling of kinship with the Chinese people? Was there between us a community of attitude, belief, religion, traditions, customs, language? As a matter of fact, we had for decades scandalously mistreated the Chinese people living in this country and by our rigid exclusion of Chinese immigrants discriminated against China as a country. As we kept tactfully reminding the Chinese, we did refrain from exploiting China's weakness, from taking territory in the manner of the other powers; but it is also true that we insisted on sharing all the political and economic privileges which other powers exercised on soil they had wrested from China. We suffered no disadvantages—a fact of which the Chinese were aware but were too discreet to remind us.

We did, however, take on the role of protector of China, and that is hard to justify by the logic of the national interest or the state of world politics in the years before the Second World War. Benevolent neutrality might have been justifiable. Moral indignation at Japan's aggressiveness and cruelty in China was understandable. But no more—unless a good case could be made for the proposition that preservation of China against attack or absorption by any great power put America in jeopardy. Perhaps such a case could have been made but it never was. Even the attempt to make it was rare and not closely reasoned.

We simply adopted China and endowed it with qualities which would sustain our parental pride and generous indulgence. Europeans were faintly amused or sometimes more than faintly irritated by our paternal notions and myths and by the self-righteous airs we gave ourselves. The Chinese, of course, responded with pleasure, occasionally with a touch of cynical amusement and sometimes with some annoyance at the implied patronage. But they are a worldly wise and hard-bitten people, with a skepticism deepened and hardened over the centuries, and they took help where they could, especially since they needed it desperately.

We looked upon China and found it like us and we were pleased. The Chinese were democratic—not altogether true, or if true, then in a sense that had little in common with what was construed as American democracy. China was nominally a republic, though in fact not a real one nor even the semblance of one. The Chinese had a sense of humor—like our own, of course—and that meant much. (Tell Americans that they are scoundrels, liars, thieves, fools and degenerates and they will indeed be resentful; tell them that they have no sense of humor and they will gird for battle.) We thought the Chinese were our plighted friends, with a friendship reinforced by gratitude, and that they would always stand by us. There were few praiseworthy qualities we did not endow them with; more virtues than we credited to most other countries. The abrogation of critical faculties was general in the case of China, and her supporters spoke, wrote, and disseminated their opinions, and they were persuasive.

The Chinese are indeed an attractive people and, moreover, inspire respect as well as liking. Few Occidentals who have lived in China have disliked them, including those who refused to have anything to do with them in personal relations. They are inheritors of an old, subtle, richly embellished culture, one which is not restricted to a small patriciate but has passed down to the lowest order. A Chinese may be impoverished, illiterate, clothed in tatters, unclean and pocked with running sores, and yet have bearing, poise, dignity. Parenthetically, unless one has learned that this is possible one cannot understand any part of the East. I have myself lived many years in China and have a deep emotional attachment to its people, too deep for patronage born of myth. I have never perceived why such emotional attachment and intellectual respect are incompatible with a cool, critical sense based on observation, the kind one applies to one's own countrymen. I have lived in China and it is out of direct experience that respect and affection formed and grew. Not many Americans have had such an experience. And, of those who have, many have returned to disseminate sentimental illusions, not perceiving that sentimental illusions about a people do not denote respect.

THE WARTIME PRETENSES

The Japanese invasion of China in 1937, the attendant and quite natural sympathy for China, and then the Second World War sharpened and popularized the image of China as an upright, if naive, little brother. On the principle that he who is the enemy of my enemy is my friend, China became ally, comrade in arms, one with us in all things. It was officially an ally but, it should be said, not a very formidable one. After the United States entered the war the Nationalist Government began to husband its resources for the coming war against the Communists, content to let us take care of Japan. The Chinese Communists did the same, of course. American military and civil officers stationed in China were revolted by the cloying fiction that China was a democracy striving to safeguard democracy for the world, for they had the truth before them; but they were silent because they had to be. Churchill refers more than once in his memoirs to his astonishment at finding here, even in Government, the belief that China was as stout a pillar of the alliance and of the democratic cause as Britain herself and was as deserving of support. Mr. Churchill plainly was not amused.

Typical of the feeling for China in this country was the emotional orgy that accompanied the vist of Madam Chiang Kai-shek, come to plead for more help. She was a guest of the White House—almost permanently, contrary to the conventions. She addressed a joint session of Congress. There was a full-dress assemblage held at Carnegie Hall in New York, with rows of the highest political dignitaries massed behind her on the platform; and strong, stalwart Governors and stronger, stalwart Senators blinked back unmanly tears as she rose to a polysyllabic peroration. She made a triumphal tour of the country, was received everywhere as royalty, and conducting herself as royalty—more so, in fact, than did the visiting British Sovereigns. She was hailed in rich words and accents—the Joan of Arc of China. By the time she went home she herself appeared to be uncertain whether she was the Joan of Arc of China or Joan of Arc was the French Madame Chiang Kai-shek. It was a silly chapter in the history of the war.

The war ended. Japan was defeated. China was liberated and independent. Then the civil war between the Nationalist government of Chiang Kai-shek and the Communists broke out, despite vigorous American efforts to prevent it. Once more the United States became involved, since the arms and money previously supplied to Chiang's Government to fight Japan were now in use against the Communists; and still more arms were sent. At the same time the Russians managed their withdrawal from Manchuria in such a way that the Communists took over the arms of the surrendering Japanese. The American quasi-intervention was ineffective. Chiang Kai-shek's armies were crushed in a debacle of farcical thoroughness; the remnants of his forces were driven off the continent to Formosa. The Communists took over the country.

CHINA AS SATANIC MENACE

There followed here a reversal of U.S. policy toward China that, like the earlier attitude, cannot be explained rationally. The only possible analogy is that of the fanatic Communist who for one reason or another turns against communism. As a Communist he has twisted, distorted, perverted fact and logic; as a fanatic anti-Communist he also twists, distorts, perverts facts and logic but now in the opposite direction, in both cases untroubled by scruples. So, too, America, mawkish about China before, now turned violently anti-Chinese—not anti-Communist but anti-Chinese, in neither case detained by logic, detachment, observation or analysis. Earlier we endowed China and the Chinese with idealized, fictive qualities; now that they ruled by Communists we endow them with satantic qualities—sentimentality in both cases. And sentimentality outraged can easily become vindictiveness. Twenty years ago our sentimentality was simply foolish and did no serious harm except as it made others deprecate our judgment; now, it is dangerous, perhaps fatally dangerous. Now as before we have given a hostage. This one too may have to be redeemed in blood.

The fact is, this country holds a legitimate grievance against China, one that any people would feel. To our sacrifice China owes its deliverance from colonial subjection. It has now turned Communist and, moreover, become an ally of Russia just when Russia has shown its hostility, when another war is threatened, and there is among us disillusionment at the demonstration that once again a war fought presumably to ensure a lasting peace and democratic forms has been

fought in vain. That Chinese ingratitude, expressed with no little malice, should generate rancor here is natural, but also the rancor would have been less acrid if we had been less sentimental, if we had not assumed that we could always expect filial piety from the Chinese.

THE PRESENT REALITIES

The contrast with our relation to Russia is revealing. Russia, too, is a declared enemy, its hostility expressed with no less bluntness than China's. Its social philosophy is no less inimical to our instincts and beliefs than China's. More important, Russia is far more dangerous than China. Indeed, the threat from China derives from its affiliation with Russia rather than from its own capacities. Yet we manage to remain moderately calm in contemplating Russia and dealing with it. There is suspicion, distrust, anger, but there is no hysteria. We have an embassy in Moscow; Moscow has an embassy in Washington. We debate with the Russians in the United Nations, exchange social amenities. Our citizens visit Russia, Russians visit here—with limitations in each case, it is true. We analyze calmly our position vis-a-vis Russia and do not act precipitately, wildly, or provocatively. There are those among us who go beyond the bounds of reason, but they do not carry with them the government or the majority of the people.

But China? To acknowledge that the Communist government effectively controls China—as the Communist Party controls Russia—is, among our statesmen, to betray the eternal verities. Russia sits in the United Nations—"peaceloving" in accordance with the qualifications for membership—but to admit the effective Government of China would apparently be to defile the high thinking, noble ideals, and fraternal harmony of that body, spread contagion through the American body politic and renounce the principles of the Founding Fathers. And to all this the American people give assent in a kind of national hypnosis. The vendetta has become almost a sacred trust for the Nation.

In the last few months there has been a concrete illustration of the result: Quemoy and Matsu. These islands have become a "symbol" so sacrosanct that we have risked world war over them and still do. Symbol of what? Of what except the degree to which the American people, already susceptible by reason of earlier illusions, have been inoculated with fictions.

Quemoy and Matsu are almost within swimming distance of the China coast. They are garrisoned by the army of Formosa, a sworn enemy of the Communist regime, resolved to return to China and supported militarily by America—America being the Nation which has caused Communist China's ostracism by polite international society. What country would allow islands so situated to remain as an armed outpost of enemies? We, for our part, while we have not made our position on the islands unmistakably clear—diplomatic gaucherie in itself—a few months ago sent powerful forces to reinforce Formosa when the Communists bombarded the islands. As this is written there is momentary pause, a deceptive relaxation; but for how long? The Communists can be counted on to try again to take the islands. If we remain consistent in our policy, formal conflict is inevitable. We are pledged by treaty to support Formosa; Russia is pledged by treaty to support Communist China. Given the international tension under which we live, so taut that a small accident, an incident, an indiscretion can snap it, what is the outlook? It must be remembered that nearly all other nations, including our allies, fail to agree that right is on our side. But we are now so over-committed, not only diplomatically but psychologically, that retreat is all but impossible.

Moral? No country or people at this time in history—or ever—can afford the luxury of sentimentality in that which concerns peace or war. It was a luxury this country could perhaps afford when it was less prominent in world politics; now the United States holds the power of decision for much of the world. How does a people disembarrass itself of folly, of shallow and meretricious psychology—or of any psychology, for that matter? It is a slow and difficult process, but the American people had better begin it. A healthy revision can come only by a cool, reasoned examination of how the psychology took form and of what is compounded.

Castro Lets Communists Infiltrate His Regime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Miami News, Tuesday, April 14, 1959:

CASTRO LETS COMMUNISTS INFILTRATE HIS REGIME

(By Hal Hendrix)

There's an old bromide which notes that if you see something that looks like a duck, walks like a duck, swims like a duck and quacks like a duck, then you had better call it a duck.

On the eve of Cuban Prime Minister Fidel Castro's trip to the United States and Canada, this old saw may well be applied to the path along which Cuba appears to be drifting.

Since the overthrow of the dictatorship of Fulgencio Batista, Cuba has been experiencing a complete revolution. It has developed into major surgery, far from just treatment with mercurochrome.

But the overhaul is becoming increasingly tinted with the coloring of the mercurochrome antiseptic—red.

The Communists have gained influence and position steadily in Cuba since the beginning of this year. They have moved openly and without restraint. They have infiltrated deeply into the army, the government, newspapers, labor, radio and television, and the fields of education.

In several instances Castro, while not believed to be a Communist himself, has echoed the Communist Party line in attacks against the United States. He has been strongly influenced by known Communists within his inner circle of friends and associates.

Inadvertently or by design, Castro has allowed strongly Communistic and anti-American supporters to gain strategic positions in the Cuban revolutionary movement.

Developments sparked by these people are causing observers inside and outside Cuba to recall the duck bromide. If communism is spreading in Cuba, they reason, it's time it was labeled as such.

It is no secret that the U.S. Government, as well as other foreign governments and business firms with ties to the West, is deeply concerned. The Red gains in Cuba were reviewed carefully last week at the San Salvador conference of U.S. State Department officials and Caribbean area diplomats.

The Cuban people as a whole certainly have not embraced communism as a substitute for democracy. Nor are they likely to, considering their heritage.

But Cubans are being spoon-fed a bigger and bigger diet of communism with each passing week.

For instance, the daily Communist newspaper in Havana—Hoy—and weekly magazine—Mella—are filled with Kremlin-flavored propaganda. In recent weeks there has been a startling resemblance of articles in Hoy and Revolucion, the official organ of Castro's revolutionary movement.

One of the most notable examples were articles appearing in both papers, written by Juan Juarbe y Juarbe. The stories bitterly assailed U.S. policies, and, among other things, called for Puerto Rican independence from the United States. Puerto Rico was termed a colony of the United States, exploited by Yankee imperialism.

Editor of Revolucion is Carlos Franqui, labeled as a Communist for several years.

At the head of the Cuban Confederation of Labor is David Salvador, an admitted Communist. During a speech last month by Costa Rican ex-President Jose Figueres in Havana, Salvador seized the microphone and shouted, "Why should Cuba or any Latin American nation support the United States? * * * They always have oppressed us."

Guiding new Cuba along its cultural path is a recognized fellow traveler, Dr. Vincentina Antuna de Carone.

In the education field, one of the most boastful of the Cuban Communists is Alfredo Guevara, who is teaching the Red doctrine to illiterate young rebel fighters who joined Castro's July 26 movement in the hills of Oriente province.

Raul Castro, 27-year-old brother of Fidel Castro, long has been considered a Communist. He now is in control of the whole Cuban Army. He is considered by intelligent observers one of the most dangerous of today's leaders in Cuba. He has been violently anti-United States.

Close to both Raul and Fidel is Ernesto (Che) Guevara, now in command of the powerful La Cabana fortress. He also is strongly anti-American and is regarded as a key Communist figure.

If it looks like a duck, walks like a duck * * *.

Sunday and Holiday Border Crossings by Private Airplanes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANCHER NELSEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, the flying enthusiasts in the National Flying Farmers' Association, and similar groups can in no instance be classified as a commercial operation, and it would seem that they would be regarded much the same as an automobile traveling in and out of the country for personal or recreational reasons. Therefore their problem should be considered much the same as ordinary automobile traffic. These points are very well set forth in a letter dated April 8 from Kenneth C. Butler, of Hutchinson, Minn., past president of the

association and I am introducing legislation which seeks to accommodate the circumstances in a reasonable way.

THE NATIONAL FLYING FARMERS ASSOCIATION,
HUTCHINSON, MINN., *April 8, 1959.*

Hon. ANCHER NELSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR ANCHER: As per our conversation last week when you were in Hutchinson, I wish to again call your attention to the interest that so many of us have in H.R. 4543 relating to the elimination of the excessive and unwarranted charges made by U.S. Customs and Immigration officers for Sunday and holiday crossings of the border. All of us who use our airplanes for business and pleasure ask that you use every effort to assist in getting this bill favorably removed out of the Ways and Means Committee and passed by the Congress.

Will you please inform me if there is a companion bill to H.R. 4543 in the Senate and send me a copy of the bill and the number.

I am sure that many Congressmen do not realize the importance of correcting the injustice, inconvenience, and loss of time and money that the present system of U.S. Customs and Immigration clearing private aircraft back over the Canadian or Mexican borders. Canada has no charge for any customs at any time; only for taxi service from their office to the airport on request. On Sundays or holidays the charge coming back through U.S. Customs can be as high as $35 to $50 per plane. At the same time automobiles can cross the border at no charge whatsoever. Even at border crossing airports, where a plane can land and taxi up to within a few yards of the customs building, airplanes get the excessive cost and the auto gets through for nothing.

Last Sunday, April 5, Mr. Heston Benson, of Glencoe, and myself went 100 miles out of our way ot come back from Medicine Hat, Alberta, and cross customs at Ross International Airport at Sweet Grass, Mont. Last fall a one way airstrip was completed that is one-half on the U.S. side and one-half on the Canadian side of the border. It has not yet even been officially opened, yet by 11 a. m. I was the eighth plane to land and cross the border customs office. I am not sure what the charge will be because the regulations apparently require that the information be sent to the Minneapolis Office of Customs and in due time I will be billed for what amount I do not know. There was no more work involved in checking me through customs than any automobile which came through the same station. This particular customs station is open 24 hours a day for the convenience of autos yet when we show up with an airplane on Sunday or holidays or after 5 p. m., we with the airplane get stuck with a very unfair charge.

We are in dire need of more of the type of border crossing airstrip such as the Canadian Flying Farmers and the Montana State Department of Aeronautics built at Sweet Grass-Couts last fall. Here an airplane can make one stop and go through both U.S. and Canadian Customs which saves a lot of time. The only thing that bothers now is the Sunday and holiday charges. The Canadian airminded people are also complaining of our customs charges. Many of them would like to come over and do their shopping at U.S. cities and towns: or take in some of our entertainment that is offered. Many also have business on this side of the border the same as we have on the Canadian side. However, with these unrealistic customs charges, it is not only discouraging, but also uneconomic to do any of this any other time except during the week days .

Twenty years ago or more this situation would not have been important. However, today the amount of air traffic between Canadian and Mexican borders present a different picture. It is reasonable to expect that this air travel between our countries will materially increase, especially with Canada. We who use our airplanes for business and as tourists are not asking for any special privileges only that we receive the same treatment that is afforded those who travel by auto or truck. The airplane is only another means of transportation and our customs requirements are the same.

I wish to request your assistance in helping to inform other Congressmen of this situation and to do everything possible to see that H.R. 4543 is passed as soon as possible.

I would also ask your assistance in requesting that a small part of the money appropriated for airports be allocated to the development of more border airstrips at locations where customs offices are now located.

Very sincerely yours,
KENNETH C. BUTLER.

Social Security Makes Nickel-Shooter of Ponzi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my own remarks I submit the following broadcast I made over the Manion Forum Network on Sunday evening, April 12, 1959, when discussing the inequities and faults of our present old age security insurance system. I do so principally for the enlightenment and edification of the many new Members of Congress.

SOCIAL SECURITY MAKES NICKEL-SHOOTER OF PONZI

DEAN MANION. I think it was Mark Twain who first said that everybody talks about the weather but nobody does anything about it. With our social security system, it is just the opposite. Everybody pays for it, but practically nobody talks about it.

The clever Washington bureaucrats who manage the involved, inexplicable mishmash, known as the Federal social security system, have made it into a political sacred cow. No matter where it roams, what it does, or how precariously it teeters on the brink of bankruptcy, no politician who equates his own chances for reelection with the public interest will dare to remonstrate.

In the handbook of practical politics, it says that all the ambitious Congressman is supposed to do about social security is to raise the benefits and spread the coverage. If he should happen to question the obvious vandalism of thus burning the taxpayer's candle at both ends, he will be deluged with vituperation as a calloused enemy of our needy old people.

Fortunately, there are a few Congressmen in Washington who do not quail before the menacing public relations octopus of the Federal Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and who thus dare to tell the awful truth about our present social security system.

I have one of these courageous Congressmen with me at this microphone now. Representative NOAH MORGAN MASON, of Illinois, has been a Member of Congress for 20 years. His firmly established reputation for honest, enlightened statesmanship enabled him to throw away the political handbook years ago. I am sure you will agree that his candor is refreshing and that his logic is irrefutable.

Here is my greatly respected friend, Congressman MASON.

Congressman MASON. Thank you, Dean Manion, for those kind words of introduction. I am both honored and delighted to be given this opportunity to speak to your Sunday evening radio audience on the subject of social security. It is a difficult subject to understand or to explain.

Our present social security setup is unsound, inequitable and dishonest. The Brookings Institute, one of the best research organizations in the United States today, after a careful and exhaustive study, recommended that our social security setup be scrapped, abandoned, and that a pay-as-you-go social security program be established in its place.

I agree with that recommendation. If it were adopted and carried out, it would mean, as the Brookings Institute expresses it: "Our generation would care for its own old people and trust future generations to do likewise."

In 1950, after 3½ months of exhaustive hearings before the Ways and Means Committee, I was one of the three members of that committee who voted "no" on a bill that proposed to expand the coverage of social security and to increase the benefits. I was also 1 of 14 House Members to vote "no" on the final passage of that bill in the House.

Since then, I have opposed every attempt to expand our social security program, to increase its benefits, or to increase the social security tax rates. Yet, I am heartily in favor of a sound, liberal social security program to take care of our needy old people.

UNSOUND, DISHONEST, INEQUITABLE

The overwhelming weight of the evidence gathered during the 3½ months of public hearings in 1950 was to the effect that our present social security setup was unsound, dishonest, and inequitable, that it was "a Ponzi-type shell game," sold to the American people, by F.D.R. and his New Deal associates, as a plan to provide security in their old age.

It is an insurance program which if practiced by any insurance company today would land every director and every official of that company in the penitentiary for misuse or misappropriation of trust funds.

The present social security program is characterized in a report of the Brookings Institute as a plan whereby "we (the present generation) do the promising; you (all future generations) do the paying." That is an accurate picture of our present social security program.

The following social security facts bear out these contentions; they cannot be ignored:

First. When the social security law was adopted in 1934, it provided that all money collected in social security taxes should be dumped into the Federal Treasury and that such cash could be used for the general expenditures of the Government, placing Government I O U's or bonds into the social security fund in lieu of the cash as a bookkeeping arrangement. That provision is still in the law.

Second. Under the law, some $50 billion has been collected in social security taxes, but less than half that amount has been paid out in benefits. The balance—all spent for the general expenditures of the Government—is a debt that has been placed upon the backs of future generations.

Taxing American workers to get money to pay social security benefits to the workers upon retirement, then spending half the money collected for other purposes is neither fair nor equitable.

Third. Our social security program, since its inception, has been used for political purposes by both parties. In election years, benefits have been increased to attract votes for the party in power, thereby making the social security fund actuarily unsound.

Then, in the off-election year, the social security tax rates have been increased to try to get the fund back on an actuarily sound basis. (If that is not playing politics with the welfare of our retired old people, I do not know what is.)

Fourth. The original purpose of the social security program was to establish a floor of security under the low-income worker for support in his old age. He was then expected to build upon that floor added security by buying insurance, by establishing a savings account, or by making investments with his extra cash.

To make this possible, a tax was levied only upon the first $2,000 of the worker's income. Today, we levy a tax upon the first $4,800 of the worker's income, leaving little if any cash for the taxpayer to invest for himself.

We have entirely forgotten the original purpose of social security. Today, Uncle Sam acts as though the worker is not capable of spending his own money wisely, for security in his old age; therefore, the Government must do it for him.

SHOULD BE ON PAY-AS-YOU-GO BASIS

These facts—and they are facts—added to the evidence given in the public hearings in 1950, convince me that we should, without further delay, adopt the social security recommendations of the Brookings Institute and place the social security program upon a cash basis—a pay-as-you-go basis.

If we did that, it would eliminate the present yearly $500 million interest charge upon our fictitious social security fund—which will soon become a $1 billion interest charge.

It also would do away with all need for reserves, all need for level premiums, all need for costly and elaborate bookkeeping systems, all need for the present heavy administrative costs of social security, and it would make possible the payment of more liberal social security benefits to our retired old people in the lower income brackets. That in itself would be well worthwhile.

To demonstrate how unsound and dishonest our present social security program is, I offer the following hypothetical case:

John Smith decides to establish his own social security program, so he deducts a certain percent of each pay check he receives and places the cash regularly in his safe deposit box. After doing this for several years and having thus set aside, say, $5,000, to insure security in his old age, John Smith starts to spend each month more than he earns—as Uncle Sam does now.

Then, John Smith hits upon the plan of taking a certain amount of cash out of his lockbox each month to spend, placing in the box, in lieu of the cash extracted, promissory notes to himself. If John Smith keeps this up, when he retires he will have only promissory notes to himself to live on—which he has no way of changing into cash for groceries.

That is exactly what Uncle Sam is doing with the social security tax receipts—the only difference being that Uncle Sam has the general taxing power to invoke in order to change his I O U's into cash to meet his future social security obligations.

But, that means of course new taxes, additional taxes, to meet obligations that are supposed to have been paid for already by the beneficiaries.

I wonder if that scheme of taxing the children and grandchildren of the social security beneficiary for something he and his employer are supposed to have paid for can be called anything but dishonest and immoral, a Ponzi-type shell game that has been sold to the American taxpayer as a plan to provide security in his old age.

For years I have been working in Congress, not to abolish social security, as some people would have you believe, but rather to place our social security program upon a sound basis, a cash basis, a pay-as-you-go basis, collecting each year just the amount of social security taxes needed to pay the benefits due that year for the support of our retired old people.

In that way—paraphrasing the words of the Brookings Institute report—we (the present generation) would take care of our own old people, and you (all future generations) would be expected to do likewise. To my mind, that would be the sensible thing to do in connection with our social security problem.

DEAN MANION. Thank you, Congressman NOAH MASON. Now, my friends, do you see any reason why the irrefutable truth that Congressman MASON has just spoken should not be brought to the millions who are now being ruthlessly taxed under the false pretense that they are thus providing for their old age?

We must take care of our needy old people and that is the very reason why the present so-called social security system, which is merely taxation with misrepresentation, should be changed for something that will do the necessary job.

Send Congressman MASON'S speech to your Congressman. Ask him to give you his frank opinion on the merits of what Congressman MASON has suggested.

Address of Paul G. Benedum at Tyler County Oil Centennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KEN HECHLER
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, on April 16, the beautiful Ohio River town of Sistersville, W. Va.—once the center of the greatest oil boom in West Virginia's history—climaxed a week-long celebration of the oil centennial. It was a great occasion as oil men from all over the country assembled to celebrate the century of progress of an industry whose development—as I pointed out in my talk at the oil centennial banquet—is a tribute to the American system of free enterprise.

The beloved and respected Sam Mallison was toastmaster at the banquet, and he did a wonderful job in capturing the spirit of the occasion. The main speaker was Paul G. Benedum, president of the Hiawatha Oil & Gas Co., nephew of that great pioneer oilman and public benefactor Mike Benedum. Mr. Benedum's address was so stimulating that I would like to give all Members an opportunity to read it and I include it in the RECORD at this point:

It is a trite pleasantry for a visiting speaker to say, "I am glad to be here," but I say it tonight tonight, and say it with all emphasis at my command, because in my case and on this occasion, it is a truth which I feel very deeply.

This is hallowed ground to me. My father and mother started housekeeping in Sistersville.

Not too many years ago I was in your county seat of Middlebourne, and there beneath a coat of white paint, I saw the faint letters of a sign on the side of an old building. It was a very simple sign, crudely painted, but to me it was more attractive and more thrilling than the great electrical displays on dazzling Broadway. That sign read, "C. Y. Benedum and Brother."

Charles Yantis Benedum was my father. His brother, who was associated with him in the oil business was my uncle Mike, who, due to a kind providence, is still with us as he approaches his ninetieth birthday. I visited uncle Mike this morning before I left Pittsburgh and as I started to walk out the door of his house, he called to me. "Paul," he said, "tell those people down at Sistersville that I would give my right arm to be with them tonight." "And Paul," he said, "tell them that they and all the other people of West Virginia are almost constantly in my thoughts and prayers."

Only oldtimers like Paul Neunschwander and John Wright can remember when my father was a candidate for the legislature from this county. That was in 1896 and I imagine that Paul and John are the only persons present tonight who were old enough to take part in that campaign. And knowing their dedication to the Republican Party, I'd bet $7 that they were both against him. If they were not, they were about the only people in Tyler County who weren't.

My father was a good oilman and a smart businessman. But he was mighty dumb as a politician. He was a Democratic candidate in this, one of the banner Republican counties in West Virginia. Joe Trees was just as artless in the field of politics because in that same year of 1896 he was the Republican candidate for the legislature from Wetzel County.

I profited by my father's mistake. I got smart and joined the Republican Party, and I had no sooner than gotten in before Roosevelt, Neely, and Jennings Randolph came along and took over. They made me out to be even less politically astute than my father. Now I am stuck with the Republicans because JENNINGS and BOB BYRD and their Democratic cohorts won't take me back into their party. They say that I made my own political bed and that I will have to lie in it. And I can tell you that since last November, it has been something less comfortable than a foam rubber mattress. But I do feel at home here tonight with my friends on both sides.

There's Bernie Curry. He said he wouldn't come unless I brought my banjo. Well, if Senator BOB BYRD will join a Republican banjo with his Democratic fiddle, we'll get some harmony in West Virginia.

Bob, I'll bet a heckler couldn't make more noise.

There is another reason why I am glad to be here. It is of far greater importance and significance than the personal delight which I feel. You are observing the 100th birthday of an industry which more than any other single factor has lifted the drudgery from the backs of mankind, elevated the living standards of our country to incredible heights. Furnished the spark and most of the power for the most gigantic and productive economic machine the world has ever known. It has made of America a military fortress that has stood against the assaults of all foreign aggressors.

I am proud to have some identification with the industry which has chalked up such outstanding achievements and which, in so doing, has fully measured up to its public responsibilities by meeting every demand of peace and war.

As a native West Virginian, I am deeply proud that as the result of technological advances, the industry is undergoing a thrilling renaissance here in this State. I am told that more drilling rigs are running in West Virginia today than at any time in many years. I predict that as time goes on and as the demand for oil increases with the growth of population and the expansion of our economy, Tyler County will increase its participation in this resurgence and enjoy the material benefits of another oil and gas boom. We know that three-fourths of the original deposits of these precious resources are still in the sands here. I predict it is only a matter of time until improved methods of recovery will make it feasible and profitable to produce them.

I hope they are as profitable as the well Don Connolly drilled.

If Pennsylvania was the birthplace of the oil industry, then West Virginia was its cradle. Actually oil was produced at Burning Springs in Wirt County in this State before Colonel Drake ever started his well at Titusville. However, at this late date, I am not disposed to start any argument as to the place of the industry's birth. Khrushchev will claim that the first well was drilled in Russia anyway.

The history of the oil industry is a symbol of American "do or die" achievement. The great events of human progress—those that changed the way men live—are not always easy to find in the history books. Too many histories dwell on political changes—changes in the mastery of men over other men. Most political changes are not basic; they are limited in scope and time. They affect a nation, a culture, a civilization; they last for a decade or a century. They do not affect all men for all time to come.

The basic changes come from man's mastery over nature. They change the way men live forever after. They are not wrought by conquerors or rulers or even by statesmen; they are wrought by innovators—men who learn how to do new things.

Babylon rose and fell. She became a forgotten hill on a barren plain. But men still cooked their food and warmed themselves with fire. Alexander conquered the world, and after him his world fell apart. But men still fed themselves by raising crops.

Caesar had his Brutus, and Charles I his Cromwell. But men still moved themselves and their goods on wheels.

Napoleon won at Jena and lost at Waterloo. But men went on shifting their work to machines.

Hitler is dead, Mussolini is dead. But oil and gas still heat and light and carry men.

We owe the way we live to the discoveries and inventors—our unknown ancestors who learned to use fire; the prehistoric men who first grew crops; the nameless geniuses who developed the wheel; the early men who discovered iron and the later men, who made steel abundant; the men who drilled the first modern oil well. To such men we should raise our monuments. They are the men who change man's way of living. Their discoveries are the great events of human progress.

Such an event took place 100 years ago, on a little stream called Oil Creek, in Northern Pennsylvania. A man named Drake drilled a well. Trouble plagued him. He couldn't drill through the water that kept coming into the hole. Then he became an innovator. He tried something new. For the first time in history a string of pipe was set through the water sand and the well went on to success and fame. Failure comes to men who do only what others do. Success, fame and fortune go to those who are not afraid to try something new.

Because of that discovefy, one American in every three owns an automobile, an average of one in every family. Because of that discovery, millions of Americans no longer cut wood or shovel coal; when cold weather comes they turn a valve. Because of that discovery, a father in Stockholm flies to see his son in Detroit in a day; a mother flies home from Calcutta to New York in less than two.

These are not blessings that the rich man has and the common man covets; the common man has them himself. Most oil and gas heaters are owned by workaday people. More common folk than plutocrats ride in American planes. More than half the automobiles are bought by people with less-than-average incomes.

Because of Drake, the innovator, today we live in an entirely different world from that of a generation ago. We have been propelled into the space age at jet speed. I don't think we should shed nostalgic tears at the passing of what we call "the good old days", because really they were not so good as they appear in retrospect. Instead, we should seek for the central theme of evolution. We must adjust ourselves to its broad new horizons and equip ourselves and our children to meet its terrifying responsibilities. We must face up to the fact that we have long since passed the point of no return. We cannot go backward. We must go forward in the fulfillment of our evolutionary destiny.

Wisely or unwisely, America has assumed a position of world leadership. It is my own thought that if, with all our God-given material and spiritual resources, we had turned our back upon this challenge and abandoned mankind to a return to the Dark Ages, we would have been unworthy of the blessings that providence has visited upon us.

In taking the position that we have assumed in world affairs, we have inevitably found ourselves in conflict with the forces of darkness that would strip men of their freedom and dignity and make them the cringing slaves of a cold, heartless, ruthless and all-powerful centralized political bureaucracy.

In meeting this fearsome challenge, we must appraise our relative strength, not just as of today, but, more important, of tomorrow. In doing this, we must recognize that this is an age of technology. In the past, unlettered men may have become heads of state or led armies to military triumph, but, in this day of missiles, electronics and ultrasonics, we must find our real leadership of tomorrow in our colleges and universities. The campus of today is the battlefield of tomorrow.

At this very hour it is in the quietude of the laboratories and the drawing boards that tomorrow's battle is being fought. The innovators of this age must be especially prepared for their tasks.

In appraising our strength of today and tomorrow, we start with a vast treasure of material resources, but any valuation of them would be spurious and misleading if it did not take into consideration two other factors—human resources and a free, stable and solvent government. Natural resources are worthless without human resources in the form of men of courage and dedicated purpose—especially equipped to meet their respective responsibilities. And both would be futile and unproductive without free and stable government. The three elements—materials, men and government—form the tripod in which is wrapped up our individual and national destiny. Any weakness in any one leg of that tripod throws the whole into unbalance and threat of collapse.

If we are lagging in any field of competition with the forces of evil and darkness, it is in preparing the oncoming generation to meet the trials and challenges of tomorrow. It is disturbing, and of the most serious significance, to realize that Soviet Russia spends 13 percent of its gross national income on education, while we spend only 3 percent for the same purpose. There are more students enrolled in one university in Moscow than in half a dozen of our largest institutions of higher learning put together, and more books in the University of Leningrad, one of the smaller Russian libraries, than are to be found in the libraries of the University of Pennsylvania, Temple University, Penn State and the University of Pittsburgh combined.

Please do not construe these observations as a plea for an indorsement of proposed programs for vast Federal appropriations for aid to education. It may be that some degree of Federal assistance will be necessary to keep our tripod in proper balance, but fundamentally the responsibility for education lies upon your own doorstep. If it calls for higher local taxes or expansion of bonded indebtedness, it will be the cheapest insurance you ever bought. You will be insuring not only yourselves, your country, your way of life, but you will be insuring freedom for all mankind.

Let me appeal to you as Americans crusading for the most noble heritage any people ever enjoyed.

There is no more appropriate place and time than here and now to rededicate ourselves to the perpetuation of economic freedom and human liberty.

Thoughtful men recognize the indisputable fact that free enterprise is the root of our country's economic success.

If our economic system is to be safeguarded we must have a solvent Government and a sound currency. Without these two elements we cannot have real, continuing prosperity. In fact, we cannot have real national security. Deficit spending, continuing growth in the national debt, and spiraling inflation do not make for integrity of the dollar and national solvency.

In spite of what seems to be general opinion the recent great increases in Federal spending have not been for foreign aid and defense—but rather for domestic-civilian programs. There are now more than 60 programs for State and local subsidies.

When we dance we must pay the fiddler; and when we borrow we should expect to pay back the loan. While any loan is outstanding, the borrower must give up certain rights and privileges. If we borrow from the Federal Government we must give up those rights to the Government.

We have borrowed—and that borrowing is one of the reasons we have centralized power in the Federal Government until we have descended to the level of State socialism.

Gentlemen, the evils of State socialism are historically documented wherever nations have stooped to it.

We Americans must realize that the foundation of our system rests upon the fact that the people support the Government.

It is not the purpose of Government to support the people.

The whole is greater than any of the parts and the national interest must be placed ahead of local or personal gain.

That calls for sacrifice—sacrifice by all States, localities, industries, labor unions, and individuals.

I'm proud of the oil industry It has shown that it will make the necessary sacrifice for the overall good.

Our industry has never asked for or accepted a subsidy.

During World War II when other industry expansions were paid for 100 percent by the Government, the oilman dug in and paid 85 percent of his expansion costs out of his own pocket—while furnishing 65 percent of the total tonnage shipped overseas.

When Europe, dependent upon foreign oil, was threatened by the closing of the Suez Canal, who saved the day and who kept the

factories running and the people from going hungry and cold as the Kremlin would liked to have seen them and perhaps averted world war III? It was the American oil industry.

When, because of the unbalance brought on by the Suez crisis we found ourselves with a surplus of crude and products, did the oil industry run to Washington and ask the Government to buy the surplus or give them a subsidy? No, siree: The oilman, for many months, while his expenses continued at full rate, shut his wells down for 22 days out of the month—and he reduced his refinery runs to fit his demand. At the same time he reduced his prices until the only price rise he'd had in 5 years was practically wiped out.

That, gentlemen, is pulling yourself up by your economic bootstraps. That, gentlemen, is sacrifice. Sacrifice for the greatest good of the whole Nation. Let those who criticize us show such a history of sacrifice. I can defy them with confidence.

That's why I'm proud to be an oilman.

Tape Recording To Be Sent From Boulder as Greeting to Meppel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BYRON L. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, as one illustration of what one American city is doing to help create better understanding, I note with pleasure the following article from the Boulder Camera, on March 12, 1959:

TAPE RECORDING TO BE SENT FROM BOULDER AS GREETING TO MEPPEL

An all-Boulder tape recording, featuring some of the city's civic and cultural leaders is being made as a friendly greeting to be sent to Meppel, Boulder's sister city in the Netherlands.

The greeting is a rejoinder to one recently received from Meppel containing messages from Burgomaster and Mrs. Atonie Kleijn and several other Meppel leaders, together with music from their bands and choral clubs.

The half-hour tape-recorded program will be played over Holland radio stations, as well as in schools and civic groups.

James Ward, radio-television specialist at the University of Colorado, is in charge of the recording production which consists of messages and sound pictures of life in Boulder.

A committee has also been formed to develop the recording. Committee members are Mrs. Ethel Auger, Boulder High School United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization; Miss Helen Schlytern and Miss Barbara Williams, Casey Junior High UNESCO; and Mrs. Addison M. Talbott and George F. Reynolds, Boulder UNESCO Council.

KLM Royal Dutch Airlines is cooperating in the venture and will fly the tape recording, together with a large box of Boulder exhibits to Meppel. To give Meppel residents an idea of the products made in Boulder, samples of manufactured goods will be sent to the city in the Netherlands. Donations of such articles as cutlery, fishing equipment, chemicals, and Junior Achievement products can be made to any one of the committee members named above.

Various garden clubs in the Boulder area are cooperating by sending seeds and bulbs for the "Boulder Garden" which the superintendent of parks keeps growing in the central Meppel park. Some samples of the outstanding art work being done in Boulder schools will be featured, and the new "Rush to the Rockies" publicity and chamber of commerce publications about the Boulder area are being placed in the collection.

Tentative plans for the recording include a greeting from Mayor Leo Riethmayer and short talks by Boulder residents who have been to Meppel. These talks will present different phases of Boulder life and will be given by the following: Professor Reynolds, Alfred W. Beffie, Howard Higman, Mr. and Mrs. W. Post Van der Burg and Jack Cys. Ridi Stolker, a foreign student at the university, will act not only as interlocutor but will give a Dutch student's impressions of Boulder through a conversation with three other Dutch girls on the university campus.

Miss Stolker is loaning music of the Dutch national anthem and several folk songs to choral groups in the university and in the schools so that some of the singing on the tape may be in Dutch. As a sample of our own folk music, the Colorado Mountain Club is being asked to record some campfire songs and a taping of a typical square dance will be made.

The Meppel-Boulder friendly affiliation began just 9 years ago this April when Burgomaster Kleign and Mayor Perry Bartlett signed a UNESCO affiliation pact. During the last 9 years the two cities have been brought closer together through exchanges of visitors, letters, pictures, school contests, books, art exhibits, scrapbooks, garden seeds and bulbs.

Boulder's first visitor from Meppel was Mr. Ig. Veenstra, then head of the Agricultural College in Meppel, who came here in 1951. Burgomaster and Mrs. Kleijn spent 8 days in Boulder in July 1953.

The burgomaster was officially welcomed at the city hall by Mayor John D. Gillespie and was given a large golden key to the city of Boulder at a large meeting in the outdoor bandstand. He accompanied the city council on its annual tour of the Boulder mountain watershed and he and Mrs. Kleijn were driven over Trail Ridge.

The week of sightseeing and parties was climaxed by a community steak fry on the top of Flagstaff where supper was served by members of the Colorado Mountain Club.

Many Boulderites have visited Meppel including Professor Reynolds, Mr. and Mrs. Alfred W. Beffie, Mr. and Mrs. Howard Higman, Mrs. Helen Fischer, Mr. and Mrs. Earl Crockett, Francis Geck, Miss Mitja Das and Mr. and Mrs. Jack Cys.

It is hoped that the recording now being made and the box of articles representative of Boulder being assembled will further strengthen the bond between Meppel and Boulder. Suggestions of articles to be included in the box will be welcomed by Mrs. Addison M. Talbott, 717 17th Street, or Mrs. Ethel Auger, 542 Arapahoe.

Unemployment in Pennsylvania's 26th Congressional District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, in the 26th Congressional District of Pennsylvania, which I represent, we have a chronic unemployment problem for some years. Chronic unemployment is usually the result of some basic economic change which affects a community's primary source of jobs. In my district the decline of the coal industry upon which the economy of a large part of the area is dependent, has been one of the chief factors in creating our unemployment problem. The situation which exists in Fayette County in my district is well described in an article from the April 10 issue of the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette. Under unanimous consent, I include the article in the Appendix of the RECORD:

DISTRICT JOB DISTRESS—ROUGH IN UNIONTOWN AREA—CLOSING OF MINES BRINGS ACUTE UNEMPLOYMENT; MEN EAGER TO WORK BUT CAN FIND NO NEW JOBS

(By Alvin Rosensweet)

UNIONTOWN, April 9.—"It don't look good. It don't look good a-tall," Joseph (Trapper) Opalko said.

Joe has worked 38 of his 54 years in the coal mines of Fayette County, mostly in Leisenring. Nos. 1 and 2 are worked out and the miners around Bute give No. 3, with its work force of about 100 men, another year.

Every day a small knot of unemployed miners hangs around the volunteer fire department hall in Bute, a mining patch about 5 miles north of Uniontown. The day before they had put out seven brush fires—without pay.

HE WAS LUCKY

Opalko was luckier than most—he got a year and half work on a construction job in Pittsburgh since he was laid off at the mine in January 1956. His unemployment compensation of $35 a week still is running and once a month he gets surplus food, butter, powdered milk, rice, and cheese.

Opalko was president of the United Mine Workers local in Bute when there was a local. There isn't any more. Depleted coal mines and mechanization have taken their toll.

"Most of the men here are on surplus food and a good many are on public assistance," Opalko said. "I had a few bonds but I used them up. I pay $20 a month on the house, but you gotta skimp on everything. I can't get my union pension till I'm 60 and I can't get social security till I'm 65."

Many of the out-of-work miners have gone to Cleveland but most have come back. Either they couldn't land a job or they worked a couple of weeks in a factory and were laid off.

"The trouble is when you move you have to get an apartment and you don't come out with anything," said Dan Gaudiano, 47, who was laid off at Leisenring No. 3 in February 1956.

One out of every four persons who can work in this area is unemployed—12,300 out of an available labor force of 47,400. Unemployment runs 25.9 percent. Most of the unemployed are coal miners, said Frank Zack, manager of the Pennsylvania State Employment Office in Uniontown.

Outside the employment office, Joe Stavish, 53, a miner all his life, lamented the situation. He was laid off January 6, 1958, at the Chartiers mine of Emerald Coal & Coke Co., in Greene County. Luckily, he said, his house in New Salem is paid up, but he bought a car a few months before he was laid off. The Chartiers mine is working, and he hopes to get back soon.

"It's been tough," Joe said. "I went through all my savings."

"Nine and one-half percent of the population of Fayette County is on public assistance," C. C. Connelly, supervisor in charge of the board of assistance, said. "Our latest figures showed 17,086 persons are dependent on public assistance. And the figures are

going up as unemployment compensation ends."

IT'S ROUGH EVERYWHERE

Across the Monongahela River at the VFW Hall in Carmichaels, Greene County, it's the day for passing out surplus food. Unemployed miners like John Bowen and Joseph E. Tasher help distribute food to the needy. At Carmichaels alone 281 persons get free food once a month for their families. Nearby, at Stringtown and at Nemacolin, others are lined up for surplus.

Bill Schifko is only 25, a big husky ex-GI, but he can't get a steady job since he was laid off in 1957. Bill worked 1 week in a Detroit cement plant, but the job ended. On and off he's made from $100 to $160 a month on a Cumberland Township road crew. Now that it's spring and there's no need for red dog for icy roads, that job is running out. His unemployment pay has ended.

"I'll really have to scrounge now," he said.

"The Government is sending $4 billion overseas, but they better do something here," said John Bowen, who had worked in the mines since he was 12 years old. Now 54, he has been laid off at the Buckeye Mine at Nemacolin since January 1957, 2 long years ago, going on 3.

"It's no good," said Bowen, who wore the blue chambray shirt and the blue overalls of a workingman. "They're getting more and more machines in the mines and 5 men can load more coal than 30 used to. We've got no children, but after I pay for insurance, coal, and food we don't pay any other bills.

"Besides, a woman gets tired seeing a man around the house all day doing nothing."

ONE IS PHILOSOPHICAL

Joe Tasher appeared philosophical about the situation.

"We've just been existing since I got laid off at Nemacolin December 14, 1957," he said.

Most of the unemployed can recall without hesitation the day they lost their jobs.

"I had a couple dollars, but it's all gone now," he said. "Lucky my car's paid for. We pay $30 a month rent and get surplus food."

At Crucible, Albert Ohler, 28, said he doesn't know what he's going to do when his unemployment checks run out.

"I've only got three more checks to go," he said. "I'm on extension now. We live with my in-laws and when I don't work, I can't pay."

Mining is about all Al's ever done he said.

"I bolted, timbered, did anything at the Crucible Mine since 1950," he said. "Then about 65 of us were laid off June 6, 1957. I've got a little pickup truck and I pick up coal and sell it now and then. I went to Cleveland three or four times but I never got any work. Besides, I'd rather stay here. I don't care for a city. I was born and raised here. My family and friends are here. All I've ever done is mine."

In the little community of Crucible, 225 families get their surplus food each month at UMW Local Hall 4731 across the way from a slag dump.

SO MANY FEWER NEEDED

"Some of the men are bitter. They say there's plenty of work," said Andy Hanko, chairman of the local's surplus food committee. Andy was laid off March 4, 1958, and went back to work August 2.

"You used to have 20 men on a unit, now you got five," he said, explaining one important reason for unemployment in the pits. "What they should do is cut Social Security to 62 years. Then some of the older men would retire and give work to the young fellows. The $100-a-month UMW pension they get at 60 isn't enough."

Andy went through the long layoff panel tacked onto the bulletin board. He reeled off the names of the men out of work—Dukate, Spollar, Barish, Maskil, Hvizdan, Palone, Haligowski.

With automation, it was possible that many would never be called back.

St Lawrence Seaway: Great Example of River Valley Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, sometime within the next 30 days, the first ship will go through the great, new St. Lawrence Seaway. Thus, the dreams of many years for the development of this great river and for direct access by oceangoing ships from the Middle West to the entire world will be realized. This is a project which will benefit the whole Nation and in which the people of the entire country may take pride. We in the Tennessee Valley area, who have experienced the value of the integrated development of a river basin are confident that the St. Lawrence River development will similarly benefit its area and the Nation. In this connection, the mgazine Friends, in its March issue, had a very brief but cogent article on this development entitled "St. Lawrence Brings Great Changes in a River Valley."

Under unanimous consent, I insert this article in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

More than 400 years ago French explorer Jacques Cartier sailed a thousand miles up the St. Lawrence River in his search for a new trade route to the orient, but was halted by the formidable rapids of the upper river. Ever since then, men have dreamed of taming those rapids, to allow deepwater ships unrestricted passage to the Great Lakes. With the building of the St. Lawrence Seaway, the dream has become a reality. The river's rapids have been eliminated and its winding channels straightened. But of perhaps even greater importance than the boon it has brought to navigation, the seaway has harnessed the power of the river to provide a great new source of electricity. The huge dams that have transformed the stretches of white water into a placid lake are also providing water to spin the turbines of the second largest powerplant in the world (only Grand Coulee is larger). The seaway and power development, an international, joint effort of the Ontario Hydro-Electric Power Commission and the New York State Power Authority, will have far-reaching significance to both Canada and the United States. Already, construction has dramatically altered the face of the earth in the river valley. Thousands of acres of land have been flooded. Old towns have disappeared under the waters of the man-made lake. Modern new towns have grown almost overnight. New industry and manufacturing plants are coming to the region, to put to use the millions of kilowatts of electrical energy produced by the power project.

The St. Lawrence Seaway has strikingly reshaped the river's upper reaches, and will bring more changes in years to come. A tremendous rehnbilitation program was associated with the building of the giant power project, for an area of more than 20,000 acres was flooded to provide the required headpond. In Canada, half a dozen towns on the river bank were drowned by the rising waters behind the dams, and now ships pass over former homesites. About 6,500 people were relocated on high ground, some in their old dwellings, others in new homes; in all, 550 houses, churches, and other buildings were moved (moving and modernization were free to owners). In New York, farms and summer cottages were flooded. Many miles of railroad and highway on both sides of the river were relocated, to follow the shores of the new lake, which is dotted with little islands that once were hilltops. A shoreline park system with scenic drives is planned in the valley, and recreational facilities are being built. The development of this vacationland, together with the industrial expansion resulting from the power project, should bring new prosperity to the entire St. Lawrence region.

The Fight for Better Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, 12 distinguished physicians from my State met at luncheon in the Speaker's dining room here last Thursday with the Georgia delegation and with our Governor, the Honorable S. Ernest Vandiver, to discuss the Nation's sick and aged, and what the medical profession is doing about this continuing problem.

We, the members of the Georgia delegation, were made proud over the farsighted attitude of our Georgia physicians. In opening the discussion, Dr. Eustace Allen of Atlanta, chairman of the Medical Association of Georgia's National Legislative Committee, made a few remarks that reflected the group's constructive perspective.

I ask unanimous consent to insert Dr. Allen's statement into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and respectfully commend it to my colleagues for perusal.

Dr. Allen's statement follows:

We, the representatives of the Medical Association of Georgia, consider this an honor and a distinct pleasure. For you to give of your time to come and sit down with us and to discuss some of the mutual problems of Georgia, we are grateful. Today, health is the most prominent subject of our country. We realize that health is something that money cannot buy. Good health and good sense are two of life's greatest blessings. Sometimes health and sickness are used synonymously, and the word health has many different meanings to people under different surroundings. Any program which has to do with health or sickness has a great appeal to the public. Everyone sympathizes with those who are ill or handicapped physically or mentally. The emotional appeal is great. So great that we often decide issues on emotional grounds rather than on facts and figures. There has been sickness since the beginning of mankind. Medicine is the oldest profession. Elbert Hubbard once said that sin and ignorance are the cause of the three learned professions, ministry, law, and medicine.

We are going to have illness as long as we have sin and ignorance.

Today we the people are aroused as never before in this fight for a better health, less sickness and a stronger Nation. No nation can survive and no people can be happy without health. One of our great problems today is our aging population. The American Medical Association has set forth means and money to study the health problems of our aging population; the President of the United States has a committee studying the problem. The Senate and the House of Representatives have committees making similar studies. Exhaustive studies are essential to arrive at the proper recommendations for a solution. It seems to me it would be best to delay legislative action until these reports are in and evaluated and then we will know "whither we goeth." No stroke of the pen nor passing of a law now, or at any time in the future, is going to do away with sickness.

We are here today because we have a mutual interest in the common good of our people. Mutual confidence and cooperation are the only hope for civilized and productive relationship among ourselves and among nations. The breeding place of misunderstanding and conflict is the closed mind. I fear that is why the medical profession today is on the defense. We had a belief that if we did our job well; if we took care of the sick; if we improved medical care for the community, then our work was done. We did not realize that we should report to the public. We have not explained to the people what we are doing to improve health of the Nation and what progress we are making in the care of the aging. We failed when we did not take the people into our complete confidence. We unfortunately thought results would speak for us. Our Nation is the best medically cared for in the world. But to tell people, who are sick, that we have the best medical care in the world does not go well. They reply, "If you have the best medical care and improved health, why am I sick? All causes of illness, high cost of medical care, hospital cost, etc., erroneously are blamed on the physician.

We are here to offer our help to you, the lawmakers, and at the same time we ask you to help us by guiding us in the ways of political service and community well-being. We know we must have positive action to solve our medicoeconomic situation. We are here to cooperate and at the same time seek guidance and advice.

Again let me thank you for coming and ask you to call on us for any assistance you feel we can give.

Needed Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER PIRNIE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the April 7, 1959, edition of the Herkimer Evening Telegram.

This editorial relates to an area of concern for a great number of our senior citizens and, in my opinion, is worthy of the House:

NEEDED PROGRAM

Some insurance companies are inaugurating a program to provide health insurance for the elderly at premium levels within their means. It is to be hoped that others will find a similar undertaking desirable. Obviously, it is long overdue.

Older people in this country are facing a situation which is steadily growing worse. High taxes make it increasingly difficult for a wage earner to save any large sum of money for his old age and the situation is further complicated by high price levels, which take an even greater share of income. At the same time, hiring policies make it harder and harder for older people to continue working careers. Many companies have fixed retirement policies which take no account of ability and willingness to continue working.

Meanwhile, as people come into their later years and face the prospect of living on decreased incomes, largely social security, pensions, and what they have been able to save, they also, in most cases, lose their health insurance protection. Yet, as is evident, the chronic diseases and those which prove the costliest in terms of medical and hospital care, are most likely to strike among those past middle life.

If a husband or wife is stricken, savings may be used up in a matter of months. The only recourse is to appeal for welfare aid, a procedure which those who have always been self-supporting are extremely reluctant to do. Then, if the afflicted person finally dies, the remaining partner is often left either without income, or with only a restricted one.

The need for some improved system of dealing with such situations is obvious.

Bob Aufderheide: A Friend and a Servant of Rare Capacity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, we will remember Bob Aufderheide for a long time in Oregon. Dan Sellard, of the staff of the Eugene Register-Guard, is a man who spends a lot of his spare time enjoying Oregon's wonderful forests. He knew Bob Aufderheide well. The following editorial, included here under a previous consent, was written by him. A background of Bob Aufderheide is furnished by a second editorial included here, carried by the Albany Democrat-Herald on April 14, 1959:

[From the Eugene Register-Guard, Mar. 30, 1959]

A HUMBLE MAN

Newsmen here shared with countless others the saddening thought that in Bob Aufderheide's death Saturday, the community had lost a friend and a servant of rare capacity.

Thousands of Bob's friends will no doubt reflect on the numerous times that he demonstrated his humble feeling of love for his fellow man. Our cherished memory is this:

We talked with the forest supervisor for a long afternoon while a search was on for a young forester who was lost. During the conversation, Bob would pace around and look up into the hills for a sign that the man had been found.

Such a search doesn't demand that the supervisor of a big forest leave his desk, but Bob knew his presence would be a morale boost to the searchers and to the man's young wife.

The employee had only worked for a short time, but there was real concern in Bob's eyes as he waited for the news from the woods.

When the announcement came that the man had been found, Bob said in his quiet way:

"That's fine. I hope he isn't hurt."

This same concern was reflected by Bob for the woods, the streams and the other resources in his charge.

Such was Bob Aufderheide's nature. His assignment as chief of the most productive Federal forest was the measure of his competence.

[From the Albany Democrat-Herald, Apr. 4, 1959]

HE EARNED THE TRIBUTE

Robert Aufderheide, for whom funeral services were held at Eugene Tuesday, was rightfully acclaimed as one of the Nation's outstanding public forest administrators. He died at Eugene Saturday at the age of 50. Mr. Aufderheide had devoted his entire life to forestry, preparing himself during his undergraduate years for that work, and pursuing forestry as a career following his graduation from Oregon State College.

His lifelong residence in Oregon acquainted him thoroughly with Oregon's needs and the wishes, sometimes conflicting, of its people. This background served him well in the administration of the public trusts for which he was made responsible first in the Umpqua and finally the Willamette National Forest, of which he had been supervisor since 1954. He attained the position of director of one of the country's biggest forests through a series of promotions which he had won through excellence of his service in the Rogue River, Siuslaw and Umpqua Forests as well as at the Pacific Northwest Range Experiment Station in Corvallis.

As Willamette National Forest supervisor Mr. Aufderheide's personality as well as his acquired knowledge enabled him to reconcile opposing interests as few others could have done. He was confronted with the task of satisfying demands that expendable trees be made available to commercial timber interests that play a major role in maintaining Oregon's economy, without impairing the forest's scenic and recreational values, so jealously guarded by wildlife enthusiasts. He was constantly beset by partisans of these two camps and his success in maintaining a balance between timber harvesting and conservation was phenomenal.

No man could ask greater tribute than credit for having served well his fellow man. This Robert Aufderheide did.

Lucinda Priest Praised as Conservationist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Clarion Democrat, Clarion, Pa., of April 11, 1959:

LUCINDA PRIEST PRAISED AS CONSERVATIONIST

Clarion County people living in the vicinity of Lucinda and Leeper, and all the members of St. Joseph's Parish in Lucinda, know of the deep and constant interest of Father William Holl, St. Joseph's pastor, in the conservation of natural resources and in the abatement of stream pollution.

Few know, however, that an outstanding tribute was paid to Father Holl at the recent convention of the National Wildlife Federation in New York City—a tribute earned by Father Holl's admonitions to his own parishioners on the subject of preserving the land and its natural inheritances.

Dr. Alvin R. Grove, Jr., a member of the faculty of the Pennsylvania State University, was invited to address the convention of the National Wildlife Federation on the subject, "Organizing a Statewide Program for Clean Streams." Dr. Grove discussed many aspects and phases of stream pollution; one phase of pollution which came in for repeated notice in his address was the old bugaboo of acid mine water seepage from abandoned drift or open-pit mines.

In this connection, Dr. Grove said:

"In one area of the State, for example, a single priest—Father William F. Holl by name—taught in his parish that the land belonged to future generations as well as those holding ownership of it at the moment. As a result of this simple but fundamental teaching, the coal mined from this area was properly mined, the overburden and topsoil were replaced. Today, the surface of the earth is being farmed and the ugly scars of acid mine pollution are totally absent."

A checkup reveals that Dr. Grove's analysis of the situation was correct; lands in the Lucinda area belonging to parishioners of Father Holl were stripped, it is true; but it is equally true that many acres were restored to grade and are now attractive, productive, and not dumping loads of acid seeping into the streams in that area.

Future generations owe Father Holl, and many others like him, due gratitude. Too few people have been willing to raise their voices against the raping of the land which is the principal inheritance of those still unborn. Father Holl's parishioners at St. Joseph's, and all conservation-minded residents of Clarion County, are proud of the recognition and tribute won by the Lucinda priest.

Barber or Teacher: To Be or Not To Be

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, on March 27, 1959, there appeared in the Voice of the People column of the Birmingham, Ala., News, a letter written by a male schoolteacher at Banks High School in Birmingham. This letter dealt with the comparative salaries of barbers and teachers and pointed up very graphically the financial plight of many men who wish to pursue the profession of teaching our children in the public schools.

With the thought that this letter written by Mr. Eugene Sample, may be of interest to the Members of Congress, I am happy to insert same herewith in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

I noticed with interest your cartoon on the editorial page of the News on March 19, 1959. This cartoon showed feet marching along with "Tom Thumb National Pay Scale" across the marching feet. Below this was a picture of a small man looking up at those marching feet with the caption "Alabama School Teachers' Salaries" in front of it. As I read that I could not help but think of the article in the morning paper the day before by Mrs. Walter Ferguson about "Schools Need Men." They both tie together so beautifully. Mrs. Ferguson quoted Mr. Edward J. Meeman, editor of the Memphis Press-Scimitar, by saying the main thing wrong with our educational system—lack of male teachers. She goes on to say, "Boys admire men; they imitate men; they crave the companionship of men." All this I agree with, unless they are older boys, and then they think of us as being a little off beam if we are schoolteachers. Why do I say this? Simply because every boy of high school age realizes how little schoolteachers are paid. They know how this compares with other salaries; and when they see us sticking to teaching, their common expression is, "He is a little nutty somewhere." We not only hear this from students, but from our wives also.

As an example of what I am talking about, I would like to cite you to this: I paid a barber working for me $2,839.12 more than the board of education paid me in 1957. After completing work for a master's degree last summer and with 7 years' experience, I still paid him $2,789.81 more in 1958 than the board of education paid me for teaching.

Let's look at this from another angle now. This barber, a real good one, went to barber college for 6 months, which cost him approximately $2,000. I went to the same barber college for 6 weeks in 1946, just after I came out of the Army. Since I had barbered for 3 years in the Army, I finished the course in 6 weeks rather than 6 months.

Now, getting back to the teaching: In order to get a master's degree, you must attend college for 5 years and pay out from $7,000 to $9,000. Since I used the barber that works for me, suppose we still use this same barber.

We will say he went to barber college for 6 months and worked the next 4½ years while I went to college getting a master's degree. He spent $2,000 for 6 months. For the next 4½ years he makes $30,000. I spend $7,000 and am in school the entire 5 years. From this you can see that from the time we both started to school, he to barber college and I to the university, until 5 years later the barber would be $35,000 better off. How, you may ask? In 5 years he spends $2,000 and 6 months in school. At $6,000 per year, which a good barber is making, this would leave him 4½ years to work. He would make $30,000, take $2,000 from this and you have $28,000 left. Since I was in school the entire time you must assume that I am minus $7,000 so we add that back to the $28,000 and you can see that the barber would be $35,000 better off 5 years after starting to school than the teacher would. This barber working for me began only 3 months after coming out of barber college. He has been with me for 3 years. This gap would become greater as the years pass. I am not saying that all barbers make that much, they don't. In fact they are not making enough compared to the hours they work. Barbers work approximately 55 hours per week and average from $90 to $110 per week. This is not enough money in today's times. You can expect the barbers to go up on the price of haircuts if everything else keeps going up. I am in favor of it myself. The big catch is that the men school teachers have no way of going up in order to get more money and they can't live on what they make as school teachers.

Of the 10 men on the faculty here there is not one that is supporting his family solely on his pay as a teacher. This is not so just at Banks High School or of Birmingham but all over the Nation. Most men are required to have a supplementary income. When is the public going to wake up to the fact that they are going to get only what they pay for?

The men who are sticking with teaching are really dedicated to teaching. The only thing wrong with this is that we don't have enough who are willing to make this sacrifice. We should not have to work at two or three jobs in order to make a decent living.

I am thankful that I own my own barber shop, which I have had for 9 years, so I can stay in teaching. I am proud to say that I am a barber and even prouder to say that I am a teacher. Yes; barbers need to make more money. When barbers decide, as a group, that they must make more money to meet today's demands they, or I should say we, get together and agree to raise prices. I have used this comparison simply to show how ridiculously low school teachers' salaries are. The advice I would get is this: "Well why don't you quit teaching school and barber then if you are dissatisfied with what they pay you." My answer is that I will continue to do both until I am able to make a living at teaching. The thing that bothers me is what is happening to the youth of our land as a result of the lack of qualified teachers, both men and women, largely due to the low salary.

EUGENE SAMPLE,
Banks High School.

A Public Works Program for a Prosperous Private Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT W. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. CLEMENT W. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, the article reproduced below, though published 4 months ago, is the clearest statement indicating the imperatives of a stepped-up public works program. Basically, it reports that we cannot have a prosperous private economy if we do not repair the neglect of public works that has existed since World War II. It offers a wonderful antidote to those who would consign us to regressive and stagnate policies:

[From Reporter magazine, Jan. 18, 1959]

THE SHAM BATTLE OVER SPENDING

(By David Demarest Lloyd)

The President has announced that he will devote his remaining years in the White House to a campaign against Government spending. To prove that this is not an idle threat, the directives have gone out to the departments to slash their budget estimates and the usual expenditures ceiling has been slapped on the Defense Department, throwing the procurement of military hardware into the customary turmoil and confusion. The Democratic leaders, still smarting under the President's campaign rhetoric, have announced that they are not "spenders" either, and that when the budget comes to Capitol Hill they will slash it as they have before. The stage is thus set for the great yearly spectacle of the economy drive—and this when the country is still not entirely out of the recession doldrums, the Soviets are pulling ahead of us in armament and initiative, and our unmet needs for every form of public improvement, from schools to roads, cry out for more, not less, public spending.

Only the naive, however, would conclude from all this—or even from the President's statement that he will present a balanced budget of about $77 billion—that Federal expenditure will be cut substantially. After the ceremonial struggle has been staged, the budget and the rate of spending will remain about the same. Still unanswered will be the question of whether this result is good enough for what the Nation needs. Yet it is of the greatest urgency that a full-scale debate be started on one of the most fundamental issues of our time: the formulation of an adequate, sensible, and long-range policy of public spending.

In spite of all the ritual exorcising, the Federal budget rises steadily. Its rate of increase is generally greater than the rise in the price level. The press and the higher levels of Government profess to regard this tendency with indignation, even with horror, as if it were a nervous disorder that could be cured by willpower and moral preaching.

The the Government's expenditures show a normal and relentless tendency upward may not be due to the wastefulness of public servants or to the heresies of the New Deal and of modern republicanism. If George M. Humphrey could not cut down Government spending, who can? Since 1954 the Eisenhower budget expenditures have been following the upward trend year by year, rising from $64 billion in fiscal 1955 to $79 billion in fiscal 1959.

It is a common misconception that the principal reason for this upward trend is the cost of defense. Actually, expenditures for what the Budget Bureau calls "major national security purposes," have been maintained at a relatively steady level. Starting from $13 billion in 1950, defense expenditures were boosted by the Truman defense program and the Korean war to a peak of almost $52 billion in 1953. The Eisenhower administration began to cut them in fiscal 1954 and succeeded briefly in reaching a low point of about $42 billion in 1956. These major national-security items are on the rise again, but they have not yet passed the fiscal 1954 mark of $47 billion.

The rise in prices and in the cost of soldiers and weapons that has occurred in the intervening years means that these sums will buy far less defense than in 1954. In real or dollar terms, therefore, the national-security sector of the budget has not led the upward trend. Rather, it has been the sector most exposed to economies, because it is both the largest and the least understood.

Neither is the international-aid part of the budget to blame for the general increase in Government spending. In Truman's time, international expenditures were dominated by the massive proportions of the Marshall plan and ran around $3 or $4 billion a year. Before Truman left office these expenditures, for a number of reasons, had fallen to a level lower than $800 million a year. Today they are less than a billion and a half.

WHOSE CREEPING SOCIALISM?

The truly significant increases are not in the defense and foreign-aid areas but in the rest of the budget—in the domestic functions and services of the Federal Government. In 1952 under Truman these domestic expenditures totaled $19 billion, rising to more than $21 billion in fiscal 1953. Under Eisenhower, they have continued upward, reaching $24 billion in 1956, more than $25 billion in 1958, and $31 billion in fiscal 1959.

While the military and foreign-aid expenditures of the Government have been held to roughly the same order of magnitude throughout the recent period, the domestic expenditures of the Government have risen more than 50 percent. And all this in spite of George Humphrey.

If we look at the component segments of the domestic part of the budget, we find that there is not one of them, with the exception of the veterans' program, that is not bigger now than it was in fiscal 1950. The upward trend can be seen clearly by comparing the spending figures for fiscal 1958 with the spending figures for 1954, the first fiscal year for which the Eisenhower administration was responsible. The figures for fiscal 1959 show the impact of the recession and are in most cases dramatically higher than those of 1958.

Federal expenditures for labor and welfare (which do not include trust expenditures for Social Security and unemployment benfits) rose from approximately $2.5 billion in fiscal 1954 to $3.4 billion in fiscal 1958. In fiscal 1959 they have risen another billion, a total increase of almost $2 billion during the Eisenhower years. The increase in expenditures for agriculture and agricultural resources is even more startling: From a level of about $2.5 billion in fiscal 1954, the expenditures have risen to nearly $4.5 billion 1958 and up almost $2 billion more in 1959, for a total increase of close to $4 billion. This is the second greatest percentage increase increase in any major budget item and offers eloquent evidence of the failure of Secretary Benson's agricultural program. It is interesting to recall that Charles Brannan, his predecessor, whose annual budget averaged about $1.5 billion in Truman's second term, was pilloried for the so-called Brannan plan, which, it was charged, might increase the agricultural budget as much as $2 billion.

Close on the heels of this major rate of rise in the agricultural sector is the upward spurt of expenditures under the heading Commerce and Housing, which have shot up from an abnormal low of $800 million in 1954 to a little more than $2 billion in 1958 and to almost $4 billion in 1959.

Interest on the Government debt has also increased substantially, rising from about $6.5 billion in 1954 to $7.7 billion in 1958. This is the Government's share of the cost of Humphrey's high-interest policy.

There are only two areas of the budget in which the rise has been relatively minor. The first of these is the field of natural resources, where the Republican opposition to river and waterpower development has held expenditures down to an average of about $1.5 billion a year. The other is the cost of running the agencies of the Government, which in spite of minor ups and downs has settled at the level of just under $1.7 billion in 1959, only $400 million more than it was in 1954.

BILLIONS UNDER THE RUG

These budget figures do not reveal the full extent of Government spending under Eisenhower. Items that used to be carried in the regular budget under the Truman administration have been transferred to the category of Government trust funds, where their expenditures and revenues do not show in the budget totals. The most important of the items thus swept under the rug is the highway program, which used to be listed as an outright Government expenditure from appropriated funds. In 1956, when the highway program was expanded, the gasoline excise taxes were earmarked to support it, and the whole operation was dubbed highway trust fund and lumped with the social security programs. This fund will account for more than $2.5 billion worth of expenditures in 1959 and is rapidly running out of money. Unless the President gets an increase in the gasoline taxes, Congress will have to appropriate funds for this program, and it will reappear as a large program in the regular budget.

A major expenditure that always used to distress the budget officials under the Truman administration was "Fanie Mae," otherwise known as the Federal National Mortgage Association, which by its support of the secondary mortgage market aided in the financing of billions of dollars' worth of new homes. By fiscal legerdemain this operation was also turned into a trust fund and taken out of the regular budget. Nevertheless, this expedient did not result in a reduction of budgeted expenditures in aid of housing. Even with Fanny May hidden from view, housing expenditures have risen steadily since fiscal 1954.

In comparing the Truman and Eisenhower administrations in the field of domestic spending, we therefore have to look behind the trust-fund device, and add to the Eisenhower record some $2 to $3 billion a year more than the budget figures show. This would lift our total domestic expenditures for fiscal 1959 to about $33 or $34 billion.

From the political point of view, one of the curious things about the Eisenhower administration is that it has not made a virtue out of the rising trend of domestic expenditures. Here, if ever, is the chance to outdeal the Fair Deal, to point with pride to increased expenditures for welfare, for farmers, and for housing as evidence of a Republican concern for the well-being of the people. Such political opportunism seems to go against the grain even of modern Republicanism.

Perhaps the explanation lies in the fact that the rise in these domestic sectors has taken place in spite of and not because of the intentions of the administration. Nor, for the most part, have these increases been forced upon an unwilling administration by a softhearted Congress. The most important of the increases have come about because of the automatic operation of existing laws governing Federal expenditure. Much of the increase in labor and welfare, for example, arises from the formulas fixed by law for determining the size of Federal grants-in-aid to the States for public assistance, including funds for old-age assistance, for the blind, dependent children, and disabled persons. Inevitably, the growth of population brings with it an increase in the numbers of the unfortunate, and an increase in Federal aid.

There is no way of denying the growing needs of the country for welfare expenditures, but the Eisenhower administration has been desperately trying to curtail the responsibility of the Federal Government to meet them. Elaborate and quite artificial programs have been projected for turning certain excise taxes back to the States if they will use them to absorb the Federal share of such welfare programs as vocational education and the building of sewage-treatment plants for cities. The main idea behind this kind of hocus-pocus is to get the expenditures in question out of the Federal budget. If this means waiving certain Federal revenues, well and good; it will at least appear to the uninitiated as a reduction in Federal spending. At its last session, Congress would have none of this nonsense, and the programs and revenues remain in the budget.

The appalling increase in agricultural spending is also due in part to the operation of standing legislation. Under a price-support program, the Government stands ready to absorb everything offered at the support level. Lower farm prices encourage the farmer to grow larger quantities in order to preserve his usual income. Benson, by constant reductions of the support-price levels, has driven farm prices downward and thus increased the amount of surplus offered and the amount the Government has to buy under the program. With farm prices poised for another drop in the coming year, Benson's rate of spending will probably continue its rocketlike ascent. For the Eisenhower administration the whole thing must seem

like a bad dream, particularly since the farm States are now going Democratic. To spend as much on the farms as Roosevelt spent for the entire national budget in the heyday of the New Deal and still to lose the farm vote borders on the fantastic.

The Democrats should not gloat, however. Even if Benson had never been heard of, the decline in foreign markets and the rising productivity of American agriculture would probably have pushed the expenditures of the Department of Agriculture up substantially over the last 5 to 6 years.

LET'S FACE IT

These automatic increases in Federal spending under statutory formulas are only one indication of the rising demand for Federal funds in the national economy. Bigger appropriations are constantly being called for, to help urban renewal, to clear slums, to finance housing, to purify water, to purify the air, to manage airplane traffic, to build hospitals, to finance medical research, to assist in education—in short, to alleviate the thousand and one growing pains of an expanding economy and an exploding population that is spreading from the cities out over the land, swamping the existing structures and resources of local government, and presenting problems with which the state houses cannot cope. This rising demand hammers constantly at the Executive and at Congress from all sides in ways that are politically most potent, and not even the gates of hell, not to mention mere mortals like Humphrey and Eisenhower and Byrd, can prevail against it in the long run.

The long and short of it is that the Federad government is being compelled to assist the country in its process of internal economic growth. But because the leaders of the administration disapprove of such assistance on philosophical grounds, Federal aid is unplanned, spotty, and without direction. The farmers get astronomical outpourings of funds, which bring them neither security nor stable prices, while the cities squabble over inadequate sums for renewal, and education is totally neglected except in areas near large Federal installations. Rational planning is at a discount. For example, river dams under construction are completed, but their utility is diminished by abandoning plans for supplementary units in the same river system and by turning the sites over to others for less than adequate exploitation. The same wastefulness and lack of design is apparent in the crazy-quilt pattern of protection extended to our human resources.

There is mounting evidence that the Nation needs a massive infusion of capital expenditure for normally public purposes—that the backlogs of need for such things as schools, pure water, hospitals, institutions, and public works of all kinds are now so great that they threaten the continual growth and expansion of the private economy. Business and industry, after all, depend on an underlying structure of public expenditure for everything from the education of their employees to the roads that carry them to work. It might be discovered, if the Government would settle down to face the problem instead of fighting it, that the deficiencies in these areas are now so great that only an unprecedented jump in the expenditure of Federal funds in the immediate future can restore the lagging growth rate of the economy as a whole. An annual increase in Federal spending is inevitable anyway. But apparently the annual rate of increase we have had lately is not enough to do us much good. Rather than a steady progression, there may have to be a change of magnitudes in the nature of a mutation.

Even a cursory look at the list of needs confirms this possibility. Add a billion more a year to expedite the highway program, plus half a billion for housing and urban renewal, plus at least a billion for school construction or general aid to public education, with a few hundred million for fellowships and higher education, plus 300 million (at least as lending authority) for depressed areas, plus an increase of at least 30 percent in the neglected and faltering area of natural resources, with additional amounts for the purification and expansion of the water supply. Without exhausting the roster of legislation introduced regularly at every Congress, you have a total approaching $5 billion to be added to the annual budget. And this is for domestic needs alone, taking no account of the problems of national defense or international relations.

WHERE WILL WE GET THE MONEY?

Those who urge such increased Federal spending are under obligation to clarify the scope and purposes of what they advocate and their relative priorities among various objectives. Otherwise they will perpetuate thé same inequitable and unbalanced pattern that now results from the purely negative approach of the administration. This would suit the Eisenhowers and George Humphreys, who are trying to give spending a bad name anyway, but it will not do for those who regard Federal expenditures as a necessary element in the Nation's growth.

Similarly, the upper levels of government and politics must agree on a theoretical justification of increased Federal spending. Otherwise the current doctrine that spending is an evil will be unchallenged, and the present spending muddle will persist.

The orthodox approach is to pay the increased costs out of increased revenue. This does not necessarily mean raising taxes. As the economy grows, the Government's revenue increases, even with a stationary level of tax rates. Following the great Eisenhower tax cut of 1954, which lost the Government $4 billion of revenue in the next year, the tax receipts of the Treasury thereafter shot up to a level some $4 to $6 billion higher than they were under Truman's Korean war rates, and they remained on this plateau until the recession set in.

In recent years our Federal budget has hovered around 18 percent of the gross national products. Assuming that the gross national product grows at the rate of about 5 percent a year, by 1963 it would be nearly $549 billion; and at a constant ratio of 18 percent, the Federal budget would be almost $100 billion. In other words, by the end of 1963, if we grow as we should, we shall be able to shoulder a Federal budget of $100 billion with no more trouble than we now shoulder one of $75 billion. This would allow an annual increase in the Federal budget of $5 billion without raising taxes.

To carry out this projection we have to make it a goal of our public policy to increase our output by 5 percent a year. We are not doing so well now—indeed the increase has reached or exceeded 5 percent in only two of the Eisenhower years—but we have grown at the rate of 5 percent or better in the past, and the experts agree that we can do it in the future.

In the immediate future, however, we may need to increase expenditures more than $5 billion a year in order to remedy the neglect of past years and to meet the pressing needs of the cold war. Assuming that we grow at an annual rate of 5 percent or better, we shall probably come out all right, but meanwhile we must either increase taxes savagely or increase the national debt.

The idea of an increasing national debt incites even more horror than the idea of spending. But our highly orthodox Republican administration has increased the national debt during 1958 by some $12 billion. Might it not be better to plan, deliberately, to raise the national debt a few billion dollars every year for a few years, as a means of getting what we need, than to be compelled by circumstances beyond our control to lift it $12 billion in 1 year, without getting anything from it beyond a reprieve from economic catastrophe?

When is the national debt too big? Nobody really knows. We now have the biggest one in our history—some $280-odd billions of it—but we also have the biggest national economy in our history. Some people contend that the national debt is too big when its servicing imposes too great a burden on the taxpayers. But the aggregate interest cost of the debt is not tied to its size. From 1955 through 1957 the size of the debt declined by nearly $4 billion, but the interest bill rose by nearly $1 billion.

Perhaps the size of the debt has some optimum relationship to the size of the economy, but it is hard to tell from experience what this should be. In 1940, after the depression, the national debt was equivalent to 40 percent of the gross national product. In 1946, at the end of the war, it was 129 percent of the gross national product, and still we did not come apart at the seams.

In 1950, at the start of the Korean conflict, the national debt was equivalent to 90 percent of the gross national product, and in 1954 the ratio had declined further, to 74 percent. By 1957, although the dollar volume of the debt was higher than in 1950, the ratio was down to 62 percent. Proportionately to our economic activity and output, the national debt has been declining, although public discussion has taken little note of the fact.

WHO IS TO BE MASTER?

It is universally agreed that the national debt has a bearing on inflation and deflation, but nothing in the statistics proves that there is a direct relationship between prices and the size of the debt. In the depression years 1930–35 the debt doubled, but consumer prices continued to fall. In the war years, the debt quintupled in size, but consumer prices inched upward only by degrees. The great jump in prices took place in the years 1946–50, after OPA had been jettisoned, when the debt was being reduced. In the years 1955 through 1957, the debt was reduced by $4 billion, but prices rose six points on the consumer index scale. It is laboring the obvious to insist that it is not the size of the debt but its management that affects prices.

Only part of the debt is where it can affect the supply of money and credit. Some 30 billions of Government bonds are held by the Government itself, in the Social Security and other trust accounts. Another large segment is held as long-term investment. The remainder is left for the banks and the Federal Reserve System to play with as part of the mechanism for regulating the volume of money. The Federal Reserve has a broad range of powers to manage the money supply and the sale of bonds. It may be harder to avoid damage to the public interest now, at a time of relatively full employment, than it was when the economy was depressed or when it was harnessed to the needs of the war. But if the country has to enlarge its debt in order to fight the cold war and continue its economic growth, the Federal Reserve and the Treasury ought to be able to find ways of doing it. It's just a question of who is to be master—the national interest or the banking system.

In any case, the quantity of money and credit seems to have very little to do these days with the rise in prices. Squeeze the supply of money and raise interest rates, but prices still do not go down. The only prices capable of declining these days are the prices of commodities. Other prices are estab-

lished not in terms of the market but in terms of the corporate balance sheet. Aside from the luckless farmer, the mechanisms of the economy are set to raise incomes to meet higher prices and not to bring prices down to meet incomes. In collective bargaining, in the halls of Congress, wherever wages are fixed, the argument is unanswerable that higher prices require higher wages. Against this conviction, the policy of squeezing credit is impotent; it ruins small business without affecting prices. This is the structure of our society, and it might be well to assent to it and take a fresh look at inflation control. It may be that the thing to do is not to tinker with an elaborate machine of credit, interest rates, and monetary devices, but to take up the whole question of direct controls.

Just how to prevent inflation, however, is not the question we are facing here. Suffice it to say that the size of the national debt is not a controlling factor. Federal spending is not necessarily destructive of the value of the dollar.

A NEW KIND OF NATIONAL BUDGET

Much will depend on the outcome of the great spending battle of 1959. The English-speaking nations have a way of deciding their destinies in controversies over the public purse. From the role of Parliament under the Tudors to the row over taxation without representation to the issues of high tariff and free silver, the questions of how to tax and spend have dominated the course of our history. Today we face another fateful issue. It differs from the countercyclical use of the public purse to cure deflation as expounded by Keynes. It differs from the use of government credit to win a war. Yet it partakes of both and has new elements of its own. How we decide it will determine whether we meet the Communist challenge and the new problems of our tremendously expanding economy. Theories about spending and debt inherited from our small-town past, now being vigorously expressed by the man who once was a poor boy in Abilene, will push us to the wrong conclusion. Operating against these dying folkways are the political pressures of our economic situation.

Political pressures by themselves will not necessarily guide us to the right conclusion. They will undoubtedly prevail, and change the pattern of Government spending, as they did in the early years of the New Deal—when Roosevelt's campaign commitment to economy went down before the claims of human suffering—but the results today may well be as unsatisfactory as they were then. Not even Keynes' theoretical justification of deficit spending was sufficient to persuade the Roosevelt administration to spend enough and in the right places to reverse the deflation. Today we have no Keynes to provide us with a theoretical justification of deficit spending for necessary public services in a time of manageable unemployment. Even our best economists are still thinking of Government spending as an antideflationary spigot to be turned on and off as the economic tides rise and fall. The budget figures show that this concept is outdated, that spending will go up no matter what we do. But unless we know what we are doing, the present disorder and waste will also continue.

To bring all the needs of the country into one focus—our defense and international needs, our needs for public improvements and public services, and the needs of our private economy as well—we must work out a concept of a national economic budget. Such a budget should not be limited to a fiscal or calendar year, but should extend over a sufficient period of time—say 10 or 15 years—to enable us to bring within its sights the accomplishment of some of our major national and international goals. And in framing such a plan, we must face boldly and honestly the question of whether controls—controls over certain prices and certain wage agreements—may not be necessary to prevent inflation. They may prove not to be required, but at least we ought to find out. If some of us recoil in horror from starting along such a path, we should ask which other ways are available for our Nation's survival aside from the sustained application of forethought to public affairs.

Until Reds Renounce World Conquest Aims, Flexibility Is Dangerous

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I clude the following article by Edgar Ansel Mowrer:

Of all the tired slogans that have misled the American people since 1940, relaxing tensions is probably the most deceptive.

Now get me right: nobody basically wishes to see tensions relaxed more than this writer. For tensions in a world of H-bombs are just too dangerous to be harbored an hour longer than is necessary. I therefore sympathize with many influential Americans, such as Senators FULBRIGHT, MANSFIELD, and HUMPHREY, who harp on relaxing tensions in each of their many public appearances.

Even my old friend Elmo Roper, with so many of whose political aims I am in complete sympathy, blemished an admirable speech last month to the League of Women Voters in Baltimore, by proposing the twin aims of greater flexibility and relaxing tensions.

To me—under present circumstances—flexibility is just a new word for the discredited appeasement. And relaxing tensions is a misleading and a harmful slogan. It encourages a large number of people to believe that it is feasible.

All we need, according to these people, is a little good will and a readiness to meet the Russians halfway, and tensions holding a dread threat of war will relax or go away.

RUSSIA AT FAULT

This, to me, is hogwash. And the reason is clear to anyone who carefully examines the nature of existing tensions.

These, without the shadow of a doubt, center overwhelmingly in the Kremlin's past conduct and present intentions. The overwhelming cause of the cold war is simply (1) Moscow's insistence on keeping its paw on restless captive peoples; and (2) its efforts to expand its captive area, if possible to the whole world.

All other world tensions—the dispute between India and Pakistan, between Israel and the Arabs, between Castro of Cuba and Trujillo, of the Dominican Republic—are secondary and contain no real danger of a world war.

The real tensions spring from Moscow's insistence on ousting the West from West Berlin; on its brutal suppression of the Hungarian revolt; in Red China's frantic insistence in mastering the Tibetans and reducing the Dalai Lama to another Red stooge like his colleague the puppet Panchen Lama. For the West, short of surrender, is bound to seek to stay where it is, and the unwilling captive peoples will never—I repeat, never—relax their efforts to become free by any conceivable method. Nor should we in the West—unless we are ready to renounce our history and beliefs—ask or expect them to do so.

Now at one time or another, as Roper stated, changes in the Communist countries may (or may not) bring about a change in communism's ambitions. But until they do, or until the West, by accepting the cold war and playing to win, demonstrates communism can never spread further without starting a major war, any relaxing of tension implies the surrender or retreat of the West.

Therefore, thus who advocate relaxation under present circumstances are, whether they know it or not, assisting the advance of communism by encouraging Moscow and Peiping to believe they can press forward with impunity and by weakening the West's will to resist. For it is not possible for a free people at the same time to expect relaxation and to maintain a proper posture for successful defense.

CHIEF ASSET

Since this is the case, the West, far from negotiating any modification at Berlin that will make that city less objectionable to Moscow, should hang onto it at all costs. For West Berlin is one of our chief assets in the cold war, as nuclear arms in West Germany's hands will soon be another.

The Kremlin does not like either. Must we for that reason rush to mollify those whose aim is our destruction? Do we lack the guts to accept the Kremlin's challenge wherever it is made? Are we afraid to take the risk of war to defend our ideals, our friends, and our very existence? If so—as some are showing—the sooner we surrender the better for then communism will take us over physically intact.

But if, as I believe, most Americans are not ready for surrender to tyranny no matter what the threat, then those who now advocate relaxing tensions had better take another look, realize just why this is not possible today without weakening the West, and shift their emphasis from the preservation of peace to the defense of free men and women.

Poison in Your Water—No. 61

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 14, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, one of the foulest streams in the United States is the Missouri River, and to keep current the picture of that river as one of the most polluted in the United States, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from the Omaha, Nebr., Evening World-Herald of March 25, 1959, setting forth the nature of the water pollution and the bacteria count in the Missouri River near Sioux City, Iowa. The article is as follows:

POLLUTION 15 TIMES LEVELS AT SWIM POOL—EXPERT TELLS OF RIVER SAMPLING AT OMAHA

(By Gabe Parks)

SIOUX CITY, IOWA.—Pollution of Missouri River water reaching Omaha is 15 times stronger than the accepted health standards for swimming.

The contamination is nearly three times greater than the level recommended for sources for municipal use.

This was testified Wednesday by F. W. Kitterall, Cincinnati, Ohio, sanitation expert for the U.S. Public Health Service, at a Federal water pollution hearing.

FOURTEEN-MAN TEAM

Mr. Kitterall supervised a 14-man team of engineers, biologists, chemists, and bacteriologists which studied the Missouri River between Gavins Point, S. Dak., and Omaha last August and September.

He said the coliform bacteria count at the Mormon Bridge—just above the metropolitan utilities district water intake—averaged 14,800 per 100 milliliters. The standard for swimming, he said, is 1,000; for other recreational purposes and for drinking water supply, 5,000.

Mr. Kitterell also said that during a 2-day period beginning August 28, the Mormon Bridge count averaged 19,500.

AROUND THE CLOCK

He said samples were taken around the clock at 2-hour intervals. The study showed the count was higher at night than during the day. This was due primarily to the regular fluctuation of the sewage-discharge cycle in Sioux City.

He pointed out that metropolitan utility district takes its river samples routinely each morning at 8 o'clock. He did not quote any metropolitan utility district figures, but said they would be higher if taken at night.

Mr. Kittrell said an estimated 85 percent of the bacterial contamination at Omaha originated in Sioux City.

HEALTH HAZARD

A color picture of grease and other materials scraped from the intake of the Omaha water plant was introduced as evidence.

In response to a question from a Government attorney, Mr. Kittrell said river pollution at Omaha constitutes a health hazard.

But neither he nor other Government experts testified that Omaha's drinking water was unsafe after treatment.

They said the high degree of pollution in river water raised the risk that some bacteria might survive the treatment.

MUST PROVE THREAT

The hearing is part of the Federal attempt to compel Sioux City to build sewer treatment facilities which would cost an estimated $7 million to $12 million.

To force the construction, attorneys from the Public Health Service must prove that the health and welfare of persons living along the Missouri River is endangered.

Charles M. Brinton, Longtime Courier Publisher, Dies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, a great pioneer journalist passed away in Baker, Oreg., recently. Charles Mackay Brinton entered the printing trade in 1898 and published weekly newspapers in various communities in the West for 60 years. He was a dear friend of mine, a wonderful man, and a fine American.

The following article from the Baker Record Courier touches briefly on the highlights of his journalistic career. I know that my colleagues will find it of inspiration to them:

CHARLES M. BRINTON, LONGTIME COURIER PUBLISHER, DIES—RETIRED IN 1958 AFTER 60-YEAR CAREER

Death came Wednesday morning in St. Elizabeth Hospital to Charles Mackay Brinton, 78, for 60 years a printer and weekly newspaper publisher, 30 of those years as publisher of the Record-Courier and its original Haines Record.

Mr. Brinton, who had retired only last year, had been quite ill since October, his condition becoming weaker Friday when he entered the hospital and he passed away without waking from his sleep Wednesday morning.

His death ended a journalistic career that spanned in its rural field some of the most unique decades in history—pioneering in the severe prairie territory, the introduction of machine typesetting and power printing presses, the political, social and economic and production problems of two World Wars, the economic upheaval of the great depression, the advent of the auto, the airplane and the space age and their impacts upon rural America.

Born November 1, 1880, near Hancock in the backwoods of northern Michigan he was taken by his father and mother, Marshall and Rosemond Brinton, to the raw prairie homestead of Dakota territory which later became Wells County, N. Dak., near Sykeston. Here he weather the rigors of frontier agriculture, herding sheep as a boy, graduating from formal education at grade five, later in his youth to take a business education at Fargo.

SIXTY YEARS ACTIVE

He entered the printing trade April 1, 1898, and was associated for nearly 20 years, most of the time as publisher, with the Free Press at Fessenden, N. Dak. During the same time he either founded or had interests in the Beech Chronicle, Belfield Times, and a paper at Bismarck.

He was married September 14, 1909, to Miss Elizabeth Rose Mueller near Gary, Minn. The couple spent a little over a year at Arco, Idaho, where they had acquired the Advertiser, a weekly, at that place prior to the advent of major southern Idaho reclamation. They returned to Fessenden where they operated the Free Press till about 1921.

At various times he had served as manager of the county fair there, had been mayor of Fessenden and chairmanned the World War I liberty loans county drives. He never sought political office, was an active Republican till about 1930, but since then a Democrat.

Coming west he was interested in the Kevin Sun and Shelby Promoter in Montana, published the Browning Review for its owner 1 year and in 1924 started the Columbia Courier at Marcus, Wash., discontinuing it in 1927.

CAME HERE IN 1928

He purchased the North Powder News and Haines Record in 1928 with printing plant at North Powder, the family residing at Haines. The plant was moved to Baker in 1934 where the Record absorbed the Courier that year, the News in 1938 and the Eastern Oregon News in 1941. A son, Byron C. Brinton, became associated as Record-Courier editor in 1934 and the father and son formed a partnership in 1937. This continued until Charles M. retired in 1958, when the son assumed the publisher role also.

Surviving Mr. Brinton are his widow of 2333 Court Avenue, and nine children: Gordon M., Seattle; Byron C., Baker; Adria F. Ingram, Haines; Dr. James E. Brinton, Los Altos, Calif.; Ardis M. Cousins, Paso Robles, Calif.; Dr. T. F. Brinton and Dr. Donald M. Brinton, Eugene; Elizabeth DeShetler, Toledo, Ohio; and Thomas W. Brinton, Baker. Also surviving are three brothers, Horace, a half-brother of West Chester, Pa.; Wells of Los Angeles; and Donald of Independence, Calif.; four sisters, Mrs. Rosebud Hunt, Coeur d'Alene, Idaho; Mrs. Claribel Glassco, Arcadia, Calif.; Miss Florence Brinton, Montrose, Calif.; and Mrs. Mary E. Roberson of Corvalis; also by 24 grandchildren.

Services for Mr. Brinton will be conducted Saturday at 10 a.m. from the West & Co. chapel with the Reverend John Urey of the Presbyterian Church officiating. Interment will be in Mount Hope Cemetery.

In lieu of flowers, friends may make a contribution to the North Powder Community Church building fund, the family said.

All of the children had visited their home in recent months, Dr. Brinton came up from Stanford University and Elizabeth came out again from Toledo the first of the week.

The New Elite: Should Boston Firemen and Policemen Have Rentals, Subsidized by Occupying Public Housing Projects?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, is public housing designed to take care of low-income, needy people—the unfortunates who have been displaced because of a slum clearance project or other governmental action?

Are occupants of public housing projects those who because of conditions beyond their control proper subjects of public welfare programs?

Is it proper that the general public should be called upon to contribute to the payment of rentals for those who are financially able to pay their own way? Just where is the line to be drawn on who should be eligible to occupy public housing and receive this public bounty in the form of subsidized rentals?

Public housing serves a proper and useful purpose if it is restricted to those who have been displaced from their homes by slum clearance or other governmental action and those who have low incomes and are proper subjects of public assistance.

Unless confined to thos properly recognized public welfare functions, public housing becomes socialized housing, and the question is raised whether the public should be expected to help pay the rent bills for those who are not legitimate welfare cases and who are financially able to pay their own way without government help.

Our attention is often called to instance where the legitimate public housing functions are abused and perverted by allowing tenants who make several thousand dollars anunually to occupy such housing and thereby have their rentals subsidized by the public. Surely the most ardent advocates of public housing will not countenance that sort of thing.

That problem is well illustrated by an article which appeared in the Boston Herald on April 13, 1959, entitled "The New Elite," as follows:

THE NEW ELITE

Last fall, in a referendum subverting Mayor Hynes' right to determine appropriate municipal pay scales, Boston firemen won pay

raises ranging from $790 to $1,050. Identical increases were subsequently extended to the police in order to reestablish the traditional equality of pay scales as between the two protective departments.

Now, the Boston Housing Authority is seeking to raise the income ceilings for continued occupancy in State-aided housing projects so that 353 families of Boston police and firemen will not be evicted because of the increased income gained through the referendum.

A better instance of having one's cake and eating it, too, could hardly be imagined.

Public housing, designed for persons of low income, must be converted to middle-income or near-middle-income status because the firemen and policemen have advanced to that status.

The Boston Housing Authority says rents will be increased for these 353 families, although it hasn't said how much. But even if these increases are commensurate with the fire and police pay raise, the continued occupancy of public housing by these families automatically bars as many low-income families from entry into the projects.

Will the Boston Housing Authority state how many low-income families must stay in shabby tenements so that the fire and police families may remain in public housing?

May we not legitimately ask whether we are on the way, here in Boston, to the establishment of a new elite—a special class of drones for whom those without influence labor unremittingly?

The Faith of Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINFIELD K. DENTON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I should like to include an address by Dr. Roy T. Combs, chairman, Indiana State Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission, and to make other brief observations, concerning the Lincoln Sesquicentennial Sabbath event held yesterday afternoon in Ford's Theater (Lincoln Museum) here in Washington, D.C. The event marked the 94th anniversary of the assassination of President Abraham Lincoln in that theater on April 14, 1865.

Mr. David C. Means, of the Library of Congress, presided, and the invocation and benediction were said by the Walter Reed Hospital chaplain, Chaplain James W. Miller. Among those present was Mr. John E. Allen, assistant executive director, National Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission, of which I have the honor of being a member. Special music was provided by the chorus of the Foundry Church Choir, under the direction of Mr. Justin Lawrie. Mrs. Leo L. Pollack and Mr. Robert Barks—the sculptor—both of New York City, presented a new bronze head of Lincoln, "The Gettysburg Lincoln," to the museum. Dr. Combs' address was well received, was inspirational and spiritual in tone. His subject was "The Faith of Lincoln."

Dr. Combs has just completed arrangements, along with the Indiana special events chairman, Mr. William A. Koch, of Evansville, for the historic Lincoln sesquicentennial program taking place May 16 to 17 at Lincoln City and nearby Santa Claus land. Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, of Kentucky, chairman of the National Commission, will deliver the main address. These areas are included in my home congressional district, the eighth, and we in southern Indiana are proud of the fact that the Lincolns lived there nearly 14 years. The future President spent his formative years there, from 7 to 21. There, as he said, I "grew up." Dr. Combs' address is commended to the Members of the Congress and to the Nation for careful reading. It was as follows:

THE FAITH OF LINCOLN

Ninety-four years ago Tuesday, April 14, on this very spot Abraham Lincoln was felled by the bullet of an assassin, the day also being Good Friday. It was on this Good Friday that Christ the Savior was crucified on the cross for the sins of the world. Abraham Lincoln, devoted to the teachings and principles of Christ and Almighty God passed into eternity. In his early childhood he was taught the Scriptures by his mother Nancy Hanks Lincoln. She said to him: "I am going away and shall not return. Be a good boy. Live as I have taugh you. Love your Heavenly Father and keep his commandments." This he did throughout his entire life. In his speeches, state papers, and recorded conversations we find that he quoted 22 chapters of the 39 books of the Old Testament. Is it any wonder that some 6,000 books and pamphlets have been written about Mr. Lincoln. There are more books about him than on any other subject with the exception of the Bible. "It requires the most gracious pages of world history to record what one American achieved," said William McKinley.

Lincoln, whose life became the pattern for the common man. Lincoln, who opened the doors of opportunity to the races of man. Lincoln, man of God, whose close communion with the Creator inspired the world. He searched the Scriptures, thoughtfully, prayerfully, and with discrimination. This man of destiny found his armor and courage for life's stern battle in Christ the solid rock. Lincoln, compassionate, considerate, sympathetic, was warmly portrayed by an incident occurring when he was a young lawyer in Springfield, Ill. A Captain Green tells of accompanying Lincoln to the country farm home to make a will for an aging woman. Arriving, the woman was found to be near the end. Gently, Lincoln drew the document and after its signing the woman turned and said to Lincoln with a smile: "I am thankful I have made preparation for the other life I am so soon to enter. Many years ago I sought and found Christ as my Savior. He has been my Comforter through the years." Lincoln bent toward her and said: "To have faith in Christ is wise. You are to be congratulated in passing through life so usefully into the life beyond so hopefully." She said: "Mr. Lincoln, won't you read out of the Bible?" He beban reciting from memory the 23d Psalm, laying emphasis upon: "Tho I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil, for Thou art with me; for Thy rod and Thy staff, they comfort me." Passing on to the 14th chapter of John: "Let not your heart be troubled. I believe in God, believe also in me." Then he spoke with tenderness and pathos, the last stanza of "Rock of Ages.":

"While I draw this fleeting breath,
When mine eyes shall close in death,
When I rise to world unknown,
See Thee on Thy judgment throne,
Rock of Ages, cleft for me,
Let me hide myself in Thee."

Most biographers believe that two great passages from the Bible best exemplified Lincoln: "In all Thy ways acknowledge Him and He will direct Thy paths," and "Thou shall keep him in perfect peace, whose mind is stayed on Thee."

President William McKinley told of the battleflag sent to President Lincoln at Springfield, Ill., on February 11, 1861, with the inscription of the first chapter of Joshua: "Have I not commended thee to be strong and of good courage? Be not afraid, neither be thou dismayed, for the Lord thy God is with thee, whithersoever thou goest. There shall not any man be able to stand before thee, all the days of thy life. As I was with Moses, so shall I be with thou." And then, a verse from Lincoln's favorite poem;

"Oh! Why should the spirit of mortal be proud?
Like a swift-fleeing meteor, a fast-flying cloud,
A flash of the lightning, a break of the wave,
He passeth from life to his rest in the grave."

But Jesus had his Judas and his Pilate; Lincoln his McClellan and his Booth.

Mr. Lincoln said: "I am profitably engaged in reading the Bible. Take all of it that you can upon reason and the balance upon faith and you will live and die a better man." And on another occasion he said: "God bless the churches. Bless whomsoever gave us the churches."

It has been my privilege to talk with Billy Graham, the great evangelist, on several occasions, and knowing of my interest in Lincoln he gave me this startling news: That in his world travels, that world leaders said to him that, "You are from America, the land of Abraham Lincoln. Had we a Lincoln today, our world in all probability would not be in the condition it is in."

Referring to the Bible, Lincoln has said to a group of devoted colored people: "This Great Book is the best gift God has given to men. All that the Savior gave the world was communicated through this Book." If our world is to survive the trouble crisis now confronting us, we must first turn to Christ and Almighty God, the liberator of all men.

New Lincolns must rise, new Lincolns of destiny. New Lincolns of statesmanship. New Lincolns with freedom's challenge. New Lincolns with sublime faith in Christ; with wisdom from God's word; with obedience to His perfect will. New Lincolns, to give patterns for the common man. New Lincolns, to open doors of opportunity to the races of men. New Lincolns to humbly walk with God, giving faith and courage to nations of the world.

"Lives of great men all remind us
We can make our lives sublime
And, departing, leave behind us
Footprints on the sands of time."

Thank you very much for your kind and thoughtful attention.

MEMORIAL OBSERVANCE OF THE 94TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ASSASSINATION OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN, LINCOLN MUSEUM (FORD'S THEATER), SUNDAY, APRIL 19, 1959, 2:30 P.M.

Invocation by Chaplain James W. Miller, Post Chaplain, Walter Reed Hospital.

Remarks by the chairman, Dr. David C. Mearns, Chief, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress.

Special music, Mr. Justin Lawrie.

Presentation of a new bronze head of Lincoln, "The Gettysburg Lincoln," by Robert Berks, by Mrs. Leo L. Pollak.

Introduction of the speaker by Dr. David C. Mearns.

Address: "The Faith of Lincoln," by Hon. Roy T. Combs, chairman, Indiana Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission, and president, Indiana Lincoln Foundation.

Benediction, Chaplain James W. Miller.

Under the sponsorship of the Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission and the Lincoln Group of the District of Columbia.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of April 18, 1959:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas, April 18, 1959)

Cherry blossoms amid balmy weather, snow, and bright 80-degree sunshine, in that order, make a strange week—but that's spring in Washington. Visitors are everywhere, enjoying sightseeing. Republican women from Dallas, Tex., and the Nation are here, holding their annual conference. It's a compliment to Congressmen to have visitors from home who will take the time to observe the legislative process. A Congressman's job would be better understood if constituents could see the committee work, where hearings are held and legislation fashioned. Then, the floor work in the House, and finally the endless office routine of correspondence over the problems of constituents. Frequently, all activities are simultaneous.

The Federal Government has grown so large in recent years it is now likely that legislation suffers from a lack of study by the Congressmen, who are besieged with countless other duties. Worse yet, this fact will go unrecognized so that Government getting out of hand will not be blamed on the right cause, namely, too little time to do too many things. Other charges will be made, and more legislation devised to correct legislation. Meanwhile, the water is muddied further by political parties that choose up sides with too hasty study of the facts. Only as a result of careful study of alternatives can the successful solutions to today's problems be found. Often, the obvious is most difficult to see. (Item: A Member sent a package of sightsavers made in his district to each Congressman saying, "We are entering that period of the session when budget figures will be flying fast and furiously. I trust these will assist you in seeing the figures more clearly.")

The military construction bill totaled $1,251 million for defense construction, $131 million of which is outside the United States and $548 million approximately is classified (secret). The bill includes such items as operational and training facilities, maintenance, research and development and test, hospital and medical facilities, housing, utilities and real estate. Texas' part is $28 million, including $348,000 for Dallas' Naval Air Station and $64,000 for the Army Reserve Center.

The military is big business in this Nation, even in this relatively small construction end. In fact, defense expenditures are so great and so integral a part of this Nation's economy, I wonder what would happen if Russia actually wanted peace, and we were suddenly faced with disarmament and demilitarizing. Could a nation of free people and business rooted in free enterprise survive competitively, as compared to the regimented societies of totalitarian states where people can be ordered about? Here's one to think about.

The Bob Taft Memorial Carillon Tower symbolizes the side of America that everyone can cherish and in remembering try to emulate, thanking God for the opportunity and freedom to do so. At the dedication these qualities came to the forefront, and refreshingly, without apology. Bob Taft laid down principles and then followed them, even when odds were great, when pressures against him were almost unbearable. Ambition and power were sacrificed when he relinquished seniority privileges to join another committee to write a labor law, which he reasoned then was the Nation's great need. Conscience was his guide, not political popularity. And when it came time to die, knowing this in advance, he met this without missing a stride. As he told Herbert Hoover, who urged him to go to the hospital, "My friend, you know what is the matter with me. I am going to die with my boots on." Here's American manhood at its best. As Mr. Hoover said, "In the belfry of this monument there is a magnificent carillon. When these great bells ring out, it will be a summons to integrity and courage." Congressmen should hear and heed these bells. Bob Taft's memory will help all Americans.

Our Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, was resoundingly praised in the House when his retirement from office was announced. I wondered why he couldn't have received some of this praise earlier when instead his critics were denouncing him, chiefly for his unyielding firmness toward Russia. Like Taft, he may be appreciated more in the future, when those who counseled him to give in to Russia are long forgotten.

Why are so many of our greatest and strongest men removed from the scene when they are so badly needed? Lincoln, Taft, Senate Chaplain Peter Marshall, to name only three of the many. An even heavier load is distributed among those who remain. In this world we have a big job to do for ourselves, our children, and future generations. To this task we had better dedicate ourselves.

Remembering Taft's beliefs in the role of Federal Government would be so helpful today. For example: "This was the way America was built up. The only way to resume progress is to assure people again that Government will not interfere with their normal and reasonable efforts to make a living; that Government will not take away from them the profit which they make; that reasonable success will receive the recognition it deserves."

Dr. Warren Tracy and Coe College Library

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, as the National Library Week draws to a close, I would like to salute the Stewart Memorial Library, which is a part of Coe College, one of the truly fine liberal arts colleges in my district.

The library, a gift of the late Col. Robert W. Stewart, has recently undergone a facility expansion and physical improvement program. The program, which amounted to $37,763, includes a new lighting system, new stacks and study areas, and new draperies. Other improvements for the library include a microfilm and microcard reader and a verifax photo copier.

This fine progress in the Coe College Library can be attributed to the untiring work of Dr. Warren Tracy, and his fine staff. The staff includes Mrs. Warren Tracy, reference librarian; Mrs. Fred C. Fisher, Jr., and Mrs. Freda Chambers, circulation librarians; Mrs. Donald Stonemen, cataloger, and part-time student workers.

Dr. Tracy, who is now in his fifth year as head librarian, has done a remarkable job of rebuilding the library. With a few grants, and many long hours of work by Dr. Tracy, the library collection now includes 65,000 volumes and 280 periodicals—some dating before the 1900's. Under his leadership exhibits of wider cultural and artistic scope are going to be sponsored by the library similar to the current one; the Gertrude Stein exhibit.

It must be remembered that the universities with their large libraries are not fully responsible for the cultural growth of a city. But rather it is the small liberal arts college libraries, with their small staffs, that have taken the cultural lead in the cities. These staffs, such as the one Dr. Tracy heads, have made the growth of their libraries a very personal one in which the entire city has benefited.

It is indeed an honor to give particular recognition to Dr. Warren Tracy and Coe College for their fine contribution to the liberal arts college library and to their city of Cedar Rapids.

Should Your Child Go Into the Foreign Service?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues are familiar with my interest in the Foreign Service of the United States through my bill, H.R. 1232, to create a Foreign Service Academy. I believe that public sentiment in favor of this legislation will increase as the people become more aware of the Foreign Service and its work.

Along this line, I was very pleased to receive today an advance copy of a public service advertisment entitled "Should Your Child Go Into the Foreign Service?" which the New York Life Insurance Co. is sponsoring.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the aforementioned advertisement:

SHOULD YOUR CHILD GO INTO THE FOREIGN SERVICE?

(By Loy W. Henderson Deputy Under Secretary of State as told to Donald Robinson)

There is a bronze plaque in the lobby of the Department of State Building in Washington, D.C. On it are engraved the names of 71 members of the U.S. Foreign Service "who, while on active duty, lost their lives under heroic or tragic circumstances." The first name is that of William Palfrey—"lost at sea, 1780." The last is that of a U.S. consul, David LeBreton, Jr., who "drowned saving lines—Tunis, 1953."

For more than 180 years, the men and women of the Foreign Service have stood ready to sacrifice their interests, their comforts and their lives for the United States. They have stuck to their posts in the face of earthquakes, floods, revolutions and wars. They have carried on regardless of cholera epidemic and worse.

Duty is a watchword with them. A State Department courier who was aboard a plane that crashed in flames near Vienna in October 1955, didn't think about his frightful injuries and burns. In spite of the excruciating pain he was in, he declined all medical care until he'd delivered his papers into safe hands.

They are dedicated people, the members of the U.S. Foreign Service.

In all, there are 8,025 men and women in the Service now, and they can rightly be called America's first line of defense. Upon them can depend the issues of war and peace.

ROLE IN FOREIGN POLICY

The Foreign Service must, first of all, protect American interests abroad. It has the job of promoting those interests by demonstrating their mutuality with those of other nations. In short, to further and improve the relations of the United States with other countries in every possible way.

The Foreign Service must explain to other governments what the policy of the United States is, and where possible, persuade them to cooperate with us in our constant struggle to win peace, prosperity and freedom for all the world. In addition, the Service must do everything in its power to assist American citizens in their legitimate activities abroad.

Today, members of the Foreign Service serve at 286 posts in 89 countries, with the U.S. delegation to the United Nations in New York, and in the Department of State in Washington.

The Foreign Service people on detail in Washington help plan our foreign policy and direct its day-to-day workings. They maintain liaison with other governmental agencies and handle contacts with the thousands of foreign diplomats stationed in America.

Abroad, our Foreign Service men and women have duties that are ultravaried. Diplomatic negotiations, for one thing.

Right now, Foreign Service experts are negotiating with foreign governments on matters ranging from the regulations under which American business men may operate, to the exchange of scientific know-how among nations, to the proper steps that should be taken to protect the free world against the threat of Soviet imperialism.

Another big assignment the Service has is gathering information. An election in a Latin American country or a revolution in the Middle East can change the course of history. The Foreign Service man on the scene must report the facts, and his analysis of them, fast, fully and without pulling any punches.

Most of all, the Foreign Service people abroad must, insofar as they can, earn the confidence of the governments of the countries they're in. That's how good international relations grow.

SERVING AMERICANS ABROAD

And all this is merely part of the Foreign Service's role. If an American citizen runs into trouble with the police, the Foreign Service sees that he gets legal counsel and a fair trial. If a tourist becomes ill, the Foreign Service finds him a doctor.

Twenty-four hours a day, the Foreign Service is on duty, prepared to assist Americans in need. A band of American missionaries who were caught in bloody rioting that swept through a Middle Eastern country recently can bear witness to that.

A Foreign Service officer drove 50 miles through the crazed mobs to rescue these missionaries. He got them out just as the rioters were setting fire to their house—with them in it.

When they are detailed as consuls, Foreign Service officers issue or renew passports for Americans abroad. They did it for over 200,000 people last year alone. They register the birth of children born to American parents abroad so they can establish their rights to U.S. citizenship. Theirs also is the complete responsibility for issing, or denying, visas to foreigners coming to the United States as visitors or as immigrants with all their perplexing problems.

ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES

Overall, the satisfactions of a Foreign Service career are superb. You travel the world, you meet many kinds of fascinating pople, you constantly are broadening yourself.

You are on the inside of history in the making, and you often have a chance to help shape that history. I well remember the thrill that we in the Foreign Service had in 1947 when the President and Congress accepted our recommendations to support Greece and Turkey against Communist aggression.

It was the first time the United States had ever undertaken such a massive program in peacetime, and it saved both those nations from Kremlin domination.

The greatest satisfaction of all, of course, is the realization that you are helping your country and advancing the principles on which our national and international life is based. Especially is this so today. At a moment when humanity is at the crossroads, Foreign Service people are in a position to help guide it along the path of peace and freedom.

But the Foreign Service is no place for people who want a soft, easy existence. It is a career exclusively for young men and women who are willing to toil endless hours—and undergo hardships, inconveniences and, if need be, danger for their country's sake.

Let me say this. There are strong disadvantages to a career in the Foreign Service. It offers little opportunity to fame; good diplomats do their best work away from the public eye. It is a round-the-clock job. A diplomat is never off duty. And sometimes his duties can be pedestrian.

There are many rigors. Foreign Service people have no permanent home. Every 3 years, they are likely to be transferred. Frequently, it is to isolated posts where sanitary housing is impossible to find, disease is rampant, the climate extremely hot or freezing cold. It can be very hard on a man's wife and children. I know.

On occasion, there are bitter frustrations. You can propose action which you are certain is wise both from the standpoint of the United States and the country in which you are serving. But, other factors, from the global viewpoint of Washington, may be overriding and your recommendations may not be accepted. This, if you let it, can hurt.

OPPORTUNITIES, SALARIES, AND ADVANCEMENT

The Foreign Service is now divided into three branches. First is the Foreign Service Officer Corps, the professional career organization which represents the backbone of our Government activities in the international field. It is a carefully selected group that is tough to get into and tougher to stay in. It numbers about 3,500 of whom more than 330 are women.

Then there is the Foreign Service Reserve. It consists of specialists, persons with particular qualifications that are required by the Service, a highly specialized knowledge of atomic energy, say, or of Soviet agriculture. These specialists are appointed for periods of 2 to 5 years; we have approximately 800 of them.

Finally, there is the Foreign Service Staff Corps. It includes typists, stenographers, code clerks, and other technical and administrative employees. They are also selected with special care. Some of them eventually qualify for the Officer Corps. Over half are women.

Advancement is strictly on merit. Every Foreign Service officer is rated regularly by an impartial selection board, and the better ones are promoted. These promotions go right to the top. Nearly two-thirds of ambassadors and ministers have come up through the ranks.

Applicants for the Foreign Service Officer Corps must be American citizens from 20 to 31 years of age and should have records of impeccable loyalty and discretion. (Each gets a thorough background investigation.) They take a written examination that lasts a solid day and encompasses the use of the English language, the applicant's capacity for interpreting both tabular and quantitative data, his general knowledge of world history, politics, economics, and other subjects. Fluency in a world language, while not an examination requirement, must be attained before an officer can advance in the Service.

An applicant who passes the written examination then takes an "oral." For 90 minutes he appears before a three-man panel that weighs his personality, his judgment, his aptitude at defending his own views and his true motives for joining the Service.

These examinations are exacting. Of 3,959 who took a recent examination, only the 676 finest passed.

The salary of a Foreign Service Officer usually starts at $5,225 and it rises to $27,500 in the case of ambassadors at more important posts. Reserve officers have the same pay scale. Salaries for the Staff Corps begin at $3,730 and go in certain specialties to $13,160. All three branches receive allowances to help cover the extra expenses incurred in living abroad.

TRAITS AND EDUCATION NEEDED

To prepare for a career as a Foreign Service Officer, I would urge a broad liberal arts education with emphasis on history, science, economics, the literature of all nations, and modern languages.

Although a college degree is not demanded, it is virtually essential. We want the Foreign Service to be a cross-section of America, with representatives in it of all geographical areas, as well as of all races, religions and social backgrounds. For instance, from a sampling of 380 junior Foreign Service Officers on the rolls as of May 1958, 140 educational institutions can be cited as Alma Maters.

Opportunities for women are exactly the same as for men. One of our most noted ambassadors today is a woman who made her way up through the ranks.

The standards in the Staff Corps are also high. Most applicants have to pass examinations in their respective fields.

What traits should you look for if your son or daughter is considering a Foreign Service career? Let me tell right off what we don't want—snobs, arrogant people, or self-righteous people. The traits we do

think a boy or girl should have are: (1) First of all—complete integrity; (2) a pleasant, outgoing personality; (3) a sensitivity in dealing with persons of different races, religions, cultures, and ideologies; (4) an open, curious mind; (5) quick thinking and good judgment in a crisis; (6) a genuine concern with international affairs; (7) sound scholarship. This especially, because the process of learning is never-ending in the Foreign Service. A diplomat must always keep abreast of the latest developments and trends at home and abroad.

And there is one more thing—robust health. You have to pass a stringent physical examination before you can be appointed.

It is now 37 years that I have been in the Foreign Service and I'm grateful for every one of them. It is a gratification to me that my efforts in life have been devoted not to increasing my wealth and prestige, but to helping my country and the ideals for which my country stands and upon which our civilization rests.

If your child joins the Foreign Service, he can have that splendid feeling, too.

Inflation: Middle Class Catches It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMER H. BUDGE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from the Salt Lake Tribune, published in Salt Lake City, Utah, and dated April 13, 1959. The article was written by Paul Ress, Chicago Tribune writer, and captioned "Inflation: Middle Class Catches It."

Mr. Speaker, on March 10 of this year I called to the attention of this body facts pertaining to the budget, the national debt and inflation. At that time I remarked that the Government was having trouble borrowing money, even though it had, in some cases, more than doubled the interest rate it was offering, due to the fear of our people of inflation. I pointed out that, rather than put money in supposedly safe Government bonds, people, during inflationary periods, are more prone to invest in common stocks and real estate, hoping the values thereof would keep pace with the inflation.

Mr. Ress' article, dealing with inflation in France, more than bears out my contention. Mr. Ress points to one French investor who put his money in French Government bonds and saw a $20 investment shrink in value to 22 cents. Meanwhile, another investor—one who had put his money in real estate—saw a $4 investment increase to $5.

Mr. Speaker, it could happen here. Should we continue our present course of wild spending for every crackpot socialistic scheme that comes down the road, we could very easily find ourselves in the same financial predicament.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics Index our dollar has dropped in value from 100 cents in 1939 to 48 cents in 1959. Where do we stop? Do we continue our spending spree until our dollar is worth less than 1 penny?

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that we take immediate stock of ourselves and our situation. I suggest that we call a halt to this unnecessary spending and operate as a responsible legislative body—a legislative body responsible to ourselves, our constituents and posterity.

The article follows:

INFLATION: MIDDLE CLASS CATCHES IT

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Inflation has proved damaging in many countries. In a series of stories, the Chicago Tribune Press Service correspondents in France, Germany, and Italy tell of the effects in those countries. Additional stories will tell of the effects of inflation in the United States.)

(By Paul Ress)

PARIS, April 12.—France suffers from a chronic disease—inflation—and a galloping malady it is, too.

To make matters worse, the country is in the throes of a recession.

Overtime hours, on which poorly paid factory laborers depend to make ends meet, have been sharply cut. Prices in the last 18 months have risen officially 10 percent, in reality 15 percent.

As a former conservative premier, Paul Reynaud, put it, "When wages climb up the staircase, prices take the elevator."

Storeowners have not been hit so badly as other members of the middle class, the most numerous in the country.

Take the case of the thrifty man who bought Government bonds with his savings between World Wars to live on in his old age and has been ruined by inflation.

Roger LeFevre was wounded at Verdun in World War I. Demobilized, he went back to his job of traveling salesman for a soapsuds firm. In the twenties, he put his savings into 3-percent Government bonds. He bought them for 100 francs, or $20 apiece.

"Do you realize what my bonds are quoted at on the stock exchange today?" asked LeFevre, 69.

"Exactly 102 francs, and I mean 102 of these devaluated 1959 francs. Just 22 cents."

As LeFevre says, purchasing power does not lie.

"With my 100 francs in 1922," he said, "I could buy a good readymade suit of clothes. With 100 francs now I can buy 18 cigarettes, not even a full pack of the cheapest brand."

A retired army officer, Charles Armentiere, a tall, blond Fleming from northern France, was more farseeing.

While he was fighting colonial wars in Syria and Indochina, he invested in real estate and gold.

"I bought a piece of property at Viroflay, near Versailles, in 1927. It cost me 20 francs, or $4 for a square meter (10.7 square feet). The land is worth 2,500 francs, or $5, a square meter, now. I haven't gained much, but my investment has not been lost through monetary inflation. As for my gold, those ingots are more solid now than the Rock of Gibraltar."

Men like Colonel Armentiere hedged against inflation by placing their eggs in several baskets and especially by showing no confidence in the government for which they were working or fighting.

Less fortunate citizens, such as the traveling salesman LeFevre, who trusted in his government's word and financial stability, are living on their relatives or scratching out an existence with meager handouts from the state.

Physicians and lawyers continue to thrive, but salesmen and small businessmen feel the pinch, the common people of France are not menaced by a wave of misery, but a feeling of anguish about the future fills their hearts.

"When times are bad, my business booms," said a butcher, Michel LeBlanc.

LeBlanc sells horsemeat, not beef.

Unlike Americans, the French do not turn up their noses at the thought of eating horsemeat. They like it.

But the popularity of horsemeat and LeBlanc's prosperity in these inflationary days result mostly from the low price of the meat.

"I sell a pound of chopped horsemeat for 40 cents and my best cut of horse steak costs 90 cents a pound," said LeBlanc. "You have to pay $1.60 a pound for beef filet. Not many Frenchmen can afford to pay that, and so they line up in my shop for horsemeat."

Mme. Eugenie Simonnet, who owns a grocery next door to LeBlanc's shop, heard him talking.

"Your business may be good, but mine has been getting worse every month for over a year," she said. "My customers have less to spend. I have had to increase my prices, and that, too, slows business.

"See that sign on the wall?"

She was pointing to a plaque warning that the grocery does not give credit. Every good store posts that sign prominently. French shopkeepers have an ingrained hostility to the idea of extending credit even to a good customer. But Madame Simonnet lamented:

"Now I have got to grant credit to my customers or I'd have no business at all."

It Isn't Funny Any More

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, on April 13, 1959, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter I received from Westinghouse, who recently lost an order for a huge generator for the Tennessee Valley Authority.

General Electric and Westinghouse were underbid to the tune of about 33⅓ percent by a foreign manufacturer.

Ever since our protective tariff walls were shattered, automobiles, building materials, and commodities of most every nature have been pouring into the United States from foreign manufacturers—to the end that it is not funny any more.

Mr. Speaker, one of these fine days, and soon, our own economic condition will force us to think seriously about Americans for a change. The wage earner, the businessman, and the farmer, all have a big stake in this problem.

Please read the following from the American Lumberman:

IT ISN'T FUNNY ANY MORE[1]

Shortly after the war, a few foreign cars started to trickle into the country. Women thought they were cute and the men ad-admired them for other reasons, which Detroit is still trying to analyze.

Only 7,542 foreign cars were imported in 1949, hardly enough to cause a ripple in the Detroit flood. Last year the figure skyrocketed to 383,000 cars and imports exceeded

[1] This editorial is from a four-page article, "Is it Smart to Sell Imports?" in American Lumberman, Apr. 13, 1959.

exports for the first time in automotive history.

Foreign car sales in this country gained 91.5 percent last year while sales of American-made cars declined 26.6 percent. Another 35 percent sales boost is predicted in foreign car sales this year.

The ripple of 1949 has developed into a merchandising storm that has led domestic auto manufacturers to rush competitive small cars into production.

What began as fresh material for the cartoonist and jokester has developed into a competitive threat of no laughing matter.

Many building materials—nails, glass, plywood, small tools, hardboard, and hardware—have followed the same pattern with grave consequences in prospect for the American manufacturer and possibly the dealer.

In 1951, Japan sold 1.5 percent of the American hardwood plywood market; last year, they sold 40 percent in this market. Imports from Japan alone equaled 87 percent of the total domestic output, says the Hardwood Plywood Institute. Imports of hardboard increased 446.2 percent in 1957, according to testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee. In just 1 month, February of this year, 825 cases of mechanics' tools arrived from England, Germany, Japan, Italy, and Finland.

What is the result?

Some manufacturers have frankly cut the quality of some lines of merchandise to meet foreign competition—and lost; others have turned to specialty items that are less competitive; still others have made arrangements to produce certain items abroad for sale in this country at a price.

Some have tried to meet the challenge with better packaging and improved point-of-sale helps. But many manufacturers admit that imports have caused a problem, critical in some cases, that you can help solve.

"Few dealers seem to realize the serious threat they are creating by handling foreign-made products," remarked Thomas B. Andrews, sales manager, Southern Screw Co. "If the trend continues, within 5 years this country will have the greatest unemployment problem in history."

There is no quarrel with fine, quality merchandise from abroad. The hand craftsmanship of European artisans found in knobs, pulls, and escutcheons is unequaled here, domestic hardware manufacturers readily admit. This is high-class merchandise at a high price in contrast to many of today's imports, which are low quality at a low price.

What is happening in building materials is just a small part of the overall import picture. As one sales manager pointed out, it will take a united front up and down the line, with pressure for quotas and heavier duties, to stem the tide.

Caught between an appeal to "buy-and-sell American" and a need to meet competition, the dealer who cares to think about it faces a neat dilemma: What happens when the profit motive collides with patriotism?

J. H. Walsh, merchandising manager for the Lufkin Rule Co., has an answer:

"Our research indicates that the sale of cheaper foreign items does nothing more than cut down on the total sales of profits of those dealers handling these items. Lower prices do not by themselves increase the total market unless the quality is equal to the higher-priced item."

Your decision to sell or reject imports counts just as surely as your vote—or failure to vote—at the polls.

THE EDITORS.

U.S.S. "Bryce Canyon": U.S. Good Will

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most effective instruments for creating good will abroad for the United States of America has come to be the officers and men of the U.S. Navy. Wherever they travel the wearers of our naval uniform regard gaining respect and friendship for our country as important a part of the duty to which they have devoted themselves as manning and fighting their ships if ever needs be.

Officers and men of the U.S.S. *Bryce Canyon*, homeported at Long Beach, Calif., and now serving in the Philippines, are typical of Americans in uniform doubling as people-to-people ambassadors of goodwill.

Recently, within little more than a week's period, several fine gestures of friendship to the people of the Philippines were signalled from the *Bryce Canyon*.

The ship established a $500 scholarship trust fund to provide a young Filipino of Olongapo with a year's instruction at the Feati Institute of Technology in Manila.

In announcing the scholarship, Capt. E. H. Steinmetz, USN, commanding officer of the destroyer tender, said:

Our officers and men raised the funds to provide an opportunity for a particularly deserving young man of Olongapo to further his education in the industrial arts field. The young man to be selected must have a demonstrated aptitude and capability for training in the industrial arts, must be of excellent character and moral integrity, must be financially unable to continue his education without assistance and must not be directly related to any active or retired U.S. Armed Forces personnel.

The *Bryce Canyon* spends most of her time in port at Subic Bay—

Captain Steinmetz explained—

and in appreciation of the very good relations we enjoy with the Philippine citizens of Olongapo we wanted to offer some needy young man with ability the chance to go to college. We wanted to demonstrate our thanks to his townspeople for their many kindnesses to us.

Just a few days earlier 11 officers and men of the *Bryce Canyon* had gone ashore on a mission of mercy. A 38-year-old woman lay dying in the Olongapo Hospital suffering from severe anemia, jaundice, and a severe gall bladder condition. The hospital had no blood bank and only a limited blood supply. The woman required a pint of blood a day if she was to live.

No call went out, no one requested any blood, but the word leaked back to the *Bryce Canyon* that someone needed help. True to their ship's motto, "Always ready," the crewmen literally rushed to the hospital and gave 11 healthy pints of blood.

Grateful for the blood donations, the doctors served, to the surprise and pleasure of the donors, two rounds of local Philippine Island beer stating: "Beer is the best medicine for rebuilding the red blood corpuscles."

The woman's condition is still uncertain, but the Filipino doctors believe she will live, and the men of the *Bryce Canyon* have given their stamp of approval to Filipino blood-building techniques.

This act, in its turn, was preceded only a few days by a visit of several officers and men of the *Bryce Canyon* to a nearby pigmy village to donate over 150 pounds of food to its people.

The pigmies, called Negritos in the Philippines, are a very poor people and make their livelihood selling bows and arrows as souvenirs in the town of Olongapo. In the days of old they were a savage headhunting tribe but civilization has slowly caught up with and passed them. They live in the hills near the Subic Bay Naval Base, in bamboo huts.

Among the food given the pigmies was dry milk. This was the first time the pigmies had seen milk of such a dry consistency but after shown how to mix the milk they expressed their amazement and gratitude for the food.

Meanwhile, being constructed aboard the *Bryce Canyon* is a giant flagpole for the Philippine Boy Scout camp at Manila, which will be the site of the World Boy Scout Jamboree beginning July 17.

These are but examples of the kind spirit of America exhibited by the many ships and many men of the U.S. Navy in many lands throughout the world. To them all, a grateful Nation says, "Well done, U.S. Navy."

Foreign Aid and the Bolivian Mess

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DENVER D. HARGIS
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. HARGIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I offer a timely editorial recently penned by Mr. Larry W. Marcellus, who publishes the Fredonia Daily Herald in my home district. I believe Mr. Marcellus' pungent comments deserve the serious attention of this body. I believe they are typical of the growing Midwestern trend toward sharp criticism of present foreign aid policies and the appalling record of wasteful mismanagement chronicled to date:

A shining example of why we don't enjoy a tax decrease comes from South America—Bolivia.

In that tin-producing country, the wage earner really enjoys life. There is a law down there that makes it practically impossible

for any firm to lay an employee off or fire him. Firms have people on their payrolls who turn up only on payday to pick up their salary. Only they know what they do the rest of the week. These companies are, of course, heading straight for brankruptcy. Reports have it that only about 12 percent of the employed earn their wages.

Why all the concessions to the workingman? He was instrumental in getting the present administration into power, and at the expense of the country and industry, the administration is bending over backward to present the wage earner utopia on a silver platter. The country is operating in the red deeper and deeper each month.

This Bolivian situation is of interest to us in the United States because we furnish that Government with about one-third of their national budget according to the Wall Street Journal. We pour good money after bad into a country that has a tremendous flair for mismanaging funds. Apparently there is no bottom to the hole the American taxpayer is trying to fill.

We feel this is indicative of a lot of our foreign aid spending. As was noted in this column yesterday, England is doing a pretty good job of paying back the money we have loaned them. There are a few others who have or are paying back loans, but they are few.

We speak of Bolivia mismanaging funds, but we wonder whether or not we have too many cooks for the stew in Washington. Too many people to pass the buck when a complaint rolls around. We feel we would be better off if we took a few cooks away from the stew pot of foreign aid and limit the responsibility. We might just find it profitable for John Q. Taxpayer. After all, he's the guy who has to foot the bill for the whole affair, and he deserves an even break.

City Grows 900 Percent in 9 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. KASEM
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. KASEM. Mr. Speaker, I feel that the article below on West Covina, Calif., which is wholly within my district, and includes my home, clearly represents and illustrates the growth we are experiencing. The article, written by Mr. Kimmis Hendrick, appeared in the April 11, 1959, edition of the Christian Science Monitor.

The article points out how in an area with a high growth rate such as this, tax revenue from local sources cannot adequately keep up with the needs for education of the children, and the children will not wait. They keep right on getting older, whether we are able to give them adequate schools immediately or not.

The article follows:

CITY GROWS 900 PERCENT IN 9 YEARS

(By Kimmis Hendrick)

WEST COVINA, CALIF.—The most amazing thing about West Covina's growth is the way most people take it for granted.

They whiz through West Covina on the freeway, turning off maybe at Eastland Shopping Center, one of the city's three major shopping centers, without ever giving a thought to the possibility that this is the fastest growing city in the United States.

California is full of such places. Fields of orange groves yesterday. Cities today.

FREEWAYS SET OFF BOOM

But there's nothing quite like West Covina. It had only 4,499 people in 1950. It has close to 50,000 now. (A figure given for January 1, 1959, is 47,023.)

The real reason this spectacular increase draws fairly little attention is that it has all occurred since the last census. West Covina just isn't on the books as a city. So far as the records go, it could still be the pretty little place some orange ranchers incorporated back in 1923—the postcard kind of place with snow-tipped mountains for backdrop and blossoming trees in the foreground.

What caused the change?

Basically, the California boom itself. Explain that, and you understand West Covina. But the catalyst here was the new San Bernardino Freeway, which links San Gabriel Valley with Los Angeles and practically bisects this city in the process.

When the war ended in Korea and GI's were looking for fine homes, here was a place with enough land so developers could put up $20,000 houses for $14,000. Easing of FHA loan requirements helped.

West Covina mushroomed like some magic city in an animated cartoon moving picture. It became the archetype of California suburbia. Young, chockful of children. Brimming with future. Comfort for all kinds of people—wage earners, professional men, working wives. West Covina's average family income of $8,000 a year represents industry and commerce, teaching, public relations, the law—just about everything.

Here comes to focus one of the most typical facets of the California boom—the classlessness of society. Karl Marx missed the point. In the industrial revolution as it culminated in California's astonishing growth, everybody emerged as a real or a potential capitalist.

If West Covina folks were to stage a revolt of any kind, it would be against high taxes. This revolt is in the making. The rate here is extremely high, but it's due to the fact that there are so many youngsters that the city has had to build a big school system practically from scratch.

What is happening here, however, doesn't sound like the rumblings of coming rebellion. It sounds like the enthusiasm of developing civic pride.

In much of California's rapid growth, a missing ingredient has been community feeling. How do you get it when everybody is a newcomer? Loyalties stay in Indiana and Oklahoma. Los Angeles furnishes the exaggerated example—so spread out and so new, with enterprising citizens often too enterprising to be civic minded, that the question of city pride is still an open one.

Even 2 years ago it couldn't have been said of West Covina that there were signs of cohesive city thinking.

People hadn't settled here to shoulder burdens. They had come here because this was the country. It was spacious, beautiful.

But they could not neglect their children. Children meant schools. Schools meant taxes. Taxes meant public concern.

BUILDING FOR TEENS

One sign of the way things are going is the West Covina Teen Kan Teen Foundation, Inc. Sparked by a local industrialist, the project is putting up a youth center to be run by the teenagers themselves. The $50,000 structure, planned for completion this year, will be paid for by donations, owned by the city, and operated as a growing-by-leaps-and-bounds evidence of the community's care for its boys and girls.

Then there is the new vigor of the West Covina Chamber of Commerce, not only in rousing people here to the city's opportunities, but in beginning to tell the story nationally that this is a growing market of substantial importance to American enterprise.

Politically, things are changing. The days when land-development interests controlled the city council are giving way to broader representation. "There is a strong growth toward good government," one prominent citizen remarked.

Problems? Smog is one of them. It rolls this way from Los Angeles as inexorably as the heavy freeway traffic. By the same token, West Covina people realize that they are partly responsible. It is beginning to be said here, as in other cities around, that the job now is to begin to speak up, loudly and insistently, to demand and support remedial measures.

Soviet Stand on Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, with each passing day, I wonder how long we can continue to deal with a nation that heaps one lie on top of another, year in and year out. I, of course, refer to Soviet Russia.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter which appeared in the New York Times of April 18, 1959, which gives proof of another lie uttered by Nikita Khrushchev when he stated on March 7, 1959, that the Soviet Union had always been for a united Germany:

SOVIET STAND ON GERMANY—KHRUSHCHEV REMARK ON UNIFICATION DECLARED CONTRADICTED BY RECORD

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The New York Times of March 28 carried an interesting report from its Moscow correspondent Osgood Caruthers. He reported a speech Mr. Khrushchev had made on March 7 at Leipzig which was kept secret by the Soviet Government until March 27, when it was made public in Moscow.

In his Leipzig speech, Mr. Khrushchev declared that the Soviet Union had "always been for a united Germany." Mr. Khrushchev also asserted that the Soviet Government and especially Stalin had "persistently and consistently" advocated the idea of German unity.

Mr. Khrushchev knows how short the memory of the people is or he would never have made this statement, which I consider the most blatant lie he has ever told an audience. What is really astonishing is not the fact that he lied to the completely uninformed people of Soviet-controlled Germany, but that he dared release the lie to the free world, which knows better.

What are the facts? What does the record show? Did Stalin really persistently and consistently advocate the idea of German unity?

SECRETARY EDEN'S REPORT

Sir Winston Churchill in the third volume of his history of the Second World War reproduces on page 628 a report from his then Foreign Secretary, Anthony Eden, dated January 5, 1942. I quote:

"At my first conversation with M. Stalin and M. Molotov on December 16 (1941), M. Stalin set out in some detail what he considered should be the postwar territorial

frontiers in Europe, and in particular his ideas regarding the treatment of Germany. He proposed the restoration of Austria as an independent state, the detachment of the Rhineland from Prussia as an independent state or a protectorate and, possibly, the constitution of an independent state of Bavaria. He also proposed that East Prussia should be transferred to Poland."

In 1955 the Department of State published the Yalta papers, a documentary volume of 1,032 pages which obviously too few people have ever read.

Let me quote from the Bohlen minutes of the second plenary meeting, February 5, 1945, 4 p.m., Livadia Palace. (Present: Roosevelt, Churchill, Stalin):

"Marshal Stalin said that in the discussion of Germany he would like to include the following points:

"(1) The question of the dismemberment of Germany. * * * Marshal Stalin inquired whether the three Allies should bring up dismemberment at the time of the presentation of the terms of unconditional surrender. In fact, he added, would it not be wise to add a clause to these terms saying that Germany would be dismembered without going into any details?"

May I express the hope that our Voice of America and other propaganda media made ample use of these facts, giving the lie to Mr. Khrushchev?

JULIUS EPSTEIN.

International Aspects of Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, in the March 12 issue of the County Herald, the journal of the Jefferson County (Ala.) Teachers Association, there was published an article which I prepared for this periodical entitled "International Aspects of Education." With the thought that the article might be of interest to the Members of Congress, I am pleased to insert same herewith in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

INTERNATIONAL ASPECTS OF EDUCATION

We tend, so very often, to think about education in terms of the local viewpoint only. When education is mentioned our thoughts run straight to underpaid teachers, to crowded classrooms, to inadequate counseling and guidance for students, to the current American debate between the progressive educationists and the neoorthodox three R's supporters, and the question of whether Johnny and Janie can read. It is all well and good that we should indeed think first in terms of local education, for it is, obviously, on the local front that our efforts in behalf of better educational systems and methods and facilities have the most effect. Or I should say, it is on the city and county and State educational levels that we can most readily tell whether our efforts are having any effect whatsoever.

In any case, it is natural to consider education to be an immediate and intimate concern. What subject is there that receives more comment in the discussion of local affairs than this? Indeed, all of us talk about education and its needs, many of us worry about the problem, and a lot of us even try to do something about it.

Nevertheless, even if it is well and good and natural to think on education from the standpoint of what it means to Birmingham or Graysville or Shades Mountain, to Jefferson or Lamar or Baldwin Counties, or to the State of Alabama, I think we are detracting from the significance of the word if we do not extend our concept and consideration of education to an international scope.

How trite it must seem to you to read that your Congressman says that "the world is growing smaller each day" and that "today's foreigners are tomorrow's neighbors." And yet, how true. Is there anyone who has failed to be awed by the fact that jet planes and, more frightening, intercontinental ballistic missiles have stretched the meaning of "proximity" to include the entire world; distance is now so relative a term that it is measured in minutes and hours and only very rarely still in miles.

"Fly to Atlanta in 31 minutes," invites a local airline office. By the time most of you straighten up your desks at the end of the day, gather up your papers to grade and that complicated old Register to work on, and finally arrive home, the business executive who left Birmingham by plane at 3 p.m. is halfway to Washington. And on Saturday, if you are able to indulge yourselves and sleep 'til noon, do you realiez that the tourist who boarded the jet airliner in New York at 6:30 a.m.—the time you ordinarily have to get up—is now almost able to see the West England shore?

In saying that the world is becoming evermore smaller, we actually should be able to mean that our own private worlds are being enlarged. This brings us rather abruptly to one of the main points I am trying to make: education, as we look at it in and from Alabama, is, like travel, today necessarily considered universal in breadth. What we are doing in our local schools should not be automatically divorced from what the rest of the world is attempting to do in and through its educational institutions.

And yet there arises at this point a rather stinging question. If science and research and advanced knowledge—if education, in its broadest sense—have brought the nations of the world so close together, in the connotation that distance barriers have been broken down, what have science and technical skills and general education done to bring those human beings affected by this collapse of isolating geographical boundaries closer together from a different and more important standpoint?

How ironic it is that in an age when it is proclaimed that the moon is shortly to be visited by man, said man cannot seem to bridge the cultural gap between himself and people of the next hemisphere. How ironic that in an age when the suggestion that we may soon have to deal with Martians is not always made jestingly, Americans cannot not only not deal successfully and peacefully with the Russians who are their earthly enemies, but cannot even understand and deal with their longtime friends and neighbors in Latin America without great difficulty and many unnecessary misunderstandings.

I now proceed to answer part of that stinging question of what is being done in the field of education to narrow the cultural distances that still cause us to be in large measure intellectually confined to our own backyards. I will attempt to give only part of the answer because there is another part, even the most vital part, of the question that you yourselves must provide the answer to, and that is this: whatever we have done and are doing educationally to bring mankind on earth closer together in understanding and mutual appreciation, is it the right thing and have we done enough of it?

Perhaps my giving one answer to the question will enable you to consider more intelligently what your completing answer shall be. It is my hope that this is the case.

What America has done in international education is, quite naturally, largely synonymous with what the U.S. Government has done. By far the largest programs of international educational exchange are supported, totally or in part, by the Federal Government. But as these programs are based on the approval and support of the electorate, the Government's efforts in this field can, without stretching the point excessively, be equated with the efforts of the American people.

It was in connection with President Roosevelt's good neighbor policy with Latin America that the U.S. Government made its first significant commitment in the field of international education. A year after the Convention for the Promotion of Inter-American Cultural Relations had met in Buenos Aires in 1936, the Congress of the United States gave statutory authority for a broad program of exchange of persons betwen the United States and other American Republics to the end of extending scientific, technical, and general cultural relations with these countries.

The Second World War interrupted continuing development of such programs. It was that war, however, which was surely the most singularly shocking factor in our final realization that international cultural and educational exchanges were vitally necessary if peace was to prevail, however shakily, in the world. Thus it was that at the end of the war the U.S. Congress overwhelmingly approved a measure introduced by Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, to use some of the currencies and credits of other countries acquired by the United States through the sale of surplus property abroad for educational purposes. Two years later, in 1948, the United States Informational and Educational Exchange Act (often called the Smith-Mundt Act) authorized a worldwide program of broad purposes. Its intent was to "enable the Government of the United States to promote a better understanding of the United States in other countries, and to increase the mutual understanding between the people of the United States and the people of other countries," by providing for "an educational service to cooperate with other nations in (a) the interchange of persons, knowledge, and skills; (b) the rendering of technical and other services; and (c) the interchange of developments in the field of education, the arts, and sciences."

In addition, several other acts of Congress have provided for particular and distinctive educational exchanges with specific countries; such agreements exist with Finland and India, for example.

Aside from the international educational exchange programs which are operated mainly under the Fulbright and Smith-Mundt Acts by the Department of State, there are two other principal programs that relate to higher education. One is the program of educational activities of the International Cooperation Administration (ICA) which includes mainly the technical cooperation program authorized by the Mutual Security Act of 1954. The other is the basic program of the U.S. Information Agency (USIA) which is largerly educational in nature and includes distinctly educational pursuits and aids.

There are some programs of international exchange on the secondary school level that are partially supported by the Government and I shall shortly deal with them and raise the question of whether they should receive extended support.

To summarize briefly the differences between the main programs related to higher education in general, the primary objective of the Smith-Mundt and the Fulbright programs is to increase international understanding to understanding abroad of the

United States, its culture, and its foreign policy. This is done by sending American grantees abroad and bringing foreign nationals to this country, keeping this prime objective in mind. The specific educational or technical activities of the individuals involved in this program are of secondary interest.

In the ICA program, in contrast, the primary objective is to increase some specific technical competence abroad with specific ICA-sponsored projects. For example, prior to the building of a dam in Iran using joint American and Iranian funds, U.S. technicians are selected and sent overseas and/or Iranian engineers are brought to this country with the objective of accomplishing a particular technical-educational aim relative to the project.

The USIA has a multipurposed and broad-ranged field of activity. Through their offices located in principal foreign cities, they disseminate general information about the United States to anyone who requests it. Aside from sponsoring regular programs, such as providing public libraries where foreigners can obtain copies of every important American literary work, the USIA cooperates with American teacher-grantees by providing them background information for lectures, films on various aspects of our country, and such free souvenirs as maps of the United States to be distributed. They are also called upon to provide similar information to such study groups, civic organizations, and particular individuals as request them in those areas where there are offices of the Agency. There is no doubt that the USIA activity of supplying millions of dollars worth of American texts to foreign universities and secondary schools markedly affects instruction in these educational institutions, and this is particularly true in the underdeveloped countries.

Under the Fulbright Act of 1946, particular bilateral arrangements were authorized between the United States and individual nations. Made through the executive branch of the Government, these agreements provide for the exchange of persons for educational purposes. By the present time, 39 countries have concluded agreements with the United States to participate in this program. This program also permits granting of scholarships to foreign nationals to study in American-sponsored schools abroad. In the first year of its implemented existence (1948), the act saw an exchange of some 237 persons. This number has increased steadily, with the increased number of bilateral agreements involved, until by 1957 there were some 6,000 participants in the program that year. About one-third of these were Americans who went abroad to study at the university or graduate level, to teach on secondary or university level, to engage in particular research projects, to act as consultants to foreign governments or organizations, or to lecture before general audiences on topics of current interest. The remaining two-thirds of the participants were foreign nationals who engaged generally in the same type activities in this country.

Under the Smith-Mundt Act, which calls for exchange of persons for the same type purpose but promotes more specifically programs sponsored by academic institutions, libraries, nonprofit organizations, and business and industrial organizations, the number of persons participating each year has also grown to about 6,000 in the past few years. Under both the Smith-Mundt Act and the Fulbright Act, over 50,000 persons have participated in this international educational exchange.

The total cost of the two programs has grown to almost $25 million per annum, but it is well to remember that this is in large measure provided by what amounts to interest on wartime loans to foreign nations and by the sale of surplus property in foreign countries claimed by the United States as partial payment of debts owed to our Government by those countries.

There are several other programs carried on by the Government that should be mentioned. One of these is the cultural presentations staff, established by Congress in 1954 at the request of the President, which has undertaken a program to assist cultural and athletic groups with foreign tours. This proved to be such a successful venture that 2 years after the program was set up by Congress on an emergency basis, it was made into a continuing activity by that body in an act approved August 1, 1956. Under the auspices of this program, over 2,500 American artists and athletes have performed in over 90 foreign countries.

This activity, along with special ones like our presentations at the recent World's Fair at Brussels, may not in the strictest sense deal with education. But it does, after all, educate those who view the presentations, of whatever nature, in the ways of American culture and tradition, and does so in a manner that perhaps cannot be equaled in any other way.

One of the most recent developments in the area of educational and cultural exchanges was the recent agreement between our Government and the U.S.S.R. to swap movies, radio, and television broadcasts, and magazines as well as exchange professors and graduate students for a period of 2 years, beginning in January 1958. Other exchanges are to take place between athletic teams and outstanding entertainment groups and artists. The most significant venture on the part of the United States under this agreement is the upcoming merchandise fair our Government is sponsoring in Moscow to show off our outstanding peaceable commodities, commonplace to us but which the average Russian will surely look on in wonder. Who can doubt whether this will make for good propaganda for our Nation in Russia?

In other areas of student exchange outside the Fulbright and Smith-Mundt Acts, the State Department also makes a contribution. Each year for the past several years, the Department has given grants-in-aid to such groups as the American Field Service. This is the largest of 5 privately sponsored organizations that promotes the exchange of students on the high school level. It is this program which perhaps presents the most interesting aspect of international education to you, for foreign exchange students are currently placed in several schools in Birmingham, Jefferson County, and Alabama. Perhaps you know first hand how very much one student from Norway or France or Germany can do to increase your students' interest in that country and to increase even community interest in learning about social and educational practices of foreign countries. Even a spark of such interest, when kindled by an interesting personality in the form of an exchange student, can result in solid friendships and greater mutual appreciation.

And I think I should mention that even a more important result of having exchange students in our high schools is that our young Americans take another look at our own culture and our own institutions in order better to answer the questions put to them by the "foreigner"; they know that for him it is not just an academic question, as is the case when a teacher poses it and already knows the book answer, but an innocent and sincere one that demands a thoughtful reply.

This program of high school student exchanges reached a number of 1,500 participants in 1958. They came from 38 countries. The Government subsidy of this program, in the form of grants-in-aid from the Department of State amounted to $125,000 in that year, a very small sum compared to the amounts spent in connection with exchanges on the university and higher educational levels. I wonder if it is your experience that this program is sufficently worthwhile to be enlarged and to receive greater Government support?

To refer again to the program affecting higher education, a recent survey was made by the U.S. Advisory Commission of Educational Exchange of the views of college presidents whose institutions were involved in student and teacher international exchanges. These men indicated their belief that the program has benefited higher education in several particular ways. One was that the caliber of the foreign scholarship winners to the United States was so superior that it enabled admissions officers to set up proper criteria for admitting other foreign students who wish to study independently. Another was that foreign students make important contributions to academic and community life especially through the interpretation of their cultures to the American people. They further said that presence of foreign students on the campus stimulates among the student body and faculty an increased interest in foreign affairs, and this is particularly true as regards those individuals who do not specialize in foreign languages or international affairs.

That the effect of those who have studied or taught abroad is beneficial to the institution to which an individual returns in the United States is, I think, almost universally true. There can be no question that foreign study is an immense boon to language teachers.

And finally, in most instances, those Americans who go abroad to teach, study, lecture, or engage in research, are generally successful in presenting the American way of life, the American culture, and the American viewpoint.

It will perhaps be of particular interest to you to have the report of a friend of mine recently returned from a year's study in Europe that even regional American cultures and traditions are appreciated by the European student of America. He states that one of the most popular courses taught at the University of Strasbourg, by an American Fulbright professor of English, was on the works of Mark Twain. Thus a greater understanding of America and Americans was gained by analyzing a particular region during a particular period. This should be reassuring to those of us who are concerned lest our friends across the seas think of us in terms of Brooklyn accents and Hollywood riches.

There have, of course, been areas of dissatisfaction with these programs. Foreign students complain sometimes that they have not been able to get the type of education for which they came here. Some have manifested a general inability to adjust appropriately to the American system of education which differs so widely from their own. Likewise, Americans gone abroad to study or teach often find that language barriers and local social customs sometimes make it extremely difficult to become sufficiently acquainted with the local populace to do any educating along the general lines proposed as the main point of the program, that is, the familiarization of foreign friends with the American culture and viewpoint.

One of these difficulties, it might be mentioned here, is the result of our all too meager emphasis on foreign languages in secondary and higher education. It is to be hoped this situation will shortly be ameliorated.

Such then is the general picture of the program of international education currently being carried on by the U.S. Government. It is not by any means the complete picture, but perhaps it will suffice to stir your thoughts and inquiries on the subject. I insist again that it is indeed important that you and I, along with those who are perhaps

not so intimately connected with education, do take time to consider the subject from an international viewpoint.

Those who are today's students are tomorrow's teachers of men; and if there is a student or a potential student in any part of the world who is today denied access to the light of truth, it may well be he who helps bring darkness on the world tomorrow.

What the Recognition of East Germany Would Mean

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, next month formal negotiations on Berlin and on the whole of Germany will begin. I am distressed that there is, as recent surveys have shown, so little understanding of the many and complex elements of this problem. For this reason, I ask that an unusually clear and thorough article by Arthur J. Olsen which appeared in the New York Times, April 19, be reprinted in the RECORD where it will be available for both Members of Congress and interested citizens.

The article follows:

WHAT THE RECOGNITION OF EAST GERMANY WOULD MEAN

(By Arthur J. Olsen)

BONN, GERMANY, April 18.—The cancellation by Nikita S. Khrushchev of his May 27 deadline and his agreement to negotiate on Berlin have obscured the hard fact that the Western allies will be negotiating with the Soviet Union in the coming months under duress.

The Soviet Union demanded last November 27 that the four-power occupation of Berlin be ended and that the Western sectors be turned into a demilitarized free city. This should be accomplished within 6 months, the Soviet note said.

The United States, Britain, and France, whose presence alone sustains 2,200,000 West Berliners against implacable Communist pressure, snapped back that they would not negotiate under duress.

Premier Khrushchev has since backed off from his most arrogant demand, the time ultimatum. Thus the West was able to accept negotiation of the Berlin problem, with the meeting of foreign ministers in Geneva on May 11 to be the first round.

ZERO HOUR

Although the Western allies were able to preserve their self-respect they could not wipe out the realities of the Berlin situation. The clock is still ticking toward the zero hour when Mr. Khrushchev will act to change the status of West Berlin to his liking. What is not known in the West—and very likely not even in the Kremlin—is the calendar date on which zero hour may fall.

During his visit to East Germany last month the Soviet Premier laid out the procedures he proposes to follow if the West refuses to accept a reasonable solution of the Berlin crisis.

The Soviet Union is determined to give Germany a peace treaty that would "settle the remnants of the war," he said. If the West will not go along, and if the West Germany Republic refuses to sign the proposed Soviet treaty, then the pact will be made with the Communist East German regime alone.

The Soviet treaty draft recognizes the German Democratic Republic as a sovereign state with unlimited authority over its territory. Existing limitations on the territorial sovereignty of the East German state would fall away. The exception would be the free city of West Berlin, which the German Democratic Republic would recognize even though it formally claims all Berlin as part of its territory.

This is the heart of the Soviet challenge to the Western presence in Berlin.

SOVIET RESPONSIBILITY

The Soviet Union now holds itself to be, along with the three Western occupation powers, the ultimate authority in Greater Berlin. And it accepts a responsibility to provide the Western powers with access to their sectors of the city by road, rail, air and waterway.

If the Soviet Union made a separate treaty with its East German satellite, it could—and Mr. Khrushchev has promised it would—turn over that responsibility to the East Germans.

In a practical sense this would probably be effected simply by the withdrawal of Soviet control personnel at various checkpoints on the transzonal travel routes. One day there would be only the green-uniformed East German frontier police to stamp documents, check cargoes and wave travelers along their way.

Only in the air corridors, which leap over Soviet or East German control points, would it be difficult to translate a political decision into flesh and blood reality.

AIR CONTROL

East German officials have hinted at a solution of their potential air control problem. They would demand that aircraft making the flight between West Germany and Berlin make an interim stop at Madgeburg 40 miles inside the Soviet zone frontier. There East German sovereignty would be exercised by a check of passengers and cargo moving in or out of West Berlin, an enclave which would still be beyond their reach.

For most West Germans and persons other than allied government personnel, the change in regime would not make an immediate difference. All nonofficial traffic to and from West Berlin has been controlled by East German personnel for the past 10 years.

There would be one drastic change, however, if the East Germans managed to secure control of air traffic. Nearly 3,000 refugees, persons technically guilty of crime, complete their escape from East Germany by air every week. Moreover, thousands of West Germans—those on the Communist "wanted" list—would be deprived of their only secure means of entering or leaving Berlin.

At the moment the East German policemen stepped into the Soviet's huts perched at all zonal crossing points the United States, British, and French Governments would reach the hour of decision.

They could ignore the change and meet force with force if necessary. They could bow to the threat of force and fall back on a new airlift—assuming Soviet fighters let planes come through—while the issue was submitted to diplomacy.

Or they could instruct their official personnel to submit themselves and their vehicles to East German surveillance.

But this decision would mean de facto recognition of a sovereign East German state. When disputes arose over interpretations of access rules, Western plenipotentiaries would have to sit down with East German officials and negotiate a solution as equal parties.

If the Western allies chose to disregard the sweeping political consequences of recognizing the East German regime, they might be able to negotiate agreements for more or less unhindered access. This would be a dubious attempt because the East Germans have already declared such commodities as explosive and "propaganda materials" to be unacceptable in interzonal traffic.

Such an agreement would postpone but not avoid an eventual showdown on the road to Berlin. The Communist aim is to drive Western forces out of the city. The peace treaty which the Soviets and East Germans would sign would make those forces' continued presence, in the Communist view, illegal.

It is possible, but unlikely, that the Communist powers would seek to correct that allegedly illegal situation by expelling Allied garrisons by force of arms. Western experts believe a policy of slow strangulation would be adopted, conceivably taking years to execute.

The Communists could use control of access routes gradually to cripple Allied communications and obtain control of the West Berlin economy. Vital shipments of industrial goods from the West could be held up on pretexts. The products of West Berlin's big electrical industry could be barred from export as "war materials." Food supplies from the West could be rejected as "unsanitary."

There might never have to be another Berlin blockade to achieve the Soviet objectives. The day might come when the suffering population of West Berlin would ask Western garrisons to depart. Coexistence on East German terms or even total capitulation to Communist pressure would look preferable to slow strangulation.

Long before this melancholy moment the political consequences of the recognition of East Germany would be apparent. In the simplest terms the West would have recognized a permanent Soviet hegemony in Eastern Europe.

The West would have to fashion a new European policy in which many of the present anathemas, such as the confederation of the two German states and military disengagement predicated on a neutralized Germany, would lose their point.

West Germany's firm adherence to the Western camp would be subjected to searching questioning within the country. The satellite populations would have to find other reasons than the United States' encouragement to maintain their rearguard resistance to communization.

Perhaps the great powers could fashion an acceptable new order in Europe after abandonment of the Western policy which has stood since the Potsdam meeting in 1945. Perhaps the Western alliance would crumble, as Chancellor Konrad Adenauer says it would, following capitulation on Berlin.

Certainly there would follow a profound and unforseeable change in Europe. This is the measure of the duress under which Western statesmen will labor as they sit down at the negotiating table in Geneva.

Vital Importance of Informational Media Guarantee Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include a statement by Curtis G. Benjamin, president of the American Book Publishers Council, that I hope will be read by my colleagues who may not be fully informed as to the vital importance

of our informational media guarantee program. The statement follows:

ONE BATTLE WE'RE LOSING AND WHY

(A statement by Curtis G. Benjamin, president, American Book Publishers Council, president, McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc.)

A country's primary export is its knowledge. Books are primary vehicles of knowledge. That is why books are in the vanguard of the export trade of all the great exporting nations of the world.

The Russians know this. In 1957, the U.S.S.R. printed 30 million books exclusively for export, many in English, and all in the languages of the non-Communist world.[1] In the languages of the Near East alone, they printed and distributed 413,600 books in 1957, as compared with 166,415 in 1956.[2] Russian textbooks on engineering are to be published in India in English under a technical aid agreement between the U.S.S.R. and India signed in Moscow on December 13, 1958—another example of the many international publishing activities directed from Moscow.

The Soviet book export program started seriously about a decade ago. Recently the Russians have started a world trade drive. For them, as for others in the past, books are proving the forerunners of trade. Books are the advance guard of the Soviet economic challenge because, in selling, as every good salesman knows, the first thing a man has to sell is his ideas. It is the same with nations.

Two of the leading exporting nations of the Western World—Britain and West Germany—have proved this principle in their recent history. German book exports in 1938 were $3,700,000, a total attained with the help of a government subsidy which enabled German publishers to sell their books abroad at 25 percent below domestic prices.[3] In 1958, book exports from West Germany alone were $20,500,000.

Britain, which lives by export, has traditionally exported more of its book production than any other nation. Today it exports one book in every two produced. The British have a favorite dictum: "Trade follows the book." They have proved its accuracy.

Where does the United States stand in this race—a race, as it seems, for markets, but underlying that, a race for men's minds? The United States stand poorly. Excluding sales to Canada, only 5 percent (as compared with Britain's 50 percent) of the U.S. book production is exported. This means about $35 million, as compared with West Germany's $20,500,000. It means roughly 20 million books, as compared with the U.S.S.R.'s 30 million.

Soviet Russia is thus exporting about one-and-a-half times as many books as the United States today. Plainly, the export of American books is only a fraction of what it could be and should be. Why?

In expanding book exports, the American publishing industry faces two obstacles which it cannot overcome unaided. One is the comparatively high cost of producing a book in the United States; the other is the shortage of dollar exchange in many countries. The Russians have neither of these problems to solve. Soviet publishing is state-subsidized and exported books are sold for nominal sums paid in the currencies of the importers.

Even in the face of these two severe limitations, U.S. book exports have grown dramatically in the past decade, from approximately $11 million in 1946 to last year's $35 million (both figures excluding Canada). Within its resources, the American publishing industry is playing its part by vigorous cultivation of the overseas markets for books. Several textbook publishers have begun to reprint important textbooks in English in Asia at one-half to one-third of their U.S. costs, thus bringing them within reach of the mass student market in Asian countries. The American paperback has become a symbol of low cost in those countries which have dollars to spend on book imports. But the demand among the key people in other countries for serious technical, scientific, educational, and professional books requires durable, hard-bound and—in terms of the world's average purchasing power—expensive editions which are not needed in the very large quantities that make low-priced paperbacks possible.

The U.S. Government has shown itself not unaware of the national importance of the export of books.

To alleviate the problem of cost, the U.S. Information Agency and the International Cooperation Administration have supplemented commercial sales by placing books in libraries overseas, by donating books to educational institutions and by presenting books to key individuals in the industry and governments of the developing countries of the world. But these programs are small in relation to the need.

To alleviate the problem of exchange, the U.S. Information Agency has administered, since 1949, the informational media guranty (IMG) program. This has enabled publishers of books judged to be worthy of the American way of life to sell their books, for local currency, in countries such as the Philippines, Formosa, Vietnam, Burma, Indonesia, Pakistan, Turkey, Israel, Poland, Yugoslavia, Spain, or Chile, which would otherwise have been unable to buy books because of shortage of exchange.

The IFG program is not a giveaway. Publishers have to sell their books and customers overseas have to want them enough to buy them. IMG merely guarantees that the exporting publisher receives in dollars the payments he collects from his customers in their currency. IMG costs very little in terms of our total foreign military and economic aid and accomplishes much. In 10 years it has enabled the sale of $150 million worth of books, magazines and films to countries of key economic and strategic importance, at a cost of $10 million.

Yet while our defense budget, in a cold war which everyone knows is primarily a battle for men's minds, is freely voted billions of dollars, the budgetarily obscure and modest IMG program has been slashed for the fiscal year 1958–59 and faces another reduction for 1959–60.

The first cut took place last August, when Congress reduced a requested appropriation from $7 million to $2½ million. This money was needed to restore the revolving fund on which IMG operates and which, due to unavoidable loss on the resale of exchange by the U.S. Information Agency in the past 10 years, has shrunk from its original $28 million to $8 million, plus another $10 million in inconvertible currencies.

The result of this cut is that some countries, whose friendship and understanding we seek today and with whom we shall seek to build a trading partnership in future, cannot obtain American books up to the level of their need. There are countries today where schoolteachers, college professors, students, engineers, doctors, businessmen, scholars—book users of every description—need American books and cannot get them. The loss is not only theirs. It is that of the United States to the extent that this country values its influence in the world and believes that this influence is a force for good.

We believe that the frustrations of book exporting are more than a problem for the export departments of American publishers to solve. They are, or should be, a matter of vital concern to all American citizens. Trade is but the visible and outward sign of that which follows the book. The international exchange of books leads directly to a better world understanding, and thus to peace. Books are a country's most basic commodity. Nothing unites the causes of culture and commerce so effectively. A book costs less, lasts longer and penetrates more deeply than any other means of communicating ideas.

The real battlefields of the cold war are not in the missile bases alone. They are in Nigeria, where a professor is setting up a curriculum for a new college. They are in Brazil, where a businessman is wrestling with a personnel problem. They are in Burma, where idealistic young officials are striving to master the principles of public administration. They are in Japan, where a salesman is trying to prove the principles of free enterprise in his daily life. They are in Poland, where a distinguished scholar finds hope in the researches of his colleagues of the West. They are in Indonesia, where 10 students are sharing a dog-eared textbook. They are in the minds of men in every country in the world. Men with problems turn to books. They can turn only to the books that are available.

We appeal to Congress to restore the IMG program to a level which will insure that any country willing to sign an agreement to buy American books, at their full price, with its own currency, should be permitted to do so.

We appeal to Congress to equip the appropriate agencies of the Government to make more books available at low cost or as outright gifts to individuals and institutions in Asia, Africa, and South America who desire and deserve them.

This needed action on the part of Congress involves relatively small expenditure of Federal funds. What American taxpayer would grudge a fraction of a cent of his dollar to place a good book in the hands of a man who needs it? Without it, this is one battle that we shall continue to lose.

[1] Publishers' Weekly.

[2] USIA release.

[3] Memorandum of Reichsschrifttumskammer (German Chamber of Literature), Aug. 27, 1935.

Nixon Concentrates on Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., Friday, April 17, 1959:

NIXON CONCENTRATES ON ISSUES—VICE PRESIDENT SEEN NOW EMPLOYING CALM REASON ON NATION'S PROBLEMS

(By William S. White)

Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON has put away one weapon—his old mastery of producing useful headlines built upon intense controversy within the Nation. He is now brilliantly employing another and a softer tactic, in new circumstances.

He is progressively drawing favorable attention by persuasion and calm reasonableness, where he used to demand it by loud threshing about on the national scene. He is a world away from the NIXON who, only short months ago, led a hotly partisan GOP congressional campaign because this seemed the only possible way to stir the Republican sluggards.

There will be here, however, no nonsense about "new NIXONS" and "old NIXONS." A golfer is not a new golfer if on the 14th hole the lay of the land and of his ball requires him to put the iron back in the back and begin a series of spoon shots.

To watch Mr. NIXON these days, approve him or disapprove him, is to watch a truly virtuoso political performance. The fact that his antennae to public moods and changing public attitudes are extraordinarily sensitive has, of course, long been obvious. What is now striking is the way in which Mr. NIXON—who is, underneath, a curiously lonely and one-man operator—is using those fabulous antennae to master his great problem for 1960.

On all form, on such "gut" facts as his present control of much of the regular GOP organization, he is the distinct favorite for the 1960 presidential nomination. No one, however, is more acutely aware than is Mr. NIXON that Gov. Nelson Rockefeller of New York already poses a real threat and might offer a massive threat before convention time.

The Vice President's vulnerability lies in this: He came up strictly via the route of controversy and the soundest single objection to him is fear he might be a divisive force in the White House. To be thought of as that kind of symbol is to some degree always harmful to a presidential contender. To be seen in that light in 1960, in a perilous world, probably would be fatal to him.

Thus, given this as his basic potential weakness, what is he doing to strengthen his position? He is presenting himself as an evermellowing public figure, and he is doing a good job of it. He is staying out of the partisan fighting that used to occupy him almost endlessly. He is equally staying out of such infighting as there is among the Republicans—who, unlike the Democrats, never forget that their true antagonists are not each other but rather the opposition party.

He is accepting only a very few speaking engagements, and of those all are in markedly high-level, and preferably even academic, surroundings. He is speaking of big matters like the world court; his tone is much the tone of a man who is already President and more interested in a country than in a party. He is saying generous things, even about the Democrats.

These things are meant, for Mr. NIXON, whatever his faults, has no phoniness in him. But they are the kind of remarks he never would have uttered until Mr. Rockefeller began to breath genially down his neck. For the Vice President, until lately, has been, by circumstances, in the rock-'em, sock-'em school of politics. One of his old models in this actually was a man not overfond of him—Harry S. Truman.

But Mr. Nixon now follows the basic techniques, not of Mr. Truman, but of Franklin D. Roosevelt. Mr. Roosevelt maintained power largely by tying himself close to great all-national issues. This, and not merely his famous personality, enabled him to sustain a quite illogical coalition between conservative Southern planters and Detroit auto workers.

Mr. NIXON, in sum, is becoming what he always would have preferred to be, an issue politician as distinguished from a personality politician. His improving place in the polls is probably thus explained.

He has decided that the public is already a bit tired of the old faces—including NIXON'S. And he knows that in any personality contest with Nelson Rockefeller he would be fighting in the wrong field. He is, therefore, moving to force Governor Rockefeller to engage him in quite another field—the field of largely impersonal issues.

The odds are at least even that before it is over Mr. Rockefeller will find himself playing in Mr. NIXON'S ballpark.

Address by Dr. Alvin J. Carlson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL F. SCHENCK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, the Medical Society of Montgomery County, Ohio, has long been regarded as an outstanding and active professional organization with many forward looking ideas. The members and officers of the Montgomery County Medical Society have always taken a very active interest in all civic matters in our area, throughout the State of Ohio, and the Nation. They have also always used great care in the selection of their members in the various elective offices of their society. Those elected to serve during 1959 are no exception.

Frequently we have heard it said that medical societies have exercised considerable reluctance to consider or approve legislative proposals which in any way seem to infringe upon what some have referred to as their selfish professional interest. Some have said that these medical societies have always been against such legislative proposals and have not been willing to suggest a program they, as professional men and women, could and would support.

Dr. Alvin J. Carlson, M.D., is president of the Montgomery County, Ohio, Medical Society this year. His inaugural address, on January 9, 1959, discusses many questions confronting the medical profession and makes some very pertinent observations on these socioeconomic problems.

In the hope that Dr. Carlson's address will prove both informative and helpful to Members of the Congress and will also be illustrative of the well considered views of at least the president of one important medical society. I ask under unanimous consent, that Dr. Carlson's address be made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The address follows:

INAUGURAL ADDRESS BY A. J. CARLSON, M.D., JANUARY 9, 1959

My secretary has told me, in answer to my question as to why I have been elected president of the county medical society, that it is "easier to control a fractious horse when you have the bit in his mouth, than when when he is loose in the field." Be that as it may, I am cognizant of the honor and responsibility.

I am sorry that my father could not have lived to be here this evening. If he had, he would have said "Vel, Al, now that you are president, vot are you going to do?" This question has been ringing in my ears for the past several months. In the end I decided to do just what he would have done, and that is to voice my opinion as to the major problems confronting organized medicine and to say how I think we should deal with them.

A year ago my predecessor, Dr. Black, was worried about the possibility that I might have to preside over the wake of the medical society. I have always had a weak spot in my heart for the idea of wakes, though I have never attended one. However, death is the one major requisite for a wake and the medical society is far from dead.

Dr. Black's concern, of course, was in regard to the prospect of socialized medicine. I have never lived under a system of fully socialized medicine, but I, along with most of the rest of the practitioners of today, assume it is bad. This may or may not be a warranted assumption. Further, as I see it, it may be inevitable.

If we consider that socialized medicine is not a good system, and is not inevitable, then we, in organized medicine, are committed to fight it. To do this requires a positive program of study on the shortcomings of our present system, and a positive program toward the alleviation of these shortcomings, because herein lies the major impetus for a change in systems, in my opinion.

It was poor and shortsighted practices on the part of capital and management that gave the impetus to the formation of labor unions. It is probable that poor and shortsighted practices by labor unions will result in other major changes in this field. I hope it will not be because of poor and shortsighted practices by organized medicine that socialized medicine will take over.

Medicine, under the private practice system, with the help of the basic scientists and the public health men, has made the United States one of the healthiest countries in the world. This is because through the years changes have been made in materia medica, methods and techniques. Organized medicine, during this time, has been responsible for some of the changes and has dragged its feet on others.

The horse and buggy type of medicine is gone and in its place is a highly specialized, highly technical, hospital dependent type of practice. This has resulted in a lowering of infant mortality and an increase in average lifespan in this country that equals the best in the world. On the face of it one might think that these facts would be enough argument against changing the system, and many so think.

For my part, however, it seems that this very progress has brought with it problems equal to, or more difficult of reasonable solution, than those with which we started. First, the progress mentioned has resulted in an increase cost of good medical care, quite apart from inflation, that takes it out of the common man's budget. Second, the major effect of this progress has been to change the ratio between births and deaths with the end result that population in general is burgeoning and the ration of people over 65 to the rest of the population is becoming a major socioeconomic and health problem.

In the past the medical armamentarium consisted of poultices, potions, cupping, bleeding and probing, and pregnant women were delivered in the home. This resulted in the death of many patients, mothers and babies, but was relatively cheap. Nowadays we have at our disposal life-saving drugs of so many different types, and new ones are being developed so frequently that a medical textbook is, for practical purposes, out of date when it is printed. These drugs occupy hours of the pharmacists' time to stock and catalog and distribute, and they occupy hours of the nurses' time to administer and record. So much so that the old fashioned patient care by registered nurses must be turned over to a new group, the practical nurses.

Nowadays we have hospitals piped for oxygen, and suction systems; they are wired for radio and recorded music in every room—even elevators and halls. Laboratory and other studies available as aids to the physician are numerous and highly complicated. They require expensive machines and instruments and scientists to run them.

With the use of advanced surgical and medical techniques, advanced medical anesthesiology, and blood banks, bone banks, artery banks, heart-lung pumps, artificial kidneys, etc., we keep people alive today who wouldn't have had a chance in the past.

We literally bring people back from death and we keep people alive who have demonstrated a strong desire to die. All of these achievements and the wherewithal it takes to achieve them are considered good and I am not the one to argue this point, but I do wish to emphasize the expense involved.

We keep people alive very frequently to the age of 70 and 80 and over. Some are vigorous and active and some are mentally or physically crippled. Even if they are vigorous we retire them at 65 with or without pensions. The domiciliary and health care of those older people who are mentally, physically, or financially crippled is a monumental and poorly answered problem now, and what will it be when and if we solve the problem of cancer and degenerative vascular disease?

We have evolved a health and longevity climate in this country that everybody loves and feels he is entitled to the benefits of. We must now in some positive way work out the means for this enjoyment on a private practice basis or people will get it by means which are onerous to us. It is not enough to cry out against something, to ridicule or belittle. Some better solution must be offered.

The record of doctors and of organized medicine in the field of socioeconomic problems relating to health is somewhat spotty. Voluntary prepayment health insurance plans were once decried by spokesmen of the AMA and now we are hanging on voluntary health insurance coat tails to save us from socialized medicine. Doctors cry out against hospital costs and preach efficiency, little realizing that they themselves have created these costs, and as a group could be more efficient.

Organized medicine has opposed third party and closed panel medicine, which has been proposed or instituted by both labor and management for efficiency purposes, because it disturbs the right of the patient to choose his own physician. There is strong opposition among doctors to voluntary service type insurance contracts because it disturbs the right of the physician to set his own fee.

Government attempts to insure medical and hospital care for the over 65 age group are opposed on the basis that it is an entering wedge for socialized medicine. This entering wedge, however, was inserted years ago, and we have not come up with a satisfactory or reasonable counterproposal.

I, for one, am not willing to believe that management, labor and government are proposing or instituting these programs because they wish to change the basic system of medical practice per se, out of spite, so to speak. They are simply trying to get good medical care to their constituents on a more efficient or economical basis. If their solutions are anathema to us then we are obligated to propose methods of achieving the same result on terms that are satisfactory to us. This will not be easy and in my opinion cannot be done by clinging to the status quo. Changes must be made—changes commensurate with the change from horse-and-buggy medicine to the type practiced today.

Voluntary, nonprofit, health insurance, organized medicine's sheet anchor in these stormy seas, is having a tough go of it. It cannot pay the ever increasing cost of today's medical care without raising premiums. This has been done and must be done again until the average person will not be able to pay the premiums. When this happens on any significant scale, private practice as we know it will disappear.

The foregoing brief analysis contains the gist of what I consider to be the major problems facing medicine today in our society and I submit that doctors and organized medicine must be active participants in their solution, rather than bleacher spectators. We must not merely view with alarm.

What then, can the Montgomery County Medical Society propose as a positive program to save private practice of medicine? The following suggestions are made because I believe in the private practice system and would hate to see it fail. They are not all original with me and I am sure they are not the only ones that could be made. They deal with many aspects of the problem and there is much overlapping. The first group has to do with attempts to lower the cost of medical care so that voluntary health insurance can survive, and so that more individuals will be able to pay for their own care.

First, there must be closer liaison between hospital administration, hospital staffs, insurance companies and the medical society on the local level. In Dayton this could be worked out through the now-existing hospital council. In this group the following possibilities would be studied, discussed, and implemented:

I. An ending of domiciliary care in general hospitals. This insurance breaking situation exists for reasons too numerous to mention here, and we all know it. Basically there are reasons related to patients' and relatives' desires, to hospital administration habits and to doctors' convenience.

Patient and relative desires for hospitalization may be cut down by using a form of deductible insurance that requires an initial cash payment by the patient; by having more and better medical coverage of more and better convalescent, rest, and nursing homes; and by having some insurance coverage of a reasonable amount of nonhospital diagnostic workup. Here, also, more home care by doctors of all specialties and the performance of more minor surgery in offices would help.

General hospitals operate full time on the basis of at the most a 6-day week and in some departments less. Hospital charges which must be paid by insurance companies or individuals go on 7 days per week. This results in many expensive, wasted hospital days which could be ended by having hospital diagnostic and treatment services available every day on something more than an emergency basis.

Domiciliary care results from patients having to wait in hospitals because surgery time is not available or because a particular time is not suitable to the surgeon or the referring physician. Real cooperative effort could alleviate this situation. Bacteria, viruses, and cancer cells do not know about Sundays and holidays, and they never heard of the 40-hour week. In their ignorance they work most all the time. Perhaps we should reorganize our defense.

Prehospital consultation in the office and in the home would eliminate many wasted hospital days as recently demonstrated in Allentown, Pa. There are, I am sure, many other areas where this particular type of unnecessary expense to insurance companies and individuals could be reduced significantly.

II. Other subjects which could be explored by representatives of medicine, insurance companies, and hosiptal administrators, I will mention more briefly to save time. But they are items which, if successfully solved, would reduce the cost of medical care.

(a) Study, emphasize, and extend the practice of dividing hospitals into areas of intensive, routine, and ambulatory care. In this way we could save by economically using our present insufficient supply of nurses, as well as by not having to have entire hospitals fitted with very expensive gadgets meant primarily for intensive care.

(b) A thorough-going objective analysis of the economy and efficiency of the installation of highly expensive, highly technical, and only occasionally used equipment in more than one hospital in the area. I refer here to diagnostic and treatment setups used only on a part-time basis and I wonder if the case load to be expected will justify the large expenditure. Analysis and action in this area is to me indicated nationally as well as locally.

(c) The group mentioned above could study the possible saving to be had by popularizing the use by doctors of generic, instead of brand names, for drugs. Economies in inventory and distribution could be had in hospital and other pharmacies by this method. In addition some encouragement could be given to pharmaceutical houses to reduce the extensive and expensive advertising which is mailed to doctors. It is possible that this might reduce the cost of drugs.

(d) A study of our present methods for nurses training and graduate nurse utilization might reveal that savings could be made here. I have in mind the waste expensive specialized training which results when a great number of registered nurses end up as doctors' secretaries or receptionists or who soon become married and leave nursing altogether. Exploration in this field might easily reduce costs.

(e) Finally, in the light of the aforementioned studies, it may appear that more efficient use of the general hospital beds we have would obviate the necessity of building more general hospitals at this time, or in the near future.

III. Still another possibly verboten region in which doctors, by themselves, could reduce the cost of medical care would be in reducing the amount of unnecessary medical and surgical treatment. This would involve a certain amount of doctor self-education and self-policing, as well as education of the public, that it is not necessarily true that a given ache requires a pill, a given droop an operation.

In capsule form there are my ideas on how to combat the ever-rising cost of medical care and any progress we make in this direction will make socialized medicine a more remote possibility. Now, may I direct your attention to another somewhat less specific area where medical society activity should be expanded.

To the extent that doctors and organized medicine take the credit for the marvelous advances in health and longevity enjoyed in this country, they must also accept the responsibility for the problems their advances have created. Pre-eminent among these are the problems of the decreasing ratio of deaths to births, per se, and the specific problems of the over 65-age group, which are many and varied.

To deal with these entities it seems to me we must have more and closer liaison with public health and public welfare agencies. We must have more effective doctor and Montgomery County Medical Society participation in discussion, education and promotion on subjects such as rest and nursing homes, rehabilitation, job placement, recreation, etc., for the aged. Assuredly this participation is not foreign to doctors, but I believe immensely stepped-up action is indicated. More effective promotion of proven public health projects is to me also a logical function of the medical society.

As doctors and as organized medicine, we must eventually go further than this, and I realize it is a touchy subject. To me it is obvious that as the age old controls on human population are being broken down, one after the other, we will eventually end up with uncontrolled population growth. Unless we substitute some other type of control humans will constitute a cancer of the earth as recently expressed by Julian Huxley. The warning signs are with us now in the form

of ever-increasing wasted resources, pollution of water, earth and air, and in the desecration of areas of natural beauty. They can be seen, also in the accelerated conversion of more and more productive land to housing and for industry and transportation.

In each individual's lifetime perhaps little change is noticed, but if we are interested in what kind of a country and world we present to our grandchildren and to their grandchildren, we will start mobilizing on these problems. I do not know how to institute population control, but I feel an answer can and must be found, and organized medicine as an informed non-sectarian group must have a major part in this solution.

To conclude, I have tried to present what I consider to be the major problems confronting us as doctors, as organized medicine and as citizens and I have indicated what I think should be our course. I may be wrong on all counts, but I have tried to be sincere and forthright. To implement any of these thoughts and ideas the work and support of the great majority of the society will be required. To me a medical society of this type is not primarily a scientific organization, but should act as a sounding board for medical opinion on community problems related to health and medical care. To do this adequately more active participation in discussion in this field is needed from every member. The program of society meetings this year has been molded along these lines and I hope you come to each meeting and express your ideas and opinions.

Secretary Herter's Task

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune this morning:

HERTER IS URGED TO FOLLOW DULLES' MORAL PRINCIPLES

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, April 19.—Christian Archibald Herter will be an effective Secretary of State as long as he sticks to the moral principles in world affairs that have guided John Foster Dulles. The moment he succumbs to the insidious tactics of appeasement carried on by various advisers, some of them inside the Government itself and some in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the advice he can give President Eisenhower will become less and less valuable.

It is an open secret that the enemies of Mr. Dulles are among those happy over the selection of Christian Herter. They are mistaken in their assumptions, but they believe anybody is bound to be more flexible in their direction than was the outgoing Secretary.

The story of the drive to oust Mr. Dulles is important for the American people to know. It has been carried on for the last 3 years by certain members of the press in Washington, New York, and London and in other European capitals.

The first piece of fiction given wide currency in the press dispatches was that Mr. Dulles played the game alone—that nobody else in the Department of State ever knew what his policies were or were likely to be. This was a species of mischievous gossip which originated with disgruntled partisans—a few foreign service officers whose ideas were not accepted. They fed hostile propaganda to certain press representatives.

But the simple truth is that Secretary Dulles did hold a staff conference every day that he was at his office. Sometimes they lasted the better part of the morning. At least 15 individuals, including all the Deputy Secretaries and assistants and heads of divisions, attended. They were always asked to express their views. Often in their presence the Secretary would pick up the telephone and report to the President on the trend of the discussion. There was always a planning conference before the Secretary left on a trip.

HAD RIGID VIEWPOINT

It is a sweeping misrepresentation to say that John Foster Dulles was a one-man operator and had no regard for teamwork. This was so often repeated that it was accepted even by some disinterested writers. They were misled, too, by the fact that Mr. Dulles relied largerly on his own knowledge of foreign affairs accumulated over a 40-year period, which none of his conferees possessed. He is, of course, a subjective personality and has none of the extrovert in his manner. Hence, in the hearings on Capitol Hill, he was looked upon as a stern individual with a rigid viewpoint. His conferences with foreign diplomats tended to be formal and austere. But this so-called rigidity was to his credit. For he didn't bend with the wind or yield to the pressures of expediency that came from the peace-at-any-price side. He thought only of his country's future—not of personal aggrandizement or applause or popularity.

Mr. Dulles gave to the press more information on foreign policy than any one who ever occupied the post of Secretary of State. He held lengthy press conferences both in this country and when he was broad. He answered all manner of questions. Indeed, he was some times accused of talking too much.

PRECISE IN COMMENTS

Diplomats abroad occasionally resented his comments as cabled across the ocean in brief and fragmentary dispatches in the press. European governments then had to be told to get the full text to see that he didn't say what he had been reported to have said. His legal training caused him to be precise and to respect the precedents of international law.

Christian Herter, on the other hand, got his training in politics. He ran for Congress and was elected five times. He was twice elected Governor of Massachusetts. He has, therefore, a skill and experience in dealing with the public and the press which will redound to his advantage.

How much perspicacity has the new Secretary? Will he be able to see through the propaganda distortions and the crafty statements made to him during the course of diplomatic conversations? It must be remembered that Mr. Herter was recommended by Mr. Dulles for the post of Under Secretary, with the knowledge that it would be training for the promotion if the Secretary retired. The latter definitely planned to resign on reaching his 70th birthday, but President Eisenhower wouldn't let him go at the time. It was Chris Herter who, it was tactitly understood all along, would be the next Secretary of State.

EISENHOWER SMEARED

Mr. Eisenhower has a great deal more background on foreign policy and more knowledge of world affairs today than a sniping press credits him with. The critics have been trying to picture Ike all along as a "sick man" and as a "puppet of Dulles" or a "part-time President." This type of smear has been appearing regularly in the European papers, and most of the correspondents here for foreign newspapers have fallen for it.

Back of all this is a drive to bring about a deal with Moscow—it's the same naivete that has misled profession diplomats in Europe before. It's a most dangerous type of pressure that could easily throw the Western alliance out of balance and give a misculating Khrushchev his chance to emulate Hitler. The new Secretary of State will find out who are his friends and who are his opponents the moment he shows himself aware not only of the Communist game but of the wiles of those in the West, inside and outside government, who unwittingly play the Communist game.

Address by Secretary of Labor John J. Gilhooley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. DORN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues the address by Assistant Secretary of Labor John J. Gilhooley before the Catholic Men's League of the New York Naval Shipyard, grand ballroom, Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York, N.Y.; April 5, 1959:

In one of the local newspapers here, the New York Sunday News, there is a feature of the magazine section that has caught my attention from time to time. I am certain that many of you are familiar with it, and perhaps you find it as interesting as I do. It is called, I believe, New York's Changing Scene, and consists usually of two photographs, set one above the other. In the top picture we are given a view of a certain street in New York—41st Street, perhaps, and Second Avenue—as it looked a generation or two ago. In the second photograph, there is pictured the same location as it looks now, some 50 or 60 years later. One is always struck by the alteration—the changes—that have taken place in the area over the years, and there is pleasure in examining closely the two pictures to note the exact features that have passed with the tide of time, and the things that have remained.

I have often wondered why there is pleasure in such a practice as this, and have come to believe that the past holds great interest for us, at least partially because the pace of the world we live in seldom allows us to look back, constantly urges us forward, whipping us through our lives with headlong speed—so quickly, in fact, that often changes are upon us and beyond us before we can realize that what was once so familiar is now almost as though it had never existed. Thus, the interest of the newspaper feature is at least partly involved with the pleasure of seeing, once again, the long-forgotten, or the half-remembered.

I have said that in our time we are pushed—relentlessly—through the present moment and onward always. Our eyes seem to have time only for the track ahead. Our machines whirl always faster, faster, and we, inside them, are caught up. Our age, in short, when it is not bent on power, concentrates on speed. And you and I, men of the 20th century, must, at least unconsciously, accustom ourselves to this outward pace.

For it is not only our machines which mirror the speed of our existence, but every area of our lives. The world we were all born into is, in one sense, the old world yet—but changed it is, gentlemen, from what it was a few short years ago. To illustrate, let us adopt the technique of the New York

Sunday News feature, and with Hamlet, look first on this picture, and then on that.

The first picture is the world of 1919—40 years ago. A war was just completed—a war fought to end war—and men settled back to enjoy a thousand years of peace. Americans returned to their homeland, took up their lives, married, and looked forward to raising children to live well and do mightily under the banner of freedom they had sustained. Communism was a vague, distant, seemingly temporary disturbance in one of those vast unknown areas of the world—the howl of a wolfpack lost on the Arctic wastes; piercing, but far off and barely discernible in the pleasant summer days of 1919. Europe was remote; Russia, at the extreme edge of Europe, and Asia, except for slow, leisurely ships, was as inaccessible and distant almost as it had been to veterans of another war in 1865.

Look now on the other picture: April 1959. There is no man here who needs the scene drawn. Europe today is next door; Russia, a few houses down the street; Asia, around the corner. The wolf has howled on our own block, and, even more significantly perhaps, has been detected traveling in packs in the Asian and African areas around the corner. Those young boys, sons of the men of that summer in 1919, have had themselves to go out and fight two more wars to end war, and are themselves today hoping for their own sons the thousand years of peace their fathers long ago thought they had bought with their sacrifice.

What now threatens that dream? Many, many things, some large, some small. But we are all agreed, I think, that it is the wolf of Communist subversion, Communist imperialism, which more nearly threatens our children in the streets—that we must deal with these problems, and we must deal with them effectively.

Now we can only deal with the wolf if we deal both with the problem of the wolf outside our very houses, and also with the wolves who threaten the lives of our neighbors around the corner, for wolves are mobile, are they not? and the wolf who is out of sight today may be joined tomorrow with many of his fellows right outside the door.

Now what have we been doing about our global wolves, the Communists?

At home—that is, in the street outside our own house—it seems to me that we have done well. We have recognized that there were—and are—Communist conspirators, we have met them, and, let us not deceive ourselves, we are well on our way toward routing them. But, President Eisenhower is fond of quoting the motto he, himself, chose for NATO: "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." And we would be foolish, indeed, if, despite our past victories, we did not keep a watcher at the window as sentry against other wolves at home. And, gentlemen, our sentinel is one of the ablest men we could have—Mr. John Edgar Hoover, of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Under his leadership America will stand secure at home and resolute in the protection of her children's liberty.

Therefore, in one sector we are doing the job. What of the other sectors? What of the areas around the corner in this shrinking world: Europe, Asia, Africa? Or need we really worry about them? Shall we assume that they will do what we have done, i.e., strengthen their own internal security (as we did)? Why, some may ask, need we be concerned with their problems at all?

This brings us to the central question of American foreign policy today: Do we guard effectively and successfully against the wolves at home, and yet leave the same breed of wolf free to roam the neighborhood? And with jets and H-bombs today's world is all one neighborhood. Or do we help to police the neighborhood, partly because that is a decent way to behave toward your neighbors, and partly because that is the way, the only way in today's close-coupled world, to be really sure that our own homes, our children, are fully and permanently protected.

There are these two alternatives: Either we help our neighbors or we do not. If we do not, we know—deep down we know—that it will not be long before the wolves strike—directly or indirectly—and we know how ill-equipped some of them are to repel the attack. If we do not help them—if we accept this alternative—then we must be prepared to live with a world of wolves. What happens then when we—or our children—go out into the streets?

What is to be done? The answer to this is written boldly in the history of the last dozen years. We have adopted the strategy of forward defense. We placed our first line of defense on the frontiers of freedom. The alternative would have been to make the first line the last ditch—our own shores. We wisely heeded advice such as Gen. Douglas MacArthur gave when he declared the problem is global, and that the problems of one sector of the world must be seen in the light of the problems of other sectors.

You have watched NATO and the Marshall plan save Europe, the richest prize that Stalin ever tried for. Western Europe holds the balance of world industrial power. As long as Western Europe is on the side of the free world, the balance is heavily with us. But if Western Europe should ever go behind the curtain, the balance of industrial power would swing to communism. With the protection and the support of America and her allies, Western Germany has become a bone in the throat of the Communist wolf—at least that is how the head of the pack—Khrushchev—seems to view her.

You have seen aggression checked in Korea, Indochina, and twice on the Strait of Taiwan. You have seen firm action by American and British forces protect the sovereignty of free countries in the Middle East. Eleven years ago the airlift frustrated a Stalinist powerplay for Berlin. Now Mr. Khrushchev is making another play, and President Eisenhower has made our stand plain. We will talk any time about anything, if it will help the cause of a just and honorable peace, but we will not be bullied. We will not be shoved around by anybody, anywhere.

As I say, we made our choice a dozen years ago to adopt a strategy of forward defense—the only alternative to turning the rest of the world over to the Russians. We have stuck by that choice, at the cost of blood and treasure, to be sure, but have thereby checked the outward thrust of communism. We have kept the wolf within his lair.

Because of the firmness of the stand of America and its free world allies, the old Stalinist policies of direct aggression and pressure did not pay off, so the Russians changed their tune. In place of aggressive efforts in Europe and the Far East, they swung their focus toward the developing areas of the world, to the Near East, South Asia, and more recently, Africa and South America.

South America is our neighbor, a land of rapid growth and rich potential. Africa is a tremendous storehouse of untapped resources of every sort. The Middle East holds the oil supply for Europe, without which Europe's prosperity and ability to defend herself would wither away and vanish. South Asia contains both natural resources and people in huge supply. It is the counterbalance to Red China, valuable on the side of freedom, dangerous to us if ever enslaved.

But the Soviet effort toward these developing areas has not been primarily military—they know the other free nations would not stand aside and let them get away with that—but economic and political—they are trying to move in under our guard. It is the old aggressiveness cloaked in a new form—the wolf in sheep's clothing— but we are not deceived.

As Americans with courage and firmness proved equal to the brutal challenge of Joseph Stalin, so we are willing, and with God's help, able to recognize and frustrate the maneuverings of the wily Khrushchev, and his crafty sidekick, Mikoyan.

Our response to the present challenge must continue to have a military side: we must keep our own guard up. For as Sir Winston Churchill, for one, has said, the major deterrent to war in the past has been American striking power. We must have the planes and missiles, the submarines and warheads to check a small attack, or to punish devastatingly a large one. We have both the capacity and determination to keep our military guard high, and I know that you would want us to keep it high. But we must help our neighbors to keep their military guard high, too, for in guarding themselves they help guard us. Therefore, we have set up a system of defense alliances with 42 free nations, and we carry on a program of military assistance which helps them to support the arms which defend us all.

President Eisenhower summed up the importance of military assistance when he said:

"Dollar for dollar, our expenditures * * * will buy more security than far greater additional expenditures for our own forces. * * * Without the strength of our allies our Nation would be turned into an armed camp, and our people subjected to a heavy draft and an annual cost or many billions of dollars above our present military budget."

As to the urgency of the economic challenge, we don't have to do any guessing, we can listen to the words of Nikita Khrushchev himself. This is what he said:

"Economics is the main field in which the peaceful competition of socialism and capitalism is taking place, and we are interested in winning this competition in a historically brief period of time."

You couldn't ask for a much plainer announcement than that.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur years ago put his finger on the basic problem, the big danger in these developing areas when he said that in Asia what the people want most urgently is a little more food, a roof over their heads, adequate clothes on their backs. The Asians must have these before they can turn their eyes and their energies to the defense of freedom. For gentlemen, you cannot eat fredom—nor is the freedom to starve one of the freedoms men will fight for.

That is why the U.S. Government has instituted a program of economic as well as military assistance to these vital areas which are now a prime target for the aggressive ambitions of the Communist conspiracy. Unless the developing nations of the world can make progress toward economic betterment, industrialization and a better life, they will not be able to resist the penetrations and pressures of the agents of Communist imperialism. Therefore, we seek to help them stamp out disease—improve their farms—show them the way to develop industry and commerce, in order that their countries may enjoy the political stability essential to maintaining their independence.

Without such a program of economic development the free world cannot meet the Communist challenge, and all our military dollars will have been spent in vain.

Now you and I do not believe in giveaway programs or "the dole," either at home or abroad. We believe the Lord helps those who help themselves. We know that a giveaway program in the end does not help men—it turns them into parasites.

That is why, in rendering assistance, either military or economic, to these other lands

we make it a point to stress self-help and initiative—the virtues that built a great America, and will keep her great. Except in unusual cases—those where countries are most gravely and directly threatened by communism—the amount contributed by the local people themselves to their defense and development is far greater than the total of all outside assistance.

From time to time we hear criticism of the mutual security program—as the program of military and economic assistance is called—on the grounds that some mistakes have been made in it.

Have there been mistakes? There have. Vice President NIXON put it this way:

"I recognize that there has been waste and inefficiency in our (aid) * * * programs. * * *I have been very critical of that waste and inefficiency. This is a new field for Americans—mistakes are inevitable. We should subject these programs to searching criticism, but for the purpose of improving them rather than to destroy them."

Reasonable men must, I think, agree fully with the Vice President. For in terms of our discussion here, if, in firing at the wolf we find the bullets inadequate, we do not throw away the rifle. We find the proper bullets.

This job is slow, costly, unrelenting in its demands. Its effects are seldom publicized, but when they do come to the surface, we see the kind of brilliant result that can be witnessed today in West Germany.

To repeat: we have done and are doing the job at home. Apart from that task, our weapons are twofold: military assistance and economic assistance. The military program is a holding operation: the economic programs are today the central battleground in the cold war. If we lose that sector, we lose Asia, then Africa, then South America. And then there would be too many wolves for us to fight alone. In short, unless we do this job, the wolves will win, while our bullets rust in our rifles.

Now it is true that the maintenance of all our defense and aid programs taken together does demand sacrifices on the part of our people. But you and I were born free men: free by God's intention as men; free, by God's grace, as Americans.

Will it be said of us in the years to come that we were too weak, too complacent, too selfish, too flabby, to meet the dangers and difficulties of life as free men—that we had neither the brains to understand the threat, nor the human resources, the will to sacrifice needed to meet the challenge?

Will it be said of us—and who will say it but our sons—will it be said of us that we lacked the moral fiber to do what the crises of our time demanded, that we lacked the fortitude, the charity of Christian men?

I do not think so. I think our answer will be that of Father John LaFarge in his recent book called "The American Amen."

Amen: So be it.

"Thus, if sacrifice is demanded of us, amen.

"If other men depend upon us, amen.

"If the wolves put their challenges on this level, and dare us to match—indeed defeat them here—amen.

"A quiet, firm, confident, American amen."

Gentlemen, I am grateful for the opportunity you have given me to share my thoughts with you on one of the major problems of our time. For just as the Soviet challenge is made directly to men like ourselves—individually so, too, it is here that we shall beat them. We shall beat them where they boast themselves strongest—among the workingmen of a country. For workingmen are the backbone of our country.

And—this final unchanging picture I would leave with you—when the wolves try to bend America's backbone, they shall find that here is a vertebrae that will not now—nor ever—break.

Lewis Strauss, Foe of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, David Lawrence has written a most pertinent editorial on the confirmation of Lewis Strauss as Secretary of Commerce, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on April 16. Under leave to extend my remarks I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues:

VICTORY FOR REDS IS SEEN IF SENATE REJECTS STRAUSS

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, April 15.—Communists could gain a big victory in the U.S. Senate if the nomination of Lewis Strauss to be Secretary of Commerce is denied confirmation.

Apparently there is a movement to punish Mr. Strauss not only because he prevented America from abandoning the development of the hydrogen bomb during the Truman administration but because he had the temerity to carry on the fight later which led to the denial of security clearance to J. Robert Oppenheimer, the noted scientist who had advocated delay.

Many who are participating in the movement are unwittingly playing the Communist game. Renewal of antagonism to Mr. Strauss because of his part in attacking security risks in scientific circles was noted this week. In a news article by Edward Gamarekian, a staff reporter of the Washington Post and Times Herald, it is stated that petitions began to be circulated last week protesting the selection of Mr. Strauss as a speaker at the meeting and banquet of the American Physical Society on May 1 in Washington. These petitions were circulated at Cornell University, Columbia University, the Argonne National Laboratory at Lemont, Ill., and the Brookhaven National Laboratory in Upton, Long Island, as well as in the Boston area.

The petition stated that the invitation to Admiral Strauss to speak "gives the public impression that Admiral Strauss has the backing and respect of the scientific community" and that it would be "unfortunate" if the invitation were "construed as American Physical Society support of Admiral Strauss and his attempts to obtain Senate confirmattion of his appointment as Secretary of Commerce."

BASIS OF PROTEST

The newspaper article then goes on to say:

"The individuals who sparked the protest at the Argonne National Laboratory said they objected to Strauss because he had 'deliberately misled every one on such matters as fallout, clean weapons, and weapon testing,' and because he had 'used security regulations as an instrument of political power, particularly in the Oppenheimer case'."

Whatever Admiral Strauss ever said publicly on the subject of weapon tests was based upon the advice of noted scientists known to be loyal to the Government of the United States. Naturally there are differences of opinion among scientists, and in recent years there has been a tendency to exaggerate the ill effects of fallout from bomb tests. But, in any event, those who held the view that there was no present danger in the way the tests were being conducted had as much right to their viewpoint as the critics.

It is regrettable that the Oppenheimer case has to be dragged in once more, but some of the critics of Admiral Strauss evidently want it that way. Their assumption is that the Senators have not read the record in that tragic episode and that the American people are unfamiliar with Oppenheimer's many financial contributions to Communist causes in the past. There is the puzzling fact—which was brought out in the official record—that Oppenheimer continued his regular contributions to Communist organizations even after Stalin took Hitler unto his bosom in the first year of World War II.

OPPENHEIMER LIE RECALLED

Most damaging, however, was Oppenheimer's lie to American Military Intelligence officers who wanted to know the details of a visit by a Russian agent who sought to get secrets from Oppenheimer while he was in charge of the Government's atomic laboratory. It is true that after several months Oppenheimer confessed that he had lied, but this was only after the American Government had established in other ways the case against the Russian.

Usually when a Cabinet officer is up for confirmation by the Senate there is the customary inquiry as to his views on public questions. The feeling has always been that the President has a right to choose Cabinet officers sympathetic to his own policies, irrespective of the views of the political opposition. So it seems strange that any extraneous issues should be interjected into the Strauss case. It is a mystery, too, why there is a protracted delay in the Senate in acting on the Strauss appointment. It looks like an attempt to block it by delay till the end of the present session, when, if not confirmed, the nomination expires.

OTHER OBJECTORS

There are some Senators active in the fight against the confirmation of Mr. Strauss who have their own antipathies—such as are involved in the controversy over Government control of the public utility industry—all of which are unrelated to the friction among the scientists. Some of the scientists, on the other hand, have subtle ways of exerting pressure on the Government and on Congress itself. One of the most active of the scientists on the propaganda front was never called before a certain committee for an investigation of his connections with Communist-front organizations, and the rumors on Capitol Hill are that some Democrats of prominence helped to suppress the inquiry that was planned.

The Communists will be happy if they can just "get Strauss." It is doubtful whether the Senators are aware of the true nature of the underground battle being waged against a loyal American whose courage enabled America to develop the hydrogen bomb as a factor in its deterrent force against the Soviet Union.

State Taxation of Nonresidents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include

the following statement which I made before the Senate subcommittee conducting hearings on the problems of State taxation of nonresidents:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN RODINO ON SENATE JOINT RESOLUTIONS 29 AND 67 RELATING TO CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS ON STATE TAXATION OF NONRESIDENTS

Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the subcommittee for permitting me to make this statement concerning the problems covered by Senate Joint Resolutions 29 and 67 prohibiting or limiting the States in the taxing of incomes of nonresidents. Being a Representative in Congress from New Jersey, I am intimately and deeply concerned with this taxing problem. My own feeling in the matter results from the present discriminatory practice of New York in its taxation of New Jersey residents.

As you doubtless will recall, the legislature of New Jersey in 1957 adopted a resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 40, petitioning the Congress of the United States to adopt a constitutional amendment which would prohibit States from taxing the income of nonresidents. As a result of that petition, I sponsored in the 85th Congress House Joint Resolution 497. Simultaneously 12 bills similar to my own were introduced in Congress, principally from Members representing districts in the States of New Jersey and Connecticut. About a month after the legislature of New Jersey petitioned Congress, the State of Connecticut also petitioned the Congress (S.J. Res. 9) asking that the Congress convene a Constitutional Convention for the purpose of amending the Constitution to prohibit States from taxing the income of nonresidents.

At my request, the chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary caused a preliminary study to be made of the issues involved in this problem. A memorandum, containing the arguments pro and con, was prepared by one of the counsel of the House Committee on the Judiciary in collaboration with the American Law Section of the Library of Congress, and dated February 13, 1958—a year and 2 months ago—which I wish to submit for the subcommittee's record. (Document attached to end of statement.)

To my mind, the most effective way to deal with this problem of discriminatory taxation is a constitutional amendment eliminating the power. However, such a solution would be most difficult to accomplish since 31 States presently tax the in-State incomes of nonresidents and the membership of Congress from those States would be reluctant to go along with such legislation. In addition, the approach would require a two-thirds vote of each House of Congress aand ratification by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States. It is unlikely that the taxing States would ratify the proposed change.

Perhaps it is appropriate at this point to mention that the major concern of the 31 taxing States has not been whether nonresidents should be exempted or given equitable tax deductions but rather how best to protect their own residents from double taxation on out-of-State income.

The authority of a State to impose a taxation on income earned within the State by a nonresident was declared over 40 years ago by the decisions in *Shaffer* v. *Carter* (252 U.S. 37 (1920)) and *Travis* v. *Yale and Towne Mfg. Co.* (252 U.S. 60 (1920)).

Last year, after the preliminary studies were made, it seemed wiser, in view of the obstacles presented by the Constitutional amendment approach, to intensify efforts at the State level for the negotiation with New York for more equitable tax treatment of New Jersey residents.

Presently, a resident of New York may deduct from gross income such items as municipal taxes on his residence property, sales taxes, mortgage and personal loans, medical expenses within specified limits, premiums on hospitalization insurance, and gifts for charitable, religious and benovelent purposes.

A nonresident on the other hand may deduct from his taxable gross income in New York only an amount equal to 10 percent of such gross income or $500 whichever is less. While he may itemize his deductions, he may claim only those expenditures incurred in the production of income in New York, and such items as gifts to charitable, religious and benevolent corporations, if organized or operated under the laws of New York.

From an equitable point it seems to many of us that the nonresident taxpayer should be permitted to claim as deductions not only those expenses incurred arising in New York but also, on an apportionment basis, those deductions ordinarily allowed resident taxpayers.

In an effort to broaden deductions conferences were held among Governors Meyner of New Jersey, Harriman of New York, and Ribicoff of Connecticut.

Among other things, a Commission on Out-of-State Taxation of New Jersey Residents was created under Senate Concurrent Resolution 25 (1957) by the New Jersey Legislatures. Also, a study was made by Mr. Theodore Tannenwald, Jr. for Governor Harriman of New York in which he recommended enlarging certain deductions for out-of-State residents who must pay New York State taxes on personal income.

As disclosed in the newspapers of recent dates, New York did revise its tax laws but the only gain nonresidents received is a change in the flat sum they may claim in lieu of itemized deductions. Under New York's new law, this is raised from $500 to $1,000. The revision will not change the fact that the nonresident will pay considerably more tax than the resident with the same income, despite the fact that the nonresident is ineligible for many of that State's services.

According to latest figures, over 137,000 New Jersey residents working in New York are paying more than $20 million yearly to New York; Connecticut residents pay over 8 million.

When the 86th Congress convened in January, I reintroduced my bills. They are now designated House Joint Resolution 68 and H.R. 4174. House Joint Resolution 68 calls for a constitutional amendment; H.R. 4174 an interstate compact. To date, five methods have been suggested for dealing with the problem:

1. Constitutional amendment proposed by Congress, prohibiting State taxation of nonresident incomes.

2. Constitutional convention to prohibit State taxation of nonresident incomes.

3. An interstate compact permitting uniform tax treatment of all nonresidents through State agreement.

4. A national or uniform reciprocal law not to discriminate between residents and nonresidents in the levying and collection of taxes.

5. Federal preemption through the interstate commerce clause.

The first method enumerated above is the subject matter of the bills now before the subcommittee.

The State of Connecticut has asked for a constitutional convention under the second method of approach. This ostensibly could take the matter out of the hands of Congress and place it before a convention. However, there has not been a constitutional convention in the 169 years of our existence and, besides, 33 States must ask for it before one is in order.

So far as I know, the interstate compact approach was first suggested on June 3, 1958, at a hearing in Trenton, N.J., before the Commission on Out of State Taxation of New Jersey residents. In substance, the compact would grant the States the power to enter into agreements looking toward uniform tax treatment of nonresidents. It may be argued by some that such an approach is unnecessary since the States now have the power to enter into such agreements. While this is doubtless true, I nonetheless feel that a compact arrangement could have salutary effect because it would permit the States to make binding agreements containing penalty and other provisions. In the event of a breach of the agreement by one of the participating States remedies, if it were so provided in the agreement, could be brought in our courts.

The fourth suggested approach concerns a national uniform law. As you know, we have many laws which are not Federal laws in the sense that they are enacted by Congress but are nevertheless national in scope in that they can affect all of the several States. Some of these laws are the Uniform Negotiable Instruments Act, the uniform extradition laws, and the uniform reciprocal enforcement of support laws. These laws come about by the drafting of so-called model acts which contain standard provisions and which are submitted to the States for adoption by the State legislatures and, of course, are binding on all States which adopt them. In the past such laws have been drafted by the Council of State Governments and by the American Law Institute. Certainly, it is within the realm of possibility that these organizations working singly or in conjunction with each other, and with agencies of the Federal Government and/or the Congress, could promulgate a model act for uniform tax treatment of nonresidents with strong enforcement provisions so that the States would be required to give full credence to its provisions.

The fifth suggestion, and one which in my opinion offers the best approach, is a Federal preemption law. Congress has plenary powers over interstate commerce. In some areas it exercises exclusive and absolute control; in others it shares concurrent jurisdiction with the States, and in still other areas it permits the States to occupy the field alone. It is my understanding that Congress under its interstate commerce power could deny to the States the right to tax the incomes of nonresidents where the organizations that employ them are engaged, either in whole or in part, in interstate commerce. It may be that the States should be denied this power of taxation absolutely. It may be that they should be denied it only in certain areas. I feel that this preemption approach merits serious study, looking toward Federal legislation which would restrict the States in this area of taxation so as to guarantee to nonresidents fair and equitable treatment.

As you know, the Supreme Court recently handed down a decision holding, in line with its decision some 40 years earlier, that States may tax the incomes of foreign corporations on activities within the taxing State which are exclusively in furtherance of interstate commerce. (*Northwestern States Portland Cement Co.* v. *Minnesota.*) I have been advised that the Senate Small Business Committee and the House Committee on the Judiciary, among others, have this decision under study.

Mr. Chairman, this problem is not confined to New York, New Jersey, or Connecticut or to any one region of the United States but is national in scope and effect. It affects all 49 States. It affects not only Minnesota in the northwestern part of our country, but it affects Georgia in the South. In recent months, newspapers have carried accounts of difficulties between Maryland and Virginia; Idaho and North Dakota have a similar problem. Pennsylvania and Delaware, as well as New Jersey and the city of

Philadelphia, are also engaged in controversy concerning the taxation of nonresidents.

Mr. Chairman, the unfair and discriminatory actions now being imposed upon some of our citizens simply because their employment requires them to cross State lines must cease. If the States are unwilling to work the problem out at the State level through agreements, compacts, uniform laws, or otherwise, then the Federal Government, through its powers of preemption or by constitutional amendment, should bring about that which the States refuse or are incapable of accomplishing.

ARGUMENTS PRO AND CON ON PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO PROHIBIT STATES FROM LEVYING INCOME TAXES ON NONRESIDENTS (H.J. RES. 497, 85TH CONG.)

PRO

In legal theory the income tax is considered to be a levy against the person, not against property or the process which creates the income. (Taxes (1955) 33: 375.) Being a personal tax it should be levied by the State of residence which provides protection and services to its inhabitants and to their property.

It is incorrect to contend that the nonresident receives the same benefits from the taxing State as do residents thereof. The nonresident does not avail himself of schools, hospitals, and kindred services that are afforded in the taxing State.

To require a nonresident to pay a contribution toward the expenses of a State in which he happens to earn money is to require him to pay something which in public policy and according to right and justice he does not owe.

It is also contrary to the theory of State income tax that a tax should be levied on nonresidents in respect of any income they derive from property owned or business conducted in the State which imposes said tax. The tax is justified as a payment for personal benefits which residents of a State derive from the government under which they are domiciled, and should not apply to nonresidents, who must be presumed to be taxed (and are taxed through various other forms of taxation) for such benefits in the State where they live. Any attempt to impose the tax upon income received by nonresidents from property situated, or business carried on, within the State changes the character of the tax and converts it into a payment, not for personal benefits derived by residents, but for benefits of a totally different nature such as business benefits, etc. These objections are not to be interpreted as meaning that a State cannot levy a tax for such benefits, but merely that it should not do so in the form of a personal income tax.

The contributions and services rendered by a multitude of nonresidents to the general business prosperity and productiveness of a State seeking to impose the income tax largely outweigh an expenses of police protection afforded by the latter State.

Only by adoption of a constitutional amendment will it be possible to end once and for all the inequities which result when the taxing State denies to nonresidents the same measure of deductions as it accords to residents. Litigation to remove this inequity having been unsuccessful, the proposed amendment alone can be depended upon to effect a much-needed reform (*Charles Goodwin, Jr.* v. *New York State Tax Commission* ((1955) 146 NYS 2d 172; (1956) 1. N.Y. 2d 680; appeal dismissed (1956) 352 U.S. 805)).

Thus a nonresident earning the same salary as a resident is denied the privilege extended to the latter of claiming deductions for sums contributed to his church, for taxes paid on his residence, for medical expenses or for premiums paid for hospitalization insurance, for interest accruing on mortgages or other evidences of indebtedness, or for capital losses incurred. The nonresident cannot take deductions for any of these outlays for the reason that they do not represent expenditures incurred in the taxing State or borne as part of the cost of earning income therein. As a consequence, a nonresident whose only source of income is his salary earned in the taxing State is compelled to pay a higher tax thereon than a resident of said State receiving the same amount of income.

The need for the proposed amendment is not avoided by suggesting that inequities resulting from the taxation of nonresidents can be eliminated by the uniform levy by all States of income taxes applicable to incomes of both nonresidents and residents. States whose citizens are unjustly treated by the tax laws of neighboring States are under no obligation to submit to dictation by the latter and to emulate the latter in the matter of tax legislation. Moreover, discrimination inflicted upon nonresidents by one State is not to be corrected by the adoption of retaliatory legislation by other States.

Justification of the proposed amendment is not refuted by contending that discriminatory State taxation of the income of nonresidents has been judicially sustained for almost 40 years. The Supreme Court expressed its approval of such practice at a time when State income taxes virtually were a rarity. Upon reconsideration of such discriminatory taxation today, the Court might well be expected to reach a result in harmony with the spirit of the proposed amendment.

By refusing to grant to nonresidents the same measure of deductions which they extend to their own inhabitants the States levying taxes on personal income in effect are erecting discriminatory barriers to the free movement of citizens across State lines which the framers of the Constitution sought to guarantee through the privileges and immunities clause of article 4 of the Constitution. Through discrimination in the measure of deductions, taxing States are making it impossible for out-of-State workers to obtain employment on the same terms of net remuneration as are available to their residents.

CON

Inasmuch as virtually all of the 31 States levying income taxes extend the same to nonresidents, the only beneficiaries of the proposed amendment will be the nonresidents from the minority of States which levy no taxes on personal income. No comparable benefit will accrue to residents of income tax States who work and earn their living in States levying no income tax; for such residents are taxed by the State of their domicile on their entire income from whatever source received.

The proposed amendment is contrary to the spirit of the privileges and immunities clause of article 4 of the Constitution; for it would confer on nonresident employees most of the privileges of residents but exempt them from obligations borne by the latter.

Nonresidents who enjoy the advantages of employment and the receipt of income within a State are morally as well as legally obligated to pay a quid pro quo in the form of a tax on income earned in such State.

In subjecting nonresidents to income taxes the States are applying the same rule as is contained in the Federal income tax law pursuant to which nonresident aliens and foreigners are taxed on income from sources within the United States.

The proposed amendment would adversely affect those States which, by reason of being highly industrialized or constituting financial centers, serve as a source of livelihood for thousands of out-of-State commuters.

Inasmuch as the principal grievance assigned in support of the proposed amendment arises not out of the levy of an income tax on nonresidents but from alleged inequities in the deductions available respectively to residents and nonresidents, it is clear that the remedy sought to be invoked is in excess of that required. Mere amendment of State income tax legislation is primarily needed and this can be achieved through negotiations at the State level, rather than by utilization of the difficult to obtain process of constitutional amendment.

Thus defenses offered in support of this amendment would be eliminated if States taxing the income of nonresidents would permit the latter to claim deductions in the same ratio as their income received in the taxing State bears to their total income received from all sources. Under this statutory change, nonresidents earning their entire income in the taxing State would be eligible to claim all of the deductions hitherto extended only to residents. Moreover, it has been estimated that the States effecting such amendment of their income tax laws would suffer no appreciable loss of revenue.

The taxing States do not levy, as they do in the case of their own residents, on the entire income of nonresidents. It is, therefore, entirely appropriate and equitable for these States to withhold from nonresidents the same measure of deductions as are accorded to residents. The validity of this distinction in the measure of deductions granted has been upheld by the courts (*Chas. Goodwin, Jr.* v. *New York State Tax Commission* ((1955) 146 N.Y.S. 2d 172; (1956) 1 N.Y. 2d 680; appeals dismissed (1956) 352 U.S. 805)).

If State A imposes no tax on the income of its own residents, why should the latter, who carry on their business or earn their livelihood in State B in competition with citizens of State B, be exempt from taxation on income by State B? To erect such exemption into a general rule would result not only to the disadvantage of citizens of State B but would encourage every citizen of State B who desired to excape taxes to transfer his legal residence to a country home in State A.

Irrespective of his place of domicile the owner of income-producing property or the recipient of income within a State has the right to call upon the government of that State for protection of his rights. Accordingly, he is under a corresponding obligation to pay taxes, including income taxes, to defray the cost of such protection.

In seeking to recover revenues lost by adoption of the proposed amendment States might be encouraged to levy novel taxes on business establishments which would have the effect of discouraging them from hiring out-of-State employees.

Of the 31 States levying taxes on personal income all but 2 grant their residents a credit for taxes levied on them as nonresidents by other States. Hence the burden alleged to be produced by multiple taxation is grossly exaggerated.

For almost 40 years collection of State income taxes from nonresidents has been sustained as constitutional (*Travis* v. *Yale and Towne Mfg. Co.* (1920) 252 U.S. 60)). The proposed amendment thus would overturn a mode of taxation that has met the test of time.

Discrimination in the Labor Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the following clipping, "Mitchell Says Discrimination Will Lead to Labor

Shortage," appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of April 15, 1959. The following day there appeared in the same newspaper an editorial "Secretary Mitchell's Good Cause."

Booker T. Washington placed primary emphasis on raising the economic status of his race feeling, I believe, that by doing this there lay the best opportunity for raising its entire social status.

It has been a source of real concern to me that Jim Crowism in the labor field has been soft-pedaled by some of loudest proclaimers of the need for a better social status for our minority groups. I think more emphasis needs to be directed here.

I commend Secretary of Labor Mitchell for his efforts. I am pleased that St. Louis was chosen as one of the first cities in which to establish an advisory council to help the President's Committee on Equal Job Opportunities in Government Contracts. The eight St. Louisans named on this Committee are all outstanding citizens. A good job should be the result. I commend the St. Louis Post-Dispatch for the space given to one news article and the fine editorial comment.

There is more room for improvement in the area of equal job opportunities in the St. Louis area than in many of the cities in the Deep South. Management, labor, Goverment, and private citizens have a big and important job to do both from a human and social standpoint as well as from the standpoint of good economics.

The articles follow:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Apr. 15, 1959]

MITCHELL SAYS DISCRIMINATION WILL LEAD TO LABOR SHORTAGE—LABOR SECRETARY SPEAKS HERE—CITES WASTE CAUSED BY REJECTION OF MINORITIES, OLDER WORKERS

The United States faces a critical manpower shortage unless employers stop discriminatory policies that waste a large part of the potential work force, Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell warned here today.

Mitchell, Vice Chairman of the President's Committee on Government Contracts, spoke at a luncheon sponsored by labor and management at Hotel Sheraton-Jefferson.

He called for a halt on limitations that have been imposed by employers on minority groups, older workers and women. He asked that employees be given training that will permit them to keep up with the industrial age.

MUST ADJUST POLICIES

The employer, Mitchell said, will have to adjust his personnel policies to the changing nature of the work force, just as the worker must be prepared to adjust his skills to the changing nature of his employment.

Mitchell said the employer must be ready to judge each applicant—whether he is over 45 or not, whether he is colored or not—on the individual's ability and qualifications for the job.

"And after he opens premium jobs to minority-group workers, he is going to have to be ready to give them the same kind of training and opportunity that he often reserved in former times for the white male under 45 years of age."

Displaying charts as he discussed the future in terms of production and manpower, Mitchell said the population of the United States was expected to exceed 194 million by 1965, and will need more than $560 billion annually in goods and services.

The population in 1955 was 165 million and the 1955 production of goods and services was $391 billion, he said. The increase in national output by 1965, he pointed out, will be an astonishing 40 percent.

The labor force can be expected to reach the necessary 79 million by 1965, Mitchell said, but the question is whether they will be the highly skilled, highly trained workers that are needed. He foresaw failure unless changes were made.

NO INCREASE IN CRAFTSMEN

Mitchell said it was shocking to note that between 1951 and 1956 there was no increase in skilled craftsmen in the American labor force. Even more shocking, he said, is the lack of interest shown by young people in such occupations.

"Of the 10 million additional workers who will be in the labor force in 1965," he said, "most will be women and older workers, with the remainder being young boys between 14 and 24. There will be almost no change in the number of men in the central working ages between 25 and 44."

Mitchell said the United States was going to have to come to terms with the realities of our economic system and the ideals of our social system.

Joint sponsors of the luncheon were the Chamber of Commerce of Metropolitan St. Louis and the St. Louis Labor Council. This afternoon Mitchell was scheduled to meet with representatives of 40 St. Louis civic organizations.

OVERSEE CLAUSE

The Committee on Government Contracts was established by President Eisenhower to oversee compliance with the nondiscrimination clause in Federal contracts. Chairman is Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON.

Federal agency contract compliance officers from Southwestern States are meeting with committee members. Compliance officers are responsible for seeing to it that workers on Government contracts are not discriminated against because of race, color, creed, or national origin.

ADVISORY COUNCIL

Mitchell announced today the formation of a St. Louis Advisory Council to help the President's Committee in assuring equal job opportunities on Government contract work in the St. Louis area. He named eight members, as follows:

Howard F. Baer, president of A. S. Aloe Co.; Mrs. Irvin Bettman, Jr., civic leader; Joseph Clark, president of the St. Louis Labor Council; the Reverend John Hicks, pastor of Union Memorial Methodist Church; Morton D. May, president of May Department Stores; J. Wesley McAfee, president of Union Electric Co.; William Orthwein, vice president of McDonnell Aircraft Co.; and the Very Reverend Paul C. Reinert, S.J., president of St. Louis University.

Mitchell challenged Congress to take favorable action on Mr. Eisenhower's proposal that a Commission on Equal Job Opportunity Under Government Contracts be established with statutory authority. The present Committee was set up by Executive order.

"Equal opportunity is the will of the American people," Mitchell said. "I'll be interested in seeing what this Democratic-controlled Congress does."

At a breakfast press conference, Mitchell said the Committee had authority to cancel a Government contract if an employer failed to comply but had never done so. The Committee was set up in 1953.

"We have never had to execute a cancellation clause, and I hope we never will," he said. "We have yet to find, on sitting down, an absolute refusal to try to work something out."

"The Committee operates on the theory that its objectives can be accomplished by education and persuasion," he said. He said complaints of discrimination in the St. Louis area had been no heavier, as far as he can tell, than elsewhere.

Secretary Mitchell was asked to comment on the resignation of his fellow Cabinet member, John Foster Dulles. "He is a remarkable man," he said. "It is a great loss."

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Apr. 16, 1959]

SECRETARY MITCHELL'S GOOD CAUSE

On his St. Louis visit, Secretary of Labor Mitchell addressed himself to a subject in the field of labor relations which will receive inevitably increasing attention. This is the need for the elimination of discriminatory practices in the employment of workers.

The Labor Secretary dealt particularly with the justice of hiring workers without regard for race or color. He is Vice Chairman under Vice President NIXON of the President's Committee on Government Contracts and in the field of such contracts discrimination is most often practiced along racial lines. But he concerned himself also with discrimination based on age, on sex, and membership in minority groups. These arbitrary proscriptions against certain kinds of workers, whatever the basis, are an economic waste, as Mr. Mitchell said.

But it is more than economic waste. It is rank injustice. No one's color, any more than his national origin or his membership in a minority group, should determine where he can work or what he can do. Nor should a worker's sex continue to control employment. Fairness and simple justice require that the test be the worker's ability and capacity to do what is required.

Secretary Mitchell's antidiscrimination travels over the country, like the conferences of civic, religious, educational, and labor leaders he is assembling in Washington, are in the best of causes. They bring the American dream of equal opportunity closer to realization.

France and Fair Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial showing some historical facts of French experiments in price control, from the Wall Street Journal, of April 20:

FOURTEEN CENTS

In France between 1666 and 1730—as John Chamberlain reminds us in his new book, "The Roots of Capitalism"—it took more than 2,000 pages to print the government rules established for the textile industry alone.

For breaking just those regulations governing printed calicos some 16,000 people were either executed or killed in fights with government agents.

In one area of France, on a single occasion, 77 people were sentenced to be hanged for violating various economic regulations, 58 to be broke on the wheel, 631 to be sent to the galleys.

Such were some of the fruits of mercantilism, one form of suffocating economic statism or planned economy. It was a system against which Adam Smith and others in effect rebelled by figuring out that the explosive energies of the private entrepre-

neur, once released, would be far more enrichening to a nation and its citizens than any kind of government paternalism or direction.

Now no reasonable person would contend that we have a merchantilist system in the United States today. Indeed, the economic history of this country has been a triumphant vindication of the theory that the unfettered individual is the only workable engine of affluence.

But as to the direction in which we sometimes seem to be heading, one may well wonder.

We have a farm economy directed by the Government, complete with controls; the farmer can be punished for doing perfectly normal and rational things. To take another area, how many thousand pages does it take to print all the State and Federal regulations hog-tying the railroads? Other businesses are also enmeshed in Government edicts, not least including the crazy-quilt of tax regulations.

Today in Washington there is ominous talk—and even specific bills—that could lead to direct Federal controls on wages and prices. And in California, a man has been jailed for the crime of selling bottles of Alka-Seltzer tablets 14 cents below the State fair-trade price set by the manufacturer.

This last—the application of mercantilism to the distributive system—now threatens on a national scale. The Harris bill before Congress would permit manufacturers of trade-marked products to fix the retail prices of their goods; it would apply to all such goods in interstate commerce and supersede State laws.

In short, this measure is nothing more nor less than a massive assault on price competition in the entire United States. Various Government agencies vigorously oppose it, citing such sensible and obvious points as that price-fixing contradicts the whole idea of a free economy, that the bill would boost the cost of living for consumers and handicap small businesses, and that it is in all probability unconstitutional.

To which might be added the observation that efforts of this kind violate the right of the individual to dispose of his property as he sees fit—and property rights were one of the things for which the Revolution was fought. Compounding the immorality is the fact that violators of this violation of human rights would be subject to punishment.

Yet this monstrosity, or one like it, is believed to have an excellent chance of approval by Congress. And that is the really disturbing thing—that men in this of all countries have succeeded so well in unlearning the plain lessons of history. In this fair trade thing as in so many other forms of Government regulation, they are seeking to smother the very individual energies which have made the Nation prosper.

What they seem chiefly to forget is what both early 18th century France and the man in the California jail in 1959 so clearly attest: To extinguish economic freedom is also to snuff out the fires of political liberty.

A Good Neighbor: Senator Humphrey on Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, at the University of Florida on April 3 of this year the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, the Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, delivered a speech on Latin America.

It is exceptional. It is a brilliant résumé of the existing problems between the governments of Latin America and the Government of the United States.

The Senator has come to grips with the central issues involved without the cliches and generalities so prevalent in discussions of Latin America.

Under a previous consent, I am including the text of Senator HUMPHREY'S statement in the appendix of the RECORD:

A NEW ERA FOR LATIN AMERICA

(Address prepared for delivery by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, University of Florida, Gainesville, Fla., Friday night, April 3, 1959)

Tonight I might have selected as my topic the Berlin crisis, the troubled Middle East or the vexing problem of attempting to control the nuclear arms race. But I have chosen intead to talk about Latin America and U.S. policy toward her Latin American neighbors. Since the end of World War II we have been preoccupied with a series of crises on the periphery of the Communist empire—Greece, Berlin, Korea, Indochina, Suez, Quemoy, Lebanon, and again Berlin. In the meantime, the seemingly less precarious situation in Latin America went almost unnoticed.

It took the demonstrations against Vice President NIXON last spring to explode any remaining illusions about the state of our Latin American relations. The plain truth is that today inter-American relations are in a more critical stage than they have been at any time in the past three decades.

At this point, I would like to pause to pay tribute to the University of Florida, one of the few U.S. universities which has a well-rounded Latin American studies program. Recently, the Hispanic Foundation of the Library of Congress surveyed universities across the country to find out which ones offered Latin American studies. I am told that only eight universities fall into category I, that is, ones which offer a well-staffed, well-rounded course of study about Latin America. The University of Florida is one of these eight. Florida's awareness of the importance of inter-American understanding also has been reflected in the thoughtful and persistent efforts of Senator SMATHERS to bring attention to the realities of our foreign policy in Latin America.

We are now on the threshold of the 69th anniversary of the Organization of American States. It has long been customary at this time of the year to extol pan-American peace, solidarity, and cooperation. Such oratory now would be a gratuitous gesture. It is dangerous to perpetuate comfortable fictions about a bond that has been broken. The first prerequisite of a responsible and effective policy toward Latin America is a willingness to face the facts, however unpleasant they may be.

OUR STAKE IN LATIN AMERICA

There is no disagreement on the importance of cordial, cooperative relations with our 20 sister Republics. Everyone agrees that strategically, ICBM's notwithstanding, Latin America remains one of the key foundations of our defense shield. Politically, close and harmonious relations with the Latin American people, who now number over 180 million, add to the free world's strength in the larger issues of the cold war.

Economically, the American Republics constitute a vital ingredient in our own well-being. The area is second only to Europe as a purchaser of our exports. Twenty-five percent of all our exports go there. In 1957 this meant the sale of $560 million worth of automobiles and parts, of $445 million worth of chemicals, $135 million of medicines, $121 million of edible animal products, and so on across the board of U.S. products. Latin American purchases add up to a lot of jobs for a lot of people in the United States. At the same time, imports from south of the Rio Grande consist of many strategic minerals as well as materials essential to our peacetime industries. U.S. private investments in the area now total over $9 billion, more than in any other region of the world.

Why, then, have relations deteriorated?

CRISIS POLICY

Part of the responsibility lies in our preoccupation with Europe, the Middle East, and Asia. While attention to these vital areas is understandable, the resulting neglect of Latin America cannot be justified. The personal diplomacy of the administration has also tended in the same direction. With all decisionmaking power concentrated in Secretary Dulles, the less precarious situation in Latin America got shoved into the background until it too became a crisis. Up until the recent disturbances, I am told, Foreign Service officers working in Latin America were somehow considered to be occupying second-class positions.

TAKING LATIN AMERICA FOR GRANTED

The good-neighbor policy itself may be partly to blame for the assumption that nothing much could go wrong within our hemisphere. Latin American representatives tried to make their grievances heard through proper channels and at stated conferences. Often their warnings and protests were bitter. But the good-neighbor policy had been so successful in cementing United States-Latin American relations that long after its demise an aura of good will lingered on, hiding the grim realities underneath. The hangover from the good-neighbor policy seems to have created an impression in the United States that the Latin American republics were solidly with us, no matter what we did or did not do.

LATIN-AMERICAN REVOLUTIONS

The attitude of taking Latin America for granted is only part of the growing estrangement between the United States and Latin America. I think that our gravest error has been a misreading of the revolution gripping the region. Some people are prone to dismiss Latin American revolts as mere changes in the palace guard, while others see Communist influence in every upheaval. These stereotypes can be our undoing.

Today, the nations to the south are in the midst of an epic social revolution. We and the Communists have vied with each other in telling people the world over that they no longer have to live out their lives in hopeless misery. The peoples of Latin America took us at our word.

They want an end to semifeudal conditions in which 5 percent of the population owns 80 to 90 percent of the land; in which a handful of nationals and foreigners live in luxury while the majority live in squalor; in which disease strikes down their children, and hunger and ignorance perpetuate their slavery; in which the wealthy minority joins with the army to keep things just as they are.

Many thousands of Latin Americans have risked exile, imprisonment, torture, and death to achieve responsible governments, responsive to the needs of their people. These courageous people usually come from the classes that produce political leadership—students, union leaders, professional and business men. The rash of revolutions that toppled tyrannies in Argentina, Colombia, Venezuela, and Cuba attests to their determination to achieve freedom and bread.

THE LATIN AMERICAN IMAGE OF THE UNITED STATES

In the midst of that upheaval, which we above all other peoples should be able to understand and to sympathize with, the United States has somehow managed to appear callous and indifferent. While we have eagerly sought Latin American support to stop the spread of Communist tyranny, we have demonstrated a peculiar nonchalance toward despotisms of the home-grown variety.

In 1954 Secretary Dulles took time to fly to the ninth Inter-American Conference in Caracas to press for an inter-American declaration against Communist intervention in the Western Hemisphere. That very same year we bestowed the Legion of Merit on Pérez Jiménez then the hated dictator of Venezuela. The incredible citation reads in part:

"To H. E. Marcos Pérez Jiménez, President of the Republic of Venezuela for the exceptional nature of his outstanding accomplishments. His Excellency, as President of the Republic of Venezuela and previously, has demonstrated a spirit of friendship and cooperation with the United States. The sound economic, financial, and foreign investment policies advocated and pursued by his administration have contributed greatly to the economic well-being of his country, and to the rapid development of its tremendous resources. These policies, judiciously combined with a far reaching public works program, have remarkably improved its education, sanitation, transportation, housing, and other important basic facilities."

Shortly after our tribute to Pérez Jiménez, the Archbishop of Caracas dared to denounce the tyrant in a pastoral letter, and thousands of anguished Venezuelans hazarded their lives to get rid of the bloody oppressor upon whom we had lavished praise.

On January 10, 1958—just 13 days before unarmed men, women, and children rose heroically against the brutal Venezuelan dictatorship—the man who had been our Ambassador to Venezuela from 1951 to 1956 wrote from his new post in Turkey to the dictator's savage secret-police chief congratulating him for putting down the first abortive revolt. The letter, on Foreign Service stationery, came to light after the democratic revolution.

These incidents are, unfortunately, not isolated. Our Defense Department, in the middle of the Cuban revolt, decorated the officer who had commanded air raids against the Cuban people. We kept up a stream of armaments to Batista long after it had become apparent that he was using them against his own people, contrary to the terms of our defense agreement.

The Communists, of course, are getting a lot of mileage out of such errors. But we must face up to the fact that our own actions, not Communist propaganda, have created throughout Latin America an image of the United States as a nation selfishly engrossed in defending its own freedoms but heedless of the aspirations of others.

THE ECONOMIC SITUATION IS SERIOUS

U.S. official attitudes with regard to Latin America's economic problems have deepened the estrangement between us.

Our economic attitudes toward Latin America have created the image of the United States are arrogant, paternal, interested primarily in promoting the interests of U.S. investors, and unconcerned for the well-being of ordinary human beings. It is painful to think that the generous impulse of the United States, which first created the idea of technical assistance in Latin America in 1942, now seems so perverted.

As you know, all the American Republics, to a greater or less degree, fall into the category of underdeveloped countries. All are dependent on the expert of one, or at best a few, commodities to earn the foreign exchange to buy vital necessities and to finance economic development.

Any downswing in the world price or demand for their few exports plays havoc with their income. This uncertainty makes development planning exceedingly difficult.

With an average annual per capita income of less than $300, some areas in Latin America are hard pressed to maintain even this low living standard in the face of a rapidly growing population.

Our neighbors have not been sitting on their hands waiting for assistance. Ninety percent of the capital invested in the area is Latin America's own. The reserves accumulated from the sale of raw materials during World War II, made possible a spurt of development in the region. From 1945 to 1953 the average per capita income rose at the rate of 3.3 percent a year, and Mexico, for example, achieved a rate twice as great. After 1952, with reserves depleted and the price and demand for Latin America's principal products on the decline, the accelerated rate of development ground to a halt.

Responsible leaders in Latin America are worried. On the one hand they have populations awakened from centuries of apathy who are demanding a better deal in life. On the other hand, the ubiquitous Communists are there, dangling tempting promises before the eyes of the underprivileged. Democratic leaders in Latin America know that they must produce some tangible results, that they must provide some hope for a better future, if democratic government is to endure.

THE U.S. RESPONSE HAS BEEN AMBIGUOUS

On the question of Latin America's economic development the United States has presented an ambiguous picture. Latin Americans understood and welcomed Secretary Marshall's stirring declaration at Harvard University 12 years ago: "Our policy is directed not against any country or doctrine, but against hunger, poverty, desperation, and chaos." Hunger, poverty, desperation and chaos well described Latin American conditions. And, we encouraged the Latin Americans to look almost exclusively to us for assistance.

We then proceeded to provide billions in aid to Europe and Asia. To Latin American pleas for assistance, we replied with advice that they should look to private investments and private enterprise as the principal channel for their funds. In 1956 Senator SMATHERS proposed an amendment to the Mutual Security Act to provide a special fund for loans for Latin America for health, education and sanitation projects. This proposal met with resistance from the State Department on the grounds that private capital was doing a good enough job. I am happy to say that Congress passed the amendment in spite of State Department resistance.

The frequent reiteration that private capital would meet Latin American requirements insulted and irritated our neighbors. We Americans like our system of free enterprise. It has worked for us, although not in the simon-pure form that some people like to pretend. Latin Americans, on the other hand, have some sour memories of the robber-baron type investments, both domestic and foreign, which we ourselves have long since ceased to tolerate.

In addition to historical differences, the advice ignored the plain fact that private enterprise goes in to make a profit, and will hardly be attracted when the basic sinews of a national economy—such as roads, power and sanitation facilities—are lacking.

Moreover, overdependence in private investment results in a piecemeal approach to economic development as private funds haphazardly move into a mine here and a factory there. Latin Americans point out that in their urgent circumstances they cannot wait for the trickle-down theory to maybe work.

THE U.S. CHANGE OF HEART

It took the violent outbursts against Vice President NIXON to make us conscious of the gravity of the Latin American situation. On March 10 last the Department of State announced a change of heart, as follows:

"Not only must account be taken of the private capital and technical know-how required to create employment for those who today are underemployed or unemployed, but also of the need to create new jobs for an even larger number of workers. In addition to the expansion of industry and agriculture which this implies, very large additional amounts of public funds will be required for facilities which only governments can provide; for example, highways, sanitation facilities, hospitals, and schools."

The recognition that Latin American growing pains differ from ours and our consequent abandonment of inflexible doctrinaire principles should open the way for better inter-American understanding.

Along the new guidelines positive steps are in progress. The administration has finally announced that it will support an Inter-American Development Bank, something the Latin Americans have been urging for years and we have been resisting for years. We have agreed to consult with the Republics before making decisions which could affect their principal exports. We have indicated a willingness to take a fresh look at efforts to deal with instability and fluctuation in the commodity market. We have lent our support to the idea of regional markets within Latin America.

In short, we have recognized the magnitude of Latin America's problem and have agreed to cooperate with our neighbors in finding solutions.

A NINE-POINT PROGRAM FOR IMPROVING LATIN AMERICAN RELATIONS

Latin America, as population zooms, as industrial development spreads, and hope and impatience mingle, is going to be a cauldron of competing political ideologies. We should welcome this development, not fear it.

In no region of the world have we deeper historical traditions to build upon. It was with the Latin American Republics that we first developed the idea of regional cooperation. The bold idea of mutual cooperation to attack disease, illiteracy, and poverty was born within the inter-American family. These are the people who wept unashamedly when Franklin Delano Roosevelt died.

Today in Latin America there are many leaders who understand and admire our democratic system and want to develop something comparable in their own countries. I know of an American who, while attending the inauguration last month of the democratically elected President of Venezuela, was asked on three separate occasions by newly elected Venezuelan congressmen how they could get hold of a copy of the "Jefferson Manual of Rules for the House of Representatives."

Our traditions of individual freedom and concern for ordinary human beings were once the cornerstone of our successful Latin American policy. Now, to Latin Americans, these much admired beliefs seem to stop at the border. While we caution our neighbors about Communist activities and Communist infiltration, we appear peculiarly cold toward the Latin American yearning to achieve genuine civil liberties.

The recent steps taken by the administration to repair our tottering Latin American policy should be applauded. They are steps in the right direction, but they will not be enough if the escalator of history is going faster in the opposite direction. We must replace our massive indifference to Latin

American aspirations with massive cooperation.

The Latin American situation cries out for imaginative, long-range planning, rather than the hurried, patch-up measures after an explosion has occurred.

A coordinated program on the order of the Marshall plan would give the Latin Americans new hope of attaining bread and freedom. The possibilities of such an effort should be explored carefully, not primarily as an anti-Communist stratagem, but because it is good for Latin America and for the United States. We should not be ashamed of our humanitarian tradition. Nor should we be embarrassed if humanitarian and security objectives sometimes coincide in our national policy.

In conclusion, I should like to propose a nine-point program for improving United States-Latin American relations. I believe this program is realistic and workable and in harmony with the best interests of our country and of our 20 sister republics.

First. The United States should increase the volume of its economic aid in support of Latin American efforts to develop diversified and viable economics so they will not be dependent, as they now are, on a few commodities. Requests for loans from the Development Loan Fund and the Export-Import Bank should be dealt with expeditiously and sympathetically. We should cooperate fully with the new Inter-American Development Institution. The proposed corps of technical experts within the institute could help the smaller, inexperienced countries draw up coordinated development plans.

Second. The United States should accelerate and strengthen its program of technical assistance in agriculture, health, education, vocational training, and public administration. The time has come to recapture the original fervor of President Truman's bold new program which was widely hailed in Latin America when it was first announced a decade ago.

Third. The United States should support vigorously the current moves within Latin America to establish regional markets. The elimination of inter-American trade barriers would broaden markets for Latin American products and make low-cost manufacturing feasible, both indispensable prerequisites to diversification and economic growth.

Fourth. The United States should review its trade and tariff policies as they affect imports from Latin America. It is self-defeating for us to provide economic assistance with one hand and take it away with the other by short sighted trade restrictions. If policies designed to strengthen our trade with Latin America cause hardship to any domestic industry, the Government has a responsibility to aid those so affected. (I recently cosponsored an amendment in the Senate to the Area Redevelopment Act (S. 722) to make such aid possible, but unfortunately it did not pass the committee stage.)

Fifth. The United States should give wholehearted support to the health programs under the direction of the Pan American Sanitary Organization. Widespread disease which stalks Latin America is a tremendous economic drain as well as a human tragedy. Investment in health is perhaps the cheapest, most effective investment we can make in the future of the Western Hemisphere.

Sixth. The United States should develop a bold and imaginative program of student and cultural exchange.

We need to reexamine our methods of screening Latin American scholarship recipients. Too frequently the test has been the friendliness of the recipient toward the United States. Young Latin Americans of so-called leftist tendencies have been excluded, when they are often the very ones who would benefit most from the program.

Seventh. The U.S. press, radio, and TV. networks should give wider and better balanced news coverage of Latin American affairs. This, of course, is something our Government can do little about. But it is essential that the American people have a continuous report and interpretation of Latin American developments if they are to understand the magnitude of the problems in that region and what we are asked to support. When news of revolutions and executions dominate our newspapers, it is hard for the American taxpayer to form an understanding of the underlying realities in the 20 American republics, and of our interest in them.

Eighth. The United States should thoroughly reappraise its military assistance program in Latin America. What we have given one nation for hemispheric defense has often provoked demands by another for an equal amount of aid. Great care should be taken not to encourage this type of arms race, which Latin American governments can illafford. We should give greater attention to the coordination of military policy and strategy in the hemisphere. This might well result in a decrease in the requirements of national military establishments.

Further, our military assistance to certain dictatorial governments has raised the question of whose freedom those governments are defending. The use by Batista of U.S. supplied armaments against his own people, contrary to stipulations of our defense treaty, has greatly damaged U.S. prestige throughout Latin America. It makes little sense to speak of hemisphere defense while arming a tyrant who uses weapons to intimidate his own people.

Ninth. The United States should lend its support to the idea of regional arms control. Last year Costa Rica submitted such a plan to the Organization of American States and received nominal support from the U.S. delegation. Our Government should now press for the consideration of the Costa Rican plan or some similar project, at the eleventh inter-American conference to be held at Quito next year.

The quality of our overall policy toward Latin America will be determined not only by what we do, but by how we do it.

Unless we pursue our policies with a genuine interest in the welfare of our fellow human beings, they will do little to heal our wounded inter-American relations. The steps already taken by the Department of State, many of them complete reversals of former policy, will avail us little if they are done reluctantly and only under Latin American pressure.

We must, if we are to recapture the warm bonds of friendship which characterized the best days of the good-neighbor policy, breathe into inter-American cooperation that intangible spirit which then characterized our relations—a deep-rooted conviction that the Western Hemisphere can, indeed it must, be a New World where freedom and opportunity flourish.

Qualities Needed for the Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include an article from the April 10, 1959, number of the Commonweal, in which Dr. Joseph F. Meñez, associate professor of political science at Loyola University and a distinguished constituent, discusses the qualities need in a member of the Supreme Court of the United States and what constitutes judicial temperament. Professor Meñez's longer article entitled "A Brief in Defense of the Supreme Court" will shortly be published by the Northwestern Law Review. His article in the Commonweal follows:

WHOSE JUDICIAL TEMPERAMENT

(By Joseph F. Meñez)

There has hardly been a time in its history when the Supreme Court has not been in the middle of controversy, when some group or other did not want to "reform" or "curb" it. The Court today is under fire. Southerners have revolted because of the desegregation decision; Congressmen believe that the Court is exceeding the 10th amendment and encroaching, as in the Watkins case, they say, on Congress itself; anti-Communists believe the Court is "soft" on communism; the State supreme court justices recently blasted the Court for "judicially legislating"; and President Eisenhower himself has intimated that some recent decisions are hard to understand.

A good deal of the current criticism is concerned with "judicial temperament." According to the critics, the members of the Court lack it. But what does "judicial temperament" mean? What measurement does the President use in appointing a Supreme Court Justice? Is the measurement the same for the Senate in confirming him? Does the public at large, as well as special organizations as different as the American Bar Association, the American Civil Liberties Union, or the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, have a still different measurement?

A further complication is that the appointment must be judged in terms of what one expects the Court's role to be in a democratic society. Should the Court be judicially activist or nonactivist? Should it transfer the standards of the Bill of Rights—now applicable largely to the National Government—to the States as well? Should it restrict the conception of judicial review, in Justice Robert's phrase, to "the laying of the Constitution which is invoked beside the statute which is challenged * * * to decide whether the latter squares with the former" or expand it and assert with Chief Justice Earl Warren that the "beginning of justice is the capacity to generalize and make objective one's private sense of wrong?"

The Constitution does not help, since it says nothing about judicial qualifications, and what might be judicial temperament to one President, or Senate, or generation might not be to another. When, for instance, Louis D. Brandeis' name was before the Senate for confirmation, he was opposed by seven past presidents of the American Bar Association. And, heading a list of 55 distinguished Bostonians in opposition to Brandeis, President Lowell, of Harvard said: "We do not believe that Mr. Brandeis has the judicial temperament and capacity which should be required in a judge of the Supreme Court."

With the exception of his fourth appointee, Charles E. Whittaker, President Eisenhower's appointments to the Court have been harshly dealt with by the Senate Judiciary Committee. Chief Justice Earl Warren was not only accused of having insufficient legal ability to be a Chief Justice but it was suggested that he followed the Marxist line. Justice John Marshall Harlan's confirmation was shamefully delayed because of guilt by association. His grandfather (of the same name) dissented in *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* with the electrifying phrase: "Our Constitution is colorblind." Justice Harlan was attacked in addition, for being a close friend of interna-

tional groups and a political follower of Thomas E. Dewey and his henchmen.

William E. Brennan, Jr., who ascended to the High Court from New Jersey's highest court, ran into a snag when he was asked to explain what committee he had in mind in 1954 and 1955 when he denounced the "barbarism" of some of the investigative hearings. It was also necessary for him to state that his catholicism was not incompatible with his oath of office, despite the fact that he was the sixth Catholic to sit on the Court, two of whom, Taney, and White, were Chief Justices. And Potter Steward, the President's latest appointee, who has a recess appointment "on approval," is expected to meet southern opposition for his ruling on segregation as a circuit judge.

Since the practice is now firmly established that nominees to the Court attend Judiciary Committee hearings, although they have done so only since 1925, it is hoped that these hearings be dignified and fair. Certainly the committee must be chary of abusing its privileges, and it should not tolerate the scandalous politics which characterized the Warren hearings when Senator WILLIAM LANGER, of North Dakota, released unevaluated charges against Mr. Warren to the press.

It might be mentioned, also, that the practice, heavily relied upon by Mr. Eisenhower, of "clearing" the names of nominees with the American Bar Association could lead to a fatal diminution of the appointing power. The bar should, of course, be consulted, but care should be exercised so as to avoid extending it a veto power. As Father Robert Drinan, déan of the Boston College Law School, recently wrote: "The prior approval of the bar association for all judicial appointments would indeed be a treacherous idea to introduce." The bar tends to be conservative, and such a prenatal influence on the nominating power—a power that approximates senatorial courtesy—would concede too much to the bar's own conception of judicial temperament.

How much does prior judicial experience enter into this concept of judicial temperament? Judging from the charges made against Chief Justice Warren and some of the other inexperienced Justices, as well as the introduction in Congress of some proposed amendments to the Constitution spelling out what is meant by prior judicial experience, it would seem a sine qua non. And yet both in logic and practice it is not. Every judge, surely, ought to possess a decent portion of technical craftsmanship; still, a mere possession of it is not sufficient to make a man a great or even an outstanding judge. The law is not always clear, and interpreting it is not always easy. The Court does not decide cases in the same way a pharmacist prepares a remedy.

It was Justice Felix Frankfurter's studied conclusion that the relationship between prior judicial experience and judicial temperament is zero. It is noteworthy that of the 14 Chief Justices only 5 (Jay, Ellsworth, White, Taft, and Vinson) had prior judicial experience, and among the Associate Justices there is a veritable galaxy of the judicial greats similarly devoid of such experience. Would the Court have performed a greater service as a fulcrum in our constitutional system had membership required previous experience? It is unlikely. Chief Justice Taft valued such experience as a measure of judicial temperament as much as anyone, and yet, of the eight appointments he made or influenced personally, the most successful were not those with most prior experience. Similarly, Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes, in a list of eight outstanding judges, named only two who had prior judicial training.

Though the Court is always described as being liberal or conservative, and the Justices have tended to form blocs, with one or two swingmen, it defies such neat partition. Moreover, these are not blocs in the legislative sense of uniformity of opinion following a caucus. Justices vote as individuals and are fiercely jealous of their independence. To attempt putting them into pigeonholes is risky business; risky, also, is to assume a judge will be consistent, for judges, with considerable more candor than politicians, change their minds.

Thus, Stanley Reed started out as a liberal New Dealer, became a swingman, and ultimately a conservative, while Charles Evans Hughes passed over the same road in the opposite direction. Madison, under Jefferson's prodding, appointed Joseph Story to neutralize John Marshall only to see him captured. Woodrow Wilson appointed McReynolds, who then stood for everything the President abhorred; and Jackson, as a member of the Court, reversed a position he had assumed while Attorney General. Explaining his reversal, he wrote: "If there are other ways of gracefully and good naturedly surrendering former views to a better considered position, I invoke them all."

Judicial temperament has almost as many definitions as there are commentators, but at least, in addition to the importance put on prior judicial experience and technical craftsmanship, it means that the Justice must possess, as Anthony Lewis recently suggested, disinteredness, a breadth of vision, ability to express oneself, and an awareness of tradition. Justice Frankfurter defines it as "largeness of view" in deciding the great issues before the Court. In "The Marble Palace," John Frank understands "judicial temperament" to mean, among other things, that the Justice must possess the qualities of wisdom, judgment, great energy, the quality of creativeness, and the ability to be clear and persuasive in argument.

So, too, must the judge possess courage, for, as James M. Barrie once said, "Courage is the thing. All goes if courage goes." He must also be humane and not apply the law coldbloodedly. Thus Justice Miller, concerned with substantial justice rather than technical considerations, repeatedly asserted: "If this is not due process of law it ought to be." Even if a judge combined all these qualities, however, it would not satisfy Edmond Cahn if the judge is not wholeheartedly committed to the Bill of Rights. Unless the judge, he feels, is passionately "attached to liberty, justice, and equality, at best his contribution will be mediocre. At worst, it may be dangerously corrosive. How a judge uses his personal endowments depends largely on how deeply he cares for freedom and individual dignity."

There is, in short, no primary meaning to the term "judicial temperament." It is a phrase which means pretty much what the users of it want it to mean. It describes neither ability nor promise, nor does one train to achieve it. If it involves anything at all, it involves judgment, and judgment, said Justice Frankfurter, "derives from the totality of man's nature and experience."

World Law—The Bridge Between the Danger and the Dream

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks which I am scheduled to present this evening before the Wilmington, Del. chapter of the United World Federalists:

WORLD LAW—THE BRIDGE BETWEEN THE DANGER AND THE DREAM

Considering the degree and the immediacy of the danger of a thermonuclear world disaster and the apparent remoteness of peace based on world law, it might be appropriate for me to commence my remarks with the words of a hymn. You are probably acquainted with the second verse of "Turn Back O Man, Forswear Thy Foolish Ways," but let me read it to you:

"Earth might be fair and all man glad and wise,
Age after age their tragic emprise rise,
Built while they dream, and in that dreaming weep,
Would man but wake from out his haunted sleep,
Earth might be fair and all men glad and wise."

Hmyns, fellowship, prayer—all these should be utilized in the search for world peace. We remember what St. Paul preached. We know that faith needs works. We wonder, are we smart enough to survive? Is it in fact too late to avert world disaster? The cosmic clock may indeed indicate 5 minutes after 12, not before 12.

I didn't come here tonight to despair, nor did I come here to bedazzle you with the prospect of a world at peace, a peace insured by effective world law.

PRESENT POLICIES PUSH ATOMIC WAR CLOSER

I didn't come to make you wring your hands and gnash your teeth and tear your hair, although I grant that these responses may be entirely defensible in the light of our present situation and of our policies which are every day pushing us closer to atomic war and to the destruction of our civilization.

I didn't come to describe for you the social, economic, and cultural configurations of a world no longer forced to dissipate its resources in a gigantic arms race.

I did come to Wilmington from Washington to attempt to delineate more precisely the danger confronting the world today and the dream—the attainment of which means escape from this danger. I came to counsel against excesses of both despair and hope. If we have decided to climb Mt. Emerest, we do not give up before we start, nor do we start without considerable preparations, preparations which might be hastened if that summit were soon to be the only place on earth that could sustain life.

So it is with the attainment of workable world law. I want to discuss several particular preparations we can make and, I add, must make immediately.

Washington, D.C., sometimes described as a place of protocol, alcohol, and Geritol, has no monopoly on attempts to solve this problem, and certainly we can't do it without the help of Wilmington, Del., Eugene, Oreg., and people in cities and countries everywhere.

A human being is a frail thing. He can easily be killed. Most of us are reluctantly reconciled to our own personal mortality, but we are appalled at the thought that our children may not have a chance to grow up because of our progress in the arts of weapon making. We would like to figure out how to save them.

We must accurately assess the danger. Are we too alarmist? Is there a balance of terror on which we can rely? Can't we take comfort in the age-old belief that for every offensive weapon man has invented, man has soon developed an effective defense?

THE LINES GROW LONGER

The danger, unquestionably, is unprecedentedly great. We have explosives incon-

ceivably more powerful than any we ever imagined possessing. Let me illustrate. If you use a line 2 inches long to represent the explosive force of an 11,000-pound blockbuster chemical bomb, the largest we had in World War II, in order to represent on the same scale a 3-megaton hydrogen bomb—a relatively small thermonuclear device—you would have to draw a line 20 miles long.

Propulsion and guidance systems are improving rapidly. Our experts assured us more than a year ago that we now were at the stage of "nuclear plenty," which means each of three nations has more than twice or three times enough bombs to wipe out all human life. Our military men talk dispassionately about the "overkill" problem.

THREE WAYS OF TRIGGERING WAR

But just because we have them doesn't mean we'll use them, does it? Let's look at the ways an all-out war could be triggered.

First, intentionally. We have, I am told, an increasing number of military men privately advocating preventive war, their reason being that in no other way will we have a chance because of vast Soviet superiority in missiles. Of course, the Soviets are aware of this reasoning. And we realize they may decide to insure that their missiles get the head start.

Second, war could start accidentally. That is, the result of human error. Many fingers are on many triggers and those fingers belong to fallible human beings.

Third, by unauthorized action, as where, without proper authority, a custodian of a weapon decides, for reasons of insanity, venality, idealism or perhaps alcohol, to cause a thermonuclear explosion.

We have laws, customs and mechanical safeguards galore with reference to the use of small arms, but a lot of people get hurt and killed with them every day.

A single atomic explosion in these times of tension would be hard to interpret except as an aggressive act, the precursor of an all-out attack. There would be no wreckage to examine, no witnesses to question, only the necessity to judge instantly whether retaliation was in order. I submit to you that the man who had to make the decision would not be inclined to characterize any mysterious blast as anything but an attack.

Until tensions in the world can be reduced, any accidental or unauthorized explosion is likely to set in motion toward all-out war forces which cannot be stopped.

FANTASTIC SPECULATION

Do I speculate fantastically? I wish I could say I did. Let me read what the Rand Corp. said last July on this subject, this corporation being, as many of you know, in effect the private brains of our Air Force:

"It should be recognized that all-out nuclear war could start in many ways, other than by a premeditated Soviet attack. A local war might become so invested with national interests and prestige that Soviet leaders, if faced with decisive defeat, would choose to counter with an all-out attack. This danger has probably increased because Khrushchev seems less cautious than Stalin, less secure in his grasp of power, yet freer to exercise his diplomacy on a global scale. War might occur because of miscalculation of U.S. intentions; in a period of acute tension, verbal and even military indicators would be difficult to interpret, and the premium on a first strike might well tempt the USSR to launch a pre-emptive attack. War might even begin by accident, triggered by a chance release of weapons, and carried on because both sides were poised in a high state of alert for quick and nearly automatic retaliation. Finally, as just mentioned, we cannot rule out the possibility that the United States, faced with a major Soviet challenge, might sometime be forced to resist militarily, even at the risk of devastation."

Later in the same report, a note of hope, at least as to fallout, was sounded:

"To conclude: Despite many unresolved questions about long-term fallout, it seems to be a sound generalization that long-term radiation problems are a less critical threat to the survival of a population than the central short-term problem, namely, how to protect a substantial fraction of the population from the immediate disaster of a nuclear war."

However, disclosures subsequently indicate that food supplies may be far more critical because of long-term radiation, so perhaps even that vestige of comfort is denied us.

ARE WE SMART ENOUGH TO SURVIVE?

The danger is clear and deadly and immediate, yet the usual reaction, when not entirely due to ignorance, is either an indifferent fatalism or a sappy kind of optimistic incredulity. One attitude is summed up in the words, "Well there's nothing we can do about it," and the other in the words, "Things look tough all right but we'll muddle through again." These attitudes may be entirely adequate from a personal mental hygiene point of view but they are not going to help us survive.

There are many things we can do about this danger and we certainly can't count on muddling through. The question is, Are we smart enough to survive? Are we smart enough to apprehend the danger, to conceive the solution and then to proceed step by step to its fulfillment? I don't know. You don't know. We wonder. We hope. We pray.

What about the dream, the solution, a world under law? It isn't so complex nor is it in itself controversial. We don't have war among the States of our Nation—not any more. We have a Federal system. What is controversial is the feasibility of even trying to attain this sort of system for the world. The usual accusations are that those who want world law are out to weaken our position with respect to the Soviet Union and also that such a system would mean an invasion of our sovereignty with interference in local affairs.

WORLD LAW IS THE SOLUTION FOR OUR WEAPONS CRISIS

Let me now call a few witnesses in support of my proposition that world law is the solution for our weapons crisis.

The President has said so. Last August his Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, Francis O. Wilcox, expressed administration policy in these words:

"In this nuclear age, when we are all faced with annihilation, man must continue relentlessly his eternal quest for peace. In this quest I believe that our best hope still lies in the concept of collective security and in taking what steps we can to strengthen the peace machinery of the United Nations."

Sometimes the White House and the Republicans in Congress differ, but apparently not on this point. Consider what Senator STYLES BRIDGES, head of the Republican policy committee, said on the floor of the Senate last July 23:

"But we are confronted today with the awful fact that thermonuclear devices make war a threat of total destruction of the civilized world. We face catastrophe if we allow the world to drift into another world war. We may not be able to escape war in any event, but we have a sacred duty to all mankind to try to find another way out.

"Aside from naked power politics, backed by each nation's armed strength, our only hope lies in developing the power of the community, as presently represented by the United Nations, to deal with the trouble spots that lead to war.

"The United Nations cannot control the actions of the great powers. If they are determined to make war, the United Nations will be powerless to stop them.

"But the great powers drift into war by lining up on opposite sides in the crises that occur in smaller nations. If we give the United Nations power to deal constructively with these events and conditions, we can remove many of the causes which set the great powers against each other, and thereby make world war less likely."

The Senator and I disagree on many issues, but not on this one.

HOW DO WE USE THE WORLD LAW CONCEPT?

What is the program? How do we use the concept of world law to bridge the gap between the danger of war and the dream of peace? The short and general answer is that we educate and discipline ourselves so that our executive and legislative branches proceed to carry out a vigorous public consensus demanding that we proceed to strengthen the United Nations and thus permit general massive disarmament.

The longer and more specific answer has, among others, these lines of action:

1. We must set about at once to consider strengthening the United Nations. Article 109 of the United Nations Charter provides procedures for calling a Charter Review Conference. In 1955 and again in 1957 this Conference was postponed pending more auspicious international circumstances.

The Committee on Arrangements for a United National Charter Review Conference meets this June. It is my hope that the United States at that time will urge the Committee to recommend to the United Nations General Assembly that governments establish national commissions, or instruct national bodies, to undertake studies to determine their position on charter review.

I want to read to you the text of a resolution to be introduced in the Congress this week by myself and several colleagues:

"Whereas the basic purpose of the foreign policy of the United States of America is to protect the freedom of its citizens; and

"Whereas the United States seeks freedom, peace, and prosperity for the peoples of all nations; and

"Whereas the United States has joined with other nations to pursue these goals through the United Nations; and

"Whereas enforceable law has proven to be indispensable to the attainment of these goals and to the peaceful and just settlement of disputes within all civilized communities: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that it should be United States policy to seek, through the United Nations, the development of world law to protect the freedom, peace, and just aspirations of all peoples, to provide for the peaceful settlement of international disputes, and to permit the elimination of national armaments; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution will be sent to the President of the United States, who is hereby requested to initiate studies at the highest level of the changes which should be made in the Charter of the United Nations or in the charters of other international organizations to further the development of world law for the purposes enumerated in this resolution; and, pursuant to this goal; be it further

"Resolved, That the United States Government should urge the United Nations Committee on Arrangements for a United Nations Charter Review Conference, when it meets in June 1959, to recommend to the United Nations General Assembly that governments establish national commissions, or instruct appropriate national bodies, to undertake studies to determine their positions on char-

ter review or revision in order to facilitate fruitful consideration of suitable measures to strengthen the United Nations Charter as an effective legislative, executive, and judicial instrument of world law when a Charter Review Conference is held."

In my opinion the very act of seeking to strengthen the United Nations would lessen tensions among nations today and reduce the likelihood of a war by design or a war triggered by an accidental or unauthorized act.

2. Proposals in the Congress and by the Vice President to increase the power of the World Court should proceed on their own and also as part of United Nations Charter revision studies. Senators HUMPHREY and MORSE, among others, propose to allow the Court to decide whether an issue is domestic or not. The Vice President wants the Court to interpret treaties so as to bind the parties. These would be gigantic steps forward away from war and toward peace.

3. The establishment of a United Nations police force, as urged by both the Congress and the President, could be done by action in the United Nations General Assembly. As presently conceived, it would be only for observation and patrol but if, as has been urged from many quarters, such as organization were used to supervise all armed forces in Berlin, its functions might well, in time, grow into something more formidable and effective.

4. Cessation of atomic testing. It was most encouraging that the Geneva talks were recently resumed. Any kind of an international inspection system would be a significant step forward. A would-be violator would have to consider the impact not only of world opinion, but the opinion of his own people.

5. Massive disarmament as proposed by Sir Philip Noel-Baker and others, on a multilateral basis and with proper safeguards of course, is possible. It is also realistic. The other evening Noel-Baker, the great authority on world disarmament, took violent exception to my using the word "dream" to describe world peace through world law. "The romanticists," he said, "are those persons who believe war can be prevented by an arms race." He went on to point out that no country can defend itself today, no matter how much it spends. You might, for a while, defend an airfield or launching site, but not the people. The cities are vulnerable, naked, defenseless. I agree with him that negotiations on a multilateral arms-limitation agreement, of great scope, ought to be begun without delay and with the utmost determination and intelligence.

6. The informing of public opinion here and elsewhere, as by discussions of the danger, the dream, and the programs by organizations like yours, and also the League of Women Voters, labor unions, churches, and schools. The monumental book "World Peace Through World Law," by Grenville Clark and Louis Sohn, should be used as the basis for profitable sessions. Unofficial international meetings should be held whenever possible to discuss these matters.

AN INFORMED PUBLIC OPINION

Our Government is based on public opinion. In these times it is more necessary than ever before that this public opinion, which elects our leaders, be informed.

No doubt you can suggest improvements on this program. Please do. I could add my own personal project of establishing a chapter in the United States Congress of the World Parliament Association. It will be called Members of Congress for World Law. I could also mention the personal security plans my able and respected friend, Ralph Lapp, the atomic publicist, has for the safety of himself and his family if they survive the first nuclear blast. They have supplies stored away in a shelter not too far out of Washington. He is neither a fatalist nor a sappy optimist, but most of us are one or both.

THE BALANCE OF TERROR

The other night, when I had the privilege of talking with Philip Noel-Baker, he ended his remarks to our small group by saying he believed that very substantial arms reductions were not only critically necessary but technically feasible in terms of effective inspection procedures.

"On the other hand," he said, "I believe that within 10 years we will all be dead and that the earth will be an incinerated relic."

The man sitting next to him, one of our highest scientific policy advisers for the administration, added without hesitation and with somber sincerity, "I believe so, too."

They may well be right. I refuse to believe that they are. It may indeed be 5 minutes after midnight; but, since we are not able to see this cosmic clock and because we want our children to have a chance to grow up, we have no honorable course but to proceed as though there was still time to save the world from becoming an "incinerated relic."

I started with a hymn and I shall end with the closing verse of "Turn Back O Man."

"Earth shall be fair, and all her people one,
Nor till that hour shall God's whole will be done.
Now, even now, once more from earth to sky
Peals forth in joy man's old undaunted cry:
'Earth shall be fair, and all her folks be one.'"

Thank you very much.

Raymond P. Harold, of Worcester, Mass.: A Model Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday evening, April 15, 1959, a grateful and appreciative citizenry, in my home city of Worcester, Mass., turned out a thousandfold, to join in honoring one of our most distinguished and public-spirited residents, Raymond P. Harold, president of the Worcester Federal Savings & Loan Association.

The occasion was the bestowal upon Mr. Harold, by the Worcester Advertising Club, of the Isaiah Thomas Award for distinguished community service. Mr. Harry G. Stoddard, president of the Worcester Telegram, served as toastmaster; Mr. Joseph W. Norton, president of the Worcester Advertising Club, expressed the club's tribute; His Excellency Bishop John J. Wright, now of the Pittsburgh Diocese, and recently Roman Catholic Bishop of Worcester, delivered the principal address, and Mr. Harold gave his acceptance speech.

Because the speeches at this great dinner were extraordinarily thought-provoking and inspiring, particularly the address given by Bishop Wright; and because the outline of the career of Mr. Harold presents a graphic picture of the ideal businessman leading the fight for his community progress, offering a patriotic example for all of us, I would like to include pertinent extracts from the addresses at this point. The speeches appeared in the April issue of the Worcester, Mass., Telegram.

EXTRACT FROM SPEECH OF JOSEPH W. NORTON

"Tonight," he said, "marks the 10th presentation of the Isaiah Thomas Award.

"It was the unanimous vote of the 1959 award committee, that the 10th recipient of this honor, would be none other than Raymond Harold, president of the Worcester Federal Savings & Loan Association, in order to give proper recognition for his tremendous personal effort and accomplishments which have made Worcester a better community in which to live, to do business, and to enjoy living.

"The physical representation of this award is a miniature of the printing press, which was an instrument of such great community service 150 years ago, in the hands of the early Colonial publisher, Isaiah Thomas. Cast in enduring bronze, may it serve as a lasting expression of gratitude from your fellow citizens whom you have served so well."

EXTRACT FROM BISHOP WRIGHT'S ADDRESS

It is to be hoped that the philosophy of responsibility may be more widely invoked against the philosophy of excuse in those areas of community affairs, business planning, and personal conduct where a like spirit of fatalism has replaced the ancient concept of human accountability, replaced this concept to the very great hurt of business and of communities.

There are reasons to hope that the philosophy of responsibility, whether as applied to individual citizens, to group movements, or to government itself, is beginning to emerge from a period of eclipse. For a generation or two, the philosophy of responsibility had lost much of its force, certainly in social thinking and, to a great extent, in political theory.

There had grown up a philosophy of excuse which men used to shuffle off accountability for failure, for incompetence, or for inaction in the face of complicated problems, personal or public.

The philosophy of responsibility in modern times has suffered from impersonal collectivist theories of society and of the state which have found favor during and since the last century, chiefly, of course, in the completely totalitarian regimes, but to some extent in every modern state.

PARALYZING INFLUENCE

The philosophy of excuse has had its paralyzing influence in many areas of the modern world.

Judge John Perkins spoke up in protest of this philosophy. He said he had grown tired of hearing, day after day, that the person being tried at the bar was not responsible for his own criminal actions, that the responsibility lay with his mother who had failed him, his clergyman who had failed him, his teachers who had failed him, and others who had failed to adjust to him.

CUT DOWN TO SIZE

It is good for civilization that the "philosophy of responsibility" should be reaffirmed and that the "philosophy of excuse" should be subordinated to it, cut down to size. Civilization was not achieved by any such philosophy as that of excuse, by vagueness about accountability, about duties or debts.

Mankind did not emerge from recurring periods of social decline and even savagery by any such formulae.

Civilization was achieved by the vision and determination, by the self-knowledge, self-discipline, and responsible action of single individuals and of individuals working

in groups who had not become cogs in the machinery of any blind movement, but who retained a sense of the central importance under God, of individual responsibility, individual personality.

GOOD AND BAD

What is the past? The past is a man named Adam—and it's also a man named Jesus. It's a brave man named Columbus and a nuisance named Napoleon, a bold man named Isaiah Thomas, a scholar named Woodrow Wilson, a poker player named Warren Harding, a smart Yankee named Cal Coolidge, an unreliable man named Benedict Arnold, a man of integrity named Al Smith, a devoted man named Herbert Hoover, and a million other men—good, bad, and indifferent—to whose accomplishments and to whose shortcomings we are the heirs.

The present is not quite the abstract mystery we make it seem to be. Viewed from one angle it is a wily fellow named Mikoyan, a sturdy old German named Adenauer, a brave girl named Anne Frank, or some of the less attractive girls whose names we hear from the international airport at Las Vegas.

WHAT WE OWE PEOPLE

And the future is no great mystery either. The future is a baby named Joey or a little girl named Jane—and most of your obligations and mine can be stated in terms of what we owe these people. Under the "philosophy of responsibility" our damnation may depend on the extent to which we defraud these people.

Ray Harold represents the type of Worcester businessman who lives by the philosophy of responsibility in just such human terms, by standing up to be counted, and, if need be, to be knocked down in the interests of building a better community.

A CHEAP PRICE

He may have made mistakes, may yet make others. But this is a cheap price to pay for the great achievements he has made in the community's progress. But he can be relied upon not to take refuge in the philosophy of excuse.

EXTRACT FROM SPEECH OF MR. HAROLD

GOOD POLICY

Of one thing I am certain, it is good policy for a business establishment to work diligently for the common good, for its success depends in large measure upon the success of the community in which it is located. This is the firm conviction of the banking establishment with which I am connected.

We hope to continue to be a vital part of the community and to contribute more and more to its success. I am sincerely aware that Worcester has been good and kind to me and to the financial institution which I am fortunate to direct.

STOPPING IS TRAGIC

Success is a journey, not a goal. It is entirely fitting that we should pause to mark a milestone. But to stop complacently would be tragic. Rather we must look forward even beyond the time that is allotted to each of us, and like Isaiah Thomas, build worthily for those who follow us.

The Isaiah Thomas award is a great honor. I cannot accept it for myself alone, but only as a spokesman for those whose help and loyalty to me entitle them to share it with me. Nor can I accept the honor of such an award without also accepting the challenge of doing my best to deserve it. This I promise, and for all that you have done for me I am deeply grateful.

Canada Hints of Retaliation of "Steal" of Lake Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Detroit, Mich., News of Friday, April 3, 1959. For the benefit of those who think that the question of water diversion will be solved by passage of the Chicago Great Lakes water diversion bill the article announces that the Canadians are contemplating diverting 3 streams, the Ogoki, Long Lac, and the Albany rivers which formerly flowed toward Hudson Bay which have been diverted into Lake Superior should the Chicago water diversion bill become law. If that is done the level of the Great Lakes will be dropped an additional 3 inches with a cost of millions per year to shipping, recreational, and other interests who use and enjoy the Great Lakes for the benefit of all the people of the United States. Diversion will be the opening of Pandora's box to release all sorts of trouble and strife. The article is as follows:

CANADA HINTS RETALIATION ON "STEAL" OF LAKE WATER

Ammunition in the fight to keep Chicago from diverting still more Great Lakes water through the city's Chicago River Canal was added by Ontario and Michigan officials last night.

Although limited to 1,500 cubic feet of water a second by a 1930 Supreme Court order, Chicago has been diverting 3,300 cubic feet through the navigation and sanitary canal, according to Paul L. Adams, Michigan's attorney general.

Frank MacDougall, deputy minister of lands and forests for Ontario, said Ontario could at any time stop its diversion of three watersheds which it has turned into the Great Lakes and which add 12,000 cubic feet a second into the huge inland water system.

These streams—the Ogoki, Long Lac, and Albany—which formerly flowed toward Hudson's Bay, have been reversed by dams and the flow directed south into Lake Superior.

"It could be diverted and sent down the Ottawa watershed in the same matter of fact way that Chicago has been doing," MacDougall said.

Such action, however, is not likely unless the Chicago water steal continues to an extent that heavily disrupts Canadian-American relations, he said.

TWICE MET VETOES

MacDougall and Adams were members of a 13-man panel which reviewed the 40-year fight with Chicago over water levels in the Great Lakes. Michigan and Wisconsin are leading a seven-State fight against further diversion which lowers the general level of the lakes. Canadian officials are equally concerned.

A bill has been entered in Congress to allow an additional 1,000 cubic feet a second flow through Chicago's canal. The bill passed the House and is under study in the Senate Public Works Committee.

Similar measures were vetoed in 1954 and 1956 by President Eisenhower.

Chicago argues that the extra water is needed for navigation and sanitary purposes.

Army engineers, Adams said, have shown that the present allotment is ample for navigation. Chicago wants the extra water to flush out the drainage canal, which has become like a cesspool, according to Michigan officials.

Adams has requested that the Supreme Court appoint a special master to study the situation and report on what should be done.

PLEA RENEWED

In a letter sent yesterday to J. Lee Rankin, Solicitor General, Adams renewed his appeal for an investigator. He noted that the Commonwealth Edison Co. has been allowed to build seven plants along the Chicago Canal and two more are planned.

These plants use water for cooling and condensation. They discharge heated water which is low in oxygen content into the sanitary canal.

With its oxidizing power weakened, the water is less able to cope with the effluents dumped into the canal by the Chicago Sanitary District, creating an even more polluted condition and bringing cries for more water from communities downstream, Adams wrote.

The meeting was sponsored by the Port of Detroit Commission, the Southeast Michigan Botanical Club, and the Detroit Audubon Society.

Governor Williams welcomed the Canadian visitors and spoke of the tremendous importance to our community of the lake levels.

J. W. Spooner, Ontario Minister of Lands and Forests, headed the Canadian delegation, along with Robert Macauley, the hydroelectric power commissioner for the province. He said that the problem will be repeated many times in the future.

SEES FUTURE GUIDE

"Therefore, it is of real importance that the answers that you select may serve as precedent for those that must follow," he said.

Mayor Miriani added his blessing to the meeting yesterday afternoon.

"The greatest threat to the freedom we enjoy and to the peace between our two countries," he said, "is the human failing to recognize that these precious possessions must be guarded and nourished at every step, at all times."

He added, "the Members of the U.S. Senate must be immediately warned that the proposed water steal is an unfriendly act to our Canadian friends and that, as such, it constitutes a threat to freedom and peace."

The Republic at the Crossroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on April 2, 1959, Representative BRUCE ALGER, of Texas, made a speech in Webster Groves, Mo., "The Republic at the Crossroads." I wish to call his re-

marks to the attention of my colleagues and they are as follows:

THE REPUBLIC AT THE CROSSROADS

Those present are joined by many not present as I nostalgically review the past which this occasion prompts. This is a wonderful reunion, after 22 years, 10 months, which for me were chronologically: College 4 years; business 1½ years; military service 4½ years; business (including my own) 9 years; and Congress 4 years, a full and varied experience.

Here, in Webster, I learned my lessons. Here I acquired the foundation for the later experiences. I had wonderful youthful years, thanks to the people, schools, and environment, right here. Oddly, as I grow older this becomes more obvious and meaningful to me.

The thanks I would extend to those here, and those not here, will be through whatever effort I can put forth to justify their training, friendship, and help. Sort of in the father-son spirit, "Make the world a little better because you were there." Humbly, but with firm resolve to say thanks, exemplified perhaps by remembering Lincoln, "That we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain; that this Nation shall have a new birth of freedom; that government of, by, and for the people shall not perish from this earth." I didn't think so much of that in Webster High or in war when I sent a combat buddy's gear home to his family. But I thought of it later, and I do now as a public servant, a Federal Representative, as we tonight reunite for a few moments as old friends—but now, not as youths, but as responsible adults with problems and a government on our hands—our hands. It's our government to preserve for those who follow, and in memory of those who went before.

I'm here because of your Congressman TOM CURTIS, not just to permit myself the pleasure of a wonderful reunion. This is not the gratuitous expression so often heard publicly or the flowery protestations on the floor of the House, as a prelude to destructive attack. For me, this is a token of respect for a hard worker, and I think of the Curtis subcommittee's work on the problem of life insurance taxation, which became a factual textbook underlying the study and hearings for this year's tax bill—a pity more didn't study this document. I predict these views, with TOM'S additions this year in the minority views, in which we both joined, will be remembered in the future, becoming increasingly influential. TOM'S effectiveness can be measured in committee and floorwork by a few simple examples. The reciprocal trade bill of last year in committee and floorwork shows his guiding hand as he reconciled the conflicting views of both parties and the objections of the protectionists. I say this from a most critical viewpoint myself, as a dissenter to parts of the program. More recently, TOM suggested the airport compromise that joined the existing allotment formula and the lower spending figure—in which Democrats and Republicans then joined. In committee such adjustments are often made through TOM'S efforts as in the Mills-Curtis formula for last year's insurance taxation. And I commend TOM for courage—as his championing the facts in the Goldfine issue last year. As many popularly joined the attack like howling wolves, TOM stuck to the facts, reminding the House that regardless of respective sides in the argument, we were violating our own House rules created to prevent character assassination.

TOM'S work time and again in the Joint Economic Committee is a guiding force, as in the current study of the 1959 President's Economic Report. It's a pity that the somewhat technical nature of the study of inflation, price stability and maximum employment lacks the glamour and public attention which its importance warrants. You would all enjoy the debate between TOM and several Members on Monday, March 9 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD). So you see, my visit is actually not a friendship matter, as such, but a matter of respect for and teamwork with a legislator who has courage, ability, and a dedication to principles, which my remarks tonight will, I hope, further explain.

As a small businessman who knew little of the ins and outs of politics, and as a Republican in an overwhelmingly Democrat area, I ran for public office 5 years ago and made but one political promise—that I would measure each piece of legislation by two yardsticks: (1) Is it a function of the Federal Government? (2) Can we afford it?

I promised I'd vote on each proposal according to whether or not it passed those tests, and letting the political chips fall where they might.

Having tried conscientiously to hew to that line for 4 years, a course described by some as political suicide, I was immensely proud when the people of Dallas County, in the biggest offyear turnout on record, roundly endorsed that attitude toward government by returning me for the third time as their Representative in Washington. But did I win the election?

What wins a given election? No one can ever be entirely sure. The time, effort, and money of many dedicated citizens, political amateurs, many of whom were previously unknown to me, won this particular election.

This much I know, and there is no need to kid ourselves about it. Dallas Countians, like others in the South, for the most part regard themselves as Democrats. But conservatives of both parties effectively united to stand behind an unabashedly conservative record in Congress, and they didn't balk at my own avowed Republicanism.

The Republic is at the crossroad. Whether it is to remain the traditional constitutional Republic in a democracy or become a centralized inflated supergovernment, antithetical to the beliefs of our Founding Fathers, which beliefs we have not countermanded, not really, nor do we intend to, I am convinced.

A democracy is government of, by, and for people. The people participate. A Republic is representative government, wherein the people are represented by others of their choosing. A representative, then, represents all the people, but is elected by a majority of the voters. Here's one problem—it is not a majority of the people, over half don't participate.

A second problem implicit in our form of government is the assumption of an "informed electorate", that is, that the voters know the issues and problems confronting the Nation and its Government. To the degree they don't, the government, as in the case of people not voting, is weakened. Using his judgment, the Representative, then, votes, representing his constituents, as he feels the majority of his constituents would, if in his shoes, facing the particular circumstances and facts. That simply is our form of government and the two problems.

We are at the crossroads because a majority don't vote, and those who vote (as well as the others) don't study the issues and aren't informed. The crossroads point which way we'll go—preserve constitutional government or embrace socialism or another ism.

It is now a question of preserving our Nation and its institutions. This is done through political parties. The parties must have sound principles or fail in this task.

It is to that job we must dedicate our principal effort. For, if we fail in it, there will not be much need to worry about elections. And, if we succeed—by awakening the American people to a recognition of thier peril—victory at the polls will follow.

We must bring to our task more than just an urge to take power. A political party enters this fray ill-equipped unless it is armed with basic principles—unchanging beliefs so precious they cannot be sacrificed for any political victory. Without such principles, a political party is nothing more than a gathering of office seekers and their friends. Without principles, a political party, in the words of our President, is only a conspiracy to gain power.

I believe the Republican Party, of the two, is the only possible party now to accomplish this objective, as you will see. To me, this assertion isn't blind party loyalty either, by a long shot, but critical appraisal.

It is true that any party representing a broad cross section of the American people will encounter differences of opinion as to details and method. That is true of our party. In fact, I suggest that we Republicans have permitted these differences to become so magnified in our own minds and the public mind that the principles which unite us have been forgotten or ignored. As a result there has been all too much talk about hyphenated Republicans—liberal-Republicans, conservative-Republicans, modern-Republicans. It is time—if we are to face the challenges that confront us—that we start thinking, talking, and acting as Republicans—period.

Let us heed the words of Lincoln when he said: "I'm afraid of the result upon organized action where great results are in view—if any of us allow ourselves to seek out minor or separate points in which there may be differences of views as to policy and right, and let them keep us from uniting in action upon a great principle in a cause on which we all agree."

Let us remember that our strength can stem only from the basic principles which unite us.

These principles are so deep and instinctive that we have unfortunately too often felt it either unnecessary or too difficult to put them into words. But they must be put into words; they must be enunciated over and over again. Our beliefs and principles must be articulated so clearly and forcefully that there can be no doubt as to where we Republicans stand and why.

Let me presume here tonight to make a modest beginning at putting into words what we so deeply and firmly feel.

We believe, we Republicans, that no generation can live solely for itself but rather that it has the heaviest of obligations to preserve the Nation and its institutions, strengthened and improved, for those who follow. We know that our heritage was won only by the sacrifice of those who preceded us. We have the high moral duty to sacrifice, if need be, to preserve and protect it.

We know, as we face the problems inherent in preserving our society, that the right way is not always the easy way, but that we have no choice except to take the hard way if it is, in truth, the right way. We recognize that we will find ourselves frequently bucking the popular tide, for we know, just as surely as the Democrats, that there is little political appeal in self-denial. If we accept the responsibility of leadership, however, and that is one of the functions of a political party, we must serve as stern guardians of the national commonsense.

We accept, as part of the responsibility of leadership, the duty of making clear to the people that the easy way, if it is wrong, leads only to the misery of retraced steps or the finality of disaster. Championing what we believe to be right may at times lose us political battles; but we are supremely confident it is the only way to a clear conscience and ultimate victory.

We believe in a government of laws which have as a principal aim the prevention of the seizure of dominant power by any man, or group of men.

We believe that the political and economic strength of a nation depend upon the genius of its people and that genius cannot flourish wrapped round with the chains of an all-powerful state or an all-powerful minority.

We believe that liberty is man's most precious possession and that it includes the freedom to have an incentive to produce. This has led to our faith in the soundness of an economic system based upon man's universal urge to better his lot. We believe that success, if it is to be the incentive for all, cannot be mocked and scorned and discouraged in an appeal to the envy of others.

We believe in a limited government as the best means of preserving individual freedom and initiative, but this does not bind us to the legitimate needs of our citizens or the challenges which confront our Nation.

We insist, however, that the needs the Federal Government is called upon to meet be real needs which cannot be met by individual initiative or by the unit of government closest to the people, and particularly, that they are not needs manufactured by those looking for special advantage or power.

We believe that the challenges to our Nation's survival can best be met, not through ill-considered actions based on fear or emotion, but by a nation which itself is guided by basic principles, proceeding confidently because it is physically strong, morally right, and carefully prepared.

It is because of these beliefs, these principles, that the Republican Party is called upon by its own conscience to move vigorously to the task of preserving our Nation against the present-day threats to its survival.

In my book there are today three great threats facing us as a people and as a Nation:

The threat of communism.

The threat of inflation.

The threat of new monopolies.

Each must be met head on. Each must be fought relentlessly if what we call the American way of life is to survive.

The first threat is the most dramatic and the most apparent. It stems from the rapid rise of Soviet military and economic power. We have seen the Soviet Union ruthlessly trample on the rights of its people and other nations in its drive to rule the world. By concentrating on the means to produce military power, it has rapidly industrialized its economy and achieved far-reaching scientific advances, a combination which has made it a real threat to world security. We may deplore their methods, but we ignore, at our own peril, the presence of vast military and economic power in the hands of a small group of men imbued with a fanatic belief in the inevitability of communism's world conquest.

The reaction of the Democrats to the more dramatic evidences of Russian military power has been characteristic. Conditioned from habit, their immediate response has been that we outspend the Russians and achieve victory through sheer weight of the American dollar. Democrat spending bills followed quickly in the orbit of the first Russian satellite and every new announcement from the Kremlin quickens their flow.

It would indeed be wonderful if all we had to do to preserve our Nation against the Russian military threat was to turn on a spending spigot. It is not that easy, and the political party which tells the American people that it is, is gambling recklessly with the future of our Nation. If, as a nation, we rely solely on scattering our national wealth to the winds in order to quiet every fear, we can lose this fight before we start.

We cannot meet the Russian military challenge by siphoning off and diluting our available resources, both of brains and materials. Yet, the numerous critics of our defense policies insist, when you put all their charges together, that we engage in just such a scatterbrained effort. The net effect of following the advice of a Symington, Johnson, Anderson, Jackson, or any other Senator or Representative who wants more money for a specific defense need, would be weakness through dissipation of our strength. It would be a defense based not on the best estimates of our National Security Council, the entire intelligence resources of the Nation, and the expert advice of our Joint Chiefs of Staff and our President, but on the worst fears of our most frightened politicians.

What it will take to beat the Russians at this gruesome game is a government and people ready, of course, to sacrifice whatever is needed for our overall superiority, but determined at the same time to proceed only on the basis of sound estimates, rational thinking, and carefully conceived plans which look not just to today but also to tomorrow. This is the hard road, and only a party of principle has the courage to stand up to the fearmongers and tell the American people it is the road we should follow.

It is clear, too, that only a party of principle can furnish the kind of leadership which stands fast against those Democrats who would sacrifice our world position in the face of the potent power of the Soviet Union. When it is all boiled down, the constant carping over the inflexibility of Mr. Dulles, the demands for a new approach to the Soviet Union, and the laments for the lack of viability in our foreign policy are nothing more than a frightened unwillingness to face up to the fact that you can't appease the Russian without losing your shirt in the process. We are confident the American people won't soon again be led down the so-called easy road of appeasement.

The second threat to our security as a Nation is the insidious menace of inflation. Our response to inflation is not only significant in its own right but it cannot be divorced from the challenge of the Soviet Union.

No greater test of the principles of the Republican Party can be provided than in the fight against inflation. It cannot be successfully undertaken unless we are willing, as a Nation, to think more of the future than of ourselves and to take the hard but right way so that our Nation and its institutions can be preserved.

As we move positively against the threat of inflation, we Republicans are accused of being preoccupied with balanced budgets, of being negative when we oppose unessential spending programs, and of having a narrow bookkeeping attitude toward the problems of our Nation.

I say to you: There can be no more positive programs, for our party or any party, than to try to save this Nation from the disaster which will take place if inflation, through habitual spending beyond our income, becomes the national way of life.

As we oppose programs which individually have vote appeal but which taken together lead swiftly and surely to national bankruptcy, we lay ourselves open, of course, to the demagogue's cry. But what we seek is more important than any single spending program. Unless we can maintain the stability of our currency, we will not have the strength to support any governmental program, no matter how desirable—be it for defense, for scientific advance, or for human welfare. Bound up in the fight for a balanced budget is the question of whether our economy will have the strength and stability to maintain us in the battle for survival.

Let it be remembered that we have been living beyond our income in 23 of the last 28 years. The credit of the U.S. Government is at the breaking point.

It is not just the national budget that is involved in the Democrat spending programs. The personal budget of each and every individual and family is involved. An unbalanced national budget means unbalanced family budgets; it means loss of credit, of earnings and savings, insurance, pensions, and annuities. When unbalanced national budgets and inflation become our national way of life, they all go down the drain together.

There is also a moral issue.

The time has come to end the completely immoral practice of passing on to our children the debts we incur for our own immediate benefit. We could at least have respect for the morality of the spenders if they would suggest that this generation pay, through higher taxes, for the cost of the programs they so glibly propose. They lack the courage for that, and in many cases, like the Senators from my State, they not only beguile the people with vast spending programs but promise simultaneous tax reductions. Let us call a spade a spade. Mortgaging our children's future is basically immoral.

There is the question of equity.

The first obligation of government is to treat its citizens equally. There is no equity when a government spends to provide special benefits for some of its citizens, because they are politically powerful, at the expense of all other citizens. But, the inequity is tragically multiplied when a government must borrow and inflate its currency to do so. For inflation does not strike all citizens an even blow; it hits hardest at the weak, the unorganized, at those who lack the means to protect themselves from its subtle and devastating robbery, the widow living on insurance, the aged living on pensions. No government which pretends to serve all the people can retain their confidence if it promotes wholesale inequity by choosing the easy road of unbalanced budgets.

There is the issue of survival.

I have spoken of the military challenge of Soviet Russia and the kind of response we must make to it. Will we have the sheer physical strength for that challenge—no matter how many missiles are on the launching pads—if our underlying base of a sound fiscal structure and a strong economy are rotted away by inflation?

The answer, of course, is "No," but the Soviet challenge is more than military; it is a total challenge on the military, political, economic, and moral fronts. Can the United States meet that total threat with its currency debased, its credit gone, its economy in turmoil, its citizens divided and its morality compromised, if we adopt inflation as a way of life? Of course not.

Politically, can we hold ourselves up to the nations of the world as a shining alternative to communism if we are unable to keep our own house in order, if we display a fatal political weakness in our form of government by casting aside principle for the fatal charms of expediency? How can we be an example to the world if we cannot in times such as these even meet our current needs out of current income?

Can we meet the Communist economic offensive if through inflation we price our goods out of the world market and if the American dollar becomes a currency to be shunned rather than desired?

And morally, where does this Nation stand as opposed to immoral communism if it succumbs to the immorality of inflation?

Let no man tell you that those who fight against the unbalanced budgets which cause inflation are preoccupied with the mechanics of bookkeeping. We are preoccupied, but our preoccupation consists of the most urgent and positive program this Nation can undertake—the prevention of a national disaster. It is our job as Republicans, as a party of principle, to awaken the Nation to this clear and present danger.

The President has presented the Nation with a balanced plan for security and public

welfare. He has presented a plan balanced as to income and expenditures. It is a truly Republican program. It is our job as Republicans to exert every effort to make this plan a reality.

I mentioned earlier that one of the basic principles of the Republican Party is the belief in a government of laws which have as a principal aim the prevention of the seizure of dominant power by any man or group of men. Because of this principle, the Republican Party is called upon to meet the threat of the new monopolies, powerful labor organizations under the domination of a handful of men.

Under Republican leadership, this Nation met the challenge of the seizure of dominant power by a few industrialists and financiers a generation ago. It curbed the power of the trusts when in the public interest it enacted antimonopoly legislation under Republican leadership.

Today similar power rests in the hands of men who dictate the policies of our national labor unions. It consists of vast economic power, the power to cripple an industry or a nation. It is economic power which has reached out so successfully for political power that it has taken over, for all practical purposes, the Democratic Party and now controls the Congress of the United States. It is a combination of economic and political power which threatens the national interest because it is a power which places its own interest above the interest of all citizens.

Curbing the power of the new monopolies will be infinitely more difficult than dealing with the old industrial and financial monopolies, for the new monopolists have wrapped themselves in the cloak of the so-called common man. They have been careful to inculcate the doctrine that their monopoly interest is identical with the interest, not only of union members, but all working men and women. No attempt can be made to curb the power of the new monopolies without incurring their charge that it is a move against the public interest.

But the public—the consuming public—does not benefit from the exercise of naked monopolistic power to raise wages, and hence prices, beyond the level justified by increased productivity—nor from the extortions of a Hoffa made possible by the power his monopoly gives him.

The public—the union worker public—does not benefit when its dues are stolen, or frittered away, or spent for propaganda or political activity against its wishes.

The public—the taxpaying public—does not benefit when the political power of the new monopolies is used to extract special benefits from a pliant Congress or legislature.

The public—the small-business public—does not benefit when its choice, confronted with the overwhelming power of a giant union, is to accede to its demands or go out of business.

The public—the farm public—does not benefit when the new monopolies drive up farm costs far beyond the ability to increase farm prices.

Nor can the public—all of us as free citizens—benefit when dominant political and economic power rests in the hands of a few men, no matter how much they claim to have our best interests at heart.

Let there be no mistake about it. The evils which have arisen because of the emergence of the new monopolies are the result of the power they hold in their hands. We cannot eliminate the evils until we restore the balance of power and to do so, we must curb the powers of the new monopolies even as we protect the very legitimate rights of working men to organize for their own protection and own welfare.

As a party of principle, we cannot dodge this issue. The Democrats must avoid it at the peril of their extinction as a political force. They are incapable of going beyond what the new monopolies will permit, and this consists only of wiping the smudges off from the faces of those union leaders who have gotten dirtiest in their greed for power. It's up to us to take the lead in a sustained effort to curb this threat to the stability of our Nation. It will in the end earn us the gratitude of the vast majority of the American people who, even now, sense the danger involved in letting unbridled monopoly power run loose in our land.

In these great tasks, then, in meeting the Communist threat, in fighting inflation, in curbing the new monopolies, we Republicans have a job to do. At stake is the future of our Nation and the security and happiness of our people.

There is only one way we can go about this task and that is to devote our every resource to it. We cannot succeed, in the face of an overwhelming Democrat majority in the Congress, unless we arouse the American people to the dangers which confront them and unless we imbue them with a belief in the principles we uphold. We must, through them, make it politically impossible, for any party or group, to lead this Nation down the easy road to its downfall.

We need to make our party an effective political organization. We need to enlist in our ranks the millions who believe, as we do, in the principles we uphold. We need the devotion, discipline and dollars without which a party cannot function. We need to tell our story, clearly, unhesitatingly, forcefully so there is no man in this land who does not know our party's principles, program, and goals. We need, in short, to get down to work.

And as we set upon this noble task of saving a nation, should the path look dim, the goal remote and the obstacles insurmountable, we can do no better than take courage from the faith that: "Right makes might, and in that faith let us to the end dare to do our duty as we understand it."

Potomac's Ills Shown in Film

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 14, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a small comment on pollution in the Potomac River which appeared in the Washington, D.C., Post and Times Herald on April 12, 1959:

POTOMAC'S ILLS SHOWN IN FILM

The poisoning of the Potomac by sewage—including the rainy day sewer overflow near the mouth of Rock Creek—was shown yesterday on a WRC–TV public service program.

It took the form of a film, "George Washington's River." The movie was produced for national distribution by the U.S. Public Health Service by the staff of the TV program "Our Beautiful Potomac."

The film showed gas bubbling up from effluent discharged near National Airport; a girl swimming near Key Bridge in water with a bacterial count so high it contained "2 million bugs a mouthful"; grease slicks on the Tidal Basin under the blooming cherry trees, and detergent suds foaming up at the mouth of Pimmit Run from wastes being dumped into the creek.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer, plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Today's Challenge, and How To Meet It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 21, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on April 17, 1959, there was a speech given by the Honorable Arthur E. Summerfield, Postmaster General of the United States, before the Los Angeles Merchants and Manufacturers Association dinner, entitled "Today's Challenge, and How To Meet It."

Mr. Summerfield, in this speech highlights the Communist threat to our national safety and our battle against inflation. It was an outstanding address and doserves to be called to the attention of every Member of the Congress and every citizen of our country; therefore I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY'S CHALLENGE, AND HOW TO MEET IT

(Address by Hon. Arthur E. Summerfield, Postmaster General of the United States, before the annual dinner of the Los Angeles Merchants and Manufacturers Association, Los Angeles, Calif., April 17, 1959)

It is always a great pleasure for me to be in Los Angeles.

I am always inspired by the vitality of this great city—and, indeed, of all California and the Pacific coast.

All my life, I have thrilled to the story of the winning of the West.

It is one of the great adventures of all mankind—the westward sweep of the pioneers, the gold rush, the pony express, the constant blazing of new frontiers.

I stand in awe of the courage and strength and faith of the Americans who lived this tremendous story.

Nothing could stop them from gaining the better life they saw for themselves and their children.

They left a magnificent heritage for you—for all Americans—to ponder and to uphold.

California today is a monument to their vision.

You are on the way to becoming our most populous State.

You have assumed great responsibility in economic and political leadership.

You face opportunities that are virtually unlimited in scope.

But this you also know—that the very essence of real opportunity is challenge.

And because the meeting of today's challenge is so fundamental to the progress you would make—so basic to the ends we must achieve as a nation—I am deeply anxious to talk with you about it.

I want to bring to you, tonight, a clear picture of the urgent nature of the challenge we face, and how we can meet it.

I want to speak to you—not only as your Postmaster General, but as a member of President Eisenhower's Cabinet and a member of the President's Cabinet Committee on Price Stability for Economic Growth.

I come with firsthand knowledge of the problems facing our Nation, and the steps your Government is taking to solve them.

But I come with more than a report.

My purpose, above all, is to talk with you about action.

For, my friends, we are at an extremely crucial stage in the progress of America.

We have a choice of paths to follow.

We have momentous decisions to make.

The ultimate responsibility for these decisions is with the American people.

And I am confident that, if the people apply their real genius, and determination, and devotion—the final decisions will be the right decisions.

There are four specific problems I should like to discuss—and then, if I may, I should like to suggest the vital part you can play in meeting each of them.

They are:

1. The Communist threat to our national safety.
2. Our battle against inflation.
3. The destructive monopoly power of a group of union leaders.
4. The urgent necessity for tax reform.

All of these, of course, are interrelated.

Our national defense depends upon a strong economy—and our economy is acutely responsive to what we do about inflation, about production costs and prices, and about taxation.

The Communist challenge is many sided.

It is military, political, spiritual and economic.

We and our allies have steadily rebuffed the military and political threats.

Wherever the Communists have probed, they have found us standing firm.

At Lebanon, in the China Sea, in the unity of our NATO alliance—and now in the Berlin issue—we have met the challenge with unmistakable evidence of the strength of our purpose.

We shall continue to keep our military power equal to any test.

Our overall might in planes, missiles, ships, and other equipment, must always be capable of deterring, and if ever necessary, defeating, any attack upon us.

We shall continue to meet the Soviet political challenge.

We shall lead the way in exploring every avenue of reasonable hope for justly solving the issues that divide the world.

In the battle of spiritual values, we cannot lose so long as we preserve the freedom and moral strength on which our way of life is built.

The Soviets know all this very well.

Why, then, are they confident of ultimate victory?

Because they are concentrating on all-out economic war—and they believe they can defeat us in such a war without risking their own total destruction.

They intend to become the world's one first-class economic power, forcing us into second-class status. And for us, such an outcome would be just as tragic as nuclear devastation.

Today we are well in front. But they believe we have not the system or the will to maintain our economic strength and growth.

They expect our economy to explode, while theirs continues to grow.

My friends, let me emphasize that we dare not look lightly on their great expectations.

For here we do indeed stand at the crossroads of decision.

The soundness of our economy is threatened by deadly forces that have wrecked other nations in the past.

They are the forces of inflation and onerous taxation—and we are not yet united as a people to overcome them.

I suggest to you that there is urgent reason for us to do so.

As Allen Dulles, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, said recently:

"If they, the Soviets, succeed and we fail, it will only be because of our complacency and because they have devoted a far greater share of their power, skill, and resources to our destruction than we have been willing to dedicate to our own preservation."

Let us look at some basic facts about inflation.

I am sure we all agree on what inflation is—and what it does.

Certainly we have had ample opportunity, over 20 years, to see it in action.

To most Americans, inflation means higher costs of living.

It means more and more struggle to try to make ends meet.

We have inflation when the cost of what we buy keeps rising while the value of the dollars we have to buy it with keeps dropping.

Since 1939, our cost of living has more than doubled.

The value of our dollar has dropped until the 100-cent dollar of 1939 is now worth just 48 cents.

How much lower would you say we dare to let it go?

Inflation feeds on the income and the savings of every individual, every enterprise, in America.

It eats away the savings we cherish for our family's security.

It robs us of the real value of the dollars we earn.

It destroys the will to work and the desire to save.

I suspect almost everyone in this room knows of someone whose savings, or insurance, or social security—carefully nurtured through half a lifetime—now is tragically inadequate to meet his needs.

As President Eisenhower has put it:

"Inflation is not a Robin Hood, taking from the rich to give to the poor. Rather, it deals most cruelly with those who can least protect themselves. It strikes hardest those millions of our citizens whose incomes do not quickly rise with the cost of living. When prices soar, the pensioner and the widow see their security undermined; the man of thrift sees his savings melt away; the white collar worker, the minister, and the teacher see their standards of living dragged down."

As businessmen and community leaders, you are only too well aware of what inflation brings in rising costs and stifling taxes.

And, finally, I would point out that the problem affects, in equal measure, the cost of maintaining the operations of your Government.

Now, what are we doing to meet this deadly force?

We are waging a battle, led by the President of the United States, which in the past year has succeeded in bringing the rise in the cost of living under control.

We are fighting to accomplish the stability of the dollar we must have to go forward soundly.

We are striving to continue our economic growth at the rate of which we are capable, with its expanding opportunity for every citizen.

But we are also facing tremendous pressures for a resumption of the inflationary process.

They are vast pressures for extravagant Government spending, and for a sharp new uptrend in the spiral of wages and prices.

Amazingly, the spending pressures are actually being led by some of the leaders of Congress—and of some State administrations.

They are practicing government by pressure group rather than government for the people.

And they will only be dissuaded by public opinion strong enough to impress its will upon them.

For this reason, it is vitally important for our people to understand some plain, straight facts.

Government, in our system, is constituted to serve the people. It must meet all the legitimate needs of its citizens.

It must do all it can for the good of the people, within the means the people are willing and able to provide.

But there are those in and out of Government who stoutly observe that we are a big nation of great wealth—and, therefore, we should put no limit to what we do in public projects—whether or not the people are able to pay the bills.

Nothing could be more crassly misleading—for the fact is, the people have no choice.

Who else will pay?

The Government has no wealth of its own. It is the agency of the people.

And when it spends more than it collects in taxes, every citizen has to pay the excess, in one way or another.

If it is not in higher taxes, then it is in suffering the inflation that deficit financing by any government inevitably brings.

Inflation itself is an invisible tax.

It is a tax without exemptions—a tax on the income of the poor in the same rate as on the incomes of the more well to do.

It is a severe tax on the savings of the thrifty.

It is, in the end, the highest and the cruelest tax of all.

If there is one thing that history has made frighteningly clear—it is that continued deficit financing by a government degrades the value of its money and spreads inflation ever further and deeper through the economy of its people. The ultimate result is collapse.

Great students of economics tell us the decline and fall of the Roman Empire was due principally to the confusion and upheaval of inflation.

We all know what happened when Germany accepted inflation as a national policy after World War I.

In 1923, 42 billion marks were required to buy 1 cent in American exchange.

Simple commodities of daily life cost trillions of marks—if you could get them at all.

And the way was open for a demagogue such as Adolf Hitler to lead that country into the tragedy of World War II.

These are but a few of the examples that stand out on the open book.

But they go unheeded by the many Members of Congress and the State administrations that are pushing vast spending schemes—schemes that far exceed the budgets available to pay for them.

More than 7,000 bills have been introduced in this session of the 86th Congress.

Only a small handful of these are major measures of broad national interest.

The vast majority would provide benefits of one kind or another to individuals or groups.

And in no case are new taxes proposed to offset them.

Their backers are encouraged by the fact that the majority of the present spending Congress is committed to Federal spending—and to deficit financing—as an economic policy.

Chairman BYRD of the Senate Finance Committee has noted, with alarm, that the effects of that policy already are plain.

The Senate, he reports, has voted to increase President Eisenhower's budget proposals by 24 percent, and the House has voted increases averaging 12 percent.

These increases represent billions of dollars.

Let us now discuss the third problem we face—the effect of the huge economic power exercised by union monopoly leaders.

This is a power that ranks among the highest accumulations of vested interest to be found in history.

It is a monopoly that draws upon huge financial resources—that permits a few perennial leaders to spend millions of dollars of dues money for political purposes, exactly as the leaders see fit, with no choice given the men and women who pay the dues.

It is a power capable of imposing at will an ever-rising cost of living upon our people.

There is no question but what the legitimate function of every labor leader is to ask for—to negotiate for—higher wages.

This is a rightful purpose of union leadership.

I myself worked at a factory job as a young man—and I know very well that one of my goals was higher wages.

I have always been, and will always be, in favor of a responsible union movement.

But union members, with all other Americans, have every reason to insist that their leaders, as well as the leaders in management, exercise a high order of statesmanship.

It is up to union leaders to recognize that if they use their monopoly power to force wage increases and employee benefits too high—they bring about fewer jobs and greater unemployment—and thereby miserably fail in their duty to their members.

By forcing wage increases which far outrun increases in productivity, labor leaders can set the spiral of wage-price inflation going again.

Once launched in the basic industries, the inflationary wave will sweep out through all manufacturing, transportation, distribution, every part of the economy.

Why do excessive wage costs have such powerful impact?

Because, after exclusion of all taxes, up to 83 percent of all income generated in the national economy goes to payment of labor.

For a $3,000 automobile, for example, the required steel costs about $290—and even this price at the steel mill, in turn, includes labor cost as its main component.

What this means is that an unearned rise in employment costs has four times as much inflationary effect as a corresponding rise in all the remaining costs of production put together.

With this in mind, let us note that 154 major wage contracts come up for negotiation this year—including the steel industry, with its nearly 1 million workers.

The cumulative effect of excessive wage-cost increases on this scale I leave to your imagination. There would be no way to describe it other than to call it a national calamity.

Everyone would suffer.

The blow, as we have noted, would fall hardest on the millions whose incomes have not gone up—the people on salaries, fixed incomes, and pensions.

But let no one assume that he would escape—least of all the wage earner himself.

He would soon find that the new-won increase had evaporated in higher living costs.

Worse, he could find that even his job is gone because the product he makes has been priced out of the market—no longer able to compete effectively at home or abroad.

And this, ladies and gentlemen, is no idle speculation.

The time when we were virtually the only country able to meet the great world demand for many types of finished goods is over.

The productive ability of most industrial nations is greater than ever before.

Competition is in full swing.

And today, we are seeing a rising number of American goods being priced out of the foreign markets.

The American producer, with his sharply increasing differential in wage costs, is simply unable to compete.

Nor is this a minor factor in our employment picture.

The estimate is that our export trade sustains four and one-half million jobs in America.

Let us ask this question of those who would continue to push excessive wage costs:

How many of these jobs—how many hundreds of thousands—how many millions—will be lost if we persist in making our goods so costly they have no chance to compete.

Indeed, let us ask another question:

How is it that foreign industries can make some of the products in which we are most efficient, ship those products thousands of miles to our own markets, and sell them at a price so low that we can no longer compete, even here at home.

Such is the growing situation in which our wage-cost inflation is placing us.

We are told, for example, that the Japanese have bought scrap metal here on the West Coast, carried it back to their mills, processed it into finished products, returned them back across the Pacific Ocean, and still undersold American producers by as much as $29 a ton.

We should, and do, look to the increasing of job opportunities here at home through the expansion of our production capacity.

We should take every step to encourage, not sap, the growth-power of industry and business.

But we can hardly say we are giving full encouragement if we permit wage-push inflation that deprives our industry of adequate earnings to plow back into new products, equipment, and plants.

Every thinking American, I believe, will agree that the decline has gone far enough when the ratio of profits to sales, after taxes, for all industry, drops from 7 percent in 1948 to 4.8 percent in 1958.

Especially is this true when we recognize the burden our taxation is placing on the accumulation of capital for investment.

It is the same burden being imposed on the personal incentive and earning power of every citizen.

The tax foundation tells us the average earner of $4,500 a year works 22 days each month.

Seven days of this total—nearly one-third of his working time—is taken from his income in taxes.

And as he may succeed in building his income, he can look forward to the tax chunk becoming larger.

We need to relieve this stifling tax load being carried by the individual citizen and by our business system.

Our great Nation has been built on the motivation of high levels of individual achievement.

We have encouraged, with material reward, each citizen to perform to the best of his capacity.

Even the Soviets have taken note of this advantage.

Russia, despite its Communist doctrine, now offers high incentives for outstanding individual performance in industry, science, and other areas of its society.

Consider, against this, the fact that we have been moving in the direction of destroying incentive.

Through taxation, we have steadily compressed the reward for doing something as opposed to doing little, or doing nothing.

Our population is growing rapidly.

Business can create new jobs to meet this growth only as billions of dollars are invested in new tools and capacity.

Now, where is this money to come from?

Today, Federal taxes alone can take more than half of many companies' net income.

Then follow State and local taxes.

There are over 100,000 taxing authorities in our country.

Their weight can literally crush the ability of business to meet its job-creating capital needs.

Our present tax structure is seriously outdated.

It is a set of laws reflecting largely the conditions of the past, especially World War II, when the goal was the confiscation of war profits, not the building of a sound peacetime economy.

A sensible, equitable, dynamic tax program is needed in its place.

Such a program will keep total revenues up, not by taxing away incentive and means of growth, but by steadily increasing the tax base.

These problems I have discussed this evening can be clearly stated.

But how clearly do we see the answers that can be given to them.

This is our task.

And I believe we cannot emphasize too heavily the answers that are being provided by our national leadership, and by leaders in many States.

These answers add up to a program of full employment with stable prices and tax reform—a program offering greater opportunity for every American.

It is because we have pursued such a program that our economy has bounded back from the recession to a dynamic new level.

The signposts are clearly visible and our program is well underway.

First of all, we have a sound and sensible philosophy of government.

We have adopted fiscal policies that are sound and productive and set realistic budgets.

We are meeting the full needs of our defense program.

We are meeting all the legitimate needs of our people.

We have refused to give away taxpayer money to nonessential projects, lavish spending schemes, and welfare state activities intended to curry favor with special groups rather than to meet the needs of all the people.

We are attempting to operate the Government on a pay-as-you-go basis, thereby avoiding the fatalistic deficit philosophy so easy to get into but so desperately hard to shed.

We are encouraging a higher order of statesmanship in union-management wage negotiations.

We are bringing public opinion to bear so that union leaders consider the real welfare of their members and the Nation rather than striving to outdo each other in wringing inflationary wage packages from industry.

We want adequate laws to control abuses of union leader monopoly power.

Such laws were established for business, correctly and firmly, when some businessmen abused the public trust in years past.

We want to give union members their rights to pass on the action of their leaders and the use of their dues.

And finally, we intend to push forward as rapidly as we can to achieve a progressive tax program.

I believe that heartening progress is being made in all these areas.

The sound fiscal program of the President with his insistence upon balancing the budget, is rapidly gaining wide support.

We are giving utmost attention to the development of aggressive programs to help prevent the resurgence of inflation, with its higher costs of living.

Toward this end, the work of the Cabinet Committee on Price Stability for Economic Growth is under way.

The committee, as you know, is headed by one of California's great sons, who is serving our Nation so ably—Vice President RICHARD NIXON.

I am proud to be a member of this group.

In the wage-price area, we can only hope that the statesmanship we so urgently desire will be forthcoming.

It is not immediately apparent in the announced intentions of demands we have seen.

It is clear that union members themselves want responsible union leadership—responsible to their welfare, and to the national welfare.

With the great majority of the public at large, they want laws that will help to assure responsible leadership.

In regard to taxation, we are working to carry forward a program of tax reform and reduction.

The President's stress on a balanced budget is related directly to this goal.

Steps in the right direction already have been taken with the Revenue Act of 1954.

The time is approaching for another bold and imaginative breakthrough on tax policy that will benefit and encourage all taxpayers—large and small.

Obviously, this program cannot call for immediate and sharp reduction in all income tax rates.

It calls for gradual reform.

And it calls for equitable reduction for all taxpayers.

Its goal includes corresponding cuts in capital gains, estate, gift and excise taxes.

It provides for job-creating reductions of business tax rates—and realistic depreciation provisions.

In short, the objective must be a completely organized and integrated tax program that will meet the real needs of our entire economy.

The public, more and more, is rallying behind the President, who is fighting to maintain a balanced budget, to achieve tax reform, and to bring under control the extravagances and excesses that feed inflation.

But let me not overstate this premise.

The battle is far from won.

The special interests bent on spending, taxing, and deficit financing still are riding high—still have the ears of the majority of our Federal legislators and State administrations.

Washington is swarming with representatives of the special interest groups.

Each is concerned with favoring legislation for his pet project.

The fight for fiscal sanity is being waged by the President, members of his administration, and some Members of the Congress.

It is this group, almost alone, that is bearing the brunt of the battle.

The leftwing economists, the welfare-State plotters, the racketeering union bosses, and their minions of do-gooders and political captives are using every kind of vicious attack to break this firm stand.

Washington is the ground from which they launch their tirades, and their slogans claiming "neglect of the jobless," "favoritism to big business," "inadequate defenses," "obsession with the budget," and the like.

They are making an all-out attack on the free-enterprise system, and they have many camp followers in the legislative halls—some deliberately—others without knowing the effects of their misguided efforts.

My appeal to you tonight, and to the American people, is to join this battle to meet this challenge.

Remember that, in the struggle with Russia, we are strong militarily—we are strong politically—we are strong spiritually.

We must continue to strengthen ourselves economically.

We can no more appease inflation than we can appease Soviet aggression.

I believe we shall continue to build the strongest, freest way of life the world will know.

But I also believe that, to do so, America must maintain a sound economic philosophy, and sound policies firmly based on that philosophy.

We must never accept the premise that our basic problems cannot be solved.

Inflation, deficits, high costs of living, and appressive taxation all are manmade.

So, too, is the destructive monopoly power of union leaders.

There is nothing sacred about them.

By attacking these problems with intelligence, determination, and perseverance, we shall overcome them.

May there be a reassertion—by all of us—of the courage and strength and faith of the Americans who opened the great West.

I am confident that the business and community leadership of the west coast, which is so well represented here tonight, will play a vital part in keeping our free enterprise system strong.

As civic leaders in a key city and State, your views and actions are vitally important—to your own progress, to your State, and to the Nation.

This is why I am deeply impressed by the emphasis your association places on employee communications.

Employees want information on which to base their decisions.

And they want fair and honest information.

I have always felt that businessmen should provide their employees with the facts about the issues that affect the ability of the business to compete, to advance, and to grow.

For these are the factors that determine the rewards and the opportunities for the employees themselves.

Perhaps too many businessmen are failing to meet this responsibility, to the detriment of their employees, their stockholders, as well as themselves.

I would ask you to give this your deepest thought.

Are businesmen and civic leaders doing enough to help provide the facts to everyone associated with them—employees, stockholders, community neighbors, and voting citizens.

Is any competition more important than the competition to determine how soundly this Nation is to conduct its economic affairs.

Is any problem more important.

I would dare to suggest that you assess what you are doing individually.

If you believe that we must attack the causes of inflation and onerous taxation firmly and intelligently—if you believe union monopoly power must be curbed—ask yourself if you are doing all you can to support that belief.

Your belief in America can be effective only as you let it be known.

I urge you to take your place among those who will speak, work, and fight for sound policies and a stronger America in the years before us.

There is nothing more important to you, your family, your future, and your Nation than that you take your stand now.

Speak up—let your representatives in Congress know what you think.

Let them know you understand that a Government big enough to do everything for its citizens from cradle to grave is also big enough to take everything from them in taxes.

Every businessman must understand that the political party of his choice is what he makes it—either by his participation or lack of participation in its affairs and in its choice of candidates.

Unless responsible citizens, especially business leaders, devote more of their time and effort and organizing ability—as well as their money—to unselfish politics, directed to the greatest common good, Government by pressure groups will continue to grow.

Only by universal participation can we be sure that the Government will serve all the people—not some special interest—and assure the greatest opportunities for all our citizens.

My friends—this is the banner of true liberalism.

Advancing under it, we shall meet the Communist economic challenge as surely as we shall meet the military and political challenge.

We shall constantly move forward into the golden era of unlimited opportunity that lies ahead.

We shall preserve the great free and growing economy which is the foundation of all our freedoms—our security—our prosperity—and our future, in a strong, free, and better world.

Address by James K. Vardaman, Jr., to the Georgia Bankers Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 21, 1959

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, my home State of Georgia is fortunate to have as one of its newest citizens the Honorable James K. Vardaman, Jr., the distinguished son of a former Member of this body, and himself a member for 13 years of the Federal Reserve Board. Mr. Vardaman recently became president of the Bank of Albany, located in Albany, Ga.

Because of his unique background as a former member of the Reserve Board and now as a commercial banker, Mr. Vardaman was invited by his new colleagues in the Georgia Bankers Association to address their annual convention held last week in Augusta, Ga.

His address was an able discussion of the role and problems that confront banking in our changing society, and included some interesting and penetrating observations about our country's future. I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF JAMES K. VARDAMAN, JR., PRESIDENT, THE BANK OF ALBANY, ALBANY, GA., BEFORE 67TH ANNUAL CONVENTION, GEORGIA STATE BANKERS ASSOCIATION, AUGUSTA, GA., APRIL 16, 1959

On last December 1, by grace of perseverance, good luck, and the friendship of President Eisenhower, I ceased to be a Washington bureaucrat seeking for a solution of banking and economic ills, and gleefully became a part of the problem. So today, not only do I not feel called upon to tell you what to do about our troubles and problems, but I think it would be presumptuous for me to even attempt to do so. Rather, if you will bear with me for about 20 minutes, we will consider together as fellow sufferers, some of the questions that are going to have to be answered during the next 10 years—and a few that may require answers within the next 10 months, before the adjournment of the 1960 Congress.

Like other industries and individuals, banking is today at a crossroad. That is nothing to be alarmed about, because it always has been; and this crossroad is not much differentt from those of the past. Almost every month during our banking career we have arrived at a crossroad—where a determination is to be made—to change direction, to go forward or backward—or to stand still, which latter is really just another way of going backward, relatively.

And at today's crossroads, the same as at those of the past, we can either point with pride, or view with alarm, depending on what mood we are in. But maybe this time we had better do both—the first to help our morale and the second to protect our future.

As private bankers, we can certainly point with pride to the development of our industry and more particularly to the people who staff our banks. Of all American enterprises there is not one in which the rank and file of personnel, both employees and officers, has shown so much improvement as have our bank people. Walk into most any bank today and you cannot help but be impressed by the friendly, intelligent, and understanding appearance and attitude of the people you meet—at the desks and behind the counters. These are really our public relations group, and without them and their cooperation—no matter how much advertising we do—our banks cannot progress and our communities will not be served. I hope that we who have reached positions in the top executive echelon of the industry will always be mindful of our debt to these people and always be sure that our bank pay scale does not fall below that of other comparable industries.

Institutionally, too, banks can be proud of their record, particularly since World War II. The industry has made much progress—ethically and materially. By broadening its services, it has in some instances caught up with the public which it serves, especially in the small loan and consumer credit fields; also in trust service it has been wisely progressive, although there is yet much to be done by banks in that field in cooperation with the reputable lawyers of the American Bar Association. However, the two services in which banks have probably made the greatest advance in public confidence and support are in ethical conduct of commercial banking, and in the expansion of physical plant and equipment for the prompt and convenient service to customers.

Increase in public confidence has come with the elimination to a large extent of the "Scrooge" type of banker—the one who allowed or even advised the customers to borrow too much, who charged outrageous interest, and who foreclosed at the first opportunity. The FDIC and the State banking departments have done much to eliminate that type of banker, but unfortunately there are a few left. But an enlightened public will soon take care of them—and their banks, too, if they are not got rid of.

Public support of banks has increased in proportion to the increase in quality, quantity, and convenience of commercial bank services. Among these improvements may be numbered more intelligent and better trained and more courteous personnel; modern, open quarters, and the elimination of the old fortress and cathedral type of banking houses; the drive-in and the walk-up windows, and most of all in those progressive communities where the law permits, the location of facilities or branches away from the congested districts, where customers can transact their business without rupturing their dispositions and time schedules by fighting traffic and parking conditions in downtown areas, and standing in line before inadequate tellers' facilities and officers' desks.

Indeed, it appears to me that banking, as an industry, can justifiably "point with pride" to many phases of its operations; but again I emphasize that the greatest advance has been made in the quality of bank personnel.

Now, let's "view with alarm" for a few minutes—or better still—let's leave out alarm and view with commonsense and courage, some of the potentials and actualities which cast their shadows upon our future as bankers; and upon the institution of private banking—and even upon our inpendence as free citizens of an intended constitutional Republic. I use the word "intended" advisedly because our Founding Fathers would hardly recognize the structure which we have allowed to grow up in Washington, as even a stepchild or distant relative of the sort of Republic that they intended we should have.

One of the blackest clouds that hangs over us is the potential takeover by the Federal Government of all private banking, either by a straightjacket pattern of controls of rates and services, or by direct Federal ownership. I can feel, rather than see, some of the smiles of derision that welcome such a statement; but I say to you with complete sincerity that, in my considered opinion, private commercial banking is today, closer to total Federal Government control or ownership than it has been at any time since 1933.

Why is this true? There are several political reasons for this Socialistic trend; but the strongest impelling force is the certainty of tragic inflation and the imposition of total Government controls. Once this transpires, private banking will pass to Federal domination—and remain in that status for many years.

We have not as bankers, nor have our business leaders, nor our public officials—none of them—presented a workable plan for the prevention of inflation—nor has anybody been wise enough to figure out any such plan, so far as I know.

As of now, all the Federal Reserve will do, or the Treasury can help do, is to take actions which will defer, moderate, and spread out the inflationary impacts so that the natural and corporate populations can have some time to adjust themselves to changing values. You may call this creeping inflation or any other coined phrase you choose, but the result will be the same. And the only alternative under our present law and system of Government, is a stop-spending and tax program on the part of Government, and a discount rate and reserve requirement from the Federal Reserve that, together, will stop progress and bring about the bust quicker than if nature is allowed to take its normal course.

Of course, another alternative is to change the present law and Government system and put into effect that bureaucrat's dream—a complete control plan of wages, profits, spending, and production, and allocation of basic materials. That sort of program would definitely end the boom and bust cycle—and also all personal freedom and liberty.

Certainly we have been alternately inflating and deflating since the birth of the Republic—and if you don't believe it, just compare the purchasing power of the dollar for each 10-year period of United States history. Personally, I prefer that cycle to the cure by bureaucratic regimentation; even though I believe that if the present inflationary trend continues unchecked, something is bound to "give" along about the late 1960's, and the resultant carnage will make the 1930's look like a happy Sunday school picnic on a sunny spring day.

I certainly do not even pretend to have the answer to this problem and during my recent 14-year tour of duty with the Federal Reserve Board, I never heard so much as one man or woman come up with a workable suggestion to stop this apparently inevitable cycle. We all give lip service to a "balanced budget" and to sane economic behavior—but it is always for the other fellow, never for us, where it pinches our own pocketbook.

We like to sit around the cracker barrel and belabor Congress for its alleged extravagance and "pork barreling." No particular conduct of the American people and the American press is more insincere than that sort of hypocritical criticism.

Who is Congress? Are they a special brand of humanity, set apart for their wisdom or sanctity or courage? Certainly not. They are just a plain, average group of American men and women, elected or chosen by their plain, average, American fellow-citizens every 2 years. I have been associated with Senators and Congressmen in a rather personal and intimate capacity off and on for nearly 40 years. And in my informed opinion, they constitute an above-the-average group—in intelligence, in sincerity, in loyalty to American ideals, and best of all, in just plain and humble Christian faith.

Never forget: the Congress represents you, and is a cross-section representation of your and my hopes and desires, fears, and faiths and also of our individual greed and selfishness.

It has been my observation through the years than an extravagant or inflationary Congressman is one who votes to spend money on some Federal project that you or I do not want nor approve; and a constructive or conservative legislator is one who votes for everything that helps our particular community and votes against those projects which do not help us or our own localities.

As an example, Georgia papers headlined a few weeks ago with great gusto and praise the fact that so many millions or billions of dollars were being spent in Georgia by the Federal Government. And the press was rightfully complimentary of the splendid men and women who make up the Georgia congressional delegation, and of their helpful service to the people of this State.

Without presuming to guess or suggest an answer, I ask you the simple question: How long would a man or women be allowed to stay in Congress from Georgia who voted against those projects which favored his or her community in this State, regardless of its inflationary impact on the national economy?

One finds similar uninspiring parallels in the attitudes of private business and in labor organizations; in agriculture; in veterans; and most unfortunately for the safety of our country, in the Armed Forces. I have yet to find one wholly unselfish organization, be it political, labor, industry, military, agriculture, or social.

Every one of you here probably has had this same thought and experience; and it's not that the world is all bad or that people are not any good. It's been my hapy experience that about 99 percent of people are honest and good to the best of their knowledge and belief. But people are also human; and the self-preservation instinct simply will not be downed in our time. You know this as well as I, so why should we ask the question: Is inflation inevitable? One might just as well ask if humans are human.

And because I think that inflation is a certainty does not make me feel any doubt as to the successful future of America—its continued growth and development, spiritually and economically, and as a happy home for many hundreds of millions of people. Our future as viewed from today is no worse than it appeared after the Revolution, or the Civil War, or World War I, or at several other times in our history.

Inflation of a sort, or depression of a worse sort, have always been with us. And always the younger generation, and the next generation, have handled the problems inherited from the previous bunglers, in a way which has made this a better world, and particularly have these successive generations made this a better country to live in—a better country morally, and a happier, more comfortable country materially.

And having learned this from history and experience, I have no patience with the mouthings of old people or cynics, or just plain hypocrites of any age, who pretend to see the end of good times in this country, or who forecast death and destruction to the happiness and welfare of our people.

What most of these gloom garglers are really doing is reluctantly recognizing and bemoaning the fact that the old order changeth and giveth place to the new. That change may not be progress in some of our minds; but it is inevitable evolution; and we had better learn to live with it, even if we don't like it—and even though it is sure to cost some of us money and other material losses, based on our present monetary standards.

Just stop and think what our grandfathers would have thought of the income tax of today? Or the real property tax? Or the capital gains tax? Any one who reads our history knows that in the opinion of the old folks this country has been on the road to ruin ever since the first Continental Congress.

My advice to you of my ancient age is to quite growling and grumbling; grease your rusty mental joints with a little oil of commonsense, and learn to live in this very good country of ours and enjoy it.

And above all, have faith in the younger generation and the next generation, and know that they will do a better job than we have done.

Of course, we would probably not recognize this country and its Government if we came back 50 years from now; but it will still be here, and our progeny will be living in it and probably enjoying themselves more than we are today—with a 3-day workweek and a proration of profits to labor and capital alike—and some on the side for the indigent and unemployed.

That prospect does not disturb me, so long as it does not come in my time. I am not adjusted to it. But this country 50 years hence will be their world, just as this one is ours. And ours today would probably be just as indigestible mentally to General Washington and his contemporaries, as our socialistic future is to you and me.

What I have tried to say to you, ladies and gentlemen, is that evolution and progress are one and the same in many respects. And one's opinion depends largely upon whether one's view is through the clear, unglassed eye of youth; or through the dimmed optics of age—often hampered by outdated bifocals which were probably dropped in the breakfast oatmeal when you read in the morning paper that Walter Reuther was demanding a 4-day workweek.

Seriously, to you few gentlemen who may be near my age—and to you ladies who could never possibly be half my age—let's learn to accept without weeping and wailing those economic and social changes in our lives which are being forced on us in pretty much the same manner that child labor laws, the right to strike, and the 8-hour day and other evolutionary and revolutionary changes were forced on our parents and grandparents.

But the decision to accept does not imply that we of our generation should do anything to hurry these changes. And that is one more thing I want to talk about in closing, I feel that we as bankers are deliberately and effectively and with considerable feeling and heat, doing much to aid the enemies of private banking to effect an early Government take-over of our industry, or at least to bridle it with both general and selective controls on rates, reserves and earnings. I refer to the manner in which the bitter personal and institutional fight is being waged between the group known as "Independent Bankers" and the group known as "Branch Chain or Holding-Company Bankers."

And before you throw vegetables this way, I say hurriedly that I am not here to favor or oppose any particular form of commercial banking in Georgia, so long as the institutions are chartered by the State or Comptroller of the Currency, and are members of the FDIC and the sovereignty of the State of Georgia is sustained.

I have no feeling one way or the other as to which systems you choose for Georgia; and being a newcomer and a stranger among you, I would not presume to advise or influence your own opinions in any way.

But I do want to question seriously the advisability of the trend and nature of the contest being waged—especially the destructive criticism being levelled against each side by the other, in view of the effect on the public and legislative minds.

If only one half of the bad things being said and circulated to the non-banking, but actively voting public, are true, then that public may well conclude after a few more months of this short-sighted bombardment, that both sides are rotten to the core, and that maybe the Federal Government had better take over the whole kit and caboodle, and do away with private bank ownership entirely.

Having just come from 13 years of service in one of Washington's greatest bureaucracies—a position which placed me in intimate and knowledgeful contact with other bureaus of similar ambitions and intent—I can assure you that the big Government empire builders are using the intrabanking struggle, and all of the mean and unfair things that are being said and published by each group about the others to keep the banks divided among themselves. In other words, divide and conquer. And bankers' own words are being quoted to convince the American voters generally, and the Congress in particular, of the viciousness and weaknesses of all types of private banking.

If any of you want to pursue this subject further, I will be glad to talk with you individually or in groups, to try to make clear to you what I personally know to be true; that is, that you had better reach some agreement among yourselves, and I do not care what that agreement is, but it is imperative that you do reach some intraindustry understanding and present a united front to the public and to the Congress; or else we may have legislation of a national character which will wipe out State lines and State systems, so far as commercial banking is concerned.

Throughout this family fight, and the others that are bound to follow as long as

we retain the few freedoms left to us by the Supreme Court, the Federal Reserve Board and the Department of Justice, let's please try to remember that the world does not end with our generation. Our children and their children will come along to enjoy this great country which our generation seems to have pretty well messed up.

Never having known the "good old days," they will undoubtedly enjoy life even more than we. Poor things, they will probably not be able to visit but three or four planets in the course of their lives, and their 5-hour day and 3-day week will undoubtedly be as tolerable to them as the 14-hour day and 6-day was to our people who lived during the "golden age" of early nineteen hundreds.

They will muddle through and be happy, because they will not know any other way of life.

Kowalski Fight for Economy and Dignity in the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 21, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Representative FRANK KOWALSKI, of Connecticut, deserves credit for pressing hard for a congressional investigation of the waste of manpower in our Armed Forces by using military personnel for various menial jobs from maid to chauffeur. Developments are beginning to confirm Representative KOWALSKI's charge indicating that a full division of able-bodied, expensively trained fighting men are being shamefully wasted.

This is a disgraceful waste of the taxpayer's money. The Milwaukee Journal has recently commended and supported Representative KOWALSKI in his fight for economy and dignity in our Armed Forces. I ask unanimous consent that an editorial recently printed in the Milwaukee Journal, entitled "Wasteful Defense Servants," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASTEFUL DEFENSE "SERVANTS"

When Representative KOWALSKI, Democrat, of Connecticut, declared that the military services were wasting the equivalent of a division of men by using them as servants, chauffeurs, and in other menial jobs, the Defense Department denied the charge.

KOWALSKI is a West Pointer and served 33 years in the Army before retiring as a colonel, so he speaks with authority. But a Defense Department personnel official estimated that the services had a maximum of 3,000 men in servant-driver type jobs.

Now, however, a Defense Department report indicates that the Congressman was essentially right. Some 17,500 soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines are used as aides, stewards, chauffeurs, etc.

The figures are somewhat fuzzy. They need the further explanations which a House Armed Services Subcommittee proposes to get. Investigation will probably show some of the jobs to be essential. Yet anyone who has been in military service knows the extent to which manpower is wasted.

Vigorous congressional action to require the services to use men in jobs for which they have been expensively trained will pay off. Defense dollars will be saved and defense forces bolstered, even though some high ranking officers lose extra services to which they have become accustomed.

Needed: A Realistic Approach to East-West Foreign Ministers' Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 21, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as we know, the free nations are currently meeting to formulate a program for the coming Foreign Ministers' Conference with the Soviet Union at Geneva.

The West, I believe, must approach this conference, not with wishful thinking, but with realism.

We recognize that there are critical issues for which we must strive for solutions. At the same time, it is important to emphasize that we cannot isolate the German situation. The pressures on Berlin are only a segment of the global strategy by which the Communist world conspiracy is attempting to further its objectives.

Recently, Mr. Allen Dulles, director of the Central Intelligence Agency, in an address in New Orleans, outlined some realistic factors of the worldwide campaign of communism.

Among the factors stressed by Mr. Dulles are the following:

As long as the principles of international communism motivate the regimes in Moscow and Peiping, we must expect that their single purpose will be the liquidation of our form of free society and the emergence of a Sovietized, communized world order.

They change their techniques as circumstances dictate. They have never given us the slightest reason to hope that they are abandoning their overall objectives.

They are devoting about twice as much of their gross national product to military ends as we do.

Those who feel we can buy peace by compromise with Khrushchev are sadly deluded. Each concession we give him merely strengthens his position and prestige and the ability of the Soviet regime to continue its domination of the Russian people.

The April 20 issue of the U.S. News & World Report carried a number of such excerpts from Mr. Dulles' realistic appraisal of the Soviet Union's ability and purposes. I ask unanimous consent to have these excerpts printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY WORRY ABOUT RUSSIA?—A REPORT FROM ALLEN DULLES

Following are excerpts from an address by Allen W. Dulles, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, in New Orleans on April 8, 1959:

"The challenge of Soviet power presents today a triple threat: First, military; second, economic, and third, subversive. This challenger is a global one.

"As long as the principles of international communism motivate the regimes in Moscow and Peiping, we must expect that their single purpose will be the liquidation of our form of free society and the emergence of a Sovietized, communized world order.

"They change their techniques as circumstances dictate. They have never given us the slightest reason to hope that they are abandoning their overall objective.

"To achieve this objective, they are devoting about twice as much of their gross national product to military ends as we do. The U.S.S.R. military effort as a proportion of gross national product is greater than that of any nation in the world. Their continuous diversion of economic resources to military support is without any parallel in peacetime history.

"We estimate that the total value of their current annual military effort is roughly equivalent to our own. They accomplish this with a gross national product which is now less than half of our own.

"Before leaving the military phase of the Soviet threat, I want to dispel any possible misinterpretations. First, I do not believe that the Soviet now have military superiority over us; and, second, I do not believe that they desire deliberately to provoke hostilities with the United States or the Western World at this time. They are well aware of our deterrent force. * * *

"Taking into account our over-all military strength and our strategic position vis-à-vis the Soviet Union, I consider that our military posture is stronger and our ability to inflict damage is today greater than that of the Soviet Union.

"The secret of Soviet progress (economically) is simple. It lies in the fact that the Kremlin leaders direct a far higher proportion of total resources to national-policy purposes than does the United States. I define national-policy purposes to include, among other things, defense and investment in heavy industry.

"Here are some examples: While the Soviets last year were producing only 1 automobile for every 50 we produced, they were turning out 4 machine tools to our 1. * * *

"Commercial investment, which includes stores, shopping centers, drive-in movies and office buildings, has been absorbing over $6 billion a year in the United States, and only $2 billion in the U.S.S.R.

"Our housing investment is roughly twice that of the Soviet even though living space per capita in the United States is already four times that of the U.S.S.R.

"What of the future? In Khrushchev's words, 'The Soviet Union intends to outstrip the United States economically. * * * To surpass the level of production in the United States means to exceed the highest indexes of capitalism.'

"For example, compare primary-energy-production trends in the two countries. Soviet production of coal, petroleum, natural gas, and hydroelectric power, expressed in standard fuel units, amounted to 45 percent of the U.S. production in 1958. By 1965 it will be close to 60 percent. The absolute gap in primary energy has been closing since 1950. At the present pace, it will continue to narrow over the next 7 years.

"Similarly, the absolute gap in steel production has been shrinking over the past 5 years. The maximum gap in steel capacity apparently was reached in 1958.

"The comforting illusion spread by the 'disciples of the absolute gap' should not serve as a false tranquilizer.

"At the same time, it is important not to exaggerate Soivet prospects in the economic race. In the propaganda surrounding the launching of the 7-year plan, Khrushchev made a number of statements about Soviet

economic power which were nothing more than wishful thinking. Specifically he stated that, 'after the completion of the 7-year plan, we will probably need about 5 more years to catch up with and outstrip the United States in industrial output. Thus,' he added, 'by that time [1970], or perhaps even sooner, the Soviet Union will advance to first place in the world both in absolute volume of production and in per capita production.'

* * * * *

"The Kremlin leaders claim U.S.S.R. industrial output to be 50 percent of that of the United States. Our own analyses of Soviet industrial output last year concluded that it was not more than 40 percent of our own.

"Secondly, Khrushchev forecasts that our future industrial growth will be only 2 percent a year. If this is true, the United States will be virtually committing economic suicide. This prediction I regard as unrealistic.

"A saner projection would place 1965 Soviet industrial production at about 55 percent of our own. By 1970, assuming the same relative rates of growth, U.S.S.R. industrial output, as a whole, would be about 60 percent of that in the United States.

"Those who feel we can buy peace by compromise with Khrushchev are sadly deluded. Each concession we give him merely strengthens his position and prestige and the ability of the Soviet regime to continue its domination of the Russian people, whose friendship we seek.

"The over-all power of the free world is still vastly superior to that under the control of the leaders of international communism. * * *

"They are not supermen."

Buzzard's Roost Dam on Illinois River, Oreg.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 21, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the Coos-Curry Electric Cooperative, Inc., of Coquille, Oreg., has applied to the Federal Power Commission for permission to construct the Buzzard's Roost Dam on the Illinois River. To the best of my knowledge, the proposal for constructing a 500-foot dam in this vicinity is the largest hydroelectric project ever undertaken by a consumer-owned rural electric cooperative.

Economic feasibility of the project, estimated to cost approximately $52 million, will depend somewhat on the source of funds and the interest rate on any loan obtained. This is brought out in a preliminary analysis of project financing, which has been provided me by Mr. Bruce Shavere, the manager of the Coos-Curry Electric Cooperative.

So that my colleagues in the Senate will know details of the largest cooperative-sponsored waterpower project ever proposed, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a preliminary summary report which emphasizes the impact of interest rates on the cost of power to consumers. Naturally, the cooperative will have to satisfy the FPC regarding its proposed facilities for handling the fishery resource in this area before any license can be issued. This and other factors must be thoroughly evaluated by the Commission before any license is approved.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRELIMINARY SUMMARY REPORT, BUZZARD'S ROOST HYDROELECTRIC SITE, ILLINOIS RIVER

The Buzzard's Roost hydroelectric site is located on the Illinois River, a tributary of the Rogue River in Curry and Josephine Counties, Oreg. A hydroeletcric development at this site will consist of a major storage project intended to regulate and utilize essentially the total natural streamflow of the Illinois River and its principal tributaries above the dam.

It is contemplated that the project operation would be coordinated with the Bonneville Power Administration Columbia River system to achieve the most efficient and economical utilization of these resources, including the resorvoir storage, when operated integrally with the Columbia River system. Such coordination will be achieved through an agreement between the Coos-Curry Electric Cooperative, Inc., and the Bonneville Power Administration whereby Bonneville would regulate the operation of the project in conjunction with its Columbia River system to obtain the most beneficial use of these resources as a part of the Northwest's power resources. Such coordination may result in a firm output from this project in excess of that which could be realized if the project were to be considered as operating independently from the Columbia River system.

A summary of basic data and project costs along with a summary analysis of annual costs and the resultant power and energy costs is presented on the attached sheets. A brief general description of the principal project works is as follows:

A concrete arch dam having a crest length of approximately 1,500 feet would be located on the Illinois River approximately 6 miles upstream from the confluence of the Illinois and the Rogue Rivers. The dam would be of the nonoverflow type with a separate side channel spillway having a capacity adequate to pass the maximum flood which could be anticipated on the river when utilizing the available storage behind the dam. A reservoir covering approximately 4,250 acres would be created behind the dam which would have a total storage volume of nearly 1,200,000 acre-feet. A maximum drawdown in the reservoir of approximately 70 feet would yield a usable storage in the reservoir of approximately 200,000 acre-feet which, for the purpose of this preliminary analysis, is assumed adequate to provide the necessary regulation of the streamflows to allow essentially full utilization of the streamflows of the river during a repetition of the 1936–37 water conditions.

A reinforced concrete powerhouse would be located at the base of the dam and would be constructed as an integral part of the dam. The powerhouse would contain generating equipment totaling 135,000 kilowatts, consisting of three 60,300-horsepower Francis-type turbines directly connected to generators rated at 50,000 kilovolt-amperes, 0.9 pF (45,000 kilowatts). Step-up transformers and circuit breaker controls would be constructed adjacent to the powerhouse.

The plant output would be transmitted from the project site to Gold Beach by means of two 115-kilovolt transmission lines, where the power would be delivered to the cooperative's distribution facilities and where connections would be made to the Bonneville Power Administration for transmission to other users.

PRELIMINARY SUMMARY, COST OF POWER AND ENERGY, BUZZARD'S ROOST SITE

The following table shows the cost of power and energy from the Buzzard's Roost project under four assumptions as to rate of interest on funds borrowed. This analysis assumes financing under existing REA laws, which provide for payment of interest only for the first 5 years of operation and retirement of the loan during the succeeding 30 years.

It should be recognized that the 35-year debt retirement period does not properly represent the useful life of a hydroelectric project. Accordingly, the following table also shows the average cost of power and energy during the 47-year period extending from the date of completion of the project to the date of expiration of the Federal Power Commission license.

The costs presented below are based on interest, amortization of the cost of the project, and estimated cost of operation, excluding taxes. No consideration is given to the value of the facilities remaining at the end of the period.

	35-year period	47-year period
Cost per kilowatt of peaking capability, interest rate:		
2 percent	$17.91	$14.20
2½ percent	19.22	15.18
3 percent	20.59	16.20
4 percent	23.47	18.34
Cost of energy, based on 1936-37 water conditions (mills per kilowatt-hour), interest rate:		
2 percent	4.68	3.71
2½ percent	5.02	3.97
3 percent	5.38	4.23
4 percent	6.13	4.79

The Challenge of the Refugee and Escapee Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 21, 1959

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I have received from the American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service, Inc., regarding the challenge of the refugee and escapee problem.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHALLENGE OF THE REFUGEE AND ESCAPEE PROBLEM

AMERICAN COUNCIL OF VOLUNTARY AGENCIES FOR FOREIGN SERVICE, INC.,
New York, N.Y., April 7, 1959.

The American Voluntary Resettlement Agencies which are members of the American Council, have been active for many years in mass and individual migration and resettlement of peoples displaced by wars' aftermath, calamity or political oppression. In the past decade, some 600,000 such persons have been resettled in the United States through sponsorship secured by voluntary agencies. This human response to human need was a work of rescue which not only saved individuals and family lives but also has been of service to the economy of many over-populated countries. Further, it served as a great social and economic advantage to the American economy.

It is the belief of the American Voluntary Agencies that U.S. programs to assist refugees and escapees are interpreted overseas as a significant index of our Government's foreign policy. We cannot, therefore, ignore the fact that the millions of refugees still homeless and dispossessed are a threat to the peace and stability of many areas of the world, and that refugee aid and programs of resettlement, rehabilitation and integration must be continued and strengthened.

The American voluntray agencies have ongoing relationships with governmental and intergovernmental agencies charged with the responsibility for assistance to refugees, such as the United Nations Office of High Commissioner for Refugees; the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration and the U.S. Escapee Program. The need to make adequate funds available to those governmental and intergovernmental agencies is a continuing one and requires the fullest support.

While there have been important accomplishments by all the agencies working on behalf of the refugees, the task still remains tremendous and challenging. It demands the maximum efforts by all governmental and voluntary sectors.

As part of the U.S. participation in the projected World Refugee Year, our country should continue to set an example for the free world by generous, imaginative and extensive refugee assistance programs. This may well include refugee immigration legislation which would maintain our tradition as a haven for the oppressed and dispossessed, and demonstrate the good will of the American people in accepting moral as well as financial responsibility for a fair share of the solution of the world refugee problem.

MEMBER AGENCIES

American Baptist Relief.
American Federation of International Institutes, Inc.
American Friends of Austrian Children, Inc.
American Friends Service Committee, Inc.
American Fund for Czechoslovak Refugees, Inc.
American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee, Inc.
American Middle East Relief, Inc.
American National Committee to Aid Homeless Armenians (ANCHA).
American ORT Federation, Inc.
American Relief for Poland, Inc.
Brethren Service Commission.
Catholic Relief Services, National Catholic Welfare Conference, Inc.
Church World Service, Inc., National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U. S. A.
Cooperative for American Remittances to Everywhere, Inc.
Co-ordinated Hungarian Relief, Inc.
General Council of the Assemblies of God, Foreign Service Committee.
Hadassah, The Women's Zionist Organization of America, Inc.
Hadassah Medical Relief Association, Inc.
Heifer Project, Inc.
International Rescue Committee, Inc.
Iran Foundation, Inc.
Lutheran World Relief, Inc.
Mennonite Central Committee, Inc.
National Lutheran Council Service to Refugees.
Near East Foundation.
Salvation Army.
Selfhelp of Emigres from Central Europe, Inc.
Seventh-Day Adventist Welfare Service, Inc.
Tolstoy Foundation, Inc.
Unitarian Service Committee, Inc.
United Friends of the Needy and Displaced People of Yugoslavia, Inc.
United HIAS Service, Inc.
United Lithuanian Relief Fund of America, Inc.
United Seamen's Service, Inc.
United Ukrainian-American Relief Committee, Inc.
World Relief Commission of the National Association of Evangelicals.
World University Service.
Young Women's Christian Association, Inc. (World Emergency Fund).

The 1958 Column of the Year—Tribute to S. L. Latimer, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 21, 1959

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that "The 1958 Column of the Year," as selected by the editors of Dixie Business, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The column selected this year was that written by Mr. S. L. Latimer, Jr., editor of the State, of Columbia, S.C. It is entitled "From Across the Editor's Desk," and appeared in the State on May 25, 1958.

I am glad, indeed, to join in paying tribute to Mr. Latimer. His leadership of the State has made it one of the foremost newspapers in the South, and I think it very fitting that his column be selected.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FROM ACROSS THE EDITOR'S DESK

(By S. L. Latimer, Jr., editor of the State)

The late Mr. Ambrose E. Gonzales of the State, always had a ready answer, and a good one.

As the books of his classic Black Border series, done in Gullah, came out he presented me with copies. Upon receiving his autographed "The Captain," I thanked him and remarked that it had such an attractive binding. He laughed. But he didn't forget what I said. When "Laguerre," the next in the series, came out, he wrote me a note: "I hope," he said, "you enjoy the cover." I did not fail to catch the reference.

Once a rather well-known Columbian wrote a hot letter to the editor criticizing the State rather unjustly, the charges being without foundation. It irritated Mr. Ambrose for it was from a man to whom the State had been kind. He gave me the letter to publish. "I would dress him down," he said, "but I like him so I will let him off lightly." Whereupon he dictated to me this editor's note to printed after the letter: "The State would answer Mr. ——— but why waste lather to shave a jackass?" I was flabbergasted, but I said nothing. Later I showed it to Maj. McDavid Horton, my immediate superior. He too wondered what Mr. Ambrose would have said had he wanted to "dress him down." Together we went to Mr. Gonzales. "Oh, well," he said, "maybe it is a little too rough. Just print the letter without comment."

Once a group of advertisers became sore over a tax stand taken by the State and retaliated by withdrawing copy. It was costly to the paper, which was not in clover, moneywise, and could ill afford to lose the revenue. But it was a two-edged sword; it cut both ways. Those who had dropped their ads were feeling the effect in their sales. Finally one of the leaders wrote that if the State would change its policy in the matter, the advertisers would return. To which Mr. Ambrose sent this terse reply:

"DEAR MR. ———: Your letter received. The State is not for sale.

"Yours truly,

"A. E. GONZALES."

Dr. Stanhope Sams was a man of wonderful information. He would have been a whiz on these quiz shows. No telling what he would have won. At one time he was on Collier's, then on the State as an editorial writer, then a Government representative in the Far East, and later editor of the Japan Times, an English language newspaper published at that time in Tokyo. But he loved Columbia and the State, and finally came back on this newspaper, where he wielded a gifted literary pen until his death.

One day Mr. Ambrose wanted to clear up some obscure point, and was prepared to put someone to work to uncover it. I would have been the one to do the looking up had not at that time Dr. Sams come along. I have forgotten what the question was, but Mr. Ambrose asked Dr. Sams if he knew the answer, which he did. Mr. Ambrose looked at him in admiration. He liked a quick, well-informed mind. Then with a twinkle in his eye he said: "Stanhope, you've got more damned useless information than any man I ever knew."

One reason Robert E. Gonzales was such a success as an editorial paragrapher was that he had such a fine and exacting teacher in his uncle. Bob used to say that if he wrote 40 quips, his Uncle Ambrose would throw 20 of them away and edit severely half of those remaining.

But let no one come to the conclusion that Mr. Ambrose was master only of terse comment. He could write with all the great tenderness of his big heart; he could be as firm as his steel-like character; he could interpret with uncanny astuteness. He liked sports, he had a wonderful baritone voice, he loved people. What a pity that he should have been so crippled for the last years of his life; yet what an inspiration he was, as he carried on so courageously. Every one of his Black Border books was written with hands that knew untold pain, or dictated with a voice which he could use only with great strain and tiring effort.

Mr. Gonzales was born May 29, 1857, at Charleston, 101 years ago next Thursday. He died in July 1926 at Columbia. He is buried in the family plot in Elmwood.

Fair-Trade Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 21, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in a letter in today's New York Times, Mr. Arnold Ross, of New York, writes an excellent answer to many of the editorial criticisms of fair trade that have been featured in the big national newspapers.

Mr. Ross concentrates on an editorial opposing fair-trade legislation that had previously appeared in the New York Times; but his answer applies generally.

Mr. Ross makes two especially pertinent points. First he points to the fallacy of the 1956 study of the Department of Justice, which is the principal reliance of those fighting fair-trade laws. This study of eight non-fair-trade cities purported to show that consumers could save 27 percent in buying a large number of items below the fair-traded price. As Mr. Ross writes, this neglects the fact that what the non-fair-trade merchant does is use the nationally advertised item as a loss-leader to pull customers into his store. He then hikes the profit margin on other items to abnormally high levels, so that the net saving to the consumer is zero.

Mr. Ross also administers a coup de grace to the big newspaper opponents of fair trade by pointing out that they themselves practice fair trade, and insist on it, and are very successful with it. The New York Times, for instance, specifies exactly what the price you and I shall pay for that great paper when we buy it from the newsstand. Can anyone recall buying a paper below the fair-trade price printed on it by the manufacturer-publisher?

Mr. Ross has artfully snagged the Times in a neat "Do as I say, not as I do" contradiction; or, as the old French proverb goes, "Why be hypocritical, when it is so easy to be self-deluded?"

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the excellent letter by Mr. Ross printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAIR TRADE BILL BACKED—CONTROL OF RETAIL PRICES IS HELD NECESSARY FOR MAXIMUM VOLUME

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Your April 13 editorial "The Fair Trade Bill" presents an oversimplified view of the fair trade problem.

In the first sentence you describe the Harris bill as a "radical piece of legislation." This seems like a poor way to describe a principle which, under a Federal enabling law enacted 20 years ago, was adopted by 45 out of 48 States.

You further state that passage of this bill holds a threat of higher prices to the consumer. You quote a 1956 Department of Justice survey showing that "8 non-fair-trade cities' consumers could save 27 percent in buying some 77 items at the lowest prices prevailing in those cities as against the prices for the same goods in fair-traded areas."

This is only half the story. The only alternative open to a merchant faced with an abnormally low profit margin on any given type of merchandise is to mark up other categories of merchandise to abnormally high levels. The net saving to the consumer is nothing. He has merely been enticed by one item only to be gouged on another.

This, however, is not the worst evil that comes in a totally non-fair-traded economy. Only the largest dealers have the selection of merchandise required to pursue the loss-leader method described above. The end result is that the thousands of small merchants who do not have the selection of blind items which is necessary to merchandise successfully in this manner give up handling these football items altogether.

It is impossible to maintain anything like our vast system of mass distribution without a mass system of retail outlets making all types of merchandise readily available to all people at all times and at a fair price. The natural result of a non-fair-traded economy is a gradual concentration of sales in a few hands with an inevitable diminution in overall volume. The threat to our industries and factories would be a severe one.

Several months ago the Times carried a better review of this problem. It appeared in "The Merchant's Point of View." The conclusion was that mass distribution was impossible for any length of time without fair trade or something similar to it.

The New York Times, as well as every other newspaper, seems to embrace this principle of fair trade in its own distribution system. I have yet to buy my copy from any newsstand for less than the purchase price shown on the front page.

I think that your circulation manager must be fully aware that an uncontrolled retail price would be the first step to a reduction in the number of newsstands and an inevitable reduction in circulation.

ARNOLD ROSS.

NEW YORK, April 14, 1959.

Resolutions of Central Cooperatives, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 21, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, from time to time I welcome the opportunity to pay tribute to the fine work which cooperatives are performing in behalf of the public.

Today, I should like to invite attention to one such organization: Central Cooperatives, Inc.

Currently this fine cooperative is serving patrons not only in Wisconsin, but also in Michigan, Minnesota, and North and South Dakota.

We recognize that, over the years, such cooperatives have benefited not only their patrons by providing a wide variety of services at minimum costs, but also the economy of the local communities.

Recently, I received a series of resolutions adopted by Central Cooperatives, Inc., on a number of significant issues—many of which are before the Congress.

Recognizing the broad-scope thinking behind these resolutions, I am taking the liberty of calling these to the attention of my colleagues. I ask unanimous consent that these resolutions be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS, 42D ANNUAL MEETING, CENTRAL COOPERATIVES, INC., MARCH 23–24, 1959

RESOLUTION 1—PURE FOOD REGULATION

Whereas serious violations have occurred in regards coloring and preserving of foods for human consumption; and

Whereas the consumer should be protected by Government agencies; and

Whereas Central Cooperatives, Inc., has taken a lead in the protection of consumer health: Be it therefore

Resolved, That Central Cooperatives, Inc., be commended on its stand in its refusal to compromise on this vital health issue.

RESOLUTION 2—ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Whereas the St. Lawrence Seaway is now a reality; and

Whereas the Central Cooperatives, Inc., has supported the development: Be it

Resolved, That Central Cooperatives, Inc., and other cooperatives in the area make full use of its facilities now available, to open new transportation service with cooperatives in their area and abroad.

RESOLUTION 3—THE FORAND BILL FOR THE AGING

Whereas there is a lack of medical and hospital care provided for the aging through existing agencies of insurance;

Whereas life expectancy and longevity is rapidly increasing each year and it is generally agreed that the problem of providing medical care for people on social securiy is an ever increasing one; and

Whereas up toth present no Federal legislation has been passed to help solve this problem: Be it

Resolved, That the delegates assembled at this 42d annual meeting of Central Cooperatives, Inc., go on record in favor of H.R. 4700, known as the Forand bill, and that cooperatives here represented urge their Congressmen and Senators to vote in favor of this bill.

RESOLUTION 4—LABOR AND COOPERATIVES

Whereas the principles upon which both the cooperatives and the labor movement are founded are very much the same—in both groups people unite in common interest so that they can benefit from the strength which their association gives them; and

Whereas cooperatives of the Midwest have been developed primarily by people engaged in agricultural pursuit; and

Whereas they are established on the basic principle of open membership; and

Whereas workers and laborers in the industrial areas of our Nation are aware of the need of cooperation to improve their economic welfare; and

Whereas consumer cooperatives shopping centers are being developed in many metropolitan areas: Be it hereby

Resolved, That all organized labor be invited to avail itself of the services offered by cooperatives.

RESOLUTION 5—SALES TAX

Whereas it is common knowledge that a general tax is regressive and puts an unfair tax burden on those least able to pay: Be it therefore

Resolved, That Central Cooperatives, Inc., at its 42d annual meeting oppose the sales tax and insist that the principle and ability to pay be recognized in all tax matter.

RESOLUTION 6—RURAL ELECTRIFICATION AND TELEPHONE PROGRAMS

We reaffirm our endorsement of the national rural electrification and telephone programs.

We urge on the National Congress that it provide adequate safeguards for rural electric cooperatives by continuing to furnish sufficient loan funds to permit construction of line and adequate generating facilities wherever these are necessary.

The issue of interest rates on REA loans is, in our opinion, one to be debated by the National Congress rather than by executives in the Department of Agriculture, and we ask that this expression of our position be called to the attention of the Secretary of Agriculture.

RESOLUTION 7—EDUCATIONAL TV

Whereas Central Cooperatives, Inc., is operating in the area of northern Wisconsin, upper Michigan, and northern Minnesota; and

Whereas Central Cooperatives, Inc., is interested in the growth of educational television; and

Whereas channel 8 has been allocated to the Duluth-Superior area which will cover the same general area: Be it therefore

Resolved, That Central Cooperatives, Inc., and its affiliates cooperate in the drive for funds to put channel 8 into operation at the earliest possible time.

RESOLUTION 8—COOPERATIVE TAXATION

Whereas cooperatives are obligated to pay patronage refunds to their patrons in proportion to patronage; and

Whereas such patronage refunds therefore cannot be income to cooperatives, and are therefore properly excludable from gross income of cooperatives; and

Whereas legislation proposed by the Secretary of the Treasury would, if introduced in Congress and passed by Congress, declare that patronage refund liabilities of cooperatives must be included in computation of their gross income for tax purposes; and

Whereas such legislation would furthermore declare that cooperatives would be taxed on all patronage refund liabilities, unless they were paid either in cash or in certificates bearing 4 percent interest and redeemed in cash within 3 years; and

Whereas such a program would cause dire hardship in all types of cooperatives: Be it therefore

Resolved, That delegates and members of Central Cooperatives, Inc., vigorously oppose this legislation.

RESOLUTION 9—SMALL LOANS

Whereas Central Cooperatives, Inc., has always represented the interests of the consumer and has protected the consumer against inflation and business abuses; and

Whereas the consumer's interest is always under-represented in the conflict of pressure groups in legislative bodies of our State and national governments: Be it

Resolved, That the annual meeting go on record in support of Governor Freeman in his request that the Minnesota legislators (1) force lenders to state the true simple interest rate they charge, (2) reduce the small loan interest rate, (3) help people understand what credit life insurance is, and (4) let him appoint a consumer counsel.

RESOLUTION 10—YOUTH PROGRAM

Whereas the young people of today will be the leaders of tomorrow; and

Whereas continued vitality and growth of our cooperative depends upon the infusion of new life and spirit; and

Whereas Central Cooperatives, Inc., has established a scholarship program to stimulate interest by young people in cooperatives: Be it therefore

Resolved, That all member cooperatives take advantage of this opportunity to build increased understanding and participation in cooperatives by the young people in their communities.

RESOLUTION 11—EXPRESSION OF APPRECIATION

We, the delegates of the 42d annual meeting of Central Cooperatives, Inc., appreciate Brooks Hays' taking time out from his busy schedule to address our group last evening.

We express our appreciation to the management and staff of Hotel Duluth for the fine facilities, their courtesy, and accommodations.

We also wish to extend our recognition and appreciation to the guild for their service with the coffee break, to Jerry Voorhis for his inspirational luncheon speech, and to the judges of the co-op essay contest: Sister Mary, College of St. Scholastica; Robert Haakenson, University of Minnesota, Duluth branch; Orville Manion, Wisconsin State College, Superior; Lydia Peterson, Northland College of Ashland.

Foreign Language Training in the Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 21, 1959

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I should like to call attention to the recent address delivered by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Arthur Flemming, before a gathering of foreign language teachers in which he cites some of the problems in our education system today. The Secretary has been keenly aware of the lack of foreign language training in our public schools as well as the inadequacy of teachers' salaries which has resulted in a critical shortage of teaching personnel. Fortunately, he is determined to do something about these weaknesses and some progress has already been made. Excerpts from the Secretary's address were reported in the press, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the article which appeared in the Washington Star of April 18, 1959.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LANGUAGE INABILITY IN UNITED STATES IS HIT

Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary Flemming yesterday decried this country's "inability to use foreign languages," a fact which he called "one of the principal obstacles to world peace."

He also pledged himself to work "in season and out of season" to see that teachers' salaries at all levels were doubled within the next few years.

"This inability to use foreign languages deprives us of outstanding opportunities to promote understanding between the nations of the world," Mr. Flemming told more than 1,000 language teachers at the Sheraton-Park Hotel.

The teachers, gathered here for a 2-day Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, represent 300 public and private elementary and secondary schools and colleges.

Mr. Flemming noted that the trend in eliminating language requirements from academic curricula had encouragingly been reversed. At the same time, he pointed out there were 50 official and unofficial foreign languages which were "not taught at all in any U.S. institution of higher learning."

"I am also told," he said, "that there are some 30 languages, each spoken by 5 million foreign peoples, for which we have no dictionaries."

Mr. Flemming said the sputnik crisis 17 months ago had spotlighted the weaknesses in the U.S. education program, paramount of which, he said, were teachers' low salaries and inadequate language training.

"We must strengthen the salary structure of teachers at all levels," he warned. "Society has no right to penalize teachers and their families."

In describing HEW's efforts to establish language training and research centers across the country, Mr. Flemming said his Department had already underwritten $400,000 for six such centers beginning next fall. The centers would concentrate on one or more of the six so-called critical languages not commonly taught in the United States—Russian, Chinese, Japanese, Arabic, Portugese, and Hindustani.

The Secretary said he expected to get the additional $400,000 provided for in the National Defense Education Act with which to establish six more language centers.

Dr. Galo Plaza Hails U.S. Policy Changes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 21, 1959

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, one of the truly great friends of the United States in Latin America, Dr. Galo Plaza, the former President of Ecuador, was invited to address the Pan American Union in Washington yesterday. There is a report of his fine and informative address in the Washington Daily News of today, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW ERA OF UNDERSTANDING—GALO PLAZA HAILS U.S. POLICY CHANGES

(By Harry Frantz)

Dr. Galo Plaza, former President of Eucador, believes the American Republics are about to start a new era of understanding and cooperation which will help the flow of capital for Latin American economic development and will increase technical cooperation.

Dr. Plaza spoke yesterday at the Pan American Union to an audience of ladies representing Washington official and diplomatic life. The meeting was arranged by Sra. Jose Mora, wife of the Secretary General of the OAS.

CHANGES

"Recent decisions and attitudes have constituted a welcome change in U.S. policy for Latin America, which will help dissipate most of the grievances and eliminate the harsh attitudes that have clouded inter-American relations in the past," Dr. Plaza said.

"The sincere critics in Latin America of U.S. policy now speak highly of the leaders in the United States who, having detected the flaws, have embarked on honest and constructive efforts to correct them."

Dr. Plaza cited the following steps which he said are clear indications of a favorable change in U.S. policy for Latin America:

The United States has agreed with other Republics to create an exclusively inter-American lending institution;

The United States has agreed to put into practice some workable procedures to mod-

erate extreme fluctuation in the prices of basic commodities from Latin America; and

For the first time the United States has looked with sympathy and approval on our plans for a common market in Latin America after opposing any such idea for years.

Dr. Plaza said that the Communists mixed the Latin American dissatisfaction with other problems for which the United States was not responsible, "and produced a Molotov propaganda cocktail" which repeatedly exploded during the trip last year of Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON and more recently in Bolivia.

"The reasons for resentment were there, the way it was expressed was foreign to Latin America," he said.

Galo Plaza said that Latin America will have to revolutionize its economic system so as to make more efficient use of its natural resources by: the application of technology to agriculture, a rational program of industrialization and a common market.

Negro Housing in Atlanta, Ga.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 21, 1959

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the able editorial from the Thomasville (Ga.) Times-Enterprise. The title of the editorial is "NAACP, Please Take Notice."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NAACP, PLEASE TAKE NOTICE

If the NAACP is interested in anything so mundane as how Negroes are housed, where they live, and in what sort of an environment they are growing up, we earnestly suggest that they take note of the recent report of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission, which said that Negro housing in Atlanta is "vastly better" than can be found in many northern cities.

Following the investigations of the Commission in Atlanta, the Chairman, John Hannah, said Atlanta's Negro housing "may not be ideal, but the situation here is definitely better than in many northern cities."

Now we are aware of how the NAACP operates and frankly doubt that this revelation will inspire them to take time off from their determined campaign to integrate southern schools; but we do feel that if they are at all interested in the progress of their race, they might want to follow up Hannah's remarks with a good long look at conditions in some of the northern cities he mentioned.

While he was about it, the Chairman and members of the Commission issued a warning: Orders for Federal agencies in the housing field to promote housing integration would bring about the "utter ruin" of the home-building industry in the South.

This is straight talk, the kind which takes facts into cognizance and gives due recognition to all aspects of the situation and emerges with a realistic report which should not, but may, be ignored by the northern cities and the racial agitators of the NAACP. Good relations apply in Atlanta between the two races and southern whites are making a determined effort to insure that Negroes have access to adequate housing and other facilities. They have gone about the job in such a way that the results do not bear comparison with situations as they exist in northern cities; but, sad to relate, no credit will be given the South for these endeavors by the radical elements who want only their own campaign propaganda weapons to be heard.

What Our People Are Facing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have asked unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD today a series of articles prepared by the Peacock Publications in my district on the great array of problems confronting America today.

While I personally do not agree with some of the conclusions drawn in this series, there is no doubt in my mind that it deserves a place in the forum of public debate, simply because it presents a graphic panorama of the vast complexities confronting America in its struggle for survival.

I believe that the Peacock Publications deserve commendation for attempting to present to the citizens of my district the broad and overall picture of this Nation's problems. I hope that the various public and private agencies which play such an important role in the struggle for survival will dispassionately study the various observations expressed in this series and, in the shortest possible time, will offer to me, and perhaps other Members of Congress, their rebuttal.

The series mentions, for instance, a "spending bloc" in this present Congress. I, for one, feel reasonably certain that when the record is completed for this present Congress, we will have written an impressive record of action which will help the Nation back to the road of full employment.

In its conclusion, the authors of this series propose a special commission to study America's great problems, to be headed by the President of the United States and his two immediate, and fortunately surviving predecessors, Herbert Hoover and Harry Truman. This I believe is a sound idea. We, as a nation, are today faced with a gigantic struggle against the growing menace of economic war from the Communist bloc of the world. I think it would be tragic indeed if, in this great period of peril to America, we, as a nation, failed to call upon the vast knowledge and experience of our three living Presidents to help, in a bipartisan way, work out some of the solutions.

I think that Mr. Raymond J. Peacock, publisher of this chain of newspapers, Mr. Marvin McCarthy, who actually compiled this series, and the entire staff which had helped prepare this material deserve commendation for their efforts that have indeed raised some provocative questions which I shall attempt to answer at a later date and which I am sure others will attempt to answer.

Unless the citizens of America are encouraged into a full-scale debate of the great issues confronting our nation by articles such as this one I am presenting today, we may very well inadvertently destroy the dynamics of free speech which has given this Nation growth and vigor.

This series ran in three installments, namely, March 18, March 25, and April 1. I trust my colleagues will study this provocative series carefully and, in due time, add their own observations on its contents. The series, Mr. Speaker, follows:

WHAT OUR PEOPLE ARE FACING

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is the first of an exclusive series presented by the Peacock newspapers as a community service—Community America. Publisher Raymond J. Peacock expresses appreciation for the assistance given in preparation of the series by Tax Foundation, Inc., Civic Federation, U.S. Department of Labor, Illinois State Chamber of Commerce, Taxpayers Federation of Illinois, the crime commission, and other agencies. The basic information was provided by them. Figures are from official sources.)

This is the story of a multibillionaire with threadbare pockets, who is in trouble and doesn't seem to realize it.

You know him well.

He is beloved and trusted by all of his very large family, but now he has them worried. He has become the biggest spender the world has ever known, and with it the world's softest touch.

This splurging multi-billionaire puts on a fabulous front. He spends and spends far beyond his means, and picks up all the checks.

He has $20½ billion in solid gold "in the bank" at Fort Knox, but he also has $276 billion in unpaid checks floating around.

How he keeps on going and where all that money comes from, you, of all people should know.

By now you surely have guessed—this is the story of Uncle Sam, and what's to be done about him.

We wonder if you, as Mr. or Mrs. Average Citizen, fully comprehend just what you are in the middle of. You should, because it is all the nephews and all the nieces, even unto the fourth generation, who eventually must tote up and foot the uncle's staggering bill.

It is a liability measured not only in dollars, but in terms of economy, free enterprise, standards of living, conditions of working, morale, dignity, integrity—even freedom itself.

It is a complex picture; in full and concentrated form it is frightening.

The time has come to gather in all the scattered components and loose ends and wrap them up in one package, in an effort to determine just what it is we are buying.

This, then, is the introduction to a series on America's overall problem, presenting the various factors which in themselves may appear to be individual, but when put together definitely form a composite pattern.

It is to be a nonpartisan analysis, without recrimination or placing of blame. It is to be factual, based on information and matters of record provided the Peacock Newspapers by the Nation's top authorities.

The hope is to bring home the full import of the dilemma which America is facing, and, as we go along, to suggest primary steps toward what may be a solution.

The national spending spree, which the Illinois State Chamber of Commerce calls "nothing short of terrifying," is the explosive kernel from which has come thundering chain reaction.

Last year all government—Federal, State, and local—hit a postwar spending high of $131 billion, which was a 134 percent increase over 1948 and $12.9 billion more than the governments took in for the year. In 23 of the last 27 years, spending has been greater than income. The parlay has been tremendous.

Out of this overspending has come what the Civic Federation terms "a stampede for more money from the taxpayers." All taxes last year totaled $109 billion, as against $54.5 billion 10 years ago, an increase of 99.7 percent. Huge new tax proposals are now being made.

Next step in the chain follows naturally, an accumulation of America's debt as the multibillionaire of our story continues to spend what he doesn't have. The overall American debt now stands at $332½ billion, which is more than could be paid off in 2 whole years if not 1 cent were spent for anything else. Mere interest on the debt today is more than whole budgets used to be.

The present debt is a 23-percent increase over 1948 ($271 billion), which included the massive war spending. The current authorized limit on the Federal debt only is $288 billion, but actually stands at $276 billion. The ravenous tax horde is snapping eagerly at the $12 billion margin.

In Illinois and Chicago, the spending, taxing and piling up of debt has kept pace with the national trend.

And now for step 4, a truly resounding rocker—inflation. As the governments borrow more, the financial institutions use the collateral received (largely bonds and certificates) as the basis for more lending to the public, at a ratio of several to one.

Prices, overall costs and wages go up. We make more, spend more, owe more. Estimates of the actual value of the once 100-percent dollar range from 48 to 60 cents. Who really knows? Certainly, not the experts. The best authority is the housewife, who can tell you to the item or pound how much her dollar will buy in commodities today, as compared to 10 years ago.

Step 5: The economic mushrooming has thrown both management and labor into turmoil.

To meet rising expenses, management has resorted to various steps, some of them ominous. One is the constant advancement of prices. Another is a trend by some big business to enter the retail field (as reported by Advertising Age), and generally strive to increase its own bigness at expense of the small.

The Illinois Retail Merchants Association warns: "Smallness is in an increasingly precarious position."

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce says: "Present tax rates are changing the nature of free enterprise and will destroy the system in a relatively short time unless adequate tax reform measures are enacted."

Labor moves, too, in defensive counteraction. More and more pressure for higher wages is exerted. All proposals for labor-curbing legislation are vigorously combated. The mammoth Teamsters Union has sought to increase even its 1,600,000 membership, first by a proposed unionization of New York police, more lately by a move toward entering the Puerto Rican labor picture.

Threat of an industrywide steel strike, which could be paralytic, when present contracts expire in June, already is looming.

Step 6: Rackets and crime run rampant. With more and looser money on the market, the vicious elements are grabbing for all they can get. Major crime in 1958 was the greatest in America's history, with emphasis on theft and embezzlement. The racketeers have become so audacious and domineering the entire Nation is indignant. You see them on television during congressional probes, thrusting belligerent faces into the microphone, and "taking the fifth" by refusing to testify.

You feel an impulse to turn off the TV at once, and eject this unsavory intruder from the living room.

The final and most distressing phase of the chain reaction is a deterioration of national morale. People are becoming more content to leave everything to the Government. Congressmen report they are receiving a minimum of mail containing complaints or protests on conditions. Relief rolls are rising. Unemployment is going up and is nearing 5 million.

Elections come and go with little flurry and light voting, almost as a matter of course. Most people just don't seem to care any more.

Now, how does all of this affect you?

Here are a few simple examples which will do for now. In the spending spree, $769 was charged last year against every man, woman, and child in America.

The 65 million workers in the Nation now are paying an average annual tax of $1,675 apiece. The average income of workers has risen to $5,600, but the percentage of tax increase has outstripped it.

Of the gross American debt, you, your wife, and each of your children owes $1,952.

And hidden taxes—well, here's an example right at home. The Easter bonnet which mother will wear this year will have 150 taxes on it, according to Tax Foundation computations. Each egg that she colors and hides for the children will have 100 of the unseen taxes.

Yes, the time has come, and so, what's to be done about it? We believe that America is facing its greatest nonwar crisis in history. We believe it is big enough and definitely timed for this:

A consultation at America's highest level, between its present President and his two living predecessors, and their determination of what should be done:

Dwight D. Eisenhower, master military strategist and administrator.

Herbert C. Hoover, great statesman, humanitarian, and economist.

Harry S. Truman, super wise in the ways of politics and governmental workings.

Together, they could survey the great American problem, and establish a commission to work it out.

Such a commission, under this combined guidance, would be made up of our greatest and most inspired leaders.

They would have to be dedicated men, and in that we are fortunate. America still has such leaders and patriots and that's the salvation.

The last sad day will be when America runs out of dedicated men.

SECOND INSTALLMENT

You wouldn't believe that Uncle Sam, spendthrift though he is, could find so many square holes into which to pour so many round dollars.

It just doesn't fit—this greatest spending binge in history by our national multibillionaire.

It has shot so many holes in our national economy that something must be done about it—now.

Unless something is done, we face the threat of these eventualities:

1. The already crushing tax burden being increased until it exceeds 50 percent of what everybody earns. It is now 30 percent.

2. Inflation ballooning to the point where such fixed-amount assets as pensions, insurance, annuities, etc., become comparatively worthless.

3. America going bankrupt.

The first installment of this series suggested that consultations be held by President Dwight Eisenhower and his two living predecessors, former presidents Herbert Hoover and Harry Truman. Upon their determination of what should be done and under their guidance, a commission would be appointed at the highest levels to develop and consummate a program to apply the brakes before the brink is reached.

Purpose of this second chapter is to explore some of the drains down which America's wealth is going, and to point up the astonishing disagreements which exist between recognized authorities over what to do about them.

If any further evidence were needed that the time has come, this wide-spread uncertainty should be proof positive.

The Federal budget: President Eisenhower has submitted to Congress a budget for fiscal 1959–60 amounting to $77 billion. He believes that with proper economy the Government, for only the fifth time in the last 28 years, can break even on its income and spending.

The spending bloc in Congress says this is not enough, the budget should be increased by at least $4 billion.

Chairman HARRY F. BYRD of the Senate Finance Committee retorts: "A $5 to $6-billion cut in the budget could be accomplished without the impairment of a single essential function."

The difference of opinion: $10 billion, dollars.

National security: Expenditures of approximately $40 billion are proposed for missile and rocket development and keeping other components of the Armed Forces in strength and readiness. On this score, military safety of the Nation, the disagreements are minor, largely over such "outdated" elements as foot soldiers and tanks, merely a matter of a billion or so here and there.

Foreign aid: The budget calls for $3.9 billion to assist economically and militarily our allies in the cold war. Discussion of the factors involved in this debate could go on interminably.

To boil it down, President Eisenhower's special panel of advisers on foreign aid says the budget should be increased by at least $400 million. Christian A. Herter, the Under Secretary of State, concurs.

In sharp disagreement is the Citizens Foreign Aid Committee, which includes nationally-recognized leaders. This organization says foreign aid should be cut exactly in half.

The range of disagreement: $2 billion.

Inflation: Will it bring fabulous wealth or national ruin?

Says Prof. Sumner Slichter, of Harvard, an outstanding authority on economics: "I regard creeping inflation as a necessary cost to economic growth. I favor incurring this necessary cost."

Replies Chairman A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, of the Senate Banking Committee: "If inflation continues at only 3 percent a year, the savings and life insurance of today's young people will be virtually worthless when they need it most."

Public welfare and assistance: Here is a problem worthy of the great humanitarian, Herbert Hoover, because it embraces all the human element of people out of work, in need of food and rent, some face to face with an actual fight for survival.

Spend whatever is necessary, a great many say, to keep as low as possible suffering and want in this land of plenty.

But others point out, as of the end of 1958, the U.S. Department of Agriculture had in storage $5.3 billion worth of surplus farm products. Why not apportion all of these foodstuffs to the appropriate agencies for distribution to needy institutions and individuals, they ask, and, thus, save that $5 billion?

Cost of Government: There are innumerable yardsticks by which to measure the tremendous bulge in scope and spending of Government. Representative is the swelling

total of civilian employees required to handle it.

As of 1958 1 out of 8 of all the Nation's workers was employed in some phase of Government, a total of 8 million.

The disagreement here is whether to lop off a million or two and throw them out of work, or keep them on the payroll and off unemployment compensation and relief.

Nation's solvency: How could America go bankrupt with such vast resources as it has? Ask inflation's nonalarmists.

The total national wealth has been computed as $1,326,400,000,000. That spells out to a fantastic 1 trillion, 326 billion, 400 million dollars. It includes everything, all property, all moneys, all resources, even all livestock down to the last head munching the last blade of grass, and perhaps wondering if there's a Federal subsidy on it.

The Nation's gross annual income, as of 1957, had reached $440.3 billion. It is called gross national product, and includes the proceeds of all goods and services.

Tremendous recources, none can deny. But there is the inevitable other side.

So America's income is $440 billion a year, counters the rebuttal team. In that same year, 26 percent of it was spent on government upkeep alone, leaving 74 percent to take care of all other requirements of all the people.

So Uncle Sam does have $1,326 billion in his total estate, they concede. But already overspending has taken a one-fourth bite out of it—the gross government debt of $332.5 billion. At the present rate of erosion, just how much of the estate will be left for the uncle's great and grand nephews and nieces of the future?

Illinois, though riding the same tidal wave, is not in too bad shape, when compared to such traditionally stalwart sister States as Ohio, Michigan, and New York.

Ohio's Gov. Michael V. DiSalle has made a clean breast of it, the State has gone through a $213 million surplus and is now stone broke.

Michigan is broke, too, with payless paydays an imminent specter. Credit has run out at many banks. Industrial firms recently advanced the State $32 million on anticipated tax receipts, to meet pressing current expenses.

New York, up to its financial ears, has passed a record $2 billion budget and is working on a $277 million tax boost.

Welcome aboard, Alaska and Hawaii.

THIRD INSTALLMENT

This is the wrap-up of the series, "What Our People Are Facing," putting together all the assorted parts of the skids down which the Nation is plummeting.

Fortunately, there is still time to apply the brakes.

The two previous installments told how the four horsemen of folly—spending, taxing, debt, and inflation—are riding roughshod over the land and must be checked and unseated unless we resign ourselves to one of these two eventualities:

1. Either America goes bankrupt, or
2. Its citizens do.

Either one would drag the other under.

The financial analysis has been completed, and now we come to the summation. It will spotlight some of the other major issues which have developed as natural secondaries to the primary upheaval caused by the economic splurge.

These factors pertain directly to the job, the home, the way of living, the people's thinking, their future. It is necessary to view the picture as a whole to realize that the Nation faces not mere unrest but an actual crisis.

Labor: A loaded time bomb which isn't going to wait much longer is the labor-management strife sweeping the country, as each side grasps for every conceivable advantage to remain afloat in the financial whirlpool. Labor clamors for more wages as living costs rise. Management resists to the bitter end, then passes the burden on to the people by increasing prices with the wages.

Plundering and gangster leadership have brought some labor faction under congressional fire. Manufacturing groups are organized to combat racket picketing.

Unquestionably, a strengthened Federal code to govern labor-management conduct is mandatory. We must have new laws, with muscle, to whip both sides into line. Congress drafts and redrafts new regulations, but takes no stand-up position.

Management complains that the proposals are not tough enough. Labor replies through its AFL–CIO president, George Meany, that new restrictions being considered are "calculated wickedness." Inevitably comes the watering down.

Bluntly, Congress simply hasn't had the guts.

Great wisdom, understanding, and absolute nonpartisanship are required to solve the labor problem.

Strikes: The incidence of strikes in America might surprise you. In 1958, considered a normal year, the Department of Labor reports there were 3,400 separate strikes or work stoppages. That's an average of almost 10 new ones every day of the year.

A total of 2,200,000 workers were involved. They lost 23,500,000 man-days of production and pay. The average for each striker was 10.7 days for the year. Unions always maintain that the financial losses on their side resulting from strikes always are recouped. We wonder.

The bigger the strike, the bigger the cost. The steel shutdown in 1956 resulted in an $880 million loss all around.

Now there is concern that there may be an even bigger steel strike when the present contracts expire on June 30. Advance information is that the steel workers union will demand a billion dollar package in raises and benefits.

A prolonged steel strike now could cripple the country. Mr. and Mrs. Citizen may as well start scratching now. You have no doubts, have you, about who is going to have to come up with that billion?

Homefront: The way of living is, of necessity, undergoing drastic changes. Because of the uncertainty of foreign relations, thousands of young men still are being drafted from their homes. Approximately 2 million men and women remain in the armed services.

Two or more members of a family often must work to meet the household's expenses. A breakdown on what portions of each 8-hour day's work are devoted to the bare necessities has been provided by the Tax Foundation.

Think this over during your next coffee break: taxes, 2 hours, 29 minutes; food, 1 hour, 39 minutes; housing, 1 hour, 25 minutes; clothing, 37 minutes; transportation, 42 minutes; medical, 24 minutes; recreation, 20 minutes; other, 24 minutes.

So you can have all the recreation you want, if 20 minutes worth of work a day will pay for it. At $100 a week (the average worker's pay), that figures to about $4.15 a week, for shows, golf, movies, picnics, trips—everything. Good advice is, don't take up roulette.

People's thinking: The weight of the whole thing is getting people down. Morale is sinking. People just pay their bills if they can, skip them if they can't. They grumble, of course, but do nothing about it. More and more of them are coming to regard Government assistance as their due.

Despite the self-importance bristling news letters which some Congressmen send their constituents, best-informed sources in Washington say that Congress actually is receiving meager mail protesting conditions and demanding corrective action.

Congress goes on its way as it pleases, at many tangents and there is in Congress a segment of men who are selfish, willful, and uncompromising. They'll cut the other fellow's projects any old day, but not one single penny from their own.

The Peacock newspapers have proposed in this series that President Eisenhower and former Presidents Herbert Hoover and Harry Truman collaborate to determine the fundamentals of what must be done for the Nation's salvation, and then appoint a highest level commission to carry them out.

The people can bring about action, but they must speak up. They must hammer away at their elected representative in government—local, State, and National. Speakers' bureaus which reach large numbers of people could make this subject a headliner. Concerted effort of press, radio, and television could exert tremendous influence.

Dedicated men must be found to take the lead. The message can be put across before it is too late: "Do something now."

So there you have the picture of what our people are facing—perplexing and portentous.

We may be but a small voice in the journalistic wilderness, but that voice can and does cry out.

The forest gets terribly big. It could engulf us all.

What it's costing United States and you

GOVERNMENT FINANCES

[In millions]

SPENDING

	1958	1948	Percent
All government	131,000	55,893	134.4
Federal only	84,000	36,493	130.2
All States	22,000	9,441	133.0
Illinois	[1] 872	706	23.5
All local	25,000	9,959	151.0
Chicago	[1] 406	170	138.6

TAXES

All government	108,859	54,507	99.7
Federal only	76,844	40,104	91.6
All States	16,415	7,802	110.4
Illinois	[1] 690	410	68.2
All local	15,600	6,601	136.3
Chicago	[1] 213	110	93.6

GROSS DEBT

All government	332,543	270,948	23.0
Federal only	276,343	252,292	9.5
All States	14,700	3,676	299.9
Illinois	[1] 646	474	36.3
All local	41,500	14,980	177.0
Chicago	554	223	148.4

[1] Illinois and Chicago figures are for 1957.

YOUR SHARE

SPENDING

[Per capita in dollars]

	1958	1948
All government	769	390
Federal	493	254
All States	129	66
Illinois	[1] 94	84
All local	147	69
Chicago	[1] 112	50

TAXES

All government	639	380
Federal	451	280
All States	96	54
Illinois	[1] 73	36
All local	92	46
Chicago	[1] 59	32

GROSS DEBT

All government	1,952	1,586
Federal	1,622	1,481
All State	86	26
Illinois	[1] 69	56
All local	244	104
Chicago	153	66

Oregon Dunes and Sea Lion Caves National Seashore Recreation Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 21, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a group of National Park Service officials have visited Oregon coastal areas to explain provisions of a proposal to establish the Oregon Dunes National Seashore Area. I am certain that the residents of Florence and Reedsport, where the Park Service representatives addressed public meetings, share my gratitude for the information which has been provided from this authentic and expert source. Certainly no one could be better qualified to give straightforward answers to local citizens than the group of Park Service officials headed by Mr. Ben H. Thompson, Park Service Chief of Recreation Resource Planning.

In an especially cogent review of some of the questions raised in connection with proposed seashore development by the Park Service, Mr. Malcolm C. Bauer, of the Oregonian points out:

Even the most promising public development needs, to be understood before it can be popularly accepted.

The public meetings attended by Park Service officials at Reedsport and Florence, Oreg., have certainly added to better understanding of the bill which I am sponsoring to create the Oregon Dunes Seashore Area along 23 miles of Oregon's most scenic seacoast. I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Bauer's article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Portland Oregonian, Apr. 19, 1959]

PRECEDENT MEAGER FOR NATIONAL SEASHORE

(By Malcolm Bauer)

National Park Service officials, enthusiastic though they may be over the proposed creation of a 35,000-acre National Seashore Recreation Area on the central Oregon coast, should not be surprised at the questions raised by residents.

This is a new idea, and it has burst on the residents of the Reedsport-Florence area in the form of a congressional bill before many of them were aware it was even in the study stage. The NPS's comprehensive "Pacific Coast Recreation Area Survey," which includes a recommendation for an Oregon Coast National Recreation Area, was not in general distribution until after Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER's bill was in the hopper.

In fact, NPS officials candidly confess that they, too, are a bit uncertain about the details of development and prospects. As of now, there is but one seashore recreation area in the national parks system, a 28,000-acre area on Cape Hatteras, created in 1937. Circumstances there are considerably different. There are, for example, eight towns within the limits of the recreation area; all have been excluded from NPS administration, with room for expansion. Reedsport and Florence, the only two sizable communities in the Oregon dunes area, are both outside the area contemplated for acquisition.

There is, however, a helpful guide to what may be in store for this 24 miles of Oregon coastline, if it is authorized by Congress. The National Park Service has prepared a number of questions and answers setting forth intended policy in the Cape Cod national seashore recreation area, which is also in the incipient stage.

There is no reason to believe the answers would be different if applied to the Oregon project. Following are selected excerpts from a paper distributed by NPS officials who held hearings at Reedsport and Florence this week:

Question. What is the difference between a national seashore and a national park?

Answer. In general, a national park might be larger, might be less modified by man, and require more stringent application of protective controls. A national seashore is a classification of equal importance and significance. It is an area capable of sustaining, in part at least, some special public uses, such as the hunting of waterfowl, which would be inappropriate in a national park.

Question. Would homeowners be evicted?

Answer. Where continued residential occupancy does not defeat or seriously impair the major conservation purposes of a national seashore, it would be permissible practice to buy property subject to lifetime or lesser periods of occupancy of the houses by their owners, if they so wish.

Question. What provisions would be made for services?

Answer. "The National Park Service would not provide motels, restaurants, and related facilities and services within the national seashore. Such facilities are provided and could be expanded by private enterprise in the towns and villages * * * outside the proopsed national seashore."

Question. What facilities would be provided by the Government?

Answer. "The Park Service suggests that only those forms of active recreation need be provided for that area associated with the natural outdoor conditions in the area, such as selected sites for swimming with necessary sanitary facilities and dressing rooms and, of course, lifeguard service; trails for hiking, bicycling, and horseback riding; campgrounds and picnic areas, and such access roads as may be required. Interpretive facilities, such as visitor centers, nature trails, and appropriate markers and signs, add to public understanding and judgment of the area and are customarily provided by the Government, as well as certain administrative buildings—headquarters, ranger stations, maintenance shops, etc."

Question. Would there be an entrance fee?

Answer. "No, since the main routes of access are and probably will continue to be by State (or in Oregon's case national) highways."

And the following response to a question about "beach buggies" on Cape Cod will be of particular interest to Oregonians who revel in the hardy sport of bouncing jeeps over the dunes:

"The use of beach buggies would be permitted in designated areas, but would be limited to specified beach and access points only. The Park Service report suggests that indiscriminate riding over the dunes would seriously damage the scenic and scientific interest of these significant natural features."

Oregonians will want to learn the answers to a good many questions before they make up their minds on the merits of the Park Service proposal. Even the most promising of public developments needs to be understood before it can be popularly accepted.

Mandatory Control Program on Residual Oil Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, from down East have recently come some exceedingly vehement denunciations of the White House order creating a mandatory control program on residual oil imports. I think it is about time that our friends in New England pursue a more objective and consistent course in our old international trade program. In the first place, it is difficult to understand how a region of the United States that has already experienced very critical fuel shortages because of the unreliability of sea traffic in periods of hostility would object to any program designed to guarantee availability of supplies under similar conditions. The President's proclamation issued on March 10 was prompted because oil imports have so enervated domestic fuel industries as to seriously weaken the mobilization base. The President is aware that a fuel which must be transported over ocean lanes infested with enemy submarines could not be depended upon to run a war machine.

Assuming that those New Englanders protesting the White House order, have forgotten events of not too many years back, I should like to place in the RECORD a number of headlines that appeared in our newspapers during the early part of World War II when tankers coming from ports on the Gulf of Mexico were being intercepted both in the Gulf and along the Atlantic seaboard. Here are but a few that I have taken from my files: "U-Boat Torpedoes Tanker Off Jersey"; "Tanker Sunk Off Our Atlantic Coast"; "Florida Crowd Sees U-Boat Sink Ship Off Shore"; "Two Tankers Torpedoed—One Off Jersey Witnessed by Thousands in Resort Towns"; "Allied Tanker Seen in Sinking Condition Off Long Island."

There is the story of what can happen on the high seas in wartime. I might also recall for your benefit that at one time an enemy underwater action was responsible for sinking a tanker within a short distance of New Orleans. In addition, at one time three tankers went down in the immediate vicinity of Dutch West Indies, which happens to be the principal source of the residual oil that moves into our east coast markets at the present time.

Now, how was New England affected by the inability to move oil over the water? As late as the spring of 1943, the fuel shortage impaired normal activity up and down coastal areas from Maine to New York. Earlier, the Petroleum Administrator in Washington warned New England to prepare for the worse. This headline from the New York Times explains the situation: "Ickes Says Worse

Situation Is Coming and Asks Conversion to Using Coal." The wisdom of this prediction is confirmed in these 1943 headlines: "Hospital Is Ordered Closed By City To Save on Fuel Oil"; "Stillwater Worsted Mill Closed by Oil Shortage"; "Eight Rhode Island Textile Plants Forced To Close Today"; "Exodus of Labor Threatens Mills in Fuel Oil Crises"; "Fuel Oil Shortage Here To Close 95 Parochial Schools"; "Oil Shortage Forces Two War Plants To Close."

If further evidence is desired, I am sure that the Library of Congress will be happy to make available complete copies of the newspapers carrying these accounts of horror off the Atlantic coast and the subsequent difficulties in fuel-hungry New England.

The almost total destruction of tanker traffic in the early part of the war was effectuated by a nation whose sea forces included 150 submarines. Today, the Russians have a fleet of some 450 underwater craft. No power in world history has ever had so large a submarine force. Two-thirds of Russia's submarines are long-range ocean patrol types developed after World War II with the aid of German naval designers.

Adm. James S. Russell, Vice Chief of Naval Operations, in speaking before the Military-Industrial Conference in Chicago recently, included this paragraph in his report on Red naval power:

> Quantitatively we may expect the Soviet submarine fleet to remain at about its present level; qualitatively, however, the threat to the free world will continue to grow as the older and smaller submarines are phased out of service and the number of new long-range types increases. These long-range submarines pose a threat not only to our vital traffic across the seas, but to our industrial centers as well, for the Soviets have the capability for arming these submarines with missiles and it must be assumed that some are already equipped.

With this knowledge, Mr. Speaker, can anyone here take issue with the President for his action based on the likelihood that foreign oil would be available in wartime? He knows the vital importance of vigorous domestic coal and oil industries. It was his responsibility as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces to proclaim the oil import order in behalf of America's mobilization program. I am hopeful that there will be no more contesting a decision made in the interests of national safety.

I also remind my colleagues from New England that there is no justifiable reason for your anticipatory fuel problems. These illusions were created even before the mandatory control plan went into operation. The amount of residual oil to be admitted under Presidential order is the same as was imported in 1957, at that time the highest quantity in history and almost equal to the 1958 figure. Thus the deluge may continue its deplorable economic impact on producing regions of the United States, and I assure you that I shall strive for legislation for a further cutback to a place where imports are in line with the tariff and quota protection afforded industries in other areas. Meanwhile, no one should anticipate any scarcity of fuel supplies under the decree. A considerable number of the east coast plants now on residual oil are equipped to convert to coal, which is available in adequate quantities at reasonable prices. Bituminous coal prices at the mine have remained steady for the past decade, and studies by outstanding industrial economists disclose no tendency toward a sharp upward movement over the long term.

I am, of course, conscious of the fact that residual oil has been available to east coast customers at prices slightly below what they would have to pay for coal. The importing companies have captured coal's traditional markets because they are able to adjust prices without any threat to the corporate structure. The profits from the sale of gasoline and the lighter oils are usually adequate to absorb the production and refining costs, so that residual oil is left over to be sold at whatever price will capture the market.

With all of this foreign residual oil—the more than a billion and a quarter barrels of it—that entered the United States in the past 10 years, what have the people of our country gained? What benefit has accrued to the populace of any single State or region? Residual oil cannot be used for heating homes, and you would not be driving any more if you tried putting it into the engine of your car. The big plants and generating stations are principal customers of this fuel. Their use of a foreign commodity in preference to a product of America's mines is certainly not inconsistent with the philosophy expressed by their representatives in Congress. Time after time members of the New England delegation have vociferously denounced trade policies that permit imports to impinge upon business conditions in leather goods, textiles, fish, lumber, bicycles, watches, and products of other New England industries.

This factor should be kept in mind when residual oil imports are under consideration. If our coal miners back in Pennsylvania are deprived of a means of livelihood because of a foreign invasion on their markets, where do we get the purchasing power for the goods that New England manufactures and sells? In my estimation it is about time that Members of Congress from the many areas suffering economically from unfair import competition collaborate on our identical problems. I can assure you that I have always concurred in recommendations to adjust international trade policies in such a way as to safeguard industries in New England, the South, and in other regions. I am convinced that we can get together if we consider the matter on a nationwide scale. Each year a growing number of communities is added to the list of industrial centers paralyzed or severely injured through inequitable import competition. The automobile manufacturers, who formerly led the free trade brigade into Washington when the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act came up for extension, have been noticeably silent in recent times. There is a definite fear that, unless someone puts the brakes on foreign cars entering this country, the big American jobs are going to get run off the road and unemployment around Detroit will be even worse than has been the case during the past year. Even the big office machine manufacturers, who once were proudly in the president's chair of a leading free trade committee, are beginning to wince when they walk into the Pentagon and see the large number of Olivettis and other foreign-produced typewriters and calculators.

The Presidential Order restricting residual oil imports is designed to protect the Nation in emergency periods. It is certainly one executive department order to which no one in this country should object, yet restrictions on oil need to be bolstered considerably, and chances are that any help that we representatives of fuel-producing districts can get will redound to the benefit of the rest of the country. With unemployment persisting on a high scale, I do not think we can afford to pass up the chance to get our people back to work.

Visit to Capitol by Senior Class of Metairie Park Country Day School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL B. LONG
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 21, 1959

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, on April 8 it was my pleasure to have as my guests in the Senate Chamber the senior class of the Metairie Park Country Day School. This fine institution, which is located in Metairie on the outskirts of New Orleans, has one of the loveliest settings of any school I have ever seen.

The school is dedicated to the pursuit of higher education and to the development of the kind of individual who will become a valuable citizen in this great country.

Every year, the senior class of the Metairie Park Country Day School visits our Nation's Capitol as part of its general educational program. I am particularly proud to have such an outstanding group of young Louisianians come to Washington, and I look forward to their visit each year.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the names of the 31 students and 2 chaperones from the Metairie Park Country Day School in Metairie, La.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Chaperones: Mrs. Martha Wilson and Mr. Frank B. Markriter.

Students: Philip Claverie, Kenneth Cohen, James Coleman, Georgia Connell, Katherine Connell, Richard Favor, Melinda Felt, Gore Friedrichs, Harvey Gleason, Thomas Hogan, Anne Heath, Robert Johnston, Magtilit Laan, Lawrence Lashley, Henry Lazarus, Herbert LeBourgeois, Robert McCoy, Gretchen Miller, Georgia Monsted, Elinor Moore, Charles O'Niell, Courtney Ann Parker, Peter Posey, Katie Robinson, Helene Rowley, Maria Springer, Judith Weston, William Williams, Frederick Wirth, Nancy Witherspoon, and Linda Woods.

Appendix

Jefferson-Jackson Day Address by Hon. Frank E. Moss, of Utah

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 22, 1959

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on March 31 our able and distinguished colleague from Utah [Mr. Moss] addressed the Jefferson-Jackson Day banquet at Conrad, Mont.

I ask unanimous consent that his address on that occasion be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF SENATOR FRANK E. MOSS, DEMOCRAT, UTAH, BEFORE THE JEFFERSON-JACKSON DAY BANQUET AT CONRAD, MONT.

Certainly it is a real distinction to be invited to address a group of dedicated Democrats on the day they honor such party stalwarts as Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson. And I am fully aware that in Conrad, Mont., I am among very good Democrats indeed—members of the party who are effective as well as loyal—who give foot service as well as lip service. Pondereille County (Ponderay) is famous for the size of its Democratic turnouts at party functions, like Jefferson-Jackson dinners, and at the polls.

I am happy to see and great you all and to visit again with those you have chosen to lead you in party affairs. In mentioning some, I realize that many more remain unmentioned; and that, in this type of activity, it is the work of every individual and the carrying of every district that makes it possible to keep the Party going and gives people like me the opportunity of serving my State in Washington.

Youall realize, I am sure, the pleasure it gives me to see again, even for a short time, the grandeur of the mountains and plains, the lakes and waterfalls, of the West. And to visit in Montana, a state that is linked to my own bonds of friendship and mutual interest, and also with a common pioneering tradition, and by many of your people being descendants of early Utah Mormon pioneer families.

I appreciate the confidence of Congressman ANDERSON in inviting a freshman Senator to address the big celebration in his hometown. And I learned coming in tonight that the Congressman is one of those somewhat unusual men who can carry his hometown in an election. I am told that ROY ANDERSON has always been a leader, and I believe it, because I can tell you that he has certainly shown that leadership in Washington in every way—from being an officer in the Thursday Morning Prayer Breakfast Group to outstanding work for the Hawaii statehood bill in the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. As a major general in the Army Reserve, Congressman ANDERSON is the highest ranking Reserve officer in the Congress. As every one in my audience knows, he commands the 96th Infantry Division, of which there are many units in Utah; and we have many mutual friends in that organization. Fortunately, he has been assigned to the Armed Services Committee, where his experience can be used to best advantage in helping to guide our defense program during these critical times. On the Interior Committee, Congressman ANDERSON has rendered yeoman service in Indian matters. Our Indian brethren appreciate his sympathetic and constructive interest in their problems.

For a new Senator, Washington has many surprises, most of them pleasant. My biggest surprise, however—and I think I can claim an exclusive on this one—was to be asked to address Lincoln Day as well as Jefferson-Jackson dinners. One of the first pieces of mail I opened was from Republican National Chairman Mead Alcorn, requesting my preferences as to places to deliver Lincoln Day speeches.

And actually, I should like the opportunity of talking to a Republican Lincoln Day audience. They might not like what they heard, but I could tell them some things they don't hear often enough and that they ought to know. For one thing, I could quote them words of Lincoln that the Republicans don't use very often. For example, Lincoln said: "The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present * * * as our case is new, so we must think anew and act anew." How many Republican Lincoln Day speakers quoted that this year? Or were they talking about the balanced budget and that alone? Our revered Civil War President also said: "There are already among us those who, if the Union be preserved, will live to see it contain 250 millions of population. The struggle of today is not altogether for today; it is for a vast future also." Lincoln thought and planned not only for the present but for the great future which he saw for America.

And it is no accident that those we honor today predate Lincoln by many years; and no accident that our party is so much older than the Republican Party. For, if there is one thing that is necessary to the survival of any organization or institution, it is just this ability to think anew and act anew when conditions require it.

I object to conservatives wrapping themselves in the mantle of Jefferson as much as I do the mantle of Lincoln. The conservatives of Jefferson's day were not those who signed the Declaration of Independence or helped construct and obtain ratification of the Constitution.

Let the standpatters read this, inscribed on a panel of the Memorial Room of the Jefferson Memorial. I quote: "I am not an advocate for frequent changes in laws and constitutions. But laws and institutions must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind. As that becomes more developed, more enlightened, as new discoveries are made, new truths discovered and manners and opinions change; with the change of circumstances, institutions must advance also to keep pace with the times."

What conservative standpat Republican of that day or this day would have had the courage and vision to obtain the Louisiana Purchase and secure to America in her infancy the great State of Montana and all of her sister States down river to the gulf?

Jefferson was a man of action and courage; but, above all, a man of vision. Because of these, I am happy to count myself a Jeffersonian Democrat and to point to the distinguished Senators from Montana as worthy successors to the Jeffersonian tradition.

As the experienced and respected chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, JAMES E. MURRAY, stands today as the most powerful individual in America influencing the development of water resources. I am most grateful for the opportunity of serving with him on the committee. I also wish to acknowledge his personal friendship and encouragement. Before the session, when I visited Washington to make plans for the beginning, it was Senator MURRAY who made my task much easier by making available the use of his office and facilities.

And we are all aware of the outstanding contribution to the leadership of the U.S. Senate made by MIKE MANSFIELD, and of the meaning to the West of that leadership. Senator MANSFIELD is the Democratic Party whip, or assistant leader. He is a leader on the Foreign Affairs Committee. I point out further that the policy of MANSFIELD, that all Senators must have membership on important committees, has greatly benefited our section; and, at the same time increased the contribution that new members can make to the work of the Senate. So successful has been this policy in fact, that public approval, plus the nudge given by the electorate last fall, has forced the Republican leadership to adopt a similar one.

And wouldn't the growing political power of the West have delighted Andrew Jackson. Old Hickory was the first western President, coming from what was to easterners the frontier—Tennessee. And however different the backgrounds of Jefferson, the Virginia intellectual, and Jackson, the Tennessee warrior, may have been, their basic political philosophy was in agreement on one most important point—that the Government of this Republic belonged to all the people.

The Western Conference of Democratic Senators now includes the States of Alaska, Oklahoma, and Texas, and shortly Hawaii. We include 23 of the 28 Senators from the West; and when Hawaii's 2 Democratic Senators are elected, we shall be 25 of 30 Senators. Not only do we have numbers, but we have leadership as well.

Speaking of the election, one of the most interesting features to me is the reaction of the Republicans to their defeat.

To go back just a few years, about the time General Eisenhower emerged as the man who might restore the Republican presidential dynasty, professional advertising and public relations men were brought into political campaigns as never before. Often to their surprise, these gentlemen were presented as able to put vote getting on a scientific basis.

If they could sell soap or automobiles, it was said, why not candidates? And why not? What was forgotten is that the same brand of soap or the same make of car is not always the most popular; or, to put it another way, advertising men, like the rest of us, have their failures as well as their successes.

But the Eisenhower campaigns were certainly successful, and the Republican leadership had their big contributors, the rank and file, and themselves, sold on the fact that this was the answer.

So their reaction to the defeat of 1958 is that something went wrong with the sales talk. What they need, the newspapers report, is a new image. Not new candidates. Not a new program. Above all, not new ideas.

Just a new image—a new front to present to the voters.

While the Republicans are searching for their new image—something that will make Senator GOLDWATER and Governor Rockefeller look good together—we Democrats have more serious business to attend to. It is up to us to supply the deficiencies in Republican thinking, in Republican programs, and, as far as Congress can, in Republican leadership. We promised the voters action. Let's see how we are producing on that promise.

The Easter recess is the close of the first phase of a session of Congress. Newspaper commentators in Washington are saying that no Congress has done more in this short time than has this one.

Normally, at this stage, no major bills have been acted on; legislation is in the drafting stage or in committee. But we went to the country last fall with a program, and we are enacting it. Here are some of the things the Senate has done:

We have passed a housing bill to bring closer our goal of a decent home for every American.

We have passed airport legislation to prepare America for the jet age in transportation.

We have started a nationwide program to put depressed areas back on their feet.

We have added another great Western State—Hawaii—to the Union.

We have moved ahead in clearing the Nation's slum areas and helping urban renewal.

And, as always, we have stood with the administration on vital matters of foreign policy, even while disagreeing with the White House on many points of national defense.

Much remains to be done, and we are working on many other problems.

The Montana delegation is leading the fight to develop a farm program that will insure the prosperous continuance of the family size farm and provide the farmer with a fair share of the national income. And one which, if properly administered, will eventually cost the taxpayer less money. I am disturbed at the growing resentment of consumer groups at the cost and ineffectiveness of our present program. This cost is being used to separate the farmer and the farm program from necessary labor support.

Another vital program is that of education. The administration continues to do everything possible to put this on an "every locality for itself" basis, even advocating eliminating Federal contributions to areas having unusual educational demands due to Federal projects.

I am happy to be supporting Senator MURRAY and your distinguished first district Congressman, LEE METCALF, as a cosponsor of their bill to provide some degree of equalization of education on a national basis. While the control and administration of education may be a local function, the quality of education, in times like these, is very much a matter of national concern. We cannot maintain our military position or our economic position without an adequate program. And equalization of opportunity is a vital part of such a program.

Both Utah and Montana have State equalization programs. We have long recognized the folly of allowing educational opportunity to depend on the amount of taxable property that happens to fall in a particular school district. Both Utah and Montana educate large numbers of children who leave the States as soon as they are through with school and ready to become taxpayers. And our equalization programs have not meant centralized State control. What we have done in our States we can—and should—do in the Nation.

But of major importance to the West, I think, and of vital importance to the Nation, is the matter of the preservation and development of our natural resources, and of our most important resource—water.

Certainly it is not necessary for me to convince a Montana audience that we need to conserve our water and other resources. But we still have a big job to do in this field—let's make no mistake about that. And we westerners must continue to take the lead in showing why it is in the interest of all America to develop these resources. And as Democrats we must make the Nation see that we are going to get full development only with a Democrat in the White House.

It is true that we are beginning to recognize that water conservation is a national, not a local, problem. As our water table falls, our demand increases. Today we are using about 240 billion gallons a day. By 1975, if our 175 million population grows to 225 million as expected, even our present rate of consumption would strain our resources. But our rising standard of living requires much more water per capita both for personal and home use and for industrial expansion. It is expected that by 1975 we will need 350 billion gallons a day, or more than a 90 percent increase over the amount used in 1950.

Preservation of water resourecs is one of the principal items claiming the attention of the Congress, and the Western Conference of Democratic Senators is actively working on a commission to survey the Nation's needs. Already, we look upon resource development as an investment—not as an expense. We must make all our people see the problem in these terms.

One change that might help and an idea that is getting some attention in Washington these days, is a more businesslike accounting system for the Government. The plan is to separate, as businesses do, items that represent capital investments and self-liquidating projects from expenditures for regular expense items. It might be that defense items could be placed in still a third category. This would make discussion of budget items more specific and enable us to comprehend this complicated subject more clearly. It is hoped that it would promote greater public understanding and interest in the Government's fiscal affairs.

One of the problems of Utah and the Upper Colorado River Basin States is to assure adequate appropriations to push ahead on the great upper Colorado River project. A whole speech could easily be devoted to the history, the features, and the benefits of the upper Colorado storage project that is now underway. It is an example of the work that is necessary and the time that often must be expended to get these projects going.

For more than 50 years this project has been in mind. Some land withdrawals were made as early as 1904.

The project, when completed, will develop an area of 100,000 square miles. It will consist of four large mainstream dams, one on the Green River on the Utah-Wyoming border, one on the Colorado on the Arizona-Utah border, one on the San Juan in New Mexico, and one on the Gunnison River in Colorado.

It provides a true basinwide approach to the development of the water and power resources. A basin fund is created as a master account in the U.S. Treasury. This cacount will receive all funds appropriated by Congress for the project and all revenue collected from irrigation, power, and municipal water sales, or other sources.

After payment of interest, operation, and maintenance costs, the revenues will be allocated on a percentage basis to the four States and will be used for participating projects in the State.

The project will add 1 million kilowatts to upper basin power capacity; 132,360 acres of new land will come under irrigation, and 234,000 acres will receive supplemental water.

One of the most interesting aspects of one of the projects, not yet started, is that it will provide a means of raising the standard of living of America's largest Indian tribe—the Navahos. The Navajo Dam, in Arizona, will provide water largely for the use of these people, who need rehabilitation so much.

More than 200 different minerals are found in the Colorado Basin area, and the project will provide the water and power necessary for their full and economic development.

The great Glen Canyon and Flaming Gorge Dams now under construction will allow the upper basin States to store sufficient water so that the commitment to the lower basin States will be in storage and will allow much water now going down the Colorado into the Gulf of Mexico to be diverted to irrigation.

This is a self-sufficient project. Every cent the Treasury pays out will be returned with interest. It is an investment in America's future.

Great recreation areas will be opened up, not only for scenic boating, fishing, etc., but the area will develop greatly in such items as bird refuges, for ducks and other migratory birds.

Our problems are your problems—because all America is one, indissoluble—in building upper Colorado and thus building our country; just as your problems are our problems—in building your great Missouri basin and northwest projects.

The Yellowtail Dam on the Bighorn River, Missouri River Basin project was authorized in 1944; the right-of-way problem on Indian lands was settled in the last session of Congress. But the project cannot be begun until it is put in the budget. But the administration has not submitted a budget request because of its "no new starts" policy. That great dam would have storage capacity of 1,080,000 acre feet, powerplant capacity of 200,000 kilowatts, and annual generation of 597 million kilowatts per hour. Both Montana and Wyoming would benefit and grow, and so would America. This would be an investment in the future of America.

What I have said about Yellowtail applies to Clark Canyon Dam, the east branch unit of the Missouri Basin project, and the Beaverhead River in the southwestern part of your great State. There is no money in the President's budget for these needed projects, and the administration's policy of "no new starts" would doom them. However, you can count on your Democratic Congressmen and Senators to fight for these western development projects.

But theirs is a greater reason than recreation or economic benefit and comforts to our people for the development of our natural resources. That reason is national survival.

During a hundred and fifty years of our history, our isolated position behind the oceans made us invulnerable to powerful surprise attack. And our great productive machine made it possible for us to get ready, with ample time, after an attack. Today we are minutes away from Moscow via missiles. In our lifettime this profound change has occurred, the details of which we are all too painfully familiar. We are aware that the Soviet Union increased its territory and expanded its world influence since World War II, but even more ominous for the future is the fact that the backward nations are beginning to use the productive methods developed by the West; and, as they do, their enormously greater populations are beginning to tell against us. We must be ready in armament, and we must grow industrially and economically.

The men in the Kremlin know what kind of world they want it to be 20 years from now. They boldly plan for that world and channel their resources, their educational

facilities, and their diplomatic maneuvers to making it that kind of world.

If we are to win in this kind of struggle, we must decide what kind of world we want it to be 20 years from now. And within the framework of democratic individual liberty, make the necessary effort to create that kind of world.

In Washington today we hear the refrain: "How much does it cost?" "Can we afford to keep ahead?" Let us remind ourselves that those, like Jefferson, who signed the Declaration of Independence, did not count the cost. They had lived under tyranny. They wanted freedom.

Now maybe I have analyzed our situation all wrong, but I don't think so. But if I am right in thinking that we must have farsightedness, courage, decisiveness, leadership in the period ahead, I believe that is calling for a Democrat in the White House. Our party has provided vision and decision in times of crisis before. With the challenge that lies ahead, I am proud that our party can put forward so many men of capacity, experience, and vigor as candidates for the Presidency.

Unlike the opposition, which is restricted to one rather tarnished heir apparent and one glittering but politically untried challenger, we can offer veterans of the political wars from every section of the Nation. Our party has, in short, what the Nation needs and the opposition lacks—leadership.

Let us raise our eyes to America's horizons of tomorrow. Let us look ahead not only 1 year or 10 years, but 50 years and 100 years. Let us build an America and a world in which freemen live and prosper. Let us seize the opportunities for leadership which are ours.

These are the tenets and the vision of Jefferson and Jackson; the tenets and vision of the Democratic Party today.

Extension of GI Law Benefits to Korean Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 22, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Senate Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee was told recently that the educational training provided by the GI bills for World War II and the Korean conflict not only strengthened the productive power of our Nation, but enabled the veterans to earn more money, and, the witness added, "On the basis of additional income taxes which our Government collects on this added earning power, the cost of veterans education is paying better returns than any security listed on the New York Stock Exchange. Further, those added income tax payments will continue and will probably increase over the years."

Support for my proposal to extend the benefits of the Korean GI bill is coming in from a wide variety of quarters. I am pleased to say a great many people agree with me that this measure would be an investment in the future of our country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a group of articles from Army Times for April 4, 1959.

The first article, written by Larry Carney, was published under the headline "Four Educators Back GI and Korea Bills."

The second article was published under the heading "Hill Told 4-Year College Course Is About Finished."

The heading on the third article reads "GI, Korea Bills Necessary, Educators Report to Hill."

The fourth article was headed "Outdo Non-Veterans Scholastically—Vets Do Well in College, Survey Shows."

The final article was headed "Senator SPARKMAN Backs GI Bill."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOUR EDUCATORS BACK GI AND KOREAN BILLS

(By Larry Carney)

WASHINGTON.—Four leading educators spoke out last week against any reduction in the benefit formula of the proposed new cold war GI bill to make it more acceptable to budget cutters in Congress. In testimony before the Senate Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee, headed by Senator RALPH D. YARBOROUGH, Democrat, of Texas, the college administrators enthusiastically endorsed proposals to extend GI bill benefits to post-Korean ex-GI's.

Appearing before the subcommittee were Dr. Price Ashton, president of Ranger Junior College, Ranger, Tex.; Dr. Malcolm M. Wiley, vice president, Minnesota University; Dr. Clarence B. Humphrey, president, Wayne State University; and Dr. Robert G. Bernreuter, dean of admissions, Pennsylvania State University.

At last week's hearings, Dr. Ashton told the subcommittee he felt the opinion of most educators in his State was that the World War II and Korean GI bills should definitely be extended. Amounts now paid are too low, he said, and if the amounts are reduced it would make it practically impossible for veterans with families to go to college.

The educational allowances proposed in the Yarborough measure "do not grant the same degree of economic assistance to today's veteran as these same dollar amounts did for the Korean veterans," Dr. Hilberry told the subcommittee. "Living costs have increased since 1952."

Hilberry is chairman of the Michigan Council of State College Presidents. He said he had conferred with the presidents of eight other State-supported institutions which make up the council and was presenting their ideas as well.

He added that costs have increased to the veteran and as a result, the sum that a veteran will receive under the proposed cold war bill will support a smaller portion of his education than it did 7 years ago.

Dr. Bernreuter said he was afraid that if the monthly formula was reduced veteran students would "have to supplement their incomes" with outside employment.

He said this would show up in their academic achievements. "Instead of being better students than the nonveterans, the general effect would be to make them poorer students than the nonveterans."

Bernreuter said that Penn State's policy of giving preference to veterans is based upon the results of research studies contrasting the accomplishments of veterans with nonveterans. He said that a study which we have just completed shows that veterans at Penn State make better scholastic records than nonveterans.

He added veterans were more inclined to finish their education and were involved in fewer disciplinary incidents on the campus.

YARBOROUGH, in his opening remarks, said the big question before the subcommittee was whether some or all of the readjustment benefits granted to veterans of War II and the Korea conflict should be made available to the thousands of young Americans, who, because of the compulsory draft law, are required to serve in the Armed Forces during the cold war.

The Texas lawmaker said there is an urgent need to restore to our young citizen soldiers at least a portion of the opportunities lost by military service, particularly in the cases of lost educational opportunities.

He also urged passage of his bill for post-Korea orphans, saying * * * "It is only just and right that educational benefits be provided for children who find themselves fatherless because their parents were under legal compulsion to serve in our Armed Forces."

Other hearings will be conducted shortly after Congress' Easter recess. At that time the Senator plans to call to the rostrum other educators and officials of the Veterans' Administration, Defense Department, Budget Bureau, and the various veterans' organizations.

YARBOROUGH said he is hopeful that a readjustment bill for post-Korea veterans can be enacted by Congress at a very early date, so that eligible ex-GI's can resume their educational careers at the beginning of the next school semester.

The principal feature of YARBOROUGH's proposal to extend the GI bill is the provision which will continue the educational portions of the Korea measure. The cutoff date for the Korea bill was January 31, 1955. The Yarborough measure would extend the rights through July 1, 1963.

The bill provides 1½ days of schooling for each day of active service for veterans who served honorably 90 days or more.

The bill also provides vocational rehabilitation for disabled veterans, and extends eligibility for home and farm loan guarantees.

In addition, the proposed measure would authorize mustering out pay of $100 per person for domestic or foreign service for veterans honorably discharged after the date of its enactment.

Under the peacetime war orphans' measure, each surviving child would be entitled to educational assistance up to 36 months, or to the equivalent in on-the-job training.

HILL TOLD 4-YEAR COLLEGE COURSE IS ABOUT FINISHED

WASHINGTON.—A Senate veterans affairs subcommittee was told last week that the days of the 4-year college curriculum is about over. Four of the country's leading educators blamed this situation on the rapid missile-age expansions in the various technical and scientific fields.

Dr. Clarence B. Hilberry, president of Wayne State University, told the subcommittee, "it has been a long time since anyone finished engineering school in 4 years." He said that as a matter of fact, it hasn't happened for a long time even though we still call our courses full-year courses.

The Detroit educator said that many 4-year courses are becoming 5-year programs. The latest to join the list is pharmacy. These programs are not changing at just one school but at all the schools across the country, Hilberry said.

Many ex-GIs in school now under the Korea bill are not going to finish their curricula in the 4 years they are given school assistance by Uncle Sam.

"A great many of them are going to have to find the resources somewhere to continue for a 5th, 6th, and 7th year," Hilberry said, "before they have the masters' degrees and the doctorates which are required in their respective fields."

Dr. Malcolm W. Willey, academic vice president at the University of Minnesota, brought out statistics to prove that few students receive the baccalaureate degree in 4 years.

His figures show that nearly 70 percent of the students at Minnesota require more time than the traditional 4 years to obtain their first degree.

Willey said the figure was 71 percent in the school's College of Agriculture, Forestry, and Home Economics; 77 percent in technology; 61 percent in business, and 73 percent in education. He said that in Minnesota's College of Science, Literature, and the Arts, the number was 58 percent.

Willey said these figures indicate that one cannot assume that because a student enters college at 18 he will have completed his degree requirements by 22—the age at which he is likely to be called up under selective service.

He said this point "bulwarks the interruption-of-education argument, which is a valid one."

GI, Korea Bills Necessary Educators Report to Hill

Four of the Nation's leading educators told a Senate Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee last week that an extension of the GI bill to cold war ex-GIs was vital to our national security.

They said the War II and Korea bills have more than proved their investment through higher national income and better trained scholars and technicians.

A condensed version of the testimony follows:

"STATEMENT OF ROBERT G. BERNREUTER, DEAN OF ADMISSIONS AND SPECIAL ASSISTANT FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS, THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY, UNIVERSITY PARK, PA.

As the admissions officer for the Pennsylvania State University, it is my responsibility to enroll a total of 6,700 new undergraduate students for the fall semester of 1959. In doing so, I will give preference to those students who have served on active duty in the Armed Forces. This policy of giving preference to a veteran is not based, to any significant degree, upon sentimentality. Even though I am myself a veteran of War II and have personal sympathy with the problems confronting the young veteran, I do not give preference to veterans for sentimental reasons. Nor am I giving preference to them because of the nostalgic memories of those professors who remember with pleasure the days immediately following War II when a large proportion of all their students were veterans who enlivened their classes with their alert minds and their pointed questions. They enjoyed teaching such classes.

"The policy of giving preference to veterans is based upon the results of research studies contrasting the accomplishments of veterans with nonveterans.

"A study which we have just completed shows that veterans make better scholastic records than do nonveterans. Last semester at Penn State, the average grade earned by the male nonveteran student was a C. The average grade made by a male veteran student was a C+. The proportion of nonveterans who were dismissed for poor scholarship was twice as large as the proportion of veterans.

Another indication of the extent to which the veterans make better used of their opportunities is shown in the percentage of students who quit before graduating. Among those who were admitted last year as freshmen, more than one-third of the nonveterans quit. Among the veterans, less than one-fourth did not return. Proportionally approximately 1½ times as many nonveterans quit as was true of the veterans.

"Still another reason for preferring veterans has been found through a study of the disciplinary actions the university has had to take involving undergraduate students. Out of 1,587 veterans, only 4 were involved in disciplinary actions. This is approximately 1 out of each 400 veterans. This is a clear demonstration of the reason why the dean of men at our university, who is responsible for the discipline of men students, prefers to have us enroll veterans.

"The dean of men has also provided evidence which shows that veterans more frequently possess the desirable attributes which we seek to develop in our students.

"Each year the male students who reside in our residence halls are evaluated with regard to their personal adjustments, their maturity, the leadership qualities that they show, the seriousness of their attitudes toward their studies, and their ability to get along with other students.

"The veterans consistently receive higher ratings in these desirable attributes than do the students who have not had military experience.

"Each year the dean of men chooses a group of male students to act as residence hall counselors. In choosing such counselors from among those students who apply in large numbers each year he chooses those who show the greatest degree of maturity and seriousness of purpose and the ability to assume responsibility. He has not consciously given preference to men with military experience.

"Nevertheless, when he made a tally, at my request, he found that of the 36 students now employed as counselors 32 of them are veterans.

"Only four nonveterans were able to meet the standards set by his office for the position of residence hall counselor.

"It is now clear that veterans have shown themselves to be better students than nonveterans through their more serious application to their studies, through their earning of higher grades, through their smaller dropout rates, through their better discipline, through their better citizenship, and through their increased ability to assume responsibility.

"STATEMENT OF CLARENCE B. HILBERRY, PRESIDENT OF WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY AND CHAIRMAN OF THE MICHIGAN COUNCIL OF STATE COLLEGE PRESIDENTS

"I would like to make several comments about the value of the bills now before you. First, the educational benefits are particularly valuable, since they permit a wide range of choice by the individual veteran among the various educational opportunities that are most likely to be of value to him.

"These opportunities range from advanced professional and scholarly study to on-the-job training in applied skills.

"Secondly—and I want to stress this point—the proposed legislation, in the judgment of nearly all of us in higher education wisely provides for the payment of benefits directly to the individual veteran.

"The veteran then attends the school or college of his choice. Since our experience across the country appears to be so uniformly favorable, I want to endorse strongly the provisions of the legislation for direct payment to the veteran.

"A third point. The educational allowances proposed in these bills do not grant the same degree of economic assistance to today's veterans as these same dollar amounts did for the Korean veteran.

"Living costs have increased since 1952 and therefore dormitory charges, rental for housing, and expenses for board, tuition, supplies and equipment have also increased in cost to the student. As a result, the sum that a veteran will receive under this bill will support a smaller portion of his educational costs than it did 7 years ago. These increases in costs are clear in our own recent experience at Wayne State University.

"A number of justifiable requests for loans have been made by students attending the university under Public Law 550. Such requests were apparently unnecessary only a few years ago.

"In conclusion, I would like to say that in our experience in public higher education in Michigan we have found that the educational benefits provided veterans have made possible educational opportunities for a large number of very able young men who otherwise would not have beeen able to attend a college or university."

The bills before you will constitute, I believe, a positive contribution to the total education needs of our Nation. They incorporate the essential principle of direct payment to veterans. The level of allowance though not equal to preceding allowances is substantial. Additional needs of men in this group might perhaps better be met by increasing the loan funds available under the National Defense Education Act.

"STATEMENT OF DR. MALCOLM M. WILEY, ACADEMIC VICE PRESIDENT, UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

"My experience convinces me that the earlier GI bills did contribute fundamentally to national welfare, for there is no doubt that they made it possible for, and encouraged, larger numbers of men to obtain college training.

"The students thus stimulated to seek training and enabled to complete it, our University of Minnesota figures show, have fallen heavily in agriculture, in education, in business, and in technology—as well as in the specialities of the liberal arts college.

"No one can question the importance of doing everything we can to further the training of specialized personnel. For several years I served as a member of General Hershey's Selective Service Advisory Committee on Specialized Personnel, which was basically concerned with the need for more manpower.

"I also served as a member of the Commission on Human Resources and Advanced Training which made one of the most comprehensive studies yet undertaken on our country's human resources and their utilization.

"The so-called GI bills have made an immeasurable contrrbution in meeting the needs these two reports so sharply outlined.

"One cannot say that all of these students would have failed to go on to college training had there been no veterans legislation. But we can testify that a large percentage of these students are drawn from the economically less advantaged families of Minnesota, and we can assume that an appreciable number of them would not have had the resources to enter upon or complete a college education.

"We do know that a higher percentage of these students have gone further with their education and have finished it, than otherwise would be true.

"I might add, too, that the cost of going to college is rising like everything else. At Minnesota we are confronting further tuition raises. Each such increase makes it more difficult, to the point of impossibility, for some young men and women to enter or stay in college.

"The figures I quoted earlier on loan experience indicate that this is so. For one group at least, the GI assistance has served to offset in some measure these problems the students face with rising costs.

"We also know that any break in the educational career of a student, whether for health, financial, or military reasons, reduces definitely the chances that the student will complete his college work. For this reason the break associated with military service can well be the factor that results in failure to complete an education.

"It is my experience, based on contact with students, that the GI privileges have been a compensating factor that has induced students to return to college, following interruption.

"With respect to this matter of interruption, it is sometimes argued that students who graduate from high school at 18 can essentially complete their college education before military service since Selective Service calls do not come on the average until age 22.

"This might be true if all students did, in fact, enter college at 18 and continued without interruption to the baccalaureate degree. Our experience at Minnesota, where we have studied this question, shows that students in large numbers do not receive the baccalaureate degree in a nominal 4 years.

"Indeed, specific data reveal that in our college of agriculture, forestry, and home economics more than 71 percent of the students take more than the customary 4 years to the baccalaureate degree; in technology more than 77 percent; in business more than 61 percent; and in education 73 percent. In our college of science, literature, and the arts the figure is over 58 percent; and for the university as a whole, 69 percent of the recipients of the first degree take more than the normal, traditional time in school. Another observation can be made bearing on the age-range of our undergraduate students.

"The average age of a Minnesota freshman at matriculation is approximatley 18 and only 33 percent of the freshmen complete requirements for a degree within 4 years after starting, or by the age of 22. Many reasons account for this, including the introduction of 5-year curricula which are increasing, as well as general enrichment of the individual's curriculum.

"I cite these figures to indicate that one cannot assume that because a student enters college at 18 he will have completed his requirements by 22, the age at which he is likely to be called up under Selective Service. This point bulwarks the interruption of education argument, which is a valid one.

"STATEMENT OF DR. PRICE ASHTON, PRESIDENT OF RANGER JUNIOR COLLEGE, RANGER, TEX.

"I would like to speak and say at this time that the educational institutions in our State are highly in favor of the extension of benefits to veterans of the cold-war category.

"My experience with veterans under Public Laws 346 and 550 has been very gratifying.

"In the Association of Texas Colleges and the Southern Association many surveys have been made, and we have found that the veterans of War II and Korea have all tended to increase the level of education rather than to diminish it.

"At the same time we have encountered many problems with veterans simply because they are more mature.

"For that reason, we feel that we should provide benefits to the peacetime veteran because his problems are as great as a veteran of the Korean war in finishing his education. Oftentimes they have families, even dependents, and the requirements are as great or greater than they have been in the last 6 or 7 years. Expenses are higher.

"The colleges and universities in our State can take care of the veterans and do it adequately.

"We would like to see sufficient money provided by this Congress to make it a positive solution to the problem of the veteran to attend university or college.

"We have had various programs at our college in particular to try to take care of some of the financial difficulties that arise from a veteran coming out and not having adequate money to attend the college or university of his choice.

"I think generally the families of these veterans are particularly interested in having something to offer the veteran when he comes out of the service.

"Even though he serves stateside, or on foreign duty they realize that he (veteran) has a period of readjustment that will be difficult for him when he comes out into civilian life. For that reason they are particularly concerned with this legislation, and many of them express themselves along those lines.

"They feel as if it is one of the greatest pieces of legislation that has been offered in many years.

"I know in California—and I talked to many educators out there—that they have had like experiences on the quality and standard of grades and the improvement of the general attitude, disciplinary conditions of our colleges and universities through these veterans.

"I would like here to congratulate the veterans of the Korea and World War II conflicts, those who have participated in the program, because they have been a group to congratulate, and it has been very gratifying."

OUTDO NONVETERANS SCHOLASTICALLY—VETS DO WELL IN COLLEGE, SURVEY SHOWS

WASHINGTON.—Ex-GI's fare better scholastically in college than nonveterans, a recently completed survey at Pennsylvania State University revealed. Dr. Robert G. Bernreuter, dean of admission for Penn State, told a Senate Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee last week that nonveterans averaged "C" last semester at State while the average for male veterans was "C-plus." He was one of four educators that testified in favor of extending GI bill benefits to "cold war" ex-GI's.

He said the proportion of nonveterans "who were dismissed for poor scholarship was twice as large as the proportion of veterans."

Bernreuter said the study also revealed that less veterans quit before graduating than nonveterans. He said that more than one-third of the nonveterans who enrolled as freshmen last year did not return this semester. Among the veterans, less than one-fourth did not return.

Another part of the survey shows that ex-GI's get into less trouble than nonveterans. Out of 1,587 veterans at Penn State last semester only 4 were involved in disciplinary actions. This is approximately 1 out of each 400 veterans. The nonveteran ratio is 1 out of 84.

The Penn State educator said this comparison "is a clear demonstration of the reason why the dean of men at our university, who is responsible for the discipline of men students, prefers to have us enroll students."

He said that the dean of men "has also provided evidence which shows that veterans more frequently possess the desirable attributes which we seek to develop in our students."

Each year the University chooses a group of male students to act as residence hall counselors. It chooses those who show the greatest degree of maturity and seriousness of purpose, and the ability to assume responsibility, Bernreuter said.

He pointed out that the dean while "not consciously" giving preference to men with military service found that of the 36 students now employed as counselors, 32 of them are veterans.

"It is now clear," Bernreuter added, "that veterans have shown themselves to be better students than nonveterans through their more serious application to their studies, through their earning of higher grades, through their smaller dropout rates, through their better discipline, through their better citizenship and through their increased ability to assume responsibility."

Penn State's preference for veteran students is based upon the results of research studies, not sentiment. Bernreuter said many professors have "nostalgic memories" of the days immediately following War II when a large proportion of all their students were veterans who enlivened their classes with their alert minds and their pointed questions.

The professors enjoyed teaching such classes and the Penn State survey bears that out.

SENATOR SPARKMAN BACKS GI BILL

The following message is typical of the interest legislators are showing in the "cold war" GI bill. It was broadcast over 12 Alabama radio stations by Senator JOHN S. SPARKMAN, of Alabama, last weekend:

"This is your Senator, JOHN SPARKMAN. Today I want to talk with you about legislation of interest to Alabama's 348,000 veterans of War II and the Korean War, as well as those veterans who have served since those wars.

"Of special interest to these veterans who have served since that time is the fact that the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is beginning hearings on legislation that I am sponsoring which would extend the benefits of the GI bill to these veterans. More than 20,000 Alabama veterans would benefit immediately under my bill, with the total reaching 90,000 by 1965.

"I am sponsoring this bill because it would be an incentive for young men to volunteer for service in the Armed Forces and because it is only fair to provide veterans serving now some of the benefits for their service to their country and for the loss of time from civilian pursuits.

"I have no hesitancy about supporting an extension of this bill—and that's what it is. The program is in effect now for all veterans who entered service after January 31, 1955. What it has done for the War II and Korea soldiers it can well do for our soldiers who have entered service since that date.

"This GI bill is in no sense a gift to its recipients. It is a well-earned reward for a well-done job. I feel that the program should continue as long as we continue to draft the youth of our Nation away from their normal civilian pursuits.

"A total of 7.8 million War II veterans took on-the-job training. Education under the GI bill went to many men and women who otherwise could not have afforded it. This education produced 440,000 engineers; 238,000 teachers; 168,000 doctors and dentists; 112,000 scientists; 105,000 lawyers, and 93,000 social scientists and economists.

"Think what a stockpile of needed professional and technical people this program has afforded for these times when we need them so badly. Nearly 230,000 Alabamians were educated and trained following War II and the Korean war.

"The Veterans' Administration expects that by 1970 veterans will have paid back, through the medium of extra income taxes, the cost of the education that was borne by the Government.

"Another bill that I am sponsoring would give veterans of War II and the Korean war who have lost their national service life insurance a chance to reinstate it.

"Veterans would be given a 1-year period in which to file. The cost of this program to the taxpayer would be nothing. All administrative costs would be borne by the policyholder. This bill is pending before the Senate Finance Committee. A similar measure passed the Senate last year as an amendment to another bill, but was omitted by the Senate-House conference committee.

"When War II and Korea war veterans were separated from service they had the option either to keep or to cancel their national service life insurance. Many chose to cancel because of financial difficulties, or simply because it was easy to do so. I remember my own experience from War I. The pay for the premium on my insurance was simply taken out of my check each month. Well, when I was discharged, naturally I just didn't continue to pay. I had the opportunity to renew it under an act passed by Congress some years after that. I renewed it and I'm carrying it today. I

believe the veteran of our War II and Korean war ought to be given the same opportunity.

"I wish I could talk to you about other legislation I am sponsoring but I must sign off."

Usurpation of Power by the Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 22, 1959

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the increasing concern over the usurpation of power by the Supreme Court is not confined to any one section of the country, nor does it spring from any one decision by the Court. Thinking people all over the country are aware of the threat to our institutions and the individual liberties of our citizens inherent in the distorted conception of its power held by the present Court.

A judicial oligarchy of power-seeking men abusing the life tenure designed to permit patriotic men to sustain the Constitution now threatens to unravel the fabric of that great document in order that they may rewrite it to their liking.

Mr. President, I ask that a column written by Mr. George Todt, which appears in the North Hollywood, Calif., Valley Times of April 15, 1959, entitled "Against Federal Usurpation," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AGAINST FEDERAL USURPATIONS

(By George Todt)

"I would have you day by day fix your eyes upon the greatness of your country, until you are filled with the love of her; and when you are impressed by the spectacle of her glory, reflect that it has been acquired by men who knew their duty and had the courage to do it" (Pericles).

A prime objective of the Sons of the American Revolution, one of the real bluebloods among an expanding number of patriotic societies in the United States today, is to perpetuate the memory of those men, who, by their services and sacrifices during the war of the American Revolution, achieved the independence of the American people.

I was recently privileged to hear the president-general of Sons of the American Revolution, Hon. W. A. Wentworth, a retired Borden executive who had headed up his company's public relations department, address the combined Pasadena-Los Angeles chapters of the society in the Green Hotel in Pasadena. He had much on his mind—and he said it with force and dignity. He was little short of tremendous.

In the course of this great American's remarks, he made it plain that the Sons of the American Revolution took a very dim view of some of the Supreme Court's recent decisions in which it denied the States the right to (1) enforce antisedition laws, (2) investigate subversion within their borders, (3) dismiss employees who refuse to testify on the ground of self-incrimination, and (4) operate public schools in a manner consonant with local needs or desires.

What is being done to curb this situation, if not correct it? Let the highest ranking national officer of the Sons of the American Revolution answer in his own words:

"Recently the house of delegates of the American Bar Association cited 24 decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court which cripple national and State security, with particular reference to Communist activity.

"The report states that recent decisions 'have been severely criticized and deemed unsound by many responsible authorities.' Remedial legislation will be sought from the Congress. One proposal would restore the authority of the States to enforce laws against sedition. Another would clarify the powers of the Un-American Activities Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives.

"You are, of course, familiar with the admonition of the Conference of Chief Justices of State Courts of Appeals, meeting in California last fall. They said, in part: 'The overall tendency of its (Supreme Court) decisions during the last 25 years has been to press the extension of Federal powers and to press it rapidly. * * * This conference respectfully urges that the Supreme Court of the United States * * * exercise one of the greatest of all judicial powers—the power of judicial self-restraint.'

"That conference has now established a committee for the purpose of 'achieving a sound and appropriate distribution of judicial power between the Nation and the States.'

"Later in the fall, Chief Justice Warren, of the U.S. Supreme Court, spoke in California where the Conference of State Chief Justices had leveled criticism at the U.S. Court's decisions. Apparently in reply to those criticisms, he said that if the Federal Government has infringed on States rights it was generally 'only when the States themselves have failed to meet the needs of the people.'

"I ask you whose function it is to determine the needs of the people—the legislative or judicial branch of the Government? When the Court decides what the 'needs of the people' may be, is that anything but usurpation? Let us quote from George Washington: 'But let there be no change by usurpation; for, though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed.'

"At its October meeting, the board of trustees of the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution recognized the seriousness of this situation which has been created by the acts and decisions of the Supreme Court. They adopted a statement and resolution entitled 'Acts of Usurpation by the Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States.'

"In the Sons of American Revolution statement, the State chief justices are commended for their admonition to the U.S. Court that has been mentioned here previously. The Sons of the American Revolution resolution then exercises the right of petition by criticizing the U.S. justices for usurpations committed in cases involving subversion, for interference with the investigating and lawmaking powers of Congress and of the States in the antisubversive field, and for its course of action in the integration cases.

"It further declared that replacement of the present justices may be the only way of correcting the present situation, which has become intolerable."

While the majority of our citizens, including this writer, are loath to criticize the Supreme Court because of the great authority it bears and because of the natural respect we all have for this great American institution, we must always bear in mind the inevitable imperfections of human beings. Sometimes we do exceed our authority. And then, regardless of the rank or position we may hold, we must upon occasion be called to account.

As with high ranking officers in the Armed Forces during the late war: We who were lower on the totem pole saluted them because they bore in their persons the authority of the U.S. Government—not because of any exalted condition of their own private protoplasm over ours. And when such high ranking officers exceeded their authority for any reason, they were subject to courts-martial. Authority under a Republican form of government must never be construed with license or freedom from lawful responsibility. And that goes for everybody in the higher echelons, too.

When the president-general of the Sons of the American Revolution and that entire respected patriotic body feels constrained to speak out publicly upon what it now calls an "intolerable situation" with respect to the highest court in the land—then we have obviously arrived at a pretty pass of affairs, indeed. What's the answer?

Oratorical Contest Award to Shannah Pharr

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 22, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Shannah Pharr, a 17-year-old high school student from Odessa, Tex., has had an opportunity to compare the American way of life with other systems.

During World War II her parents were killed in a Nazi concentration camp. She is now the adopted daughter of an American couple, and recently she won a District Oratorical Contest which the American Legion sponsors for high school students. Her topic was "Americaism," a subject which has special meaning for her.

Mr. President, in special recognition of Miss Pharr and the other high school students who are learning through this contest more about the ideas and ideals which have made this Nation great, and as a salute to the American Legion, which sponsors the competition each year, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the Monahans, Tex., News for Monday, March 16, 1959, under the heading "German Girl, Orphaned in World War II, Wins 'Americanism' Oratorical Contest."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Monahans (Tex.) News, Mar. 16, 1959]

GERMAN GIRL, ORPHANED IN WORLD WAR II WINS 'AMERICANISM' ORATORICAL CONTEST

Shannah Pharr, 17-year-old World War II orphan from Germany and adopted daughter of an Odessa couple, Friday won the American Legion National High School Oratorical Contest for the 16th District, held at the Monahans Junior High School auditorium at 2:30.

She is a student at Ector High School in Odessa.

Jimmy Kent, who was to have represented Monahans in the contest, was unable to participate because of a conflict with a 3-day student council meeting.

Contestants spoke on some phase of the U.S. Constitution. Thomas Marlow, 16th

District Americanism chairman, said Shannah's father and mother were killed in a Nazi concentration camp, and that her talk expressed why she was proud to be an American citizen.

She will advance to the 5th Division contest in Lubbock on March 20, then to the State finals to be held in San Angelo, April 3, if she wins in Lubbock.

The State finalist will compete in the national contest at Portales, N. Mex., on April 21.

First place award is $4,000, second place $2,500, and third $1,000, all in the form of scholarships.

Fidel Castro and the Liberation of Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 22, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the seat of this Government has just had a visit from Fidel Castro, one of the most controversial figures in the Western Hemisphere.

I cannot claim any special knowledge of Cuban events, but I try to read omnivorously about such developments. I recently have read in the issue of the Reader's Digest for April 1959, a very comprehensive and complete article reporting on Fidel Castro and his revolutionary movement.

The author of the article is Miss Dickey Chapelle, who also has covered such historic occurrences for the Reader's Digest as the Hungarian revolt against Soviet tyranny, and the landing of American marines in Lebanon last summer. I think it is significant that the editors of the Reader's Digest have called attention, in their introduction to Miss Chapelle's article, to the fact that Dictator Batista, of Cuba, had previously conducted in that neighboring land of ours "a regime of terror and corruption without parallel in Cuba's tragic history."

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Reader's Digest, as condensed by me to conform to the rules of the Senate, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. The title of the article is "Remember the 26th of July."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Reader's Digest, Apr. 1959]

REMEMBER THE 26TH OF JULY—THE STORY OF FIDEL CASTRO AND THE LIBERATION OF CUBA

(Until Jan. 1, 1959, an ironclad tyranny held the island of Cuba in its grip. Only 90 miles from the United States, Dictator Batista was conducting a regime of terror and corruption without parallel in Cuba's tragic history.

(Now Cuba is free of that dictator and there is hope of democracy in the air. This is the dramatic eyewitness story of how victory was won. It is largely the story of one man, Fidel Castro, who at 32 has become a legend for his daring and determination. Starting with nothing more than a hatred of tyranny, Castro led the revolt until it became a revolution which ended in triumph.—EDITOR'S NOTE.)

(By Dickey Chapelle)

When Cuba's strong-man President, Fulgencio Batista, celebrated the dawn of New Year's Day 1959, by desperately fleeing his homeland, some of the wisest heads in the rest of the world wagged in disbelief. The odds against what had happened were too high to calculate. True, it had been known that Batista's forces were embroiled with a bearded guerrilla named Fidel Castro, who, leading a motley band of malcontents, was staging raids in Oriente Province hundreds of miles east of Havana. But Batista wielded a modern military force, possessed made-in-U.S.A. planes and tanks. How could this ignominy have overtaken him?

Probably the only place on earth which did not share the sense of shock was Cuba itself. The people there knew what the world had had no way to find out: that there was a deep-seated hatred of Batista in Cuba and that civil war had been flickering across the entire 700-mile length of the island for many bloody months. They knew it because they had been feeling the hatred and fighting the war.

Nearly 10,000 men and young women were wearing the ragged green rebel uniform, and a dozen times that number had been welded into a daring underground. This underground included the vastly wealthy and the ghastly poor; it included farmers and store clerks, college professors and people who could not write their names, veteran military officers and current debutantes. The network also embraced exiles and sympathizers in Miami, New York, and half a dozen Latin American capitals.

The Castro movement had raised huge amounts of money, recruited and equipped fighting men, bought, smuggled and even manufactured arms, supported the widows and orphans of the war and cared for the wounded. There was one thing it had not done, however: It had not won much space in the world press.

Batista's oppression was never more effective than against correspondents. He destroyed the profession of reporter in Cuba and tricked its remnants into unwitting alliance. Cuba's many radio stations were assigned wave lengths which jammed U.S. stations, blacking out their newscasts.

Batista's police identified more than a dozen foreign correspondents en route to rebel-held areas and hustled them out of the country emptyhanded. The one conflict which Cuba's strong man won to the very last was the war of words: Press association teletypes were still clicking out the official description of how Batista's forces had won the critical city of Santa Clara, between Oriente and Havana, while Batista clambered into his escape plane—because the Santa Clara battle had been irretrievably lost.

During the last weeks of 1958 I was able to watch, at firshhand, the Castro forces come of age as a working army. On the last day of November a photogenic girl courier, code-named Piedad, led me into Castro territory—5 minutes by jeep outside Cuba's second largest city, Santiago de Cuba. (It was one of her last acts as a rebel heroine; she disappeared without a trace after being detained by the police "for a traffic offense" a few days later.) At that time the rebels controlled much of the surrounding countryside in the island's easternmost province, Oriente. The day before Christmas another courier, a chunky, whistling farm boy this time, showed me how to cross out of rebel-held terrain past Batista lines. By then the only spots in all Oriente Province still controlled by the dictator were in the dozen largest towns, where his troops were entrenched behind concrete fortress walls.

Since Oriente grows almost half of Cuba's sugar, the main crop of the island's economy, the handwriting was plain on the wall. Just what it said became explicit in the last present that a group of young Castro recruits gave me. It was a road map on which they had painstakingly drawn the tactical situation in the other five provinces of Cuba. Their markings identified nine advancing rebel columns by position, numbers, arms, and the name of the commanding officer.

I stood openmouthed at their candor. "But what will happen if this is confiscated from me in Havana when I try to board my plane for the States?"

"Never mind," said a tall youth, gesturing with his made-in-U.S.A. rifle just captured from a Batista garrison. "The enemy knows what we're doing now. They just can't stop us."

This gay military heresy was more prophetic than either of us guessed. Batista fled a week later, and I encountered the tall recruit again in Habana's presidential palace a few days after that. We were there to watch the rebel forces' presidential appointee, one-time jurist Dr. Manuel Urrutia Lleó, take his seat behind the desk that had been Batista's.

Watching him, I thought about all the rebel eyes that would never see him here because they were closed in death. I thought, too, about another irony: the fact of violence in Cuba at all.

Nowhere in the world does nature show a gentler face than in Cuba. The sugar cane rears itself to record heights, the orchids bloom riotiously year-round, the tropical rains fall quick and warm, the sun is a ubiquitous blessing. Beneath rich earth lie much of the Western Hemisphere's strategic manganese ore and deep lodes of nickel and copper. Only an hour by air from Miami, the island is bordered by great scallops of white sand beach, sloping into the improbably blue sea.

But every travel folder lyric about Cuba can be matched by a saga of misrule, corruption, and terror. In the half century since U.S. blood soaking into San Juan Hill, helped to buy the island's independence from Spain, a rhythm of repression and revolution has been the beat.

In the late 1920's and early 1930's the oppressor was the cruel Gerardo Machado. When he was toppled after days of bloody rioting by students and other groups—rioting that was climaxed by a massacre of army officers—a tough young noncom moved swiftly into the vacuum of leadership: This was Sgt. Fulgencio Batista, who elbowed and bullied his way until he became a colonel, later a general, eventually President of Cuba.

Batista towered stormily over Cuban politics for almost two decades. In the beginning he tolerated certain forms of democracy: A liberal, written constitution, regular balloting, public education. But this was government by the people in name only. Batista's grip on the army was the last answer in every crisis. In 1952, fearing the outcome of an election, he made a naked power grab—and won.

At first Batista played his dictator role with benevolent overtones. Like Mussolini, he made the trains run on time, cleared the big-city streets of beggars and litter, disciplined outward avarice by innkeepers, cab drivers, and others who came in contact with tourists. He initiated the most ambitious construction program in all Latin America: Highways, tunnels, office buildings, apartment houses, hospitals, orphanages.

Havana was the chief beneficiary of this facelifting. But two out of three Cubans live in small towns or as squatters beside sugar and coffee plantations. The outpouring of capital and cement did not reach their earth-floored huts. They still ate less than their stomachs craved, their roads remained potholed and flooded, their school buildings

jerry built or in disrepair, their hospitals only paper promises.

Soon it became commonly accepted that at least $1 out of every 5 spent in the country's building boom was lining the personal pocket of a Batista henchman. The dictator himself piled up a fortune estimated at $300 million. A minister of the treasury, debt-ridden when he took office, became a multimillionaire in a matter of weeks. Hundreds of other fortunes—large and small—were made as the Government steadily robbed the people. (One senator, Rolando Masferrer, maintained a private army of more than 1,000 men.)

The looting of Cuba on such a lavish scale could not be hidden, and the cries of citizens who foresaw bankruptcy grew loud. Batista first tried to anchor his critics to his cause as he had anchored the army—with a chain of gold. Here he made two bad guesses. Not all his critics were corruptible. And stolen pesos could not dry up the rising hatred felt toward him by the people he was robbing—there simply were too many of them. So he decided to try to silence them by terror.

Around his empire of corruption, Batista built a secret-police organization. The letters SIM—for the Spanish version of Military Intelligence Service—and the sleek olive drab radio cars, with submachineguns visible in the back seat, soon became symbols of horror. Every police station in the large cities was said to have its own torture chamber. (After Batista fled I visited two of them and was seized with a feeling or revulsion.)

Cubans came to believe that no one arrested by the SIM would be seen alive again, and in time more and more families found their forebodings coming true. The mutilated bodies of husbands and sons—including teen-agers—were found in the gutters after arrest. One rebel told me he had searched for the remains of his father among 92 bodies piled at a Havana street intersection one morning. "He was one of the last I looked at," he finished.

By 1955 the interlocking directorate of graft and terror held horrendous naked power. The minister of public works had openly abolished public bidding on Government contracts. Ten thousand slot machines were under the personal control of Batista's brother-in-law, the nation's director of sport. Schoolteachers were resigning to avoid paying a direct cut of their salary checks to a fund accountable only to the minister of education. Parking-meter income was paid into a fund accountable only to the family of the mayor of Havana.

The most truculent villain of the era, according to the rebels, was a police chief, Esteban Ventura. To every rebel fighter I knew, Ventura was notorious for the cruelty of his repressive measures and stood as the symbol of the Government's participation in Cuba's prostitution and drug traffic. Early in 1958 Dr. Francisco Alabau Trelles, a patriotic Havana judge with the constitutional power to indict, openly accused Ventura of torture and butchery on evidence so convincing that not even Batista could quash it. The dictator rescued his henchman by suspending constitutional guarantees for all Cubans—the right to a court trial and the freedom of the press were the operative ones, of course—so that proceedings against Ventura could not be carried forward.

On my desk before me are two signed statements documenting the terrorism. One is from a 50-year-old schoolteacher, mother of three children. The Havana police thought she knew where rebel arms were hidden. They arrested her in the middle of the night, and she tells how she was violated with a soldering iron in Havana's 10th district police station on February 24, 1958. A physician's certificate confirms her assertion.

The other documents is from José Ferrer, who owns the largest concrete works in Cuba. Two of his clerks, sisters, shared an apartment on the outskirts of Havana. One Sunday night they came back from a weekend at their parents' home in the country and were seen being followed into their living room by two policemen carrying automatic rifles. When the girls did not appear for work the next morning, their boss sent a messenger to their apartment.

"They're here," the emissary reported by phone. "Both have been shot to death, and one has been raped."

At their funeral, a resplendent aide wearing the insignia of Batista's staff sought out Ferrer. "President Batista asked me to extend his personal apologies," he said. "This has been a terrible mistake. The police weren't after those girls at all. They were seeking two people who lived in the apartment across the hall from them."

The cancer of such terrorism spared no class of Cubans. When the imposing University of Havana proved a spawning ground for anti-Batistas, it was summarily closed. One by one, every university in Cuba, and many schools, shut their doors after their faculty members disappeared into martyrdom, exile, or the rebel forces. By the end of 1957, the ranks of sickened businessmen, revolted physicians, and angry teachers closed into a major civil-resistance network against Batista.

The best epitaph for Batista's terrorism was given me by a bearded rebel rifleman who had been a shoe salesman. "The thing that made the people hate Batista was very simple," he said. "He killed so many of them. He just killed too many people."

Terrorism, corruption, and irresponsibility are the principal reasons the Cubans deposed Batista. But they do not explain why all Cuba turned to Castro. He remained a long way from Havana, and the early reports of his personal struggle told of almost unrelieved disaster. Fidel Castro, the man who was to win so improbably, lost not once but time and again. And after each catastrophe there came a black hour when almost the only source of faith in victory was the man himself. This the Cubans see as the very heart of the Castro epic.

Fidel Castro, now only 32, was born to a life of ease and comfort. His family owned a sugar plantation in the heart of Oriente Province. Unlike most of his neighbors, Fidel's father, Angel, had known what it was like to be a penniless immigrant, to find work only a few months of the year as a cane-cutter, to tame new fields out of jungle. So his seven children learned young that it was a simple obligation of citizenship to know how to live off the land.

When he was 13, young Fidel took up a typical Cuban sport: the breeding of fighting cocks. This enterprise ended in failure. To make a rooster fight, you keep him ill fed and mean. This Fidel simply would not do, and his plump game birds were slaughtered as quickly as he sent them into battle. Fidel never forgot the lesson that the lean and hungry will outfight the fat and overnourished.

His first schooling was by the local Jesuit fathers, who channeled some of his furious energy into voracious reading of history. He was a good student, and went on to prep school in Havana. By 1947 he had become a sophomore at the Univeristy of Havana, where he joined a group of students, exiles and others in an amphibious expedition to overthrow dictator Rafael Trujillo of the Dominican Republic. The young men had barely set sail when the Cuban navy captured them. Fidel slipped overboard and reached shore after three miles' hard swimming.

He graduated from the university in 1950 with, amazingly, three degrees, two of them doctorates: one in law and one in social sciences. His colleagues remember him for his commanding leadership, his dramatic oratory and his devotion to physical conditioning. The last they found a little bewildering, since Fidel stood well over six feet tall, weighed 200 pounds—none of it fat—and lived in a sorority where indolence was a mark of status.

He did not need to practice as an attorney to make his living, but injustice against human beings always moved him to indignant court pleas. His chosen targets were a government agency which cheated farmers of their land, and a landlord who victimized slum tenants. When he won these cases, he was named a candidate for parliament on the 1952 ticket of Batista's opposition, the Orthodox Party.

The election was never held; the Batista coup came instead. Fidel was outraged. He went back to Oriente. There he gathered around him a group of young idealists who hated Batista and all his works. Together they plotted a revolt. It was foolhardy and poorly planned, but it contained an element of daring that was to mark all of Castro's acts.

Batista's stronghold in the city of Santiago was Fortress Moncada, a complex of buildings covering six square blocks behind a stout concrete wall. Two structures dominated the wall: the city hospital and an administration building.

On July 26, 1953, at the height of a gay local festival, Fidel led about 120 rebels armed with hunting weapons in an assault on the fortress. The hospital and office building were captured quickly, and 95 of the attackers breached one of the gates. Not all of the garrison was celebrating with as much abandon as Fidel had hoped, however. His main force was fired on before the men could find the arsenal from which they had planned to arm themselves with military rifles.

Two small suicide squads held the flanking buildings to cover the withdrawal of most of the men, who fled by car. Then came two bitter acts by Batista's soldiery which sealed Fidel's resolution and possibly Cuba's fate.

First, was the capture and torture of a brother and sister, Abel and Haydée Santamaría, who had stayed behind as part of the covering squad. In front of Haydée, Abel's eyes were gouged out, he was castrated, then killed. Haydée Santamaría escaped death, became a ranking rebel, and today is one of the most honored women in Cuba.

Next came the betrayal of the largest group of attackers who had spread over the surrounding countryside in small bands. A pledge of a fair trial had been obtained for them by Santiago's archbishop from the city's military chief. The cleric acted in good faith, but as the rebels were rounded up by the army they were ordered massacred on the spot by the commanding officer.

When Fidel's group was taken an officer, pistol in hand, stalked up to dispatch the leader. The rebel gritted out, "You can kill me. But you cannot kill the idea which brought me here." The officer hesitated on the trigger, looked away, then refused to shoot. The archbishop's direct intervention stopped further bloodshed, and Fidel and his brother Raúl were taken alive to Santiago.

The handful of survivors from the Moncada attack were sentenced to long prison terms and shipped to the Isla de Pinos. (While Fidel was incarcerated there, his wife of 7 years, sister of a Batista supporter, divorced him.) In 1955 Batista, prosperous and confident, declared an amnesty for political prisoners, and both Fidel and Raúl were released. With their followers, they formed a dedicated group named for the date of their attack—the 26th of July Movement. Its purpose: the violent overthrow of Batista. Its colors: red for courage, black for martyrdom. Its motto: "Libertad o Muerte";

the same words Patrick Henry used—liberty or death.

Fidel visited the United States, briefly, to raise funds for the movement, then went to Mexico to lead a group of Cuban exiles through a year's training in guerrilla tactics. They planned an amphibious operation which for sheer confrontation of impossible odds must rank among the most daring in military history. This time, less than 100 strong, they planned to spark an island-wide revolt. They counted on support from a small underground in Santiago, led by a fine-featured young revolutionary named Frank Pais.

H-hour was set for 10 a.m. on November 30, 1956, and the arrangements were confirmed in a wire to Pais reading, "The child will be born at the expected time." But the wire was too optimisic.

The old sailing vessel *Gramma*, which constituted Fidel's assault fleet, had been built and provisioned for a score of people. On this voyage she carried 82, almost capsized in a storm, lost a man overboard and was delayed by the search for him.

Pais's force, not knowing that Fidel was still at sea, made its attack at the scheduled time; in half a day the force was defeated and most of the Pais men were captured. (Pais himself escaped to fight again.) On december 2, 2 days late for the rendezvous. Fidel sighted land—and a pursuing Cuban Navy gunboat. He ordered the *Gramma* beached. Seasick and hungry, the invaders began to crawl through mud and saw grass—with a body of 1,000 government troops in pursuit. More than 50 of the rebels were dead within the next few days, and 17 were captured. These were finally tried, along with a score from Frank Pais's force.

The president of the three magistrates who heard the cases was the veteran jurist Dr. Manuel Urrutia, the man who is now President of Cuba. When the evidence had been presented, Urrutia wrote an opinion exonerating the prisoners under article 40 of the Cuban constitution—which specifically legalizes armed resistance to tyranny. It was this action that the anti-Batista forces remember last year when they named Urrutia interim chief of state. But, at the time, Urrutia was outvoted by his two colleagues. The prisoners were declared guilty.

Of the *Gramma's* ill-starred landing force, only a dozen men, including Fidel escaped death or capture. They found one another in the salt marsh and followed footsore behind Fidel while he retraced the deer-hunting trails of his boyhood through the Sierra Maestra. One of these led to the best defensive position in Cuba, Pico Turquino, which rises harsh and jagged nearly 8,000 feet, and whose foothills are thick jungle through which a man with a machete can hack his way only a few miles a day.

It was early in 1957 that Fidel's band went into hiding there, sustained by a few peasant families. A courier passed word back to Frank Pais In Santiago that Fidel was ready to lead a new campaign. A few score young Cubans took up their hunting weapons again and disappeared from Santiago and the nearby plantations to trek to Pico Turquino. Castro's revolt was born anew.

Its first mark was a series of lightning attacks on one Cuban town after another. Without uniforms, many continuing to work at their regular jobs, the 26th of July members sabotaged public transport, water, light, and communications systems. They fanned the hopes and efforts of Cubans who hated Batista, but they reaped a bloody harvest. At Holguin, a provincial railhead, police retaliated by leaving 21 bodies of suspected rebels in the streets in one 48-hour period. In one town two accused men were beheaded, and their heads were exhibited to the people from a roving jeep. In Santiago a 15-year-old boy was tortured for 24 hours, and died with long nails driven through his forehead.

Most of these terrible events went unknown outside Cuba. The eyes of the world had been on Hungary and Suez when the *Gramma* was grounded. Now Batista clamped on a total censorship. He permitted one news announcement, however: that the bodies of both Fidel and Raul Castro had been found.

In February 1957, veteran war correspondent Herbert Matthews of the New York Times made his way into the foothills of the Sierra Maestra. He brought back the report that the Castros were not dead. In whispers—the habitual speech of the entire band so that no voice could give away their position—Fidel had told Matthews how he was preparing to try again for Batista's overthrow.

It was a desperate three-pronged effort, and each part succeeded. The Fidelistas, armed with shotguns, raided one small army garrison after another and emerged with rifles. In the cities, the Milicia continued counterterrorism, and stoically bore their losses. The Resistencia Cívica, the noncombatant arm of the movement, grew from a funds-and-propaganda effort into a major manufacturer of munitions, notably rifle grenades and land mines.

Bloody false starts on both sides marked the long months of 1957. Batista peremptorily moved thousands of farmers from the Sierra Maestra foothills to withhold their food and help from Castro; then he made a direct attack toward Pico Turquino. In 2 short weeks he learned the lesson any British general could have told him in 1776: you cannot assault with massed troops through unknown territory against guerrillas who live there. At almost the same time Castro's Milicia lost heavily in an ill-timed uprising at the port city of Cienfuegos. The bodies of more than 250 rebels were bulldozed into a mass grave after 2 days of fighting.

In November 1957, a Castro raid struck a large city for the first time—Manzanillo, population 60,000. The rebels held the town several hours and stripped the army barracks of weapons after capturing the garrison of 150. Then they did something inexplicable to the prisoners of war: they simply lectured and released them.

This was the first long step toward the realization of a Castro dream—to undermine the fighting will of Batista's soldiers. No tactic could have been more wisely chosen. It forced the dictator to extend his repressions to his own army. He at once issued an order than any man could summarily shoot his immediate subordinate for simply discussing the easy out—of surrender to the rebels. This demoralizing order stood for the rest of the war.

Advantages of Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 22, 1959

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I have recently received two very interesting letters from an Armenian immigrant, telling of her difficulty in putting her two sons through medical school. These letters illustrate the hard work and deprivation which must be undergone in order that some young people may obtain an education commensurate with their ability and ambition.

The international and domestic situation today demands that the tremendous human resources represented by the youth of our Nation must not be wasted. We must make it possible for every young man and young woman to obtain the maximum educational advantages which their talent and aspiration allow.

I ask unanimous consent to have these two letters printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I have had them reproduced exactly as they were written, because I feel that the language used by the writer tells the story best.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 16, 1959.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: I am a mother of a 3rd year Med. Student. last year my husband got heart attack. My younger son is graduating N.Y. University with honor is accepted 4 Med. colleges. There is no scholarship aid to Fresman student in any college and besides his tuition 1200 dollar they need money to eat and rent and car fere. will you kindly put a bill on the Senete floor to give aid to dentist and Med. Students. Please this boys are not going to operate on their own eyes or brains or leg. they are good Christians and good citizen boys born here to help American sick and destitude. our good tax money goes to billions to the Arabs. 400 millions to the Turks, why not help our own citizens writ here at home. please I pray God that your comitee will pass this bill.

Students Mothers and Fathers who work for less than $6000. a year and denieng they bring up decent good boy sending throoh college. 1 avereg father my husband send the older boy 4 year N.Y. University graduating this June with honors. I have lost my health since 1952 my husband lost last year. we can't even deduct the college money about 2500 a year room and board. why somebody help desent parents. juvenile delinquents dope sellers lazy people get all the help.

God Bless you and your children.

APRIL 2, 1959.

HONERABLE SENATOR JAMES E. MURRAY: this morning I received your letter with great plasure I thank you for your interests, thanks again. Dear Sir the Med. School Education is very costly now a days the tuition is about 1200.00 or 1300.00 a year. books and Med kit white uniform cost about 500. they need about the cheapest room 50.00 a month. they need laundry car fare hair cut and 15. a week at least for food. train fare telephone calles all-together 3,500 a year. Why can't we Americans pass a bill in the Senate to help needy Dental and Med. College Students 2500 a year for four years let the parents help with the balance for clothing and extra bills. believe me Dear Senator, this fine boys and girls if they become Dr's they are not going to operate on their own legs and arms. in Washington our Sennotors are talking with Billions and Millions. they are not juvenile delinquents and not lazy releif grabbors. Most of the students have heart murmur and my Son gets some kind of sicknes. Good Friday I called Dr ——— from Richmond Hill L. I. he examined my Son 3rd year in Georgton Med Colleg. the Dr. said your diet is missing 3 glasses orange juice, 3 glass of yogourt and plenty meat.

My son can't buy none of those things because he has no vacation can't earn money the father is sick, so we will have a sick Dr graduate in 1960; we can give millions to the Turks to kill more Christians and Armenians and Greeks. we can feed korian, and our cream of the crop of good promising young citizens drag life half hungrey.

Dear Senator My younger boy is accepted to Boston Med. College. How can I send him to Boston when I haven't got the Money. I

have given the oldre boy 6 years room and Board but my younger boy allready borrowed 1500. from New York University 250 from A. G. B. U. for 2 year tuition. he is blind on the left eye: allready has borrowed so much, why can't the Senate or Congress or our Dear President give this boys and girls 10,000 for four years then the taxpayers money is well spent. I know this take time to pass a bill.

Our Dear President owes his life first to God and then to Dr White, the heart specilist. My younger sons right eye was saved by Dr ——— in Boston. my oldest son has his leg because Dr ——— of jamaican put 4 skrews in his leg. so all of us and you Dear Members of the Sennate and Congress and White house and your family needed a Dr. or will need one sometime or other. please please read my letter to your Member Sennators even to President Eisenhower and please do something. I am pleading for all the Med. and Dentel Stúdens. May God soften the hearth of our leaders. may God keep you well and healthy all you life. May I hear you please.

respectfuly yours

P.S.—Since 1941 we had sixteen operations in my family. I scrabe and saved to send two Boys to college now am exasted.

A Place To Save

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON: STEPHEN M. YOUNG

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 22, 1959

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, a convincing and effective argument that civil defense is a job for the military and that the request of the Office of Civil Defense Mobilization for further spending should be denied is highlighted in an editorial in the Washington Daily News of April 20, 1959.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, so my colleagues may be informed of this timely comment on the recent nationwide bomb-alert fiasco. I commend a reading of the editorial, inasmuch as it furnishes a further argument in support of my contention that here is an opportunity for economy without in any manner diminishing the defense of the Nation.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PLACE TO SAVE

Last Friday's nationwide bomb-alert circus is a reminder—and maybe not by accident—that the Office of Civil Defense Mobilization is before Congress with a request for an extra $2 million.

That is just the downpayment on a scheme of the OCDM to hire 1,400 additional administrative employees for local offices. The $2 million would last the remaining 2 months of this fiscal year, with $12 million required for next. The States would be expected to split the cost, presumably putting up another $12 million.

The agency already has 2,501 employees, and any useful work it has done, or expects to do, is not exactly obvious to the naked eye.

We go along with the statement of Ohio Senator STEPHEN YOUNG last February:

"Over the past 9 years nearly $500 million has been appropriated by Congress for civil defense.

"I assert most of this money has been wasted.

"Here is a place where we can save the taxpayers millions of dollars and in no manner place this Nation in jeopardy."

Senator YOUNG didn't mean save just the $12 million. He mean save it all, and with that we also agree.

Civil defense is a job for the military, the policemen, and firemen. In an emergency they should not have a lot of arm-banded civilian bureaucrats underfoot.

Want in the Midst of Plenty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN M. YOUNG

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 22, 1959

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, an editorial entitled "Want in the Midst of Plenty," published in the Yellow Springs News, Yellow Springs, Ohio, of April 16, 1959, is worthy of serious consideration.

The editorial clearly and concisely deals with the heartbreak, suffering, and discouragement of those individuals in our Nation who are unemployed. It deals with those who, in fact, are merely a statistic—"4 million unemployed."

Involuntary unemployment, Mr. President, in this Nation of abundance, resulting in worthy and industrious men and women being denied jobs, is a great moral wrong. Soup kitchens, bread lines, unemployment compensation, and charities must not be the answer of American intelligence and sense of justice to the problem of unemployment.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WANT IN THE MIDST OF PLENTY

The enormous total of heartbreak, suffering, and discouragement that is piled up by the individuals who make up the statistic "Only 4 million unemployed now; only 3 million by fall," should show more plainly than anything else how false it is to regard this statement as encouraging as far as either the present or ultimate situations are concerned—let alone meaning that a crisis has passed, that a problem has been solved.

A society that cannot find a place for any one of its members to fit into a productive groove has failed to the extent that that one individual's life is wasted. How much more so does a society fail that cannot find a place for 3 or 4 million.

It is hopeful that those are becoming fewer who believe that the answer is in letting the economic machine run without help, regulation or direction. Even the conservative magazine Newsweek, for instance, admits in its current issue that it is alarming that "statistics clearly indicated that the United States is emerging from the recession with an unemployment level about 1 million higher than it had when it came out of the 1953–54 recession * * * the odds are that most * * * will never go back to the jobs they once held," and concludes that—

"Government, industry and labor are faced with a vast job of training, education and relocation."

For the numbers of this Nation's—and the world's—population are so large that they make the problem of supplying all with gainful employment so complex that often the worker and the employer alone cannot solve it; Government must be used to help. Democratic Government is set up by men as the machinery through which they can cooperate in solving mutual problems; let us so use it in solving the problem of unemployment.

This is no place for a detailed blueprint of how "government, industry, and labor" can cooperate to put the jobless millions to work, making a richer life for them and all the rest of their fellow citizens, but it is fair to suggest that a good way to use unemployed manpower is in supplying of needs.

The unemployed and others are still ill-fed, poorly clothed and housed. So food, clothing and housing are needed.

Schools clamor for more room. Hospitals are crowded. Can unemployed manpower be used to build the buildings that would supply these needs?

Many cannot afford the medical and dental care that they need and that medical and dental science has learned how to supply—if financial arrangements can be made. Is there manpower among the jobless which can be trained to supply this care—which will not otherwise be received?

If the answer to these academic questions is not a simple "yes," it is also not a simple "no." If men do not have enough ingenuity to use idle manpower so as to fulfill their needs they deserve the chaos that will result. It is important that we clearheadedly see the problem and, with equal clearness of vision, set out to achieve its solution.

The Role of the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM J. ERVIN, JR.

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 22, 1959

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on April 20, my hometown newspaper, the Morganton News-Herald, published a prize-winning essay entitled "Role of the United Nations in the Modern World," written by Miss Geraldine Ball, a senior in the Morganton High School. I am given much confidence in our future when a high school student exhibits such a fine understanding of the problems of the world.

I ask unanimous consent that Miss Ball's prize-winning essay be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROLE OF UNITED NATIONS IN MODERN WORLD

(By Geraldine Ball)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is the prize-winning entry in the world peace speech contest conducted in Morganton High School under the auspices of the woman's club. Miss Ball, a senior, delivered the following:)

Man from the beginning of time has striven to find some effort or force that would enable him to bring the nations of this world together in a lasting world peace. Yet, despite his efforts, and works of pens, pacts, slogans, treaties, or formal and informal agreements, there have always been wars.

Even in this day and era there are still forces working together to produce war. In order to offset this there has been established one force or organization to be a peace working force.

January 1, 1942, only 24 days after the United States declared war upon the Axis Powers, the world saw a meeting in Washington of 26 nations representing all parts of the world. Their purpose and aim was to sign the declaration by the United Nations. Upon signing this, each member agreed to accept the princples of the Atlantic Charter, made the preceding August, and also stated that they were against Hitlerism.

This had been the first time the words "United Nations" were formally used. The man who first used them was Franklin Delano Roosevelt. By his actions the world was to see a new era dawn, an era of development, of world organization, of maintaining peace. He died before seeing this in action, but he did see war tide change and the beginning of a place where peace might be in the making.

The first step for this organization was taken by the 26 nations, but it takes more than one step to make such an organization as the United Nations. The meetings to follow were to be the ones that would be remembered in history.

The meeting held at Dumbarton Oaks on October 9, 1944, was the one which produced the final blueprint of the United Nations, with the exception of minor details and the veto vote of the Security Council. It began with each member of the Big Five submitting a separate blueprint. From these five blueprints came one having the combined ideas of all. This organization was not to have loopholes for war as had the League of Nations.

At Yalta in February 1945 the final plans were made; the Security Council and the veto vote had been hashed out. Now, and only now, could the nations' organization work together. The membership first was to be limited to nations meeting in 1942, and those declaring war upon the Axis Powers.

The only phase left now was the one of writing and approval of the charter. San Francisco was to see its name headlined in the pages of history. It was there during a period of world insecurity and turmoil that the representatives of 50 nations met. Over 400 delegates gathered at the San Francisco Opera House on April 25, 1945. Two months later they had signed the complete charter. At last there was a world community working together to make this earth a better place in which to live.

Peace was promised by the following part of the preamble to the charter: "We the peoples of the United Nations, determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind * * * have resolved to combine our efforts to accomplish these aims." Their aims were to include maintaining justice, respect, peace, and tolerance, and promoting better social living standards for the world. To maintain peace and tolerance these nations were to develop a world community of friendly relations, international cooperation among international problems, and to keep the United Nations a center for harmonizing actions.

London was the site of the first General Assembly and it was there that Russia's dreadful use of the veto vote was first seen. The Second World War had created the organization; could Russia destroy it in such a short time? That was the way it looked then and the way it looks now. The United States was able to provide a suitable plan for the issue then. Can she again do it?

War, a dreaded word, had produced through an untold loss of human lives a world organization and now peace, a loved word. Now that this had been accomplished what can the future present for us the people of the world? Crises of many issues have been presented to both the Security Council and the General Assembly. Even today one can say that the United Nations is neither a success nor a failure. Neither can its value of success in the world today be measured, because only in time to come will we know its true value.

History is not to be judged today, the day it is made, but in later years when it is looked upon by the writers of history. So we cannot truly give a good picture of any of the crises in this brief time. I will, though, present to you two important issues of the United Nations. Countries of the Security Council and the General Assembly are daily arguing about the veto vote of the Security Council. Without it the United Nations could not exist but with it the Soviet Union has gained much control through the deliberate misuse of it. The United States, on the other hand, has only rarely used it and then only using it where it is necessary. At present the Big Four are allowed the vote whenever they desire to use it. Is there a need for a change of this policy?

The other existing problem is the question of a permanent police force for the world. The reasons given against it are: an aggressor nation would not cooperate, the cost would be too great, and there are other ways to meet any existing crisis.

A permanent police force would in most respects be able to insure peace and security as sparks of war could be easily extinguished by a force employed for observation, patrol, and guard. The force would be made up of men from each member nation, with each country supporting its own men but leaving control up to the United Nations.

Truly, if one such force could be set up on a permanent basis, it would be an existing symbol of the world's desire for peace.

Today we live in a world of Christianity, communism, Marxism, paganism, and many minority beliefs, each of which is large in its differences from the others. None can be compelled to give up its beliefs and practices. Neither can these same peoples' determination be altered by another will. Now as in the past, the cause of war has not been absolutely abolished. Yet there is hope for world security and peace; but it must rest on you, the citizens of the world. You can help to maintain it by giving to this great organization, the United Nations, your support.

As I prepare to leave you, I hope I have impressed on you at least one of the true roles and the importance of the United Nations and that each of you realize that no matter whether there is a "world town" or not, the danger of war will still exist.

You and only you, as citizens of this town, can provide for the future existence of the United Nations. The United Nations' true role in the modern world is not just one of preventing wars, but also of providing for you and the future generations a field of usefulness in order that we may all live in peace and harmony.

Tribute to Dr. Simon Baruch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 22, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, a recent column by syndicated writer Jim Bishop which appeared in the Camden (S.C.) Chronicle, lists Simon Baruch as the "ideal immigrant." The life of Dr. Baruch is an inspiring one, and his love of freedom and willingness to protect this freedom found in the United tSates provides a lesson for all of us.

I ask unanimous consent that this column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SYNDICATED COLUMN DEVOTED ENTIRELY TO DR. BARUCH, LATE CAMDEN DOCTOR

(By Jim Bishop)

No country in the world throws its arms open to as many immigrants as the United States. Millions have funnelled through the Narrows in New York. Of them all, I would select Simon Baruch as the ideal immigrant, the rare alien jewel.

You have heard of his son, and the deeds of the son have placed the father in the dark cool shadow of time. But Simon Baruch must not be forgotten. He had his own unique greatness.

He was born July 29, 1840. The place was Schwersen, now a part of Poland. Simon grew up wanting to be a doctor. He was still in high school when he saved enough money to leave Schwerson for America.

Like most immigrants he appreciated the value of an education more than the native-born Americans do.

Simon finished his medical training at the Medical College in Virginia, and served his internship in Charleston. He joined the Confederate Army as an assistant surgeon and, for the last 3 years of the war, saw service with the Army of Northern Virginia.

When the war was done, the South was not a prosperous place, but Simon Baruch loved it and set his practice up in Camden, S.C. He was a foreigner. He had an accent, but what the people saw in Dr. Baruch's eyes was commiseration and understanding. This was a signal they could read plainly.

He was almost 41 when he left for New York. Dr. Baruch made the move, not because he was dissatisfied with Camden, but because he had new and daring medical ideas, and, if they were to be accepted, New York was the place to try them.

In 1888, 7 years after his arrival in the metropolis, Dr. Baruch was known as a prominent surgeon. One of his radical ideas was that, in cases where appendicitis is suspected; one should not wait for a turn for the worse before trying surgery.

Surgery should be undertaken at once. Prior to this, treatment often consisted of hot water bottles and ice bags.

In 1890, Dr. Baruch began intensive work on the use of warm flowing baths in the treatment of certain emotional disorders and typhoid fever. This had been introduced by Winternitz in Vienna, but it took Baruch, and two books on hydrotherapy, to make it popular.

At the turn of the century, the immigrant was appointed a full professor at Columbia University. He was now 60, and he felt that he should devote more time to the poor. He opened the first free public bath in Rivington Street in New York in 1901. In a short time, there were 100 of these around the country.

He worked hard. Often he worked for no fee. He talked the State of New York into buying the mineral springs at Saratoga. When the springs were purchased Dr. Baruch returned to Europe, at his expense, and studied the cures effected at the famous spas. He introduced them in America.

This is not to say that he was too busy to lead a family life. On November 27, 1867, he married Isabel Wolfe, of Winnsboro, S.C., and as his children grew, he found time to impart to them his love of man and country.

Dr. Baruch believed that hard work never killed anyone. He proved it by working for as many hours as he could remain awake. The

hours became shorter and shorter and the clocks ticked nervously and swiftly. The doctor kept working until the last, and the last was June 3, 1921, just short of his 81st birthday.

The doctor has been forgotten, except in medical circles. He came here with very little more than a clean heart and an inquiring mind. He left a legacy of goodness and understanding everywhere.

Once, to my knowledge, Dr. Baruch committed to writing his feelings about the United States. What he wrote should be set in bronze for all to see:

"If I did not stand ready to consecrate heart and soul and all that I possess to the defense of my adopted country, I would despise myself as a scoundrel and a perjurer and regard myself as an ingrate to the Government which has, for 60 years, enhanced and protected my life, my honor, and my happiness."

The ideal immigrant.

Plight of Male Schoolteachers in Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 22, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, This age of science and satellites has graphically illustrated the vital importance of education. It is painfully clear that as far as the students in America's schools are concerned, what they do not know will hurt them—and us and the rest of the world as well.

I was interested to read a recent newspaper article which gave the results of a survey which revealed that two out of every three male schoolteachers in Dallas, Tex., need extra jobs in order to earn enough to support their families. These men work about 15 to 20 hours a week in outside jobs in addition to teaching. This cuts into time available for preparing lessons.

As a former teacher, I know how important out-of-class preparation is. Yet, instead of that preparation, many of this Nation's teachers are forced to find part-time jobs to make ends meet for their families.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Al Hester, staff writer for the Dallas Times Herald, printed in that paper Sunday, April 12, 1959, under the heading "Two Out of Three Work—Teachers Need Extra Job To Live, Survey Reveals."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWO OUT OF THREE WORK—TEACHERS NEED EXTRA JOB TO LIVE, SURVEY REVEALS

(By Al Hester)

Two out of every three male school teachers in Dallas have to work at extra jobs during the school year to make enough money to support their families, a Times Herald survey showed Saturday.

And nearly all men teachers and a large percentage of women instructors work during summer months to get extra money, teachers and administrators estimate.

Dallas public schools pay comparatively good salaries when other Texas schools are considered, but a beginning teacher is expected to make a living on $3,900 per year. The State minimum teaching salary for a beginning teacher with a B.A. degree is $3,204. The system employs 867 men teachers.

RETAIL STORE WORK

"The only thing which makes it possible for me to continue teaching is my part-time work with a retail store," a teacher with 10 years' experience said. He has to support a wife and three children.

"I know I'm taking time I need to use preparing lessons, but I have to work at an extra job to support my family," another teacher explained.

Ditchdigger, painter, restaurant waiter and service station attendant—these are all jobs some teachers hold outside school time.

The teachers generally try to choose extra jobs that don't make them sink too low in the opinion of their community. Examples of good extra jobs are retail store clerk, night school instructor, construction worker or encyclopedia salesman in the summer, they said.

JOBS NOT PLENTIFUL

"But sometimes you've got to take anything. Part-time jobs aren't very plentiful," a history teacher said.

One Dallas woman teacher had a job singing in a tavern until school authorities persuaded her she would lose status with the parents of her students and with the students themselves.

Interviews with teachers show the average extra job takes about 15 to 20 hours per week. The extra work cuts into any time available for preparing lessons, grading papers or just plain resting for the coming school week.

Some teachers feel guilty about holding extra jobs because they know they aren't doing students complete justice.

"The students or my principal may not sense my shallow preparation, but I know about it," a veteran biology teacher said.

One principal laughed at a conservative estimate a reporter made of the percentage of faculty men working during the school year.

SERVANT'S WAGES

"Ninety percent of my men teachers work on extra jobs," he sad. "And the community expects them to act and to dress professionally on a servant's wages," said another principal.

Dallas school leaders don't try to prevent a teacher from working extra hours on other jobs.

"But we tell teachers their extra jobs can't conflict with their teaching duties inside or outside school hours, however," a school administrator said.

A principal pointed out that the necessity for extra work shows most plainly how salary increases are needed for teachers.

The Dallas School Board is currently planning an extensive study of teachers' financial problems. A committee of teachers, top administrators, and principals was named last week to see what can be done about teachers' money problems.

Dr. Edwin L. Rippy, president of the Dallas School Board, said Friday, school leaders know about teachers holding extra jobs to eke out a living.

"We want teachers to be spiritually, physically, and morally ready for their school jobs, and we don't like to see them have extra jobs which detract from teaching," he said.

The board president has taken a leading role in setting up the study of salary needs for Dallas teachers.

Beauty and Strength From Poetry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 22, 1959

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, in my home State of West Virginia there are many citizens who continue to make notable contributions in the field of literature.

One of these persons, known to many people in official national life as well as on the quiet streets in historic Charles Town, is Mrs. George W. Johnson, the widow of the former Member of Congress from West Virginia's Fourth District. This gentle and gracious woman now resides in Jefferson County, in the section in which her husband was born. Mrs. Johnson has written a poem of beauty and strength, "A Prayer," and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

God, give me willing heart
To understand Thy ways.
O teach me how to find
Some cheer in all my days.
To see each radiant dawn
And fading sunset fair,
To know the thrill of contacts
Wrought through friendship rare.
Of dear familiar loves
Help me to build a shrine,
With altar lit from flame
Of hearts that kindle mine.
Help me to wear the fetters
Of the deadly commonplace
More lightly and I pray
For special added grace
To count with thankfulness,
Thy answer to my needs.
For health, for comforts and
For neighbors' kindly deeds.
Teach me to heed each cry
Of mortals spent with pain,
To make the generous gift,
Without one thought of gain.
And, when my day is done,
May I find recompense
For stress of honest toil
In well-earned rest.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, as a further indication of the persuasiveness of poetry at this period of the year, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial "How About April?" in the Parkersburg (W. Va.) Sentinel of April 16, 1959.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW ABOUT APRIL?

How about this April, anyway? Some month, isn't it? Full of promise, utterly delightful and often completely frustrating.

Our friend the poet, Jeannette Arnett Leeper, of Vienna, captures the mood of April in her latest verse "Who Knows April?" It reads like this:

A handful of sunshine, a handful of snow.
April says—stop. April says—go.
The golden trumpets tossing on my forsythia bush

Look reckless there, indeed, within the snowflake rush.
Japonica's red beauty, riding out the gale,
Derides this naughty April, refusing to turn pale.
But, oh my little peach tree, with pink just shaking out,
Be careful, Lady April, what you are about.
My precious little peach tree, with promise rich and gay,
Will I remember in September what April did this day.
Sunshine in one hand, the other filled with snow,
A smile that says, "Come on." A frown that tells you, "No."
April is too close to March, too far away from May.
Where's the man who can foretell an April day?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it seems to me that in these days of individual tenseness and national strain, we could do well to listen a little less to the discordant voices who clamor for our ears, and sit in an easy chair for at least a few minutes and read the verse which strengthens us for the grind of duties.

Prize-Winning Essays on "Hiring the Handicapped in Our Town"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 22, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, across the Nation there is widespread, commendable interest in promoting the practice of hiring the handicapped.

We recall that the President has appointed a Special Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped. In States throughout the country, including Wisconsin, special staffs or programs, too, have been established for this fine objective. In addition, a great many civic, fraternal, religious, and other organizations have made significant contributions toward providing greater opportunity for those among us who are, unfortunately, handicapped.

Over the years, special studies have proved that these workers—even though partially incapacitated—bring to their jobs, concentration, zeal, ambition, and enthusiasm that, in many cases, have proven them to be outstanding employees.

Recently, an essay contest for high school students was sponsored jointly by the President's Committee on the Physically Handicapped and the Governors' Committee. The theme was "Hiring the Handicapped in Our Town." The essays written for the contest illustrate that there is, indeed, an increasing awareness of the importance of providing such persons with opportunities to earn their living and to assume their rightful, responsible places in the social and economic life of their communities.

I welcome this opportunity to endorse most heartily the overall program and to congratulate not only the winners of the contest but also all participants who gave thought and study to its worthy objectives.

As an illustration of the fine and constructive thinking that characterized the contest, I call attention to the winning essay by Ruth Ellen Newman.

Although it is not possible to pay tribute to each contestant individually, I wish also to pay tribute to those who won first, second, third, and fourth places in the Wisconsin contest. In addition, I want to commend the persons, State agencies, and voluntary organizations who assisted in sponsoring the project.

I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the winning essay, as well as a list of those who contributed to the contest itself and to making it a success.

There being no objection, the essay and the list of names were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISCONSIN GOVERNOR'S COMMITTEE PRESENTS 1959 PRIZE-WINNING ESSAYS "HIRING THE HANDICAPPED IN OUR TOWN"

Ruth Ellen Newman, first place; Elkhorn High School.

Jon Eric Bischel, second place; Racine, St. Catherine's High School.

Susan M. Rutkowski, third place; Kenosha, Mary D. Bradford High School.

Joan Catherine Maas, fourth place; Milwaukee, Holy Angels Academy.

Sponsored by Governor's Committee on the Employment of the Physically Handicapped, Gaylord A. Nelson, Governor; Ralph R. O'Connor, chairman; L. A. Mingenbach, first vice chairman; A. F. Trebilcock, second vice chairman; A. Leon Beier, executive secretary; Stanley R. Spencer, assistant executive secretary.

AWARD AND CASH PRIZE WINNERS, 1959

First: Ruth Ellen Newman, Elkhorn High School; Jack Refling, principal; Miss Martha E. Nihart, English instructor.

Second: Jon Eric Bischel, Racine, St. Catherine's High School; Rev. S. B. Witkowiak, principal; Sr. M. Evangelist, O. P., English instructor.

Third: Susan M. Rutkowski, Kenosha, Mary D. Bradford High School; Dwight D. John, principal; Miss Charlotte Moody, English instructor.

Fourth: Joan Catherine Maas, Milwaukee, Holy Angels Academy; Sr. M. Jacqueline, B.V.M., principal; Sr. M. St. Genevieve, B.V.M., English instructor.

HONORABLE MENTION

David Graves, Eau Claire, Memorial High School; David P. Barnes, principal; Mrs. Marie Chatterson, English instructor.

Ann Harycki, Stevens Point, Maria High School; Sr. M. Adalbert principal; Sr. M. Marietta, S.S.J., English instructor.

Alison Keith, Madison, West High School; Ralph O. Christofferson, principal; Miss Gretchen Holstein, English instructor.

Patricia McMahon, La Crosse, Aquinas High School; Rev. Robert H. Hansen, principal; Sr. M. Casola, F.S.P.A., English instructor.

Jan Schrader, Kenosha, Mary D. Bradford High School; Dwight D. John, principal; Miss Charlotte Moody, English instructor.

Margaret Zibell, Waterloo High School; Lloyd S. Qualley, principal; Miss Jo Ann L. Chinski, English instructor.

NATIONAL AND STATE EMPLOY THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED ESSAY CONTEST

Sponsored by the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped and the Governor's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped.

State essay contest committee

A. Thomas Rose, chairman, Wisconsin State Employment Service.
Roy Dingman, A. O. Smith Corp.
Mrs. Marie Hoyer, Ted Hoyer and Co.
J. E. Linster, Employers Mutual of Wausau.
K. L. Svee, Wisconsin Easter Seal Society.

State judges

Dr. Darrell J. Inabnit, director, United States Armed Forces Institute.
Mrs. Ray A. Brown, past president, Wisconsin League of Women Voters.
Mr. Theodore M. Meloy, vice president, Bank of Madison.

Cash prize donors

State

Disabled American Veterans.
Military Order of the Purple Heart.
The National Foundation.
The United Cerebral Palsy Association.
Anti-Tuberculosis Association.
Association of the Deaf.
Easter Seal Society.
Manufacturers' Association.
State AFL–CIO.
State Chamber of Commerce.
Rehabilitation Asociation.

National

Disabled American Veterans.

Presentation luncheon sponsor

Wisconsin State Aerie, Fraternal Order of Eagles.

Screening Committee

Miss Doris Ardelt, Radio Station WHA, University of Wisconsin.
Robert S. Baldwin, State department of public welfare.
Mrs. Inez F. Belyea, rehabilitation division State board of vocational and adult education.
Dr. George B. Benson, Veterans' Administration hospital.
Gordon C. Boardman, department of public instruction.
Mrs. Charles Cornwell, executive office.
Paul Edlund, motor vehicle department.
Ralph J. Pearson, chairman, veterans' employment service.
Miss Carmen Elsner, Wisconsin State Journal.
Ronald R. Friberg, Wisconsin Easter Seal Society.
Mrs. Velma Hamilton, Madison Vocational and Adult School.
G. Earl Heath, Catholic War Veterans, Department of Wisconsin.
Thomas G. Hefter, Credit Union National Association.
Paul E. Kaiser, Disabled American Veterans, Department of Wisconsin.
Lowell E. Lueptow, the American Cancer Society.
Mrs. Carmelita Manley, Wisconsin Free Library Commission.
Miss Wanda Montz, television station WMTV.
Mrs. Ethel Parker, American Red Cross.
Ross B. Rowen, Wisconsin Education Association.
Alfred Schadde, State board of health.
Gerhardt A. Schueler, Wisconsin Department of Veterans Affairs.
Stanley R. Spencer, Wisconsin State Employment Service.
Trygve Thoresen, bureau of personnel.

FIRST PRIZE ESSAY

HIRING THE HANDICAPPED IN OUR TOWN

(By Ruth Ellen Newman)

"Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore.
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tossed, to me.
I lift my lamp beside the golden door." [1]

This is the promise which the Statue of Liberty beams to hopeful immigrants who

[1] Inscription on bronze plaque, Statue of Liberty, 1903.

approach our shores: a place of asylum, of respect for the rights and abilities of the individual, and of opportunity to work one's destiny, free from oppression. How much more, then, must you and I make sure that our own handicapped—the crippled, tubercular, mentally ill, deaf, cardiacs, mentally retarded, blind, and others—shall have a place of dignity and opportunity in your town and my town.

I live in "Christmas Card Town, U.S.A.," designated thus by the Ford Times for the beauty of our natural scenery and Christmas decorations. We do not put the Christmas spirit in cold storage when we take down our lovely Christmas decorations in the city park. Rather, we are the typical small American community where the Golden Rule is a way of life, not last week's memory verse at church school. We rarely speak of our neighbors and friends who have infirmities as handicapped, for handicapped loses its meaning when we consider the very real contributions so many of these people make to our community life.

Our Marty, a long-time victim of multiple sclerosis, is the "doll lady" to little mothers of broken dolls, and the dolls brought to her hospital are returned to their grateful owners in better-than-new condition, often with new dresses created and sewed by Marty with her wonderfully deep understanding of little girls' likes and dislikes. Certainly it was no surprising thing that our community, under the leadership of the Elkhorn VFW, should raise over $1,000 to finance Marty's trip to a far western hospital, which improved her condition somewhat, but could not cure.

Even the high school students of Christmas Card Town grant the handicapped their places according to the abilities they possess. Several important elective positions in our high school in the past few years have been filled by those who might have considered themselves handicapped. We, who voted for them, knew better though, and the records of their terms in office prove that they had real contributions to make, and they made them. In presenting a football letter to a recent polio victim, the Elkhorn football coach said: "Bob was a real fighter on the football field, and I know he'll show this same fight in licking his present problem." Bob is showing that same fight.

Yes, my town believes in employment of the handicapped. We believe, too, in the necessity of training them for the jobs they are capable of handling. We of Christmas Card Town are proud to be pioneers of the Nation in preparing the slow learners for a brighter tomorrow. Our Walworth County special school, established in 1950, accepts slow learners whose ages range from 8 to 17 years. A carefully planned curriculum includes much routine, which imparts security to those who are mentally retarded. The pupils are taught, along with the three R's, good grooming habits, courtesy, and, last but not least, vocational training, all of which will aid them when they seek employment. Girls are trained for domestic tasks, for they may, in the future, take their places as wage earners and taxpayers by becoming babysitters, nurses' aids, restaurant workers, or household helpers. Boys who are taught shopwork may become assistant carpenters, plumbers, or craftsmen. Because the mentally retarded enjoy routine, many of them become factory workers. If employers are patient and understanding, many of these youngsters become employees who are as faithful and dependable as the traditional hired girl who stayed with the family for 37 years. Educating the mentally retarded for their jobs is difficult and time-consuming, but the teachers in our special school feel richly rewarded in seeing their charges take their places in our own community and elsewhere. So successful have these teachers been that one, Miss Ruth Curran, was chosen in 1953 as a McCall's Teacher of the Year.

Yes, my town believes in employment of the handicapped, and it believes, too, in doing everything possible to assist in their rehabilitation if that is necessary. Good will drives, TAP, March of Dimes, and other campaigns of that nature are generously supported.

Our town is the county seat of Walworth County, Wis. Therefore, the county welfare department is located here. Counselors from this department work with physically handicapped persons to assist them with training and placement. They work closely with the State rehabilitation services to find abilities and to train the handicapped for satisfying, remunerative jobs. Our county aids financially by giving the money necessary for maintenance and traveling expenses during training periods. Many examples of rehabilitation accomplished by them are inspiring. One man, a professional person from a nearby city, had lost the use of his voice after a severe illness. Our welfare department sent him to a speech clinic for more than a year, and now he has returned to his work as a normal, productive citizen. He has the dignity of being self-supporting and taxpaying instead of dependent, and of knowing that he is again making a genuinely worthwhile contribution to society.

According to a bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine, "Work gives significance to our life. * * * It allows us to create material and spiritual values without which life would not be worth living." My school, the special school, our welfare department, our town—all believe that it is far kinder to train a man to do satisfying, worthwhile work than to hand him charity of some sort. Yes; we believe in employment of the handicapped.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, perhaps our most famous American handicapped, wrote these words in a draft of a speech he planned to deliver at a Jefferson Day dinner: "Today we are faced with the preeminent fact that, if civilization is to survive, we must cultivate the science of human relationships—the ability of all peoples, of all kinds, to live together and work together in the same world, at peace."[2] Free people all over the world look to America for leadership, for they recognize that perhaps the most fundamental characteristic of our great American way is respect for the rights and abilities of the individual. Dwight D. Eisenhower said this: "For this truth must be clear before us: whatever America hopes to bring to pass in the world must first come to pass in the heart of America."[3] The people of my town and your town, are the heart of America. My town is called Christmas Card Town, but our policy in hiring the handicapped is not limited to a few sentimental sentences on paper. It is my town, and your town, which must set the good example for all the rest of the towns in all the rest of the world to see. I hope we're doing our part. Are you?

[2] Henry W. Bragdon and Samuel P. McCutchen, History of a Free People (the Macmillan Co., 1958), p. 641.

[3] Ibid., p. 645.

The Spirit of Moral Safety in Your Community

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that every Member of this Body shares my concern over the mounting traffic deaths each day, month, and year. We all are willing to cooperate in every effort to reduce or eliminate this menace.

One of my constituents has worked out a program which is being circulated by the Catholic War Veterans, United States of America, which, if practiced by all, would, in my opinion, go a very long way toward making travel more pleasant and certainly safer.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include Mr. Leonard J. Demchak's letter and the highlights of this program:

THE SPIRIT OF MORAL SAFETY IN YOUR COMMUNITY

We are living today in a world that holds time and speed as the essence. Yet, this same speed and time has been responsible for more deaths to motorists and pedestrians than the combined casualties of the Korean War.

Thousands of years ago, when the world was moving at a much slower pace, God gave to Moses, for us, His Commandments which are the foundation of all law and order.

God in His infinite wisdom and goodness included in His Commandments one: Thou shall not kill. Wherein we are forbidden to take life unjustly.

We, therefore, ask of you, "Let God's speed guide you in your travels," and remember, that you have a moral duty to safeguard not only your life but the life of your fellow citizen as well.

Yours for a Godlike approach to travel and safety,

LEONARD J. DEMCHAK,
National Chairman, Catholic Action,
Catholic War Veterans.
WASHINGTON, D.C.

WHAT YOU CAN DO TO FOSTER THE SPIRIT OF MORAL TRAVEL AND SAFETY IN YOUR COMMUNITY

AS AN INDIVIDUAL

Do something to actively support the idea within your own family, circle of friends, and business contacts:

1. Have educational periods in your home to familiarize yourself with relations that God and morality have in safety and traveling (during the period, you can review the traffic laws, instruct your children what traffic signals and signs mean, how and when to cross streets, intersections, and driveways).

2. Every member of household should be made aware that your automobile can become an instrument of death through careless, reckless driving.

3. Members of household to report immediately any mechanical defects in cars, so that necessary repairs can be made.

4. Reports to local authorities of any traffic or street lights not properly working and any holes, washouts, etc., to roadways and any public garage, school, etc., which do not have the proper warning signs.

5. When using driveways, use great caution, look out for children, sound horn, if possible have someone direct you from garage.

6. Seek and support legislation to improve safety conditions.

AS A MEMBER OF A CLUB, ASSOCIATION, OR CHURCH GROUP

1. Help organize the membership in observance of a traffic safety program from a moral standpoint.

2. Ask religious leaders (pastors, ministers, rabbis, etc.) to actively support your program from the pulpit, emphasizing the commandment "Thou shalt not kill."

3. A "Traffic Sunday" can be designated during your campaign, at which time copies of CWV "Let God's Speed Guide You in Your Travels" pamphlet can be distributed.

4. Contact TV station to show CWV "Let God's Speed Guide You in Your Travels" slides with message.

5. Distribute CWV posters, postcards, pamphlets as referred to in program aids.

AS AN EDUCATOR OR LEADER OF YOUTH GROUPS (CYO, SCOUTING, YMCA, ETC.)

1. See that school area is adequately posted with traffic and safety signs.

2. Organize and instruct school crossing guards (your local government may be able to supply finances to hire mothers to perform as school crossing guards).

3. Instruct children that they are morally obligated to obey God's commandments not to endanger their lives through carelessness, etc.

4. Distribute this pamphlet and ask that it be taken home.

AS A BUSINESS OR PROFESSIONAL PERSON

1. Cooperate with the traffic safety committee by displaying and distributing the posters, postcards, and pamphlets.

2. Movie theater owners should include a safety film on their program.

3. Contribute prizes for safety contest.

4. Participate in parades with safety floats and displays.

God giveth (1) life, (2) a mother's love, (3) a father's care, (4) a little girl's smile, (5) a little boy's vitality, (6) fruits of earth, (7) colors of the rainbow.

Don't taketh away these precious gifts of God by (1) drunken driving, (2) careless and reckless driving, (3) crossing against traffic lights, (4) stepping out from behind parked cars, (5) crossing in midblock, (6) disobeying the traffic laws of your community, (7) not having your automobile free of mechanical defects.

Equal Justice for the Poor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEWART L. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, one of the most serious shortcomings of our system of justice certainly relates to the question of the legal representation available to indigent defendants. Only last month a special committee set up by the New York City Bar and the National Legal Aid Association issued a penetrating report on this problem which was reprinted in book form and distributed to all Members of Congress. Unsuccessful efforts have been made in recent Congresses to remedy this defect, and only last August the Senate passed a bill, recommended by the Department of Justice, which would do much to correct this deficiency and provide meaningful equal justice in our courts. I refer, of course, to the optional public defender bill.

It is my hope that the House will have an opportunity to vote on this legislation during the current session. I am informed that the Judiciary Committee of the other body will, in all likelihood, vote this bill out again during the coming week, and the subcommittee of this body which has jurisdiction over this legislation has already scheduled hearings which will commence on May 6.

Strenuous support for this legislation has been marshaled this year by the National Legal Aid Association and the Junior Bar Conference of the American Bar Association. Also, Mr. Speaker, an editorial approving this proposal appeared a few days ago in the Washington Post endorsing this bill, and I present it herewith:

PUBLIC DEFENDERS

The inability of most of our courts to provide adequate counsel for defendants too poor to hire lawyers of their own is admittedly one of the weakest links in the judicial system. The right to counsel is now recognized as being firmly rooted in the Constitution. Yet in many instances the plans for designation of counsel for indigent defendants operate in a hit-or-miss manner, and adequate legal service is often denied.

The Department of Justice has properly asked Congress to meet this problem by authorizing the appointment of public defenders in the United States district courts. A recent study shows that 69 public defender offices are operating in the States. In general they appear to have given reasonably satisfactory service, but the plan meets with strong opposition in some communities. That has been true in the District of Columbia. The Commission on Legal Aid which brought in an elaborate report last year recommended, instead, a new legal aid society that would be financed by both public and private funds and governed by a board named by a panel of judges, officials, and lawyers.

The District's judicial council recently appointed a committee to put this plan into operation here. As it would provide legal aid in all criminal matters, and some others, it would serve the needs of the District far more adequately than a public defender operating solely in the district court. Congress ought to make certain that the public defender bill will not interfere with this overdue reform in the District and that adequate funds are appropriated to pay the public portion of the proposed legal aid society's budget.

Dixon-Yates Back in the News—The Case of Adolphe Wenzell and His Two Hats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the Eisenhower administration has been plagued with numerous conflict-of-interest cases, costly to the taxpayers—one of the most famous of which is the Dixon-Yates affair. This nefarious scheme, engineered by the Atomic Energy Commission in 1954, is likely to cost the Govenment in the neighborhood of a million and a half dollars.

But let an unbiased news source tell the Dixon-Yates story once again. Here it is, as related in Washington Atomic Energy Report of April 20, 1959:

THE CASE OF THE TWO HATS

(Probably no other event in recent years has had more official and political repercussions than the Dixon-Yates case. It rocked AEC and other Government agencies; upset the White House; agitated Congress. Another chapter is presented in the fact-finding report of the Commissioner of the Court of Claims on the damage suit filed by the Dixon-Yates interests over the cancellation of the controversial power contract. A news summary of the commissioner's report is published for the first time by the Washington Atomic Energy Report and Guideletter.)

In the celebrated Dixon-Yates affair, did Adolphe H. Wenzell wear two hats, one as a vice president of the First Boston Co., an investment house, which expected to finance the $110 million powerplant deal, and the other as a consultant of the Budget Bureau which initiated it?

In a 183-page report containing 246 findings of fact, U.S. Court of Claims Commissioner Wilson Cowen concludes that he did, both at the same time on occasion. The court must now determine whether it constituted a conflict of interest which, the Government contends, justified the cancellation of the Dixon-Yates contract.

The commissioner's report leaves the conflict of interest issue virtually the only one before the court in deciding the damage suit brought against the Government over the termination of the contract by Mississippi Valley Generating Co., et al, more generally known as Dixon-Yates. Commissioner Cowen in findings indicated that four other defenses to the suit raised by the Government are, at best, weak. There was no finding of fraud.

A tidy sum hangs on the outcome; also some personal reputations. Calculated from the commissioner's report, it is around $1,893,961. If the Government is found liable, some post-petition claims will be added.

The court recently considered arguments on the Commissioner's findings. Dixon-Yates interests took no exceptions. The Government took eight, all of them directed at the amount of the damages sought by various claimants.

Legal experts agree that the Court's decision will not be easy to reach, especially since the commissioners's report discloses that Wenzell's dual role was no secret to participants in the Dixon-Yates discussions. Wenzell's superiors in the Budget Bureau were aware of it, so were many others. Generally everybody seemed to know about it except the President who ordered the negotiation of the contract and its eventual termination.

The commissioner's report discloses that the President at a White House conference June 14, 1954, instructed AEC to proceed with the negotiation of a contract with Dixon-Yates for the construction of a power plant at West Memphis, Ark., to supply TVA with replacement power consumed by the AEC installation at Paducah, Ky. The report notes that conference was attended by Budget Director Rowland R. Hughes, AEC Chairman Lewis L. Strauss and unnamed "Congressional leaders." At that time, the report, Hughes, now deceased, knew that Wenzell had been wearing two hats in the preliminary arrangements. Strauss, Cowen reports, knew that Wenzell was a vice president of the First Boston Co., but denied knowing that he was representing the Budget Bureau in the Dixon-Yates discussions though their first meeting was arranged by Hughes, who was the Assistant Budget Director.

The commissioner's report on Strauss' knowledge of Wenzell's role assumes additional significance at this time when the Senate opponents of the former AEC Chairman have revived the Dixon-Yates case in a fight to prevent his confirmation as Secretary of Commerce, a position he is holding under a recess appointment. Of the first meeting between Wenzell and Strauss, the report states:

"Wenzell told Strauss he was there at the request of Hughes and was trying to get some background on the program and plan.

Strauss had never met Wenzell before, and there is conflict in the testimony of Wenzell and Strauss as to whether Wenzell stated he was connected with the Bureau of the Budget. The greater weight of the evidence shows that Hughes told Strauss that Wenzell was a banker connected with the First Boston Co. as an officer or a partner, and that Strauss was to acquaint Wenzell with the background and purpose of the meeting to be held on January 20, 1954.

"Strauss assumed that Wenzell was to attend the meeting to advise all concerned on matters within his competence. Strauss was aware that the cost of money, i.e., the interest rate on the securities which might be issued by the private utility companies, was an important element in the total cost to the Government of any facilities that might be constructed, Strauss stated that AEC was trying to move forwardly with the program that Hughes had outlined to Wenzell. Strauss also emphasized that it was important that the private utility companies give serious consideration to the matter to be discussed and that it be handled without delay. Wenzell told Strauss that he was a vice president of First Boston, and Strauss stated he was familiar with the firm. It was then arranged that Wenzell would discuss the matter the following day with Williams (Walter J. Williams, the AEC general manager)."

Elsewhere, the Cowen report further emphasizes that Strauss knew Wenzell only as an officer of First Boston, but nowhere is it mentioned that Strauss thought anything about the propriety of an outside investment banker sitting in on private Government discussions, though the fact was soon to bother First Boston, Dixon-Yates and Wenzell himself. Another curious finding in Cowen's report is that AEC officials all along regarded Wenzell as a consultant of the Budget Bureau, and that they did not know until much later of his First Boston connection through it was common knowledge among their opposite members in the Budget Bureau.

According to the commissioner's report, genesis of the Dixon-Yates case was in the President's state of the Union message of February 2, 1953, in which it was stated that the new administration's policy would seek to have either private enterprise or local communities provide power generating sources in partnership with the Government. Consequently, Joseph M. Dodge, then Budget Director, eliminated a TVA request for funds to build a new plant at TVA at Fulton, Tenn., to meet expanding TVA needs in the Memphis area.

Three months and three telephone calls later, George D. Woods, First Boston board chairman, came to Washington to see Dodge, said he was wholeheartedly in favor of the administration's policy, and volunteered his help in carrying it out. By coincidence, Dodge at the very moment had his mind on TVA subsidies and told Woods he was looking around for a man to study the subject. Woods said he just happened to have such a man available, Wenzell. Four days later Wenzell went to work for the Budget Bureau on a part-time basis as an unpaid consultant.

Wenzell finished the TVA study the following September. A major recommendation of his report to Dodge was that the TVA's power system be gradually turned over to private investors. The commissioner's report finds that Dodge was not impressed by Wenzell's recommendations and that his report was not a factor in the policy decision later communicated by Dodge to Strauss that AEC should contract for more private power to relieve the demands on TVA. However, Dodge wrote Wenzell complimenting him on an "extremely valuable constribution, not only for the material contained in it but its use as a foundation for further studies on the same subject." Dodge also told Wenzell that the report "has been examined by two important individuals whose reaction to your work equals my own." The individuals referred to, Commissioner Cowen says, were President Eisenhower and Ex-President Hoover. Wenzell was permitted to retain a copy of the report which he subsequently showed to Woods through the commissioner notes that he had no authority from the Budget Bureau to do so.

Wenzell returned to the Budget Bureau in January 1954. By that time the Dodge-Strauss program from which the Dixon-Yates deal later emerged was jelling rapidly, and Dodge, at the suggestion of Hughes, the commissioner's report relates, authorized Wenzells' return to work on comparative cost figures for the Fulton plant and the proposed private project with particular reference to the cost of money. He continued his connection with the Bureau until April 3, 1954, 10 days before the Dixon-Yates proposal was formally submitted to AEC. Meanwhile, he was a prominent participant in the preliminary planning, though he did not take part later in the actual negotiation of the contract.

It was not long after Wenzell's return to the Bureau that misgivings arose over his dual position. The Cowen report relates that Edgar H. Dixon, president of Middle South Utilities who put the Dixon-Yates program together, spoke to his counsel, Daniel James, about Wenzell's activities. At James' suggestion, Dixon mentioned the matter to Wenzell with the suggestion that he speak both to First Boston and the Budget Bureau about it, saying that it might be extremely embarrassing if First Boston was engaged to handle the financing of the West Memphis project.

The Commissioner's findings note that Wenzell, accepting Dixon's advice, first spoke to Hughes, who thought he was "exaggerating the importance of the matter" but said he should talk with counsel of First Boston about it and then talk to Dodge. A few days afterward Wenzell consulted First Boston's law firm, Sullivan & Cromwell, and was advised to resign forthwith though counsel indicated no conflict of interest was involved. If AEC officials working on the Dixon-Yates matter seemed not to have noticed Wenzell's two hats, it was generally known around the Budget Bureau. One associate, E. J. Donnelly, told him bluntly that he was "working both sides of the street," and was likely to get into serious trouble, the report asserts. Wenzell expressed his own concern to Dodge afterward telling an associate that the conversation was very satisfactory. Anyway, he never resigned.

Wenzell's own concern about his dual activities does not seem to have troubled him too deeply. A finding by Commissioner Cowen says that "he did not consider that he was advising parties whose interests were in conflict. He did not feel by his meetings, and telephone conversations with representatives of the sponsors (Dixon-Yates), by obtaining and giving to them First Boston's opinion on the cost of interest, by preparing and showing them the February 24 (1954) draft of an opinion on interest rates and by engaging in other activities * * * he was giving advice and assistance to parties whose interests were different from those of the Budget Bureau, because he felt that the sponsors' interests and the Government's interests in all these matters were common."

The report of Commissioner Cowen presents a chronological history of the tortuous route of the Dixon-Yates deal through the Government. Among many interesting things it discloses is the fact that TVA opposed the plan until Gen. Herbert D. Vogel became chairman on Sept. 1, 1954 and 2 days later joined AEC General Manager, K. D. Nichols in a public statement that the two agencies were pulling together. Hughes brushed aside objections of the city of Memphis to the project as irrelevant saying that the Dixon-Yates power would be sold to AEC and not the city. However, it was the announcement by Memphis officials that the city would build its plant rather than take power through Dixon-Yates that ostensibly caused the President to cancel the contract, though this was not the legal reason. It appears that at no time did AEC consult Memphis officials about the matter. AEC voted to accept the Dixon-Yates proposal as a basis for contract negotiations, 2 to 0. Strauss and Joseph Campbell, now U.S. Comptroller General, voted for it. Commissioner Murray abstained, as did Commissioner Libby, a newcomer. The contract itself was subsequently accepted by the Commission without a dissenting vote, the report notes.

During the course of the litigation, original claims for damages were scaled down in the amount of $1,468,352.86 by the withdrawal of several claimants. Claims withdrawn were those of Babcock & Wilcox, $204,216.40; Bowers & Wood Manufacturing Co., $15,978.72; Elliott Co., $11,890; Fisher Steel Corp., $14,949; Griscom-Russel Co., $5,961; Westinghouse Electric Corp., $1,208,743; and Worthington Corp, $6,613.

The commissioner's report finds the remaining claims generally fair and reasonable. In some cases, judgment has been stipulated by the Government should the Court of Claims find the Government liable. The claims are Dickman-Pickens-Bond Construction Co., $14,553 (stipulated); J. A. Jones Construction Co., $143,160, balance after payment of $100,000 on account by Dixon-Yates (costs have been stipulated as fair); Pandick Press, Inc., $43,338 for printing (Government contends all work is not proper item); Reid & Priest, legal services $7,097 (stipulated); House Moses & Jones, legal services $7,500 (stipulated); Arthur Andersen & Co., accounting services, $16,469.

Middle South Utilities, Inc., a parent company of Dixon-Yates, $4,455; Southern Co., the other parent company, $29,391 (Government disputes both items); Arkansas Power & Light Co., $7,484 (stipulated); First National City Bank of New York and White & Case, $500 each for trustee services (stipulated); Mississippi Valley Generating Co. (Dixon-Yates), $618,674 covering payments to Ebasco Services, Inc., in amounts of $216,559 and $183,861, and NVG's own charges of $218,254 (Government contends the $216,559 payment is unreasonable), Ebasco Services, Inc., $507,727.

Cahill, Gordon, Reindel & Ohl, $235,198; Winthrop Stimson, Putman & Roberts, $104,128; Wilkie, Owen, Farr, Gallagher & Watson, $75,878, and Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, $15,000. The last four claimants are New York City law firms which performed services in connection with the Dixon-Yates matter. The commissioner's report calls their claims fair and reasonable.

Ocean Vessels Dock in Chicago in 2 Weeks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it will interest my colleagues from other sections of our country to learn that in 2 weeks, beginning with the last days of April and extending into the first week

of May, no fewer than 38 large ocean vessels will sail through the St. Lawrence Seaway, dock at the terminal port of Chicago and from there proceed to ports in Europe, the Baltic, the Mediterranean, the Caribbean, and South America, the Red Sea and Persian Gulf, and the United Kingdom. Here is the schedule of Chicago ship sailings, as published in the Chicago Tribune of April 13, 1959, and proof conclusive that Chicago is well started on her way to become the first inland seaport of the world.

CHICAGO SHIP SAILINGS

CONTINENTAL PORTS

Ship and line	Sailing date
Francisca Sartori (Hamburg Chicago)	Apr. 26
Prins Willem III (Fjell-Oranje)	Apr. 28
Transontario (Poseidon)	Apr. 28
Alstertol (French)	Apr. 30
Erholm [1] (Swedish American)	Apr. 30
Lukseffjell (Fjell-Oranje)	Apr. 30
Rina (Nordlake)	Apr. 30
Virgilio (Hamburg Chicago)	Apr. 30
Weissenburg (Hamburg Chicago)	Apr. 30
Ville de Quebec (French)	May 6
Christa (Hamburg Chicago)	May 7
Fairwind (Hamburg Chicago)	May 7
Bykleffjell (Fjell-Oranje)	May 8
Ingrid Weide (Poseidon)	May 8

SCANDINAVIAN AND BALTIC

Fredborg (Swedish Chicago)	Apr. 27
Ravneffjell (Fjell and Fjord)	Apr. 27
Monica Smith (Swedish Chicago)	May 9
Lyngenfjord (Fjell and Fjord)	May 11

MEDITERRANEAN

Anglian (Ellerman Great Lakes)	Apr. 28
Pierre (Montship-Capo)	Apr. 28
Prins Johan Willem Friso (Niagara)	Apr. 28
Marquette (Fabre)	Apr. 29
Extavia (American Export)	May 5
Tamar (Zim Israel)	May 5
Michigan (Fabre)	May 9

CARIBBEAN AND SOUTH AMERICA

Clemens Sartori (Michigan Ocean)	Apr. 27
Santa Regina (Grace)	Apr. 27
Santa Alicia (Grace)	May 4
Heinrich Schulte (Transcaribbean)	May 8

UNITED KINGDOM ONLY

Fairhead (Head)	Apr. 28
Bengazi (Concordia)	Apr. 30
Manchester Faith (Manchester L.L.)	May 4
Beechmore (Furness Great Lakes)	May 5
Toronto City (Bristol City)	May 5
Signeborg (Niagara)	May 6
Manchester Prospector (Manchester L.L.)	May 9
Palermo (Ellerman's Wilson)	May 9

RED SEA AND PERSIAN GULF

Thunderbird (Cresent)	May 7

[1] Also Scandinavian and Baltic.

Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include the accompanying article in the Chicago Tribune of April 13, 1959, as follows:

(By Nick Poulos)

The historic moment Chicago has been waiting and preparing for in the last 5 years is rapidly approaching—the opening in a matter of days of the enlarged St. Lawrence Seaway.

Soon the first big oceangoing ships will sail through the vastly improved seaway route from Montreal into Lake Ontario, then lifted about 325 feet by the Welland Canal locks to the level of Lake Erie, race through Lake Huron and Lake Michigan, and head for the terminal port of Chicago.

And Chicago is ready.

COST $471 MILLION

While the $471 million seaway was being built by the United States and Canada—work began in the autumn of 1954—Chicago was busy preparing to assume its role as a new world port.

What are generally recognized as among the most modern and finest port facilities in the world have been built at Lake Calumet. Together with the downtown harbor development at Navy pier, Chicago, for the time being is ready to handle the expected traffic in 1959.

American-flag ships, for the first time, will join the foreign-flag vessels engaged in the Great Lakes-overseas trade.

Grace Line, Inc., was the first domestic steamship company, to be awarded a subsidy contract by the Federal Maritme Board to operate a shipping route between the Great Lakes and overseas ports.

OTHERS TO GET SUBSIDIES

Other U.S. lines are expected to receive operating subsidies to participate in the trade.

With this publication, the Chicago Tribune resumes printing of the sailing schedule of ships engaged in the trade. Departure dates of the ships from Chicago and their oversea port of call area will be listed each Monday throughout the shipping season.

The Tribune was the first Chicago newspaper to publish a Chicago ship sailings schedule.

Foreign-flag ships made a total of 365 calls at the port of Chicago in 1958, an increase of 35 percent from 1957 when 272 calls were made. They flew the flags of 11 oversea countries.

About 500 calls may be made at Chicago this season by ships engaged in the oversea trade.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer, plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va.*
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.* 6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind.* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J.*
Albert, Carl, *Okla.* 5115 Allen Terrace
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C.*
Alford, Dale, *Ark.*
Alger, Bruce, *Tex.*
Allen, Leo E., *Ill.* University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn.* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Anderson, LeRoy H., *Mont.* 911 Beverly Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Andrews, George W., *Ala.* 3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y.*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill.* 4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio.*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C.*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo.* Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J.* 113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans.*
Ayres, William H., *Ohio.*
Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va.*
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn.*
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif.*
Barden, Graham A., *N. C.* 2601 Woodley Pl.
Baring, Walter S., *Nev.*
Barr, Joseph W., *Ind.* Tulip Lane and Glen Mill Rd., Rockville Md.
Barrett, William A., *Pa.*
Barry, Robert R., *N. Y.*
Bass, Perkins, *N. H.*
Bass, Ross, *Tenn.*
Bates, William H., *Mass.*
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio.*
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y.*
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex.*
Belcher, Page, *Okla.*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla.* 1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich.* 3718 Cardiff Rd., Chevy Chase, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich.*
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak.* 118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio.*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn.*
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, (Mrs.), *Ga.*
Boggs, Hale, *La.*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass.*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo.* 3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.* 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C.* Calvert-Woodley
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y.*
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio.* 4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowles, Chester, *Conn.*
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala.* The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill.*
Brademas, John, *Ind.*
Bray, William G., *Ind.*
Breeding, J. Floyd, *Kans.*
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md.*
Brock, Lawrence, *Nebr.*
Brooks, Jack, *Tex.*
Brooks, Overton, *La.* 4413 46th St.
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*
Brown, Charles H., *Mo.* 3723 N. Oakland St., Arlington, Va.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio.* Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga.* Boston House
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va.*
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y.*
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho.*
Burdick, Quentin, *N. Dak.*
Burke, Frank W., *Ky.*
Burke, James A., *Mass.*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex.* 2737 Devonshire Pl.
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa.*
Byrne, James A., *Pa.*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis.* 1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Cahill, William T., *N. J.*
Canfield, Gordon, *N. J.*
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo.*
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo.*
Carter, Steven V., *Iowa.*
Casey, Bob, *Tex.*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich.*
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y.* The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky.*
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo.*
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill.* 1713 House Office Building
Church, Marguerite Stitt (Mrs.), *Ill.* 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa.* 3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Coad, Merwin, *Iowa.*
Coffin, Frank M., *Maine.*
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif.* 2820 Ordway St.
Collier, Harold R., *Ill.*
Colmer, William M., *Miss.*
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass.*
Cook, Robert E., *Ohio.*
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C.* 2480 16th St.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa.*
Cramer, William C., *Fla.* 6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr.* 4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa.*
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass.* 3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo.*
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn.*
Dague, Paul B., *Pa.*
Daniels, Dominick V., *N. J.*
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn.* 4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, James C., *Ga.*
Dawson, William L., *Ill.*
Delaney, James J., *N. Y.*
Dent, John H., *Pa.*
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind.*
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y.*
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill.*
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio.*
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich.*
Dingell, John D., *Mich.*
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah.* 1817 N. Quinn St., Arlington, Va.
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y.*
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass.*
Dooley, Edwin B., *N. Y.*
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y.*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C.*
Dowdy, John, *Tex.*
Downing, Thomas N., *Va.*
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif.* 3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N. Y.*
Durham, Carl T., *N. C.* The Lee House
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N. J.*
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla.*
Elliott, Carl, *Ala.*
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn.*
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn.* 5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md.*
Farbstein, Leonard, *N. Y.*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla.*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio.*
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa.* 3725 Macomb St.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y.*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex.* Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa.* The Congressional
Flynn, Gerald T., *Wis.*
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga.*
Fogarty, John E., *R. I.* 1133 House Office Building
Foley, John R., *Md.*
Forand, Aime J., *R. I.* 4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich.* 514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga.*
Fountain, L. H., *N. C.* The Westchester
Frazier, James B., Jr., *Tenn.* Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J.* 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md.*
Fulton, James G., *Pa.*
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N. J.*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md.*
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va.*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark.* 6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa.*
George, Newell A., *Kans.*
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn.*
Glenn, Milton W., *N. J.* Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Granahan, Kathryn E. (Mrs.), *Pa.*
Grant, George M., *Ala.* 4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill.*
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg.*
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa.*
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich.*
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa.*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif.*
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif.*
Haley, James A., *Fla.*
Hall, David M., *N. C.*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind.* 4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N. Y.*
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va.*
Hargis, Denver D., *Kans.*
Harmon, Randall S., *Ind.*
Harris, Oren, *Ark.* 1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va.*
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio.* 1323 Barger Drive, Falls Church, Va.
Healey, James C., *N. Y.*
Hébert, F. Edward, *La.* 26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va.*
Hemphill, Robert W., *S. C.*
Henderson, John E., *Ohio.*
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla.*
Hess, William E., *Ohio.*
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif.*
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa.* 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich.* 3018 M St. SE.
Hoffman, Elmer J., *Ill.*
Hogan, Earl, *Ind.* 5211 Flanders Ave., Garrett Pk., Kensington, Md.
Holifield, Chet, *Calif.*
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa.*
Holt, Joe, *Calif.*
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y.*
Horan, Walt, *Wash.*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif.*
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala.*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo.*
Ikard, Frank, *Tex.*
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn.* The Coronet
Jackson, Donald L., *Calif.*
Jarman, John, *Okla.*
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va.*
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa.* 2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich.*
Johnson, Byron L., *Colo.*
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif.*
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis.*
Johnson, Thomas F., *Md.*
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C.*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo.* 1111 Army Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala.*
Judd, Walter H., *Minn.* 3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo.*
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn.*
Kasem, George A., *Calif.*
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa.* Sheraton-Park
Kee, Elizabeth (Mrs.), *W. Va.*
Keith, Hastings, *Mass.*
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N. Y.*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y.* The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y.*
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex.* 3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex.* 4848 Upton St.
King, Cecil R., *Calif.*
King, David S., *Utah.*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio.*
Kitchin, A. Paul, *N. C.*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill.*
Knox, Victor A., *Mich.*
Kowalski, Frank, *Conn.*
Lafore, John A., Jr., *Pa.*
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis.*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga.*

Appendix

The Speaker's Views on Party Loyalty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK BROOKS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to take this opportunity to call to the Members' attention a timely editorial comment concerning American political party loyalty.

The responsible operation of the two major political parties in our country is as fundamental to the contemporary operation of our Federal Government as the Constitution itself. Without responsible and dedicated leadership of our major political parties, violence, chaos, and catastrophe might well be the pattern set in our own country as it has been demonstrated in other countries where men have taken political obligations lightly.

Our Speaker has emphasized:

I have no patience with people who claim to be Democrats who say they want to run other people who claim to be Democrats out of the party. Let us differ; let us debate; let us struggle to have our views prevail in the party's council.

The Beaumont (Tex.) Journal has amplified the Speaker's forthright views and has clearly set forth the basis of political party loyalty for both Democrats and Republicans in their editorial of March 11, 1959. I heartily commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

RAYBURN RAPS DISLOYALTY

The Democratic Party is a many-splendored thing.

So infers Texas' Representative SAM RAYBURN—"Mr. Democrat" himself—in appealing for a united party to recapture the White House in 1960.

"I have no patience with people who claim to be Democrats who say they want to run other people who claim to be Democrats out of the party. Let us differ; let us debate; let us struggle to have our views prevail in the party's council."

House Speaker SAM is not simply sounding off when he makes this statement. He is trying to get across to the people in split sections of the party the fact that the party is a political platform and that the platform is broad enough and long enough to accommodate every last one of them.

One doesn't, as a usual thing, quit a particular denominational church because he doesn't like the pastor or feel that some other members are not pious enough to please him. He stays in the church until a new pastor, more to his liking, is named. And the same goes with the fellow members.

Unless he dislikes the church itself, it is a wise member who realizes that the church is bigger than its pastor or any given segment of its membership.

The same logic applies to a political party, whether it be Democrat or Republican. That is the message the durable SAM RAYBURN wants to get across to members of his party.

Address by Hon. Stuart Symington, of Missouri, Before Democratic City Committee of Philadelphia, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH S. CLARK
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on Tuesday of this week the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] was the principal speaker at the annual Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner of the Democratic City Committee of Philadelphia, Pa.

Before an enthusiastic audience of 4,000 loyal Democrats, the Senator from Missouri delivered a splendid address dealing with many national problems, but in particular with the critical problems of urban affairs.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the address may appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR STUART SYMINGTON AT DEMOCRATIC CITY COMMITTEE DINNER, PHILADELPHIA, PA., APRIL 21, 1959

Thank you for asking me to Philadelphia tonight. It is always a pleasure to be among Democrats; and I know there are no better Democrats in the world than those of Philadelphia and Pennsylvania.

It is good to see your able Representatives in the House from Philadelphia—BILL BARRETT; JIM BYRNE; BOB NIX; HERMAN TOLL; that very gracious lady KATHRYN GRANAHAN; and your very able city chairman, my old and good friend, BILL GREEN.

Over 14 years ago I used to appear before BILL'S committee in the Congress, and learned to respect his understanding and judgment.

It is a pleasure to be here with your outstanding mayor, and my old schoolmate, Dick Dilworth. I know Philadelphians will show good judgment this year by reelecting him. He has dedicated his energies to a better Philadelphia, and deserves to be reelected by a landslide.

It is a privilege to work in the Senate with another capable and courageous Pennsylvanian, JOE CLARK, who is making a fine record as a Senator. He and I are together on what is needed for the future of this country, and I am mighty proud to be his colleague.

And now, may I congratulate the people of Pennsylvania for their wisdom in electing as their Governor another old and good friend, Dave Lawrence.

Governor Lawrence has already begun building a record as Governor which bids to match his magnificent record as Mayor of Pittsburgh. He is uniformly acknowledged to be one of the outstanding Democrats of our time—and I am equally proud to be with him here tonight.

The people of Philadelphia and Pennsylvania are responsive to their Democratic government because that government has been responsive to the people.

That is not true of our national administration—and this, my friends, is the reason why, in 1960, the people will vote out the apostles of indifference, delay and retrenchment—and vote in a Democratic President.

We have been hearing over-much in the last few months about what the United States can and cannot afford. Judging by some of the pronouncements issuing from Washington, we are teetering on the edge of economic collapse.

As one who passed the better part of his lifetime in industry and business, I believe I know as well as the next man how to read a balance sheet and understand the dangers of living beyond one's means.

Let me, therefore, assert my firm belief that the issue, as it has been presented to the country by the Republican myth-makers, is as phony as can be.

The so-called split between "spenders" and "savers" is another Madison Avenue confection, served up to grab the headlines.

The issue is not solvency or waste, spending or saving. The issue is how our vast national energies will be divided and what priorities will be assigned to which tasks.

No one can look realistically at the state of the American economy and come away with any impression that we are bankrupt, or nearly so.

Never in the long history of mankind has one nation been so bountifully endowed with wealth and the means of producing further wealth. Never in history has a nation had so little cause to misdoubt its basic economic strength.

And yet within this picture of great good health, there are disturbing symptoms, not of overall weakness, but of selective sickness here and there in vital sectors of the economy.

Despite the great fuss and beating of drums in Washington 2 weeks ago, the fact is that more than four and a quarter million Americans are still out of work. And while I share the President's pleasure at the improvement in employment figures, I'm afraid it is a little early to recite a funeral oration over the dead body of the late recession.

We Democrats hope that the worst is over. But this recession has been a strange beast from first to last, and it seems to me that there are still some soft spots which need watching.

For one thing, this was not a uniform recession. Its effects were principally concentrated in a few key labor markets—Detroit, West Virginia, Pittsburgh, Scranton, Wilkes-Barre—to name some of them.

In several areas at one period unemployment topped 14 percent of the labor force. In these places, I regret to say, the recession is not yet over—whatever this Administration chooses to believe.

Furthermore, there are some worrisome clouds on the horizon. Our great steel industry is still below full capacity. But steel

inventories are piling up as buyers seek to protect themselves against a possible strike.

Nobody in his right mind wants a steel strike this summer. Yet, if there is no strike, will demand hold up or will there be another production slowdown and more layoffs? These are questions which trouble leading economists—everywhere, apparently, but at the Department of Commerce and the White House.

Meanwhile, the stock market continues its steady climb, oblivious to warnings that a stock certificate ought not to be confused with a parimutuel ticket.

Meanwhile, in the midst of partial recession, great riches, and wild speculation—we are short 140,000 classrooms and our great cities are in danger of being strangled to death by slums, traffic, rising costs, and declining incomes.

Unfortunately, the tendency in Washington has been to look at the wrong symptoms and to draw the wrong conclusions about the nature of the disease.

In the past year and a half, we have had prescribed for us a sirupy mixture of tight money and tidy slogans, and the one was as useless as the other was damaging.

I am persuaded that we have been approaching this situation from almost entirely the wrong direction.

We have been trying to contract the economy. We ought to be expanding it.

During the past 6 years our national economy has been growing at an average annual rate of about one and three-tenths percent. The Soviet economy during the same period has been growing at a rate two or three times as great.

In any case, the key question isn't how much growth but what kind.

A 50 percent increase in the production of chrome doodads can't be equated with national progress.

If we are to meet the Sino-Soviet challenge, what we need, among other things, is increased investment in our human resources through improvements in our educational system. We need more schools and more teachers. We need better colleges and better technical schools. We need more attention to training and retraining workers to the latest and most usable skills.

These needs are only illustrative. I am not making a talk this evening on what the United States needs to keep pace with Russia. The topic, I'm afraid, can't be exhausted in a sentence or two.

I do want to point out, however, that investment of this sort—in schools and colleges and in other public facilities—is not, as the Republicans contend, money taken from the pockets of private enterprise.

Quite the reverse.

Who builds our schools? Private enterprise. Who supplies the raw materials? Private enterprise. Who does the work? American labor.

If you put up a half million dollar school building on the outskirts of Philadelphia, you don't take that much cash, put it in a weighted sack and throw it in the Delaware River. You pay it to builders who pay it to employees and suppliers who pay it to still more employees and suppliers and so forth.

Economists who study these things say money invested in public works turns over about four times. They call this the multiplier effect. Which means, simply, that a billion dollars invested in schools adds about $4 billion to the gross national product.

So I don't accept the Republican dogma that all public spending is evil. Employed with careful attention to sound fiscal and tax policy, public investment could do a great deal to end this leftover recession with its terrible after-effects.

With this foundation, may I turn now, in the few minutes remaining, to the subject of metropolitan area needs.

It has been the custom during this administration to treat our great cities as if they were beggars with their hands eternally outstretched.

In face of the fact that about 15 million Americans still live in substandard housing—most of it in large cities—the administration has up to now successfully obstructed all efforts to provide an adequate slum clearance and urban renewal program. The current housing bill is menaced by the threat of Presidential veto.

So is the airport construction bill. So is the depressed areas bill.

If these bills do pass finally, it will probably be because they have been scaled down in advance to meet White House objections.

The Republicans claim—and I have no doubt that most do so sincerely—that they do not oppose these programs as such.

They oppose them, first, they say, because the programs are too costly and, second, because the cities ought to do the job themselves.

These are seductive arguments and they convince a lot of people. But they are just not true.

The cost argument I have already refuted. We can afford these programs a lot better than we can afford run-down cities and wasted human lives. Any business which allowed its plant facilities to deteriorate would soon be outstripped by its competitors. And the same applies to a government.

City problems do not stop conveniently at city lines. Since the end of World War II, the motor car has created a new metropolitan America. City and suburb are one and their problems are one. But their governments are many.

We have 180 metropolitan areas in the United States. These areas contain 60 percent of all our people. More than a third of them comprise two or more counties. Twenty-four cross State lines. Twenty-nine others are flat up against the borders of States.

These 180 areas contain nearly 16,000 individual governments, including about 3,500 municipalities and 2,500 townships.

Where does local responsibility fit into this picture?

It's there all right. I'm not suggesting that the Federal Government should be the source from which all things flow. But let's be careful how we toss around this concept of local responsibility.

We can't reasonably expect our cities to be responsible for things over which they do not have sufficient control.

Yet our Federal Government seems scarcely to recognize the existence of a metropolitan problem. In fact, of all the thousands and thousands of Federal programs now on the books, there is only one which specifically concedes the existence of such a problem. That one is a relatively modest planning assistance program in the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

The administration's almost total indifference to metropolitan problems has led some to suggest creation of a cabinet level Department of Urban Affairs. This suggestion deserves careful consideration.

Certainly some action is required in this field, and soon. Already a 600-mile long super-metropolis is growing together between Boston and Washington. Others are beginning to form between Los Angeles and San Diego, Seattle and Tacoma, Pittsburgh and Cleveland, Chicago and Milwaukee.

These problems, in other words, are in their infancy. Traffic will get worse before it gets better. Congestion is increasing. Urban renewal will demand more energy and more money instead of less.

The Federal Government cannot shirk its responsibility in this field.

The proposal your outstanding senior Senator JOE CLARK has made for a Hoover Commission-type study of urban and metropolitan needs deserves the support of every thinking American. Such a study is long overdue.

This ought not to be a partisan question. But there is no mistaking the fact that it is.

The Republican National Committee itself noted on April 7 that its election disaster in 1958 was administered largely by urban voters, who are bone tired of evasions and mealy-mouthed moralism.

The time has come for action.

I have long felt that there is no such thing in history as standing still. Either a nation moves forward resolutely and unafraid, or it falls. You cannot fight a successful delaying action against the future. You either master decay or decay masters you.

I'm convinced that our cities can be rescued from blight—given the proper mixture of ingenuity and resolution. The entire country knows what has been done here in the city of Philadelphia, in Pittsburgh, and in my own cities of St. Louis and Kansas City.

Given the support of the Federal Government in those needs where Federal support is indispensable, we can and will solve the problems of our cities.

And if there is no immediate victory in gaining this support, do not despair. It is of such defeats that future victories are born.

The President's Speech on the Berlin Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, in the March 21 issue of the publication entitled "The Guardian," published by the 2d Battle Group, of the 6th Infantry, stationed in Europe, a young man from my State, J. Ronald Scruggs, of Gadsden, Ala., wrote a very interesting column, in the nature of an editorial, dealing with the speech President Eisenhower made relating to the Berlin situation. The article is entitled "Ike Stands Firm in Nationwide Speech." I ask unanimous consent that this thought-provoking article by a young soldier 19 years old, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IKE STANDS FIRM IN NATIONWIDE SPEECH

President Eisenhower's speech of March 16 examined the situation and told of our Berlin stand.

"In a divided world Berlin has been, for a decade, a symbol of freedom. But recently its name has come to symbolize, also, the efforts of imperialistic communism to divide the free world, to throw us off balance and to weaken our will for making certain of our collective security.

"The Soviets proposed a vague offer to make the western part of Berlin—though not the eastern part, which the Soviets control—a so-called free city. It is by no means clear what West Berlin would be free from, except perhaps freedom itself. It would not be free from the ever-present danger of Communist domination."

The President stated three fundamental choices we had in this situation.

The first choice of abdicating our rights is definitely unacceptable. The next choice

which we are compelled to face is the possibility of war. Though the West does not want war, for it realizes this could mean the destruction of civilization, history has taught us no nation has ever been successful in avoiding the terrors of war by refusing to defend its rights. Whatever risk of armed conflict may be inherent in the present Berlin situation, it was deliberately created by the Soviet rulers. Our final choice is negotiation, even while we continue to provide for our security against every threat.

There must be a clear understanding of what we cannot do.

We cannot agree to any permanent and compulsory division of the German nation, nor can we purchase peace by forsaking 2 million free people of West Berlin. We cannot recognize the asserted right of any nation to dishonor its international agreements whenever it chooses. We must not, by weakness or irresolution, increase the risk of war. Finally, we cannot accept any agreement or arrangement which would undermine the security of the United States and its allies.

Our position, then, is this: We will not retreat 1 inch from our duty. We shall continue to exercise our right of peaceful passage to and from West Berlin. We will not be the first to break the peace; it is the Soviets who threaten the use of force to interfere with such free passage. We are ready to participate fully in every sincere effort at negotiation that will respect the existing rights of all and their opportunity to live in peace.

West Berlin's Willy Brandt and Chancellor Konrad Adenauer were both pleased with the speech. The Berlin leader thanked the President for the firm attitude which he displayed and Adenauer stated he was gratified that Mr. Eisenhower did not leave any doubt about the U.S. determination to hold its Berlin position under all circumstances.

The East German press attacked the speech saying "Eisenhower threatens the Soviet Union," "Threatens unleashing of nuclear war," and "Eisenhower names conditions."

The week of April 6 finds the troop information topic "the Berlin story." It is vital to you, as a soldier, and as an American citizen. Every effort should be made to attend the class.

Schools Second to None

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, last Saturday evening our distinguished colleague, the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] delivered an address on education which I feel contains an urgent message for all Americans.

The Senator was speaking before the Texas Classroom Teachers Association at Dallas, and he addressed his remarks primarily to Texas school problems and Texas school attitudes. But I believe that his words conveyed truths which apply, not only to Texas, but to our Nation as a whole.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], who is himself a former teacher and a present member of the Senate Education Subcommittee, spoke of the educational challenge which is facing America today, and he indicated what he believes must be our approach if we are to meet that challenge.

Mr. President, in order that all of us in Congress, and all others, may be apprised of the insight and understanding of the Senator from Texas in this matter I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

SCHOOLS SECOND TO NONE

(Speech delivered by U.S. Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH at the Texas Classroom Teachers Association's annual convention banquet, Dallas, April 18, 1959)

Madam President, fellow teachers, fellow Texans, fellow Americans, you have paid me a great honor by inviting me to speak at the annual convention of your 23,000-member Texas Classroom Teachers Organization. On a broader plane, you really represent the highest ideals of all Texas classroom teachers, including those without your organization as well as those who are dues-paying members.

Vast as your influence over the next generation is, by your molding of the minds of that generation, you have not been content to leave your good works for fruition in the next generation alone. I came here in part to pay tribute to you for the privilege of working with you for the advancement of the aims and ideals of public education.

As a former classroom teacher in Henderson County public schools for 3 years and as a member of the Senate Education Subcommittee, I am deeply concerned about the progress and future of public education. I'm particularly concerned about it in Texas.

This does not mean that I am critical of you. On the contrary, the dedicated work you have done, despite inadequate pay and limited facilities, is magnificent. Thanks mainly to your devotion to duty, Texas has now, and over the past decade has generally had, better public schools than it paid for. It is a great credit to you and to our schools, that 56 percent of you—our active teachers—have earned a degree and 39 percent of you have your master's degree. Only two States, Arizona and Oklahoma, have a higher percentage of teachers who have earned degrees. Six percent of all Texans have 4 or more years of college—which ranks us 20th among the States in that category.

As a Texan I am proud that we have many outstanding schools and well qualified teachers in Texas—and that you graduate thousands of exceptionally well-educated students. But I believe we would fail in our public duty, if we did not take into account the rating of Texas public schools when compared with other States.

Our goal for Texas school children is "schools second to none." But we rank 33d, not first, in the percentage of our school-age children who are enrolled in school. Statistics show that approximately one out of every five of our school-age children is not attending school. We rank 39th, not first, in the average number of days attended per pupil enrolled in school per year. We Texans rank a poor 37th in the percent of selective service registrants disqualified by mental tests, and we rank 36th in the percent of population 25 years or older with at least 4 years of high school.

Texans—teachers, parents, and the majority of all our people—believe Texas schoolchildren should have schools "second to none."

What's more, I believe Texans can be counted on to support, financially and otherwise, efforts to strengthen our entire public school program. It is a matter of giving Texans the facts—of informing the man on the street of how, when, where, and why we need schools second to none. If we give the people the facts, Texans don't have to be sold such schools—they will demand them. But I don't believe the people of Texas will support a sales tax system to achieve these results.

A century and a quarter ago, our Texas forefathers revolted because of the failure of the General Government to establish a system of public education in Texas. Our proud State was ravaged by fire and by sword, her cities besieged, her towns burned, her heroes killed. But the right to a system of public education was won. Are we, the inheritors of those rights, to settle for anything less than the very best public education system for our children? Texans will not.

It is obvious that we have a long way to go to secure adequate funds for schools second to none. Your pay as teachers is completely inconsistent with the great responsibility that our democratic society places upon you. Within a few years schoolteachers' pay at elementary, high school and college levels should be doubled.

Proud, wealthy Texas is paying its classroom teachers an average of only $4,410 yearly, considerably below the national average. This is criminal neglect because the student is the casualty in the long run. As your representative in the Senate, I am working for substantial pay increases for you and for all teachers; raises in keeping with the dignity and responsibility of your task in and to society. Texas ranks 26th among the States in teacher pay. On the average, your pay is estimated to be $1,550 a year less than California teachers' salaries. We have a shortage in Texas alone of more than 2,000 teachers this year.

Many Texans, from widowed mothers to nationally known college professors, have written or phoned me of their shock and indignation at the action of the board of regents of our Texas State teachers colleges in refusing to permit students in five Texas State colleges to borrow funds from the Federal Government under the generous loan provisions of the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

The National Defense Education Act of 1958 was designed to start us on the road to higher educational achievement. The five colleges whose students were denied opportunities to seek that higher training were all established by the State of Texas to train teachers. The governing board of those colleges voted against the students, against the people of Texas, against the purpose for which it was created, and against its duty.

The regents of these five schools—Sam Houston State Teachers College, Southwest Texas State Teachers College, Stephen F. Austin, East Texas State, and Sul Ross College, have officially certified that they need $195,333 this year for student loans, these loans which bear no interest so long as the students are in college. The regents have turned their backs on the colleges they were appointed to serve. One of the great functions of higher education is to train teachers, who in turn, do so much to mold the character of the Nation.

The board has thrown up a roadblock against that training. Its order may jeopardize the opportunity of many Texas youths to continue college. Its order reminds me of a game warden caught shooting fawns, and out of season at that.

In denying these students their loans, on the specious grounds that it is Federal money, the board has shown a distrust of our Government unworthy of an official who has taken an oath to uphold that Government.

You cannot make democracy work by shooting holes in the American flag.

The board of regents of these colleges has made a decision which I would not want on

my conscience. If a single student drops out of a single one of these schools for lack of funds, the regents should be held accountable. Ironically, one of the colleges which the regents prohibited from participating in the loan program, has this statement of purpose printed on its letterhead:

"Founded to promote the advancement of the profession of teaching. Dedicated to the cause of better schools. Devoted to the welfare of children and youth."

It is my sincere hope that the board of regents of Texas State teachers colleges, for the good of the students, will reconsider its position on this matter. A total of $21,758 has been reserved out of the first moneys for the five colleges involved and more will be appropriated. If the regents finally deny this aid to their students, I shall make every effort to see that these funds are apportioned to other Texas students in other Texas colleges so that they will not be diverted to other States.

The Hale-Aikin committee study shows that in addition to higher teachers salaries, we need in Texas 3,373 new classrooms now for our rapidly increasing school-age population, and we will need 17,284 more classrooms by 1963. And in the Nation as whole, we need 140,000 new classrooms and need 135,000 more teachers now and the need is critical. Recent disasters have revealed that many classrooms are virtually firetraps that could easily turn into deathtraps for teachers and pupils.

To me the question is when, not where, we are going to get the money to meet these needs. The time is now. Educational opportunities missed by a child this year, may never return. Most Texans agree that we must and will maintain local control of our schools. We feel that wherever possible, schools should be supported by local funds. Where local funds are not available, the State should met the need. Where the State either cannot or will not meet the responsibility of giving Texas children superior schools, we should avail ourselves of Federal funds. We should be for all aid to education because the need for more funds in the field of education is so critical that revenues from local districts, cities, States and the Federal Government, all are required.

From all tax and private sources combined we spend only 4 percent of our gross national product on the education of our youth—not enough in today's competitive world.

We should also consider that Federal assistance to education might prove to be a far more preferable and fairer solution to our school fund problems than raising revenues through a State general sales tax.

It is time too that we dispel the myth that Federal assistance to schools has meant in the past, or will mean in the future, Federal control of schools. Despite the often-voiced fears from some quarters, Federal control of schools has never resulted from acts passed by Congress. And the acts pending in Congress expressly prohibit any Federal control.

In colonial days, schools were generally supported by the townships in New England, privately in the South, while the Middle Atlantic States had a combination system of church-supported schools, town schools, and private schools. There were no State colleges as such, though Massachusetts had established Harvard with public money in the 1630's.

Federal aid is no new fangled, New Deal, socialistic innovation. Such claims are based on ignorance of our history.

In 1790, the Father of the Country, George Washington, in his message to the First Congress of the United States said:

"Nor am I less persuaded that you will agree with me in the opinion that there is nothing which can better deserve your patronage than the promotion of science and literature. Knowledge is in every country the surest basis of public happiness. * * *

"Whether this desirable object will be best promoted by affording aids to seminaries of learning already established, by the institution of a national university, or by any other expedients will be well worthy of a place in the deliberations of the Legislature."

I have received some letters saying Federal aid to education would be unconstitutional. Well, George Washington was President of the Constitutional Convention which drafted the Constitution, and less than 1 year after it became effective he asked for Federal aid to education under it. I believe that George Washington knew as much about what the Constitution embraced as any modern opponent to a better educational system.

In 1862, the Congress passed the Morrill Land Grant College Act, setting aside Federal lands for the support of agricultural and engineering colleges—such as Texas A. & M. This is one example of Federal aid. And Texas A. & M. was the first public tax-supported institution of higher learning to open its doors in Texas.

Other examples of Federal aid without Federal control of education are schools built by the WPA in the thirties; educational benefits under the GI bill of rights, which I am working now to extend; grants-in-aid and research and fellowship programs such as those under the National Defense Education Act of 1958, which I cosponsored; public school milk and lunch programs which I am working to protect; funds for vocational education teachers, and others. Surely no reasonable person could say that these worthy programs have led to Federal domination of our schools.

The people should be informed of the history of American education. The principle of local financial support of schools grew out of the economic, political, and social ferment of the Jacksonian period during the struggle for universal public education. The truth is that local financial support of schools is not based upon any hallowed principle of democratic freedom, but is based to a great extent upon the reluctance of citizens of one community to pay taxes to help educate the children of another. This reluctance is understandable, but hardly worth considering in the light of our efforts to provide Texas youngsters with schools that are second to none.

I am old enough to remember when State aid to schools in Texas was begun on a large scale—many said it was socialistic and would destroy local control. Well, we are still electing trustees, and they are still hiring the teachers.

The demand of our democratic society for a higher degree of educational excellence grows with each passing day.

Some people seem to think that we can't afford to offer maximum educational opportunities in accordance with the inherent capabilities to all our youth. I say we can't afford to offer less. We cannot afford either having only half of our Texans educated, or having all Texans half-educated.

We hear a lot of talk these days about having to make a choice between quantity and quality in educational programs. It seems doubtful to me that any choice exists, for we must have both quantity and quality to survive. In this complex age of scientific advancement, we must have excellently trained specialists. But there certainly is no less demand for a generally informed people grounded in the humanities, who are prepared to make intelligent democratic decisions.

Like Ulysses in Tennyson's beautiful poem, our spirits must yearn—

"To follow knowledge like a sinking star
Beyond the utmost bound of human thought."

Basically, the cold war now raging between democracy and communism around the world is a struggle for the minds of men. Enlightenment has always been freemen's bulwark against tyranny. Education is the foundation stone of democracy, and it is an ever-increasing factor in the standard of living each man and his family can enjoy. Aristotle, when asked how much educated men were superior to those uneducated, answered, "As much as the living are to the dead." We cannot, we must not, and we will not continue to deny all our students an education of the first class.

Mass education of all the people, once an American monopoly, is fast coming to the whole world. We can maintain our leadership only by moving faster and working harder for educational progress than other countries now turning their efforts to mass education.

The parent, the teacher, the politician must all make up their minds that easy courses, little discipline, and stinted funds for education will never add up to high educational standards. They are more likely to produce mediocrity at a time when we must strive for educational excellence.

Never before in the history of man have the talents and the specially developed abilities of educated men been in more urgent demand. Never have the opportunities for educated, thinking, freemen have been so great. The next 10, 20, or 30 years will tell whether this Nation produces the large numbers of high-caliber citizens it so badly needs.

In the words of Abraham Lincoln, "We cannot escape history. * * * We will be remembered in spite of ourselves. No personal significance or insignificance can spare one or the other of us. The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down, in honor or dishonor, to the latest generation."

Here in Texas, where our State is making vast industrial and population growths, the need for more and better educated men and women is particularly great. We must meet this demand wherever we can by preparing our boys and girls for key roles in Texas destiny.

No other person has so important a role as you in meeting this challenge. The kind of greatness that Texas and this Nation produces in future years depends to a very large extent upon the learning and the values you will instill in our youth through our educational system. There is no more important job in the democratic way of life.

Education is the golden key that unlocks the barriers of poverty and prejudice, inequality and injustice. You are the keeper of the key which will give our boys and girls their greatest impetus in the pursuit of happiness.

You have done a remarkable job in the past, and I look forward to continue working with you toward our goal of Texas schools "second to none."

God bless you for your devotion to the cause to which you have dedicated your lives.

Proposed Civil Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, on Thursday, April 16, Georgia's able and distinguished young Governor, Hon. Ernest Vandiver, testified before a sub-

committee of the House Committee on the Judiciary in opposition to the so-called civil rights bills now pending before that body.

Governor Vandiver's sincere and eloquent presentation in behalf of the great rank and file of the people of Georgia constitutes a masterful declaration of, to use his words, the "mutual respect and common determination of Georgia people to fulfill Georgia's needs with Georgia resources within the framework of Georgia authority." The facts and figures which he cited stand as irrefutable proof of the impressive success which the State of Georgia is achieving in giving Georgia people of both races what he appropriately termed "the real civil rights—the right to be secure with knowledge—the rights which can be felt, used, tasted, enjoyed and enriched."

Governor Vandiver has thus made a significant contribution toward greater understanding of the problems, programs, attitudes and aspirations of the citizens of Georgia and the South; and his appeal for the rejection of "the malignant growth of sectional hatred, envy, and jealousy which permeates most of these bills" should be convincing to all who will read it with an open mind.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that his statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of the House Judiciary Subcommittee, permit me to express to you gentlemen my appreciation for extending me the courtesy of appearing before your subcommittee.

I am aware of the fact that you are now completing studies on a number of proposals pending before you and that you will file your report shortly with the full committee.

It would be presumptuous of me today to discuss the fine legal point sof these proposals, their content, their history, and their genesis. I will leave this area to my distinguished colleague, Mr. Charles J. Bloch, a distinguished attorney and recognized constitutional authority, who has accompanied me here and who will speak to you at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. Bloch has appeared before many committees of Congress in the past and I am sure is a man who is known to many of you either personally or by reputation. He is the author of the splendid book on constitutional law "States' Rights—The Law of the Land." In addition, he is a past president of the Georgia Bar Association, a past chairman of the Georgia Judicial Council, a former member of the State board of regents of the university system of Georgia, a former chairman of the Bibb County Democratic executive committee, a member of the State Democratic executive committee, and a holder of many other posts of responsibility and honor.

It is to him that I will leave the task of presenting an analysis of the purely legal and broad constitutional issues involved in this proposed legislation.

Rather, it shall be my purpose to convey to you in very general terms some of the anxiety which is held by the people of Georgia regarding the harsh nature of some of these so-called civil rights proposals. And to inform you of the very grave doubts in our minds as to their constitutional validity, whether their enactment is really needed and whether, if enacted, they would serve the best intercats of the masses of the people of the Nation.

I shall not at this time trace the history of our country or of our constitutional development other than to say that Georgia was one of the Original Thirteen Colonies, the representatives of which met to forge the bonds which link us in common union.

I shall not go into the fact that Georgia was one of the first States to adopt the Constitution and did so even before the addition of the precious Bill of Rights.

But I shall point with pride to the heritage we share as Americans, the acute problems which beset us in all areas of our country and the almost absolute necessity that these difficulties be approached with patience and understanding.

And I add with emphasis that patriotic Americans of good will must look for solutions to these problems, not by locking horns as some would have us do, but by locking arms, determined to find through faith and hard work satisfactory answers within the framework of State authority and conditions and practicalities as they actually exist, not as we would fancy them to be.

We cannot find these answers by destroying the Constitution of the United States of America.

We cannot find these answers by destroying the reserved rights of the several States and by concentrating more and more governmental power in Washington.

We cannot find these answers through the enactment of dangerous, misnamed, civil rights legislation which, in its cunning provisions, destroys more rights than are created.

From what I have read, there are three major proposals now pending in the Congress which may be summed up by reference to the Johnson bill (S. 499), the seven-point administration bill (H.R. 4457 and S. 942, S. 955, and S. 60), and the so-called liberal bills, as exemplified in H.R. 3147 and S. 810.

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, speaking the overwhelming sentiments of the people of Georgia, I must inform you of their deep concern over these bills. Not over their alleged objective of reinforcing the rights of any American citizen, but over what they would do to our form of government, if enacted, and the shambles in which they would leave constitutional processes.

These proposals are all negative in their fundamental aspects.

They seek to suppress symptoms by intimidation instead of offering concrete programs of tangible benefit designed to solve the problems which exist in like measure all over this land of ours.

Rights cannot be secured when power is granted to commit an injustice in the name of justice.

Rights cannot be secured by a government of men or through the naked force of the unsheathed bayonet or the butt of a rifle.

The protection of the civil rights of our citizenry lies not in the enactment of a welter of confusing, contradictory and unconstitutional laws but in a strict adherence to the constitutional guarantees, processes and prohibitions which already are the law of the land and which, without question, are adequate to meet every requirement of those who are concerned about protecting the rights of the American people.

Let the sacred Bill of Rights stand—it can't be improved upon.

Allow me here to make this observation.

Last year when the overwhelmingly Democratic Congress was elected, the pundits and "seasoned observers" predicted that this 1st session of the 86th Congress was going to be composed of a bunch of wild-eyed, long-haired Members who were going to pass, at the drop of a hat, all kinds of extreme legislation.

Coming as your membership did, fresh from the grassroots of America, I doubted that this conclusion was either accurate or justified.

Every responsible citizen with whom I have talked in my State and in others is proud and happy over the fact that this Congress has not turned out to be irresponsible as many misjudged it might and that the legislative process in this country still is sound and that the best interests of the great rank and file of the people come first and foremost.

It is for the great rank and file of the people of Georgia that I speak.

I do not attempt to speak for the small, almost single, handful of professional agitators that invade every State from time to time to stir up trouble and strife and to profit from the misery and misfortunes of others without contributing a single constructive suggestion for improving their lot.

It is with a high degree of satisfaction that I tell you, Georgians of both races have shown good judgment in not falling victim to the siren songs of extremist agitators.

We are making progress.

Free of meddling and outside interference, it will continue.

There is mutual respect and a common determination among all our people to fulfill their needs with Georgia resources within the framework of Georgia authority.

For over a decade now it has been the policy of the State government to equalize and to improve educational, welfare, health, employment, economic, and other opportunities for all our people.

Colored citizens have shared heaviest in these new benefits.

Permit me to emphasize that Georgia leadership pushed this policy to successful culmination in our State, not because of any external compulsion, but because we considered it right from every standpoint.

All Georgians, regardless of varying shades of political opinion, laid aside their differences and put their shoulders to the wheel.

As a result, every citizen benefited from this spirit of self-sacrifice and cooperation. Manifold progress, far beyond our fondest dreams, was the result.

The achievement of which we are most proud in Georgia is the $300 million school building program carried on by State and local communities, the majority of which was made possible through financing of the State school building authority.

During the period July 1, 1952, to July 1, 1958, 150 county school systems and 36 independent systems saw their school plants transformed in many cases from rundown shacks to the most modern structures.

For your information, the breakdown on funds was approximately, as follows: State, $162 million; local participation, $5 million; 100 percent local, $100 million; Federal, $29 million.

In Georgia, we have in the public schools 654,592 white children and 305,819 colored children.

Teaching them, we have 23,286 white teachers and 9,943 colored teachers.

There is equalization of facilities and equalization of teachers' salaries with equal pay for equal experience and academic qualifications.

Since its creation in 1952 the Georgia State School Building Authority has underway or completed 481 new school plants, 354 additions to existing plants, 166 remodeling projects, all of which represent a grand total of 10,234 instructional units, costing $162½ million in State funds.

This does not include other similar structures built with purely local funds or Federal money in impacted areas.

It no doubt will interest you to know that of the total, over 50 percent went to provide entirely new buildings for colored children though the percentage of colored to the

total population is only slightly over 30 percent.

Additions and remodeling were confined largely to plants serving white children.

In Georgia, Gentlemen, we have solved and are solving our statewide school housing problem to the satisfaction of both races.

Our efforts must continue unchecked.

Nothing must be allowed to distract us from the task at hand.

Georgia is giving her people the real civil rights—the right to be secure with knowledge—the rights which can be felt, used, tasted, enjoyed, and enriched.

Neither race wishes to give up its buildings, its autonomy nor its teachers.

Steady advancement in job opportunities, personal incomes, housing, and other meaningful benefits accruing in everyday living is the Georgia civil rights program.

Now, in conclusion, let me recall here another day in our history when reason gave way to passions of the hour.

During the period of Reconstruction which followed the war between the sections, a series of laws were enacted so base that no American can read them now without a sense of shame.

It is regrettable that there are some striking parallels between them and some of the proposals of the present day, not as harsh, perhaps, but just as contrary to the language of the Constitution and just as inconsistent with the public welfare.

The Reconstruction era is referred to by historians as "the Age of Hate."

It was a time of hysteria in which the President, himself, for the sole "crime" of upholding the Constitution was tried for impeachment and acquitted by a single vote.

It was a time not unlike the last few years when no sooner was one harsh measure of oppression penned than another and a harsher one was joyously brought forward to punish a prostate people.

While all those about him lost their heads there was one man who kept his.

President Andrew Johnson's courage, rightness, patience and ability as a fighter foiled the conspiracy against himself, against the Presidency and against the Constitution.

While a man of moderate background—of the people—Johnson was better steeped in constitutional tradition than any other President save, only his predecessor. For, in reality, Johnson's fight was Abraham Lincoln's as the latter's policies just prior to his tragic death had invoked the wrath of the radicals both in his cabinet and in Congress.

Johnson's first message, delivered December 5, 1865, contained one of the best statements of constitutional philosophy ever written by a President.

The Constitution, he said, formed the chart for his policies, adding "Its authors intended the American Union to last as long as the States themselves might last" and that "the hand of Providence was never more apparent in mundane affairs than in its framing and adoption."

The government thus established, he wrote, "is a limited government and so is every State government a limited government." The States, with proper limitations of their powers, are essential to the life of the U.S. Constitution. The assent of the States gave vitality to the Union, and "the perpetuity of the Constitution brings with it the perpetuity of the States; their mutual relation makes us what we are, and in our political system their connection is indissoluble. The whole cannot exist without parts, nor the parts without the whole. So long as the Constitution of the United States endures, the States will endure. The destruction of the one is the destruction of the other."

President Johnson thus explained his views of the mutual relations of the Constitution and the States because they made plain the principles upon which he had sought to overcome the "appalling difficulties" which confronted him.

Lincoln's successor declared: "It has been my steadfast object to escape from the sway of momentary passions, and to derive a healing policy from the fundamental and unchanging principles of the Constitution."

It is one of the blessings of our history that this brave man did not die without complete vindication for his stand in defense of our form of government.

The life and dedication of this man of courage who placed his whole future and being in the scales of public conscience are an inspiration for those of us today.

Let us reject the malignant growth of sectional hatred, envy, and jealousy which permeates most of these bills.

Most of them are nothing but the moves of political chess players in the game of partisan politics.

And, the warning flag is hoisted high for all to see that this beloved country of ours is confronted with a far more serious threat than that presented by what the peoples of other nations might think of us because we do not destroy our institutions and strike down the reserved rights of the States.

This struggle is but one facet of the ever-present, underlying Communist plan to divide and conquer.

Instead of representatives from various States of our Nation being here today arrayed one against the other, instead of you and I spending our time discussing whether or not more legislation, punitive to the South, will be enacted, I suggest to you that we stand side by side as our forefathers did in 1776 and in other times of crisis when our Nation has been challenged.

I suggest to you that together we should be investigating the real genesis of this punitive legislation.

I suggest to you that we should be saying to the Communists in America and in Russia or wherever they may be: "You shall no longer in this beloved America of ours array brother against brother, group against group, and race against race."

Berlin Medical Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I believe my colleagues are well aware of the fact that, despite overwhelming evidence that the Western allies will continue to stand alongside our friends in Berlin, many people in West Germany and in Western Europe generally seem to require constant reassurance as to our intentions. This nervousness is quite understandable on the part of those who are most immediately exposed to the tensions created by Soviet belligerence.

For this reason, I am glad that we are in a position to underline the firmness of our stance by pointing to a few recent developments concerning Berlin. A week or more ago, there was heartening news that one of our major manufacturing firms had embarked upon a program of plant expansion in that great German city. Now we have notice of an event which again emphasizes our confidence and that of the West Berliners in the future of their city.

Plans for a new medical and teaching center for the metropolis were made public at a meeting of the Benjamin Franklin Foundation in Berlin last Tuesday. It will be remembered that this nonprofit binational foundation, concerned with broadening the cultural life of the city, was established in 1955 at the request of no less a person than John Foster Dulles. Two years ago, it carried to completion the building of a modern conference hall in Berlin. Now it is concerning itself with the need for medical facilities in a city where no new hospitals have been constructed for over 35 years.

The United States will share almost equally with the city of Berlin in providing the funds for this great new medical center. When completed, the center will provide room and the most modern facilities for an estimated 1,200 patients and 300,000 outpatients.

Obviously, we are backing up our words with deeds that concretely express our confidence in the continued freedom of West Berlin. Moreover, these deeds are concerned primarily with improving the well-being of all the people in the city. What a significant contrast between this humanitarian concern and the saber-rattling of the Soviet Union and its East German satellite.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Department of State press release concerning the Berlin medical center be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BERLIN MEDICAL CENTER

At a meeting of the Benjamin Franklin Foundation in Berlin April 21, designs and plans for a modern teaching center for Berlin were made public. The design, which provides for all the newest features of a medical treatment, teaching, and research center, was developed by Arthur Davis of New Orleans with associated architects Moreland Griffith Smith of Montgomery, Ala., and Franz Mocken of Berlin.

The group of buildings will, when complete, provide room for approximately 1,200 patients and the most advanced examinations, therapeutics, teaching, X-rays, and operating facilities of the modern medical center, and will also provide for an estimated 300,000 outpatients.

The funds for this project will be provided by a joint arrangement with the Department of State and the city of Berlin. Stage I, which will be a self-contained operating unit, is expected to be completed by early 1961. The cost will be approximately $15 million. The funds for stage I from mutual aid will be somewhat under $7 million and, from the city of Berlin, somewhat more than $7 million (in Deutschemarks). The first stage, with building to be begun this year, will be a unit of approximately 600 beds with related services.

The second stage, which is planned to provide double the number of hospital beds with a variety of supporting facilities, is being planned as a part of the total project, for construction shortly after the first stage is completed.

This program, which is a part of the continuing long-term interest of the U.S. Government in the security and welfare of Ber-

lin, developed out of conversations between the American Ambassador to Germany, David K. E. Bruce, and the mayor of Berlin, Willy Brandt, who recently visited the United States to discuss this and other problems with appropriate American officials. The plans were the results of the urgent need for medical facilities in a city where no new hospitals have been provided for more than 35 years. It is designed to strengthen the medical teaching facilities of the Free University of Berlin which are not adequately equipped and which are not well located for coordinated teaching and research.

The Benjamin Franklin Foundation, which is exercising leadership in developing the program and design and in handling the financing for the project, was established in 1955 with the main purposes of constructing a modern conference hall in the city of Berlin, which was completed in 1957. The foundation, which has broad purposes related to the enhancement of the cultural life of the city of Berlin, is a nonprofit organization incorporated in Berlin under the chairmanship of Leon K. Chatelain, Jr., of Washington, D.C., a noted American architect. The other members of the foundation, 4 Americans and 4 Germans, are:

Mr. Albert I. Edelman, a lawyer in New York.

Mr. Bruce Baird, a Washington, D.C. banker.

Mr. Hugh Stubbins, a Cambridge, Mass., architect.

Mr. Howard S. Eichenbaum, a Little Rock, Ark., architect.

Mr. Otto Busack, of the Office of the Berlin Senator for Economics and Credit.

Mr. Gustav Schneevoigt, of the Office of the Berlin Senator for Building and Housing.

Mr. August Weltzien, former Berlin Senator for Finance.

Dr. Hans Busch, a high official of the Bonn, Germany. Federal Properties Ministry.

The work is carried on by the foundation in close collaboration with the authorities of the city of Berlin and the Department of State in Washington. A number of leading medical consultants have helped develop the plans, including Dr. Russell Nelson of the Johns Hopkins University Hospital, Dr. Paul Roessing of the Berlin city government, Dr. Jack Mazur of the National Institute of Health, Dr. Basil MacLean of the Blue Cross Association, and others.

The Benjamin Franklin Foundation was established in 1955 at the request of the Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles. Its first chairman was Ralph Walker, leading New York architect, who has been named the architect of the century by the AIA. Both Ralph Walker and Leon Chatelain are past presidents of the American Institute of Architects.

Good Advice for Americans Going Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, as a firm supporter of programs—formal and informal—which promote face-to-face contacts between Americans and our world neighbors, I view the oncoming vacation season for Americans abroad with some apprehension. All too often, some of our citizens traveling overseas have, by their unthinking conduct, lost friends for our country. Nor, indeed, have all Members of Congress been entirely free from responsibility in this regard.

It is true, undoubtedly, that the image of the loud American tourist fomenting anti-American sentiment abroad has been overemphasized But it is important for us to keep that problem in mind and it is vital that each citizen who travels abroad be alerted to the dangers involved.

In a recent editorial published in each of his three newspapers which are published in suburbs of Rochester, N.Y., Andrew W. Wolfe dispensed some commonsense advice for American travelers. Going beyond the ordinary comments on vacationers, Mr. Wolfe counseled each person to ponder the responsibilities he carries on overseas travels. I ask unanimous consent that this fine editorial, which deserves wide reading, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LETTER TO THOSE GOING ABROAD

All you need to do is go to a supermarket or the drugstore and you'll meet someone who's just about to go abroad, just got back, or who's got a friend, or neighbor or relative who's planning an overseas trip.

The statistics on travel to other countries and continents planned for this Summer are fantastic—numbering into the millions. The weary travel agencies with unbelieving looks on their faces, tell you there's never been anything like this.

It's fun to think of all these Americans off, to enjoy themselves in foreign lands, clambering about ancient cities with enthusiasm, and often with terrifying disregard for life and limb.

But there's a serious side to all this travel.

For many of us it's long been an article of faith that travel is vital to international friendship and to the understanding of other nations. This summer these touring Americans can go a long way toward proving this hopeful assumption—or they can prove it's all wet.

These travelers can learn much of other lands—and perhaps more importantly they can teach other peoples much about America. We think that the caricature of the sloppy arrogant American careening through Europe in his huge car, serenely confident of himself, has been overdrawn. On the one hand we've seen quite, soft-spoken Americans do infinite harm overseas, and we've seen loud, slaphappy ones make a lot of friends for us.

The problem is more complicated than superficial appearances or manners, important though these can be.

Basically, we think everyone going abroad should sit down for just a few minutes and devote a little serious thought to the fact that while abroad he or she will carry a weight of responsibility. One doesn't have to behave like an ambassador, but you must realize that you will be judged as representing your nation.

You don't have to take yourself too seriously, but let's hope that each of you in your own way can add a little plus quality to our relations with friends abroad.

Bonneville-Central Valley Power Intertie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, the Bonneville power intertie hearings, conducted 2 weeks ago—April 8 and 9—by the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, have been followed with great interest in California. Federal and State agencies, defense installations, and local public districts are eager potential customers for the surplus Bonneville project secondary energy that could be sent south over a common carrier transmission interconnection with the Central Valley project at Shasta Dam.

One result is that a resolution has been introduced in the State legislature to request the Secretary of the Interior to withhold action on a proposed exclusive intertie contract with the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. These facts are covered in the Sacramento Bee in an editorial published on April 11 and a news article published on April 15. I ask unanimous consent to have both these items printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Sacramento (Calif.) Bee, Apr. 11, 1959]

OBLIQUE ATTACK

The proposal to sell surplus Bonneville power to the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. presents the threat of a back-door evasion of the Federal law granting public agencies preference in the purchase of Government power.

Under the terms of a tentative agreement between the Pacific Gas & Electric and the Bonneville Power Administration the energy would be sold to the privately owned utility and transmitted to California over a line owned by the California-Oregon Power Co.

The matter is of extreme interest to public agencies in California and to the State of California, which will be in a position to use the power in operating its State water plan.

The proposed contract with the Pacific Gas & Electric would block the State and public agencies from obtaining the power directly from the Federal Government and put a private power company "on the toll gate," pointed out by U.S. Senator CLAIR ENGLE, of California.

The intent of the Federal preference law would be thwarted.

What the Federal Government, by any manner of reasoning, should do is to construct a transmission line to link up the Bonneville plant on the Columbia River with the Central Valley project at Shasta Dam.

This would make it possible for Federal and State agencies, defense installations and public districts to buy the power directly from the Government.

Such an arrangement would be in keeping with the spirit of the Federal reclamation law.

[From the Sacramento (Calif.) Bee, Apr. 15, 1959]

DELAY IS URGED IN BONNEVILLE, PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC CO. POWER TIE

A resolution introduced today in the legislature by Assemblyman Jerome R. Waldie (Democrat, of Contra Costa County), calls upon Secretary of the Interior Fred Seaton to withhold action on a proposed contract between the Federal Bonneville Power Administration and the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. to tie in Pacific Gas & Electric Co. facilities in California with Federal power facilities in the Pacific Northwest.

The Waldie resolution, Assembly Joint Resolution 31, asks for the delay to enable a committee of officials of California, Oregan, and Washington and the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation to complete investigations they have underway.

The Blight of Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the April 21 issue of the Washington Daily News discusses in a most comprehensive and enlightening manner a recent statement by Secretary of the Treasury, the Honorable Robert Anderson, which deals with inflation.

In all the discussion of inflation and the disastrous effect it is having on our economy, I cannot recall a more clear analysis than that given by the Secretary in which he illustrates one of the major causes of inflation.

The editors of the Washington Daily News pointedly answer those who say "we are unduly alarmed" with the comment:

There is no way for anyone to beat inflation. Like a blight over the land, or a plague engulfing a population, it ultimately damages and sickens all it touches.

For those who believe a little inflation will not be harmful the Washington Daily News has this forceful statement to make:

There is no way to survive inflation except to stop it.

A little inflation is just as disastrous as a little war. Neither is intended to do much damage, but eventually both a little inflation and a little war reach points where they cannot be contained or stopped and everyone gets hurt, badly hurt.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the excellent editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BLIGHT OF INFLATION

Treasury Secretary Anderson, speaking yesterday in New York, used a little story to show how the Government creates inflation.

He said he had a visitor in his office who obviously didn't understand why Government borrowing helps kick up the price of everything everybody buys. So the Secretary said this to the visitor:

"Now suppose I wanted to write checks of $100 million starting tomorrow morning, but the Treasury was out of money. If I called up a bank and said, 'Will you loan me $100 million at 3½ percent for 6 months if I send you over a note to that effect?' the banker would probably say, 'Yes, I will.'

"Where would he get the $100 million with which to credit the account of the U.S. Treasury? Would he take it from the account of someone else? No, certainly not. He would merely create that much money, subject to reserve requirements, by crediting our account in that sum and accepting the Government's note as an asset. When I had finished writing checks for $100 million the operation would have added that sum to the money supply.

"Now certainly that approaches the same degree of monetization (creating money) as if I had called down to the Bureau of Engraving and Printing and said, 'Please print me up $100 million worth of greenbacks which I can pay out tomorrow.' "

The obviously startled visitor at once said he would be against printing the greenbacks. Because it would cheapen the value of all the money already in circulation. He should be against this kind of Government borrowing, too, because it is the same thing.

It is this monetary inflation (pumping artificial credit into the banking system) which over the years has led to a spiraling of wages, prices, and living costs, with special interests and pressure groups scrambling to gain advantages at the expense of others.

This seriously has affected the Government's credit, eroded the value of the people's savings and weakened confidence in our currency.

There is no way for anyone to beat inflation. Like a blight over a land or a plague engulfing a population, it ultimately damages and sickens all it touches.

There is no way to survive inflation except to stop it.

First step in stopping it is for the Government to quit spending money it does not raise in taxes—and to use some of its tax revenues every year to reduce the national debt.

Our Government has adequate tax revenues to pay for defense and pay interest and amortization on the debt. But it does not have a bottomless barrel of money to pay now for even many desirable undertakings that might prove supportable later.

We can no longer suffer demagogs to delude us that the Government can appropriate money it does not have to provide us comforts and security. The printed money they spend robs us of what we earn and save, and thus adds to our insecurity.

The wealth of our Nation is only what people produce. The capital to build our industries and services is only what people save. The common defense for which our Government was created can be provided only by taxes people pay.

"This country can," said Secretary Anderson, "have a bright economic future—it can have it without inflation.

"This country cannot have an enduring bright economic future with inflation."

That is the overriding issue before the country and Congress at this moment.

"Should we impair either military security or economic growth in our efforts to achieve both," said Mr. Anderson, "we shall have failed our trust."

And lost both.

Report on Small Business Administration's Courses in Management

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, as a member of the Select Committee on Small Business, I am familiar with the numerous activities of the Small Business Administration which was converted into a permanent Federal agency by the 85th Congress upon recommendation of President Eisenhower.

One of SBA's most interesting activities is its program of management and research assistance. Administrator Wendell B. Barnes, his associates, and the staff of the SBA are to be congratulated for trying to help and encourage small businesses and industries throughout the country in this way. We need to do much more, but progress is being made. In my own State of New York this program has been helpful to many hundreds of small business operators, and its popularity is growing with each year.

Administrator Barnes has given me a report and description of this activity. I ask unanimous consent that this report be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Growth of the Small Business Administration's Management and Research Assistance Division is highly gratifying to the Agency. The activity has extended to every State and to Hawaii and Puerto Rico.

Starting with two exploratory courses in the school year 1954–55, the program in management education has grown to 155 administrative management courses for the year 1958. Only owners or managers are eligible. These courses, cosponsored by the Small Business Administration but actually offered by universities, colleges, and high schools, already have reached more than 14,000 owners of small businesses.

These owners pay $35 to $50 each for their course and they spend an average of 2 hours in classrooms 1 night a week for 8 to 10 weeks. For the first hour the speaker is either a professor, businessman, banker, accountant, management engineer or government official. During the second hour, lectures give way to discussion, much of which is exchanged between the participants themselves. One of the great values of the courses is this exchange of practical information.

As a result, two things are happening. First, educational institutions are now offering depth courses in specific subjects, such as the use of records for purposes of more profitable control. Second, many who have attended the classes are forming what might be called alumni associations with monthly or quarterly meetings which bring the businessmen-students back together for further discussion on subjects of current interest.

One important reason for the success of this program is that the subject matter, which is determined locally and usually by an advisory committee covers only administrative management. No attention is paid to problems of operation.

Though the Small Business Administration cosponsors the courses, the academic and financial responsibilities are assumed by the educational institutions offering the courses. Costs to the schools, for speakers, teachers, classroom rentals, etc., are covered by the tuition payments from students.

Some of the subjects covered include long and short term capital needs, policy organization and control, competition, human relations, operating at a profit, planning for growth, and many others.

At the conclusion of the courses, there are commencement programs and, in some schools, diplomas are awarded. The Small Business Administration and the cooperating institutions have kept close watch on evaluation forms which graduating students are required to fill out. These questionnaires indicate that 85 percent of the students have found the courses to be "good" or "excellent." A large majority found the courses relevant or vital to their own interests and management problems.

Taking New York State, for example, we find that 22 education institutions have cooperated with SBA in this program and 43 separate courses have been put on. Graduates number approximately one thousand. The fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, will show this activity greatly increased in New York.

The University of California in Los Angeles offers 42 different courses. It requires attendance at a general introductory course before businessmen can take the more advanced followup courses in financing and management. UCLA has started extension courses in several California areas. The University of Oklahoma is spreading its courses and the University of Pennsylvania has planned extensions for this year.

Classes average about 25 students, ranging from 15 in Seattle to 40 in Hawaii and Puerto Rico. The courses strike at management problems in which owners of small businesses have had the least training or experience. The goal for this program is 10,000 courses a year. Considering that there are more than 7 million small business owners, the Small Business Administration feels this goal is quite modest.

National Highway Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we recall that, in 1956, the Congress enacted the National Highway Act to establish a 41,000-mile network of roads throughout the country.

As a national program, it entailed one of the longest range jobs of planning and construction ever undertaken in this country.

Today this roadbuilding program is in trouble. Unfortunately, the age-old problem of "How do we pay the bills?" has cropped up again. As things look now, the highway program—if financing measures are not provided—may be seriously curtailed in the coming years.

According to Harold Plummer, chairman of the Wisconsin State Highway Commission, the lack of funds in the highway trust fund will result in serious curtailment of roadway construction work in Wisconsin. Throughout the Nation, this is also true.

According to the 1956 act, the Interstate System was scheduled to be completed in 13 to 15 years. Accordingly, State highway departments geared their operations to that schedule.

Under the original plans, Wisconsin was scheduled to receive an apportionment of Federal aid for the Interstate System for fiscal year 1961 an amount of $26 million; and for 1962, $23 million.

According to Chairman Plummer, recent estimates by the Department of Commerce indicate that, unless Congress acts to provide additional funds for the Interstate System, Wisconsin may receive nothing for 1961 and only about $5 million for 1962.

We recognize that this indeed represents a serious problem; not only in Wisconsin but in a great many other States of the Nation. In addition, it represents a cutback in our efforts to provide safer highways for commercial and pleasure traffic throughout the country. Too, such a serious cutback in highway construction will have serious economic repercussions in terms of loss of jobs, holding down community development programs, and a number of other adverse effects on the economy.

Today I received from Mr. Harold S. Gillette, vice president of the Gillette Publishing Co., publishers of Roads and Streets, an open letter to the Congress of the United States. This letter outlines what the editors of Roads and Streets feel will be some of the serious repercussions if Congress fails to act to keep the road construction program moving forward as originally planned.

I ask unanimous consent to have the open letter printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

(By the editors of "Roads and Streets," national publication serving the highway industry)

Two and a half years ago the U.S. Congress—after months of penetrating investigation—drafted one of the most far-seeing internal improvement programs the Nation has ever witnessed. We refer to the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, which put into being a sound, long-range national highway program. We believe that the roadbuilding program created by that measure (and strengthened by the act of 1958) was an admirable combination of reason and inspiration. It was a clear recognition of the expressed desire of the American people for a safe, up-to-date system of interstate highways.

That program is now in danger of being seriously violated.

The Bureau of Public Roads has reported that because of existing financial limitations, $2½ billion authorized for the 41,000-mile system of national interstate and defense highways for fiscal year 1961 cannot be apportioned to the States this summer, as originally planned. Furthermore, of the $2.2 billion authorized for the following year, only $500 million may be apportioned.

The object of this editorial is to call this problem to your attention and to point out what will be the inevitable result if corrective legislation is not enacted soon.

DO NOT BREAK FAITH WITH STATES

The effect on some State highway programs would be immediate. In fact, the interstate program would grind to a stop first in those States which have progressed the fastest and made the best record of quick and efficient use of the Federal funds. The first to be penalized would be those States which Congress has repeatedly commended for their progress—Ohio, California, Florida, New York, Louisiana, Illinois, Missouri, Michigan, and others.

Engineers would have no choice other than to shut down major interstate projects. Strips of pavement in some sections would lie half completed, a silent testimony to indifference. Rights-of-way cleared through urban areas and homes already emptied of families preparatory to construction would stand a witness to apathy.

These are very real possibilities.

A delay of 1 year's interstate apportionment would produce, not just 1 year's delay in specific projects but close to 2. It is impossible to just drop such construction projects and pick them up again without losing momentum. The nature of the work, seasonal limitation, advance planning, and the machinery of State contracting procedures are such that if Congress fails to assure the 1961 apportionment this summer highway departments would lose close to 2 years of production as a minimum.

FORTY-PERCENT DROP IN CONTRACTS FORESEEN

The effect of such a curtailment on the roadbuilding industry would be rapid and tragic. Objective statistics indicate that a cutback in Federal aid for the Interstate System from $2½ billion to nothing this year and from $2.2 billion to $500 million next year will force contract awards downward in a dismaying plunge. The Bureau of Public Roads foresees a 40-percent drop in contract awards starting next fall.

The uninformed may assume that the Federal-aid program has produced a surplus of work which could be shaved down for a year without any real harm to the industry.

This is not true. The big program has just begun to reach the construction stage in volume and the highway contracting industry is still working at only 64 percent of its capacity. Competition for existing jobs is aggressive, with a national average of 6.5 contractors bidding on every project.

This is not an industry in which a few huge firms dominate the field. The vast majority of America's thousands of contractors who do highway work head small organizations of men with specialized skills.

We agree with Gen. Louis W. Prentiss, executive vice president of the American Road Builders Association, that any curtailment of the national highway program would produce very real economic distress in the industry. And it would shake the confidence of these hardy businessmen in Congress' intentions of maintaining a long-range, balanced, soundly financed highway construction program.

"It will not be so easy, a second time, to find men who are willing to invest their money in roadbuilding capacity in the expectation of finding a place in an expanded program," General Prentiss points out.

The same might be said of the supporting industries. Equipment producers and materials suppliers have just begun to make the sales necessary to keep their plants on a reasonable level of production. It was only a few months ago that Life magazine ran a full feature story revealing the plight of people in Peoria, Ill., where the livelihood of so many families engaged in construction equipment production depends upon the continuity of the highway program. The same may be said for numerous other communities throughout the country. And some of these cities are already in depressed areas.

EFFECT ON LABOR

To put an unnatural stop to the interstate program would be to kill jobs in areas already suffering from unemployment and would stifle the come-back many equipment factories have just begun to achieve.

What about the effect on thousands of men and women whose livelihood is in highway construction work? Here is where a recession in the industry would be most painful. The Department of Labor has estimated that a billion dollars' worth of highway construction produces employment for 63,750 men per year on the project itself and another 78,750 men per year off the site. Cancellation of the scheduled $2½ billion apportionment this August and over $2 billion next summer would produce a loss of 641,250 man-years, according to one conservative estimate. This would ripple through the entire one-seventh of the national economy which lives directly or indirectly off of highway transportation.

It is unbelievable that the Congress would permit that kind of distress.

These are the hard facts that cause the roadbuilding industry concern. We recognize that although some of the problems which a curtailment of the interstate program would create are problems of the roadbuilding segment of the American business community, the effect goes far beyond this industry. We have confidence that Congress is interested in the welfare of every single segment of our economic life, large or small.

In the case of the national highway program, so many other Americans are affected, aside from those engaged directly in roadbuilding or equipment manufacturing, or materials production, that we feel we speak for a far greater number of Americans.

EFFECT ON COMMUNITY PLANNING AND INDUSTRIAL EXPANSION

What about the disruption of community planning? In many of the cities you represent, Mr. Congressman, urban renewal projects are intimately tied to the location and completion of proposed expressways. In every city where an interstate freeway is delayed this fall by lack of Federal funds, municipal planning for numerous other allied projects—such as new schools and housing projects—will be thrown out of gear. To delay the construction of these expressways would be to hang a cloak of uncertainty over the fate of many other community projects.

What about the expansion plans of private enterprise? One of the remarkable developments in the national highway program has been the desire it has created for small and medium industries to seek sites adjacent to or near points of access to Interstate System highways. The Nation needs all the industrial expansion it can encourage—to stimulate greater tax revenue, to provide greater employment. A delay in completion of new interstate roads means a loss in much needed revenues and a loss in local employment.

FOUR THOUSAND LIVES EACH YEAR AT STAKE

And most important, what about the curtailment of safety benefits which we know flow from the completion of modern highways. Safety engineers have testified that the opening up of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways would mean a saving of 4,000 lives a year from traffic accidents. The early beginnings of the interstate program—creating modern highway segments two and one-half times safer than ordinary highways—has just begun to bring a small drop in the national traffic fatality statistics, according to the National Safety Council.

Who would want to delay the interstate program for a year, for any reason, if so many human lives were at stake?

This is the picture which, we hope, you as Congressmen will grasp, and in so doing, exert the leadership so sorely needed to carry the national highway program through a period of disagreement over interim financing measures. In the light of these sobering facts, some financing plan, even if temporary, must be enacted.

Too much is at stake to permit the interstate highway program to falter even for 1 year for lack of temporary financing.

In Memory of Daniel A. Reed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a very eloquent letter from a former pupil of our greatly esteemed late colleague, the Honorable Daniel A. Reed, which I am happy to submit for the RECORD, of this great man:

IN MEMORY OF DANIEL A. REED—A MAN I WILL NEVER FORGET

(By Frederick E. Emmons)

When I read the nationwide announcement that the Honorable Daniel A. Reed, a U.S. Congressman for 40 years, had passed to the Great Beyond, my memory went back more than half a century to an autumn day in my senior year at Cornell. I was walking across that beautiful campus as the September breezes were rustling the rapidly changing maple leaves and the ever-blowing westerlies were ruffling the blue waters of Lake Cayuga far below to the west.

As I approached the library the chimes were ringing out the "Vesper Song" from the lofty tower far above me. Sometimes even today in my dreams I still hear them. After all these years I would not trade with anyone. I stopped for a moment when a voice called out to me: "Hey, big fellow. Wait a minute." I turned and saw big Dan Reed, our new football coach.

"Why aren't you down at football practice?" he asked.

"I don't want anything more to do with Cornell football after my experience in my freshman year," was my reply.

"What was that?" Dan asked.

"I'll tell you. I went out for the freshman team and played on the first eleven every afternoon, without missing a day, although at the time I was waiting on table for my board, taking care of a professor's furnace, and some other duties for my room on the third floor; and every Friday night typing a book, "The Clays of New York," for another professor, at 25 cents an hour.

"In spite of my daily practice and my enthusiasm for the game, and being the biggest man on the team, when the interclass game was played to determine the championship between the sophomore and freshman classes, I was relegated to the benches and neither I nor any other nonfraternity player got into the game, although many substitutes, good, bad, and indifferent, were called into the game. As a result the bench warmers did not get their class numerals.

"Then and there I declared: 'No more football at Cornell for me.' "

As Coach Dan listened to my story, he smiled and said: "I can hardly blame you for your attitude. You come out for practice. I'll see that you get a square deal."

The next day I appeared for practice. He tried me at guard and tackle. After a good workout he called: "Emmons. Go run around the field until I tell you to stop."

The teams left the field for the locker rooms and showers. The practice continued. Twilight began to fall. The teams left the field for their own locker rooms but no one called to me to stop. I continued to lope along as best I could. Twilight lengthened. The players came out and then the coaches. Dan saw the shadowy figure across the field.

"Hey, you. What are you doing?" I came up to them. "I was trying to run until you would call me to stop." He laughed as did all the other coaches. "I'm sorry. I forgot all about you. Go on into the showers. You've done enough for today." I had. As they walked away laughing, I could only grunt a thanks.

That settled me with "Dan" Reed. He gave me every consideration. He used me in every game but one. Later in Philadelphia for the annual Thanksgiving game with University of Pennsylvania, a game we had never won in 11 years, I recall Dan's pep talk.

"Fellows. We have been coming here for 11 years. They have always put us in the coldest room in this building. We usually froze to death before we even got into the game. Maybe that is why we lost. I don't think so. We just didn't play the game as we could. Now you're going out to win for the first time. I know you can do it. Let me see what you are made of and if I have done my job as coach."

It was snowing as we shivered and went out on the field. We were determined to show Dan and those guys that Cornell could win. The game was tough and uncertain. It was nearing the middle of the second half. I was worried, that once more I would lose, as I had to play in this game or forget a Cornell "C." Suddenly Dan called for me to get into the game. "Now let me see what you can do." He knew that if he had not called me into the game I never could win my letter.

Cornell won. Dan Reed had kept his word with me. As sometimes I look at the little gold football with my name and a red enamel "C," and the old red turtleneck sweater, now little more than a rag, as it was worn during all the passing years by two sons, both graduates of Cornell and both called back to lecture there, I think of Dan Reed. How could I forget a man, later to be a friend for all my life. If it had not been for Dan Reed I doubt if I would have received my first job as teacher of Latin and football coach, then principal of a city high school, because the president of the board of education wanted a man who could coach football, then high school coach to win New York championship. All through those 25 years ending in a city school superintendency, Dan Reed was always interested in my success. Those years with more than 40 summers in world educational travel gave me a life that has been the envy of more than one educational friend. I am sure that Dan Reed's record at Cornell would show that he lived up to the motto on the arch at the entrance to the campus: "So enter that thou mayest become more learned and thoughtful."

When he graduated back there in 1898, the year I entered, he must have passed through that same arch on his way to a life of service in the legal profession and many years in the Halls of Congress. As he looked up at the arch he must have read: "So depart that thou mayest become more useful to thy country and mankind."

Surely those who have known him and his career of honest, square, sometimes stubborn ideals, will agree with me that in Daniel A. Reed, God made a "Man to match our mountains."

Soviets Report Rise in Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two news items from the April 14, 1959, issue of the Christian Science Monitor, relating to the Soviet rise in production in the first quarter of this year.

When we consider that Allen Dulles, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, recently reported that our own rate of industrial progress is averaging a little more than 3 percent a year, we can understand more of the significance of these startling production increases on the part of Soviet Russia.

We, in this country, seem to be giving priority these days to higher and stiffer interest rates, which actually stifle consumption and production. It may be true, as some have charged, that this makes the rich richer and they are able to invest more in speculative stocks to become still richer, but it is a sad development for the overall economy of the United States, for it causes economic distortions.

The sad fact is that our economic growth is far behind what is needed to take care of the expanded population. As a result, we are having increased crime, increased poverty, increased failures among homes and businesses, and Soviet Russia continues to make enormous strides. In the opinion of many trained economists, if Soviet Russia makes the strides in the next 10 years that that nation has made in the past decade, and we do not increase our own economic growth, our Nation will be far outstripped in the battle for industrial supremacy. I surely hope that this will not be the case.

The articles are as follows:

SOVIETS REPORT RISE OF 11 PERCENT IN PRODUCTION

Moscow.—The Soviet Government has reported that in the first quarter of 1959, Soviet industry produced 11 percent more than in the same period of 1958.

A communique issued April 13 by the Central Statistical Administration said the plan for industrial production was overfulfilled by 5 percent during the first 3 months of the year.

The communique asserted that, notwithstanding introduction of a shorter working day in the coal mining, steel, and some other industries, labor productivity measured in output per worker increased by 7 percent in the first quarter of this year as compared with the corresponding period of last year.

Here are the figures of output given for the first 3 months of this year for a number of basic items: pig iron, 10,500,000 metric tons; steeel, 14,500,000 tons; rolled steel, 11,400,000 tons; iron ore 22,600,000 tons; coal 126 million tons; petroleum 29,800,000 tons; electricity 56,800,000 kilowatt-hours.

While painting a general picture of success, the communique also noted that passenger-automobile production fell in the first 3 months of this year to 84 percent of last. The drop was charged to a model changeover. Truck production was slightly below that of the first quarter for last year—by nine-tenths of 1 percent.

Window-glass output fell by 2 percent, while there were some production failures noted in the chemical industry, the chemical-equipment industry, and the electrical-equipment industry.

SOVIET GAINS TOLD

The Soviet Union continues to gain on the United States in the production of four basic industiral items: steel, coal, petroleum, and electric power.

The U.S.S.R. still produces less than half as much steel as the United States and slightly less than one-third as much petroleum and electricity. It produces nearly half again as much coal as the United States currently mines.

These conclusions emerge from analysis of the latest statistical report issued by the Soviet Government in Moscow April 13.

FIGURES GIVEN

The dynamic aspect of the production competition between the two nations consists in the fact that despite rapid American recovery from the recent recession and recent new peaks of output in American industry, the Soviet Union continues year after year to increase steadily its output of basic industrial commodities. Taken over a long period, the Soviet Union continues to creep up on the United States in output of these commodities.

The Central Statistical Administration in its regular quarterly report on Soviet economic progress gave figures on the output of many items during the first 3 months of the current year. These give a first opportunity since the demise of the U.S. recession, which put the United States at a disadvantage in comparisons, to see how the two countries stack up in important economic fields.

Here is the picture in current rates of output and also, for comparison, the situation in 1955:

Soviet production as a percentage of U.S. production:

	Percent
Steel:	
1955	43
1959 (current)	47
Coal:	
1955	87
1959 (current)	147
Petroleum:	
1955	21
1959 (current)	32
Electricity:	
1955	27
1959 (current)	30

Mr. Kean a Good Choice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, as a fellow New Jerseyan, I am indeed proud of the signal honor which has come to one of our outstanding citizens. I refer to Secretary Flemming's appointment of former Representative Robert W. Kean to organize a White House conference to consider the problems of the aging. Our preoccupation with world crises abroad cannot blind us to one of the great problems facing us on the domestic front: the needs of our senior citizens. I therefore think it most fitting that the man on whose shoulders this great responsibility will rest is one who has devoted 20 years to public service. His record of accomplishment will give new hope to all our aging citizens.

I compliment Secretary Flemming on his splendid choice, and I ask unanimous consent to have an editorial from the Asbury Park Evening Press of Tuesday, April 21, 1959, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. KEAN A GOOD CHOICE

Secretary of Welfare Flemming made an excellent choice when he appointed former Representative Robert W. Kean to organize a White House conference to consider the problems of old age. During his 20 years in the House of Representatives Mr. Kean became recognized as an authority on social security and he is well equipped to handle this arduous and important assignment.

The lengthening of the average lifespan is adding each year to the percentage of our people who have reached that time of life vaguely defined as old age. Many of them are beset not only with financial problems but with the maladjustments that so often arise when age forces upon us drastic changes in our mode of life. For when the passing years prevent a citizen from following the pursuits in which he has engaged there develops a need for new interests and new associations. And the development of such interests and associations has become one of our most pressing social problems.

Mr. Kean's long experience in the House of Representatives and his record as an authority on social security make him an ideal choice to organize the proposed White House conference. When he was defeated in his bid for the Senate last year there arose the fear that his valued services would be lost. Fortunately, his new assignment erases this fear.

AFL–CIO Legislative Department Analysis of Provision in McClellan Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAT McNAMARA
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an analysis of the provisions in Senator MCCLELLAN's amendment, prepared by the AFL–CIO legislative department.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AFL–CIO LEGISLATIVE DEPARTMENT ANALYSIS OF PROVISIONS IN SENATOR MCCLELLAN'S AMENDMENT

This amendment undertakes to regulate the internal operations of unions in great detail. It largely destroys the historic concept of a union as a voluntary association. Even if the premise were accepted that unions should no longer be treated as vol-

untary associations—a premise the AFL–CIO rejects—the particular provisions of their amendment are unreasonable.

Handled in an ambiguous and almost hidden way in the amendment is the matter of admission to union membership. Probably few members of the Senate realized when they voted that this amendment had any provision on this subject, for it is found at the very end in a section revising certain definitions in the Kennedy bill. As its final provision, however, the amendment defines "member" as including "any person who has fulfilled or tendered the lawful requirements for membership." It is not clear what this provision means. Apart from this amendment, no Federal law prescribes "lawful requirements" for union membership. A proviso to section 8(b)(1)(A) of the Taft-Hartley Act provides that that section shall not impair the right of a labor organization to prescribe its own rules with respect to the acquisition or retention of membership therein."

Whether this amendment is intended to overturn this long established legal doctrine and require unions to admit all applicants is not clear. Senator McClellan's original bill, S. 1137, did, in its main portion (sec. 101(2)) specifically require unions to admit all qualified applicants, but this amendment treats the subject with deliberate ambiguity and hides it in a section on definitions.

If this definition means anything—and it certainly was inserted for a purpose—it is to open union membership doors to all, including some persons completely repugnant to the majority in the union. For example, some unions today bar from membership known Communists or other totalitarians. This aendment would negate that bar. It would likewise compel unions to admit convicted felons, even those whose crime was against the union such as embezzlers, and known company spies.

Section 101(a)(2) provides that every member of any union shall have the right to express "any views" or opinions regarding any matter respecting the union without being subject to penality, discipline, or interference of "any kind" by the union. Under this provision a union member who advocates a wildcat strike in violation of the union contract cannot be disciplined by the union. Neither can a member who advocates that the union follow the Communist Party line.

This is an invitation to union leadership to be irresponsible. Not only would wildcat strikes be increased because of lack of disciplinary power but, in order to avoid political repercussions by vociferous irresponsible minorities some union officials might well abandon mature restraints in collective bargaining and demand conditions which could lead to disruption of peaceful labor-management relations.

Section 101(a)(3), entitled "Freedom of Assembly," declares that union members shall be entitled to meet with other members for the purpose of exchanging views and reaching decisions with respect to any matter pertaining to the unions without being subject to penalty, discipline or interference of any kind by the union.

At first glance this language appears innocuous yet it would appear to protect such activities as forming a caucus within a local union to promote disaffiliation from its international and affiliation with a rival union—a clear invitation to intraunion disputes disruptive of peaceful union-management relations. While persons are, of course, entitled to carry on such activities they are hardly entitled to carry them on within and as members of the union they are preparing to desert.

Again, the bill's language seems to protect the right to function within a union, even of a group which seeks the unions' dissolution—perhaps at the instigation of an employer. Surely a union should be allowed to expel such dissident and traitorous elements.

Section 101(a)(6) lays down certain safeguards against improper disciplinary action. It provides that no member of a union may be fired, suspended, expelled, or otherwise disciplined by the union except for breach of a published written rule or the organization, and that disciplinary action may not be taken unless the member has been (A) served with the union constitution and by-laws which must incorporate the safeguards of this bill; (B) been served with written specific charges; (C) given a reasonable time to prepare his defense; (D) afforded a full and fair hearing; and (E) afforded a final review on a written transcript of the hearing by an impartial person or persons. This latter provision in effect requires outside arbitration, since it provides that the impartial person or persons shall be either agreed upon by the union and the accused or designated by an independent arbitrator or mediation association or board. It brings the doctrine of compulsory arbitration, which the Congress has repeatedly rejected in labor-management relations, into the internal operations of a trade union.

This provision reflects total ignorance and disregard of the nature of union disciplinary proceedings. Automatic suspensions after 3 months dues delinquency is common union practice, but it is made criminal by this bill. Often disciplinary proceedings are usually wholly informal, and result in nothing more serious than a reprimand or a fine of not more than $5 or $10. The requirements for a written transcript and a review by outside arbitration would, because of the expense, mean that unions could not act at all except in the most serious cases.

The most serious consequence which can conceivably result to a union member even from expulsion from a union is that his job opportunities will be adversely affected. However, the National Labor Relations Act now provides, in section 8(a)(3), that if a union member is expelled for any reason other than for nonpayment of dues, the union may not seek his discharge.

The provision that a union may take disciplinary action only for breach of a published written rule can have fantastic results. Probably few unions have a published written rule against murder, or even against embezzlement.

Section 101(a)(7) provides any candidate for union office, or his agent, the right to inspect and reproduce membership lists, not regarding the fact that the Kennedy-Ervin bill already provides adequate protection for the democratic rights of candidates to solicit the membership for votes. The provision in the McClellan amendment does not protect the union again a pro forma candidate who is in reality a company spy or a Communist agent, who pretends to union candidacy for the sole purpose of obtaining the membership list for more nefarious purposes. Less damaging, but nonetheless a problem to legitimate unions, would be the lack of protection for its membership rolls from the pro forma candidate whose only purpose was to sell the list to commercial agents who now regularly and unsuccessfully seek such lists for sales purposes.

The enforcement provisions of the bill are as extreme as the substantive. Section 102 provides that any officer or agent who "through use or abuse of authority * * * or otherwise wilfully interferes or attempts to interfere with the exercise by any member of any right protected under the amendment shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned for not more than 2 years, or both." Thus any officer presiding at a local union meeting who undertakes to rule any speaker out of order will do so at the risk of fine and imprisonment. The amendment also provides in section 103 that the Secretary of Labor may bring suit in Federal court to prevent or redress violations of the bill's provisions.

Section 101(a)(1) provides that every member of a union shall have equal rights and privileges within such organization. This would outlaw the provisions, customary in union constitutions, that a candidate for union office must have been a member for a year or two.

What consequences it would have, cannot be foretold. The Kennedy bill itself abundantly protects the rights to vote and run for union office, subject to reasonable qualifications uniformly imposed. Certainly unions, like all democratic organizations, should have the right to impose conditions for qualification for office seekers.

Hungarian Puppets at the U.N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I should like to call to the attention of the Members of the Senate the illogical situation where representatives of the Hungarian puppet regime at the United Nations are permitted to participate fully in the deliberations of the U.N. General Assembly, although their credentials have not yet been accepted or rejected.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter I received from the Committee for Collective Security, 90 John Street, New York.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMITTEE FOR COLLECTIVE SECURITY,
New York, N.Y., April 9, 1959.

The Honorable HUGH SCOTT,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SCOTT: Under the present procedure of the United Nations the delegates to the General Assembly take their seats with the privilege of debating and voting before their credentials have been approved by the Credentials Committee which has not been reporting until the end of the session. A case in point involves the delegates representing the Hungarian puppet regime whose credentials have been neither accepted nor rejected by the Credentials Committee. Nevertheless they are permitted to sit in the Genera lAssembly and to debate and vote on all issues, including the validity of their own credentials.

It is illogical and indefensible that the Hungarian delegation, or any other delegation, should have the right to vote unless its credentials have been approved. A situation might arise when such a delegation might cast the deciding vote on an important resolution. The legality of such a vote might subsequently be challenged by a member state and be referred to the International Court of Justice for adjudication. Regardless of whether the credentials of the representatives of the Hungarian puppet regime should be accepted or rejected or whether they should be permitted to enter the debate in the General Assembly, they should certainly not be allowed to vote unless their credentials are approved. The General As-

sembly should take immediate steps to correct this illegal and dangerous procedure.

COMMITTEE FOR COLLECTIVE SECURITY,
GOODHUE LIVINGSTON, Jr.,
Chairman, Policy Committee.

Revised Marine Rules End Drill Brutality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article written by Mr. Homer Bigart which appeared in the New York Times of Sunday, April 12, 1959:

REVISED MARINE RULES END DRILL BRUTALITY—POLICY SINCE DEATH MARCH PUTS STRESS ON PERSUASION

(By Homer Bigart)

PARRIS ISLAND, S.C., April 9.—On a dark, moonless April night 3 years ago, Sgt. Matthew C. McKeon, a drill instructor, led a platoon of Marine rookies on a disciplinary march into a tidal creek. Six drowned.

Sergeant McKeon was convicted of negligence and drinking in barracks. The Marine Corps undertook a rigorous investigation of its recruit training methods. Steps were taken to eliminate sadism and brutality in a system that seemed shockingly harsh to the Nation.

The changes at Parris Island boot camp since the uproar over the McKeon incident have appalled some veterans of the Corps. For although the depot commander, Maj. Gen. Robert Burnstone Luckey, insists that the corps was not stampeded into basic changes in the Marine training philosophy, he has sternly suppressed practices offending against human dignity.

For example, an instructor can no longer slug a recruit. Nor can he inflict mass punishment. There will be no repetition of the death march of April 8, 1956.

Today the drill instructors, all of them sergeants, speak like psychiatrists. One hears them discuss a recruit's poor hostility control and antisocial attitudes.

A depot order forbids them from touching the person or clothing of a recruit, either directly or by use of a material object except when correcting the recruit's position, correcting his movements, fitting or correcting the arrangement of his clothing or equipment, conducting a lawful examination or inspection of his person.

This corrective touching must be gentle, for the order goes on to say that "any fracture, concussion, contusion, abrasion, or welt upon a recruit shall be considered prima facie evidence of excessive force."

Hazing is also banned. Activities specifically prohibited include:

"Causing recruits to run unnecessarily up and down ladders or in and out of buildings.

"Causing recruits to ingest more food and/or beverages than their normal requirements.

"Causing recruits to ingest any paper or other foreign matter not commonly used as food for human consumption.

"Causing recruits to march or drill with ballast in pockets or pack.

"Causing recruits to participate in an assault against each other.

"Causing recruits to inflict unnecessary pain upon themselves or to collide unnecessarily with physical objects such as causing them to run against a wall.

"Causing recruits to stand in unnatural positions for undue length of time such as doing 'wall bends'."

NO MORE CONTRIBUTIONS

In the old days, a drill sergeant needing money occasionally invited a recruit to contribute. But the new order says:

"No permanent personnel shall relate to any recruit any tale, story, or incident, whether or not true, indicating infinancial distress or a need for funds for himself, his family, or any other permanent personnel."

With all these new restrictions, the drill instructor would seem as defenseless as a scoutmaster with a party of truants.

He can't find release in swearing: Placards in the messes inveigh against profanity, and this makes conversation difficult.

He may, if sufficiently provoked, upbraid his charges as "hoods" and "bums." But he must watch his adjectives: nothing stronger than "doggone."

A crowd of sergeants at the drill instructors school insisted they could mold the recruits by persuasive leadership.

"Thumping (beating a recruit) is a lazy man's way of doing it," said Acting Gunnery Sgt. James B. Southall. "We must be patient and persuasive and teach by repetition."

"It's like training a dog," said another sergeant, mildly.

Candidates for drill instructors are put through a 5-week course so tough that until recent, fewer than half of them passed. Now the attrition rate has dropped from 52.5 percent to 39.6 percent, following an order last September stiffening the requirements for assignment.

HEAVY DRINKERS BARRED

Depot psychiatrists had found that candidates suffering from situational difficulties brought about by extreme financial problems were apt to lack the inner harmony necessary to become an effective instructor.

Consequently, the corps directed all commanding officers to rule out men who had a record of habitual failure to meet financial obligations as well as heavy drinkers and those with an unhappy family life.

Other new requirements call for emotional stability and reliability: The absence of any traces of immaturity as shown by a record of unauthorized absences, offenses involving moral turpitude or negligence in the performance of duty.

The candidates must have demonstrated ability to conduct close order drill and possess a strong, clear voice unhampered by any heavy accent.

There were 41 men in the present drill instructor's class when it began. The average man was 27 years old, had completed 8 years in the Marines, and was married, with children. Slightly more than 75 percent had combat experience in Korea or World War II.

This class is in its third week. Already 8 of the 51 have been declared unsuitable for drill instructors by the depot's psychiatric observation unit. "Immature and quite lacking in judgment," said the notation on one card.

"Excitable and ineffective; has a history of many neuropathic complaints and lacks motivation," said another.

"Little hostility control and a possible maltreatment risk," said a third.

THE JOB IS EASIER

But once he gets through the course, the new drill instructor finds his job easier in some respects than in the days of Sergeant McKeon.

Today there are three drill instructors assigned to a recruit platoon instead of two as in 1956. This gives the drill instructor more off-duty time to spend with his family. Housing is better. Also, the worst goof-offs among the recruits have been segregated in a motivation platoon.

Fat recruits always bruise the hostility control of a drill instructor, but these, too, have been segregated. They are put in a conditioning platoon, fed on a stark diet of 1,500 calories and subjected to two steam baths a day and 4 to 5 hours of weightlifting, swimming, and calisthenics. They are trained by drill instructors handpicked for understanding and patience.

"They come from overindulgent homes, but have a good background," one instructor explained. "They are rather like a baby, crying, moaning, and groaning the first few days. But later we have to slow 'em down."

In the "strength platoon," where weaklings are segregated, there are more malingerers and "sickbay commandos," the instructor said.

"They have had no physical exercise in their lives, no sport whatsoever, and most of them come from the city," he explained.

Finally, there is a "proficiency platoon" for slow learners who are barely literate or know little English.

The segregation of these problem units has eased the drill instructor's task.

General Luckey wants to lighten it still further by improving the preliminary screening of applicants at recruiting stations.

He has asked Washington to increase the minimum age for recruits from 17 to 18.

"The 17-year-old kid is a little too young, a little too immature," he explained.

To stiffen the screening, Dr. Charles Herlihy, head of the depot psychiatric unit and a lieutenant commander in the Navy, cautioned recruiters to eliminate "potential risks" when the following traits were noted:

"Marked inability to accept and respond to authority.

"Stormy emotional response to stress, e.g., blowing up in temper tantrums or rages; frequent crying spells and/or moodiness or depression; childish view of the responsibilities of people in the applicants' age group.

"Inability to measure up to the demands of situations or to maintain sustained performance commensurate with the applicant's ability; e. g., frequent job shifts, fired from jobs, school failures.

"Marked effeminate mannerisms or characteristics, noncompetitiveness, no dates or rarely, excessive concern with health.

"Marked self-isolating tendencies, quarrelsomeness and pugnaciousness, suspiciousness of others and their motives, inability to participate in group activities; notable eccentricity of appearance, speech, manners, etc.

RECRUITS INTERVIEWED

To a group of educators from the New York area, Dr. Herlihy explained that all recruits were interviewed by the psychiatric unit upon arriving at Parris Island.

"The interview lasts from 2 to 2½ minutes per man," he said. "The aim is to spot evidences of immaturity, of poor hostility control, of poor social attitudes."

As part of the interview, recruits are asked to draw a picture of a person. From this drawing, Dr. Herlihy said the unit could learn much about the recruit's "internal harmony" by finding out "how people look to him."

He recalled one case: a "benign, passive youngster" who drew a nude woman with a dagger protruding from her back.

"Unconscious factors at work here," said Dr. Herlihy. "We never did reach his layers of hostility. He lasted only 2 weeks and was sent home."

PHILOSOPHY IS THE SAME

Between 16 and 20 percent of recruits are suspected on the basis of the first interview, he said. They are ordered back for a second

interview, at which most are cleared. The discharge rate is currently 4½ percent.

"One in 300," he said, "is admitted directly to the psychiatric ward as already unsuitable for service. One in 500 goes to Naval Hospital, Charleston, as a really mentally sick person."

Parris Island is the reception depot for recruits east of the Mississippi. They stay here 12 weeks for physical hardening and basic training.

"We enforce harsh discipline, but allow nothing that degrades or physically upsets any youngster," General Luckey said. "No drill instructor touches them. We would court-martial and relieve him in 2 seconds if we caught him doing it.

"But the basic philosophy of Marine training hasn't changed much. We take kids who don't have the slightest conception of discipline and make them into guys you can take to war.

"We weren't stampeded by the McKeon incident. The changes we made were sensible. We're turning out recruits the Marine Corps wants—and doing the parents a hell of a big favor."

The Peril of Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. RAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the New York Daily News for April 22 and the coupon which accompanied the editorial. The editorial and the coupon are a forceful reminder and suggestion for action with respect to inflation.

THE PERIL OF INFLATION

"This country can have a bright economic future; it can have it without inflation.

"This country cannot have an enduring bright economic future with inflation."

That statement was made in New York Monday by Secretary of the Treasury Robert B. Anderson, at the annual Associated Press luncheon.

Mr. Anderson thus pinpointed inflation as the No. 1 domestic threat to this country's continued soundness and prosperity. We buy that analysis.

The News for years has been doing its best to keep readers alert to the peril of inflation—the continuous shrinkage of the dollar's buying power, because of Government extravagance and deficit financing, wage increases not geared to increases in productivity, unjustified price boosts, and public apathy toward most or all of such things.

It is encouraging to see the Eisenhower administration fighting inflation to the best of its ability, and with some success. Up to now, at least, the Democrat-controlled 86th Congress hasn't got up the gall to defy the President's solemn warnings against crazy spending programs.

We'd like to report in this connection that our colleague, the Chicago Tribune, also has been warring on inflation for years.

The Tribune's latest offensive in that war is now in progress. It consists of a series of articles on what inflation has done in post-World War I Germany, post-World War II Italy and France, and present-day Egypt—and on what creeping inflation has done to millions of Americans and can do to almost all of us if it is allowed to creep far enough.

The things inflation does are all bad, ruinous. And economists who think inflation can be held to a creep and kept from jumping to a gallop have been proved wrong time and again.

Along with these articles, the Chicago Tribune has printed coupons which readers opposed to inflation could clip and send to their Senators or Representatives in Congress.

Some 65,000 of these have streamed already into the offices of Illinois' two Senators—EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, Republican, and PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat—to say nothing of additional thousands sent to Senators and Representatives from Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, and Wisconsin.

Below we print a replica of the coupon run by the Chicago Tribune. If you are worried about the rack and ruin to which inflation can drive you and/or your children, you might clip the coupon and send it to your Representative or one of your Senators.

"Dear ———: People in many countries have been ruined or impoverished by inflation caused by excessive government spending. I am worried about inflation in the United States and depreciation in the value of the dollar. If our Government keeps spending more than it takes in, we certainly will have more inflation and prices will keep on going higher.

"If this happens—

"☐ My savings will be worth less
"☐ My insurance will be worth less
"☐ My pension will be worth less
"☐ My bonds will be worth less
"☐ My income will buy less
"☐ My social security will buy less.

"I hope that you will vote only for essential expenditures, and against waste and appropriation bills favoring special interests. If we are to survive as a strong nation, we must avoid further inflation. Let's keep the dollar sound.

"Sincerely,
"(Signature) ----------
"Street and No. ----------
"City ---------- State ----------"

The Farm Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the following comments which were sent to me by Mr. W. J. Brake, of Lansing, Mich., regarding the farm situation. Since Mr. Brake is an active member of the National Farm Grange, I felt his comments were worthy of being brought to the attention of all Members of the House.

It is not practical to let farmers compete on an economically pure free enterprise system when all other segments of the economy have various aids such as tariffs, minimum wage hours legislation, and all the various devices to aid that particular segment.

Nor it is practical to subsidize farmers so that they can produce cheap food for consumers.

With a number of commodity organizations the grange has worked out details of plans which would enable commodity groups to handle their own surpluses with a minimum of Federal funds. These plans are more practical than those we have seen in operation for the last 30 years.

The major function of Government is to protect its citizens from aggresssion, economic as well as physical. Farmers have suffered from an economic problem, and I do not feel that Government can solve this problem and protect farmers by merely saying, "Let supply and demand rule," when since the second bill passed by Congress to the present we have continually sought to circumvent the law of supply and demand for other segments of our economy.

National Budget Can Be Balanced

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Syracuse (N.Y.) Post Standard of April 22, 1959, entitled "National Budget Can Be Balanced":

NATIONAL BUDGET CAN BE BALANCED

Robert B. Anderson, Secretary of the Treasury, is 100 percent right on the need for a balanced budget to stop inflation.

Further, there is good evidence that he has the support of most of the country's people.

They will do their part to stop the endless rise in prices that is making the dollar cheaper year after year.

They know there is nothing in it for them but grief and an eventual lower standard of living.

Secretary Anderson, speaking Monday before the Associated Press meeting in New York, called not only for a balanced budget, but also for financial policies that would produce a surplus.

Even more effective, he hit those who say a little inflation is good for the country. Deficit spending, he pointed out, is similar to debasing the money of the country by printing press methods.

It adds to the money supply by creating larger amounts of credit.

There are several reasons why the Eisenhower administration can expect support of the country's people in balancing the budget.

First, President Eisenhower has been an advocate from his first year in office of two great national goals—a military defense second to none and a healthy, strong economy at home.

He has always had the support of the people in these aims because they recognize them as sound and right.

Second, the people of New York State—as a cross section of the Nation—bluntly showed their opposition to further price rises in their opposition to Governor Rockefeller's new tax program based almost entirely on the need for money to meet advancing costs.

This same opposition has been noted in other parts of the Nation.

Third, there has been a distant softening of the spending proclivities in Congress. Leaders both of the Democratic Party in control, and the Republicans, have quietly opposed heavy spending.

There are no loud, repeated calls for deficit spending in either the Congress or the country, except perhaps in the military field where there is discussion of whether the defense program is adequate.

The country's people, not the Congress or the administration, hold the secret of building up prosperity in the Nation.

They can do it without adding to a national deficit by means that are sound and sure.

First, they can invest their money in at least one big home project this year.

Second, they can invest more in Government savings bonds, which keep Government from borrowing from banks and adding to credit available.

Third, by this means they will provide work for the unemployed and more revenue for the Treasury, in this way adding to buying power and helping to balance the budget.

This program, simple and direct, already is working in one big field, that of automobiles, which are selling well this year. It can be extended to others and would soon create a demand for employment of the 4,600,000 persons without work.

One big project in each home, whether it be a new car or repainting the house, decorating a home's interior, installing a new kitchen or bathroom, or any one of a hundred projects, would achieve the goal of full employment, a hustling economy and a balanced budget.

That is a goal worth achieving.

The American people have the savings and incomes to do the job. It's the quickest and best way. Let's get at it.

William A. Brockwell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, after some 18 years of faithful service as manager of the restaurant in the House of Representatives, William A. Brockwell is retiring, and his courteous manner and efficient management will be missed by everyone. His term of service has been noted by a rapid growth in the restaurant services in the House side of the Capitol, and this business expansion was met under Mr. Brockwell's leadership with conspicuous ability. His qualities of leadership are emphasized when it is remembered that the expansion was carried on under the devastating handicap of very limited space available for restaurant facilities.

When Mr. Brockwell started, in 1941, there was only 1 restaurant unit on the House side of the Capitol, which served about 500 meals daily, with gross yearly receipts of $110,000, while today about 5,000 meals are served each day, with gross yearly receipts of over $500,000—truly a remarkable growth, not only in operations but also in responsibilities of management. During this period of operation, Mr. Brockwell established in 1942 a new cafeteria, seating 125 people, in the New House Office Building, which was subsequently enlarged in 1944 to a seating capacity of 180. Later, in 1947, the coffee shop in the basement of the Capitol was put into operation, as well as the Members' private dining room in the Capitol. These two new developments provided an additional combined seating capacity of 108. Snackbars were installed in each of the two House Office Buildings in 1953; and when the cafeteria in the New House Office Building was closed in 1959, the new modern restaurant in the courtyard of the New House Office Building, with a seating capacity of 525, was put into operation.

To manage such an ever-expanding project and to contend with the many problems attendant thereto required great patience, farsighted planning, courage, and real ability of an unusual sort. Mr. Brockwell combined all these attributes, and he added to the job his quiet, sincere, and honest personality, which insured success.

The best wishes of his many friends go with him during the days to come; and if he retires to his farm to enjoy its bucolic serenity and to indulge in a bit of hunting and fishing, we feel sure he will find contentment in the knowledge that he did a good job and has earned a rest from the strenuous life he has led in satisfying the gastronomical demands of Congressmen.

United States-Berlin Flight Proves Wisdom of Dulles Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Russell Brines.

UNITED STATES-BERLIN FLIGHT PROVES WISDOM OF DULLES POLICY

WASHINGTON.—John Foster Dulles doubtless appreciated the ironic symbolism of the incident.

As illness forced him from the office of Secretary of State today, an American plane was proving his official philosophy—toughness with communism pays off.

The plane, a C–130 transport, made the third test flight through an East German air corridor above the 10,000-foot level the Russians are trying to enforce. This time, watching Soviet fighters made no attempt, as before, to buzz the American craft.

URGED KOREA ACTION

Long ago, as traveling Republican envoy for the Truman administration, Dulles outlined his philosophy to me in Japan. The only way to handle the Communists, he said, is to block them or threaten them with power at every turn.

He then was selling to nervous Asian nations the idea of nuclear containment of Russia and negotiating the necessary defense agreements to carry out this policy.

It was not generally known that Dulles, from Japan was one of the first influential officials to pressure Washington to send U.S. troops into action when the Korean war exploded.

In 6 years as Secretary, Dulles conducted a running headline feud with Moscow. It was carefully designed to make sure the Russians did not miscalculate their way into war.

STIRRED CRITICISM

More significantly, Dulles was instrumental in winning from Congress a virtual blank check to go to war in defending Formosa and friendly Middle Eastern nations. This marked a profound change in domestic U.S. policy.

These moves, loudly publicized with propaganda in mind, made brinkmanship into an epithet. They stirred domestic political criticism, often frightened allies and confused neutrals.

But Dulles never wavered from this central policy. Supported by President Eisenhower to an unusual degree, he put his own broad stamp on American foreign policy.

He gave many other facets, notable skillful negotiation, to a regime that will be assessed both for successes and failures.

But the toughness—the brinkmanship—probably will be remembered most. For the Dulles' resign was a period when, until possibly now in Iraq, communism made no territorial gains.

Hiring the Handicapped in Our Town

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. A. THOMPSON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, each year a national essay contest is sponsored by the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped among 11th and 12th grade students. This year a young lady residing in my congressional district, Miss Margaret O'Meara of Lake Charles, La., has won fifth place in the 1959 national essay contest with an excellent article entitled "Hiring the Handicapped in Our Town." I believe this essay indicates the alertness of the people in our areas to national problems and is worthy of being printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

HIRING THE HANDICAPPED IN OUR TOWN

In our town, in your town, in all the towns and cities of America, there is a certain tenseness and urgency in the air. In the cold war, which has engulfed the world, the American people see a threat to their democratic way of life. Danger to life and liberty lurks over the horizon, and a blanket of wariness covers the globe.

The victor in this war will be decided, not in battle with a bomb, but in the factory, the stock exchange, and the proving ground. On these strange fields of battle the weapons are not tanks, planes, and ships, but living standards, production records, and scientific accomplishments. The most important weapon in the cold war is manpower. The threat of Russian superiority in manufacturing, agriculture, and trade, which is the Soviets' acknowledged goal, must be met. All available manpower must be utilized if our economic system is to survive. An invaluable source of manpower to our country, in our town and in yours, is the physically handicapped.

In 1950, 7 million handicapped workers were employed in the United States. Since that time the number has steadily increased. These people are a reservoir of untapped resources and will, in days to come, play a large part in the theater of the cold war. Employment of the disabled will be one of our most efficient weapons.

Employing the handicapped is a fairly new idea in our town. In past years the potential offered by the handicapped lay unnoticed. These people were dependent on their families and on public charities. They were dead weights, unable to support themselves. There just did not seem to be

a place for them. Because their physical and mental facilities had been idle for so long, they began to lose interest in life. They no longer had the desire to become skilled in new fields and to regain confidence in themselves.

A few farsighted businessmen changed all that. They saw what was being done in a nearby pioneering firm and followed its example. As in many places, the idea needed only a little shove to get it going in our town. It soon met with the approval of other businessmen in the area, and employment of the handicapped grew rapidly. Persons who had been discouraged by hearing repeatedly, "We're sorry; we can't use you," were given new hope by seeing their fellow handicapped find employment. There was a new interest in vocational rehabilitation programs. Job seekers, who had given up, regained the incentive to try just once more.

Local businessmen were impressed with the results of hiring the handicapped. These workers had proved their worth. They had shown time and time again that it was good business to employ them. The outcome of hiring the disabled in our town corresponded with similar results all across the Nation.

Employers were found, as it has been found in nationwide surveys, that impaired workers as a whole have slightly higher production rates than workers without a handicap. Certain individual handicapped workers had performed exceptionally well, either because of or inspite of their disabilities. They were often put in a department to spur others on to greater achievement through their example.

Businessmen were delighted with the conscientiousness of the handicapped, who exercised safety precautionary measures to such an extent that a smaller number of serious injuries occurred to them than to unimpaired persons.

Employers who feared that insurance costs would rise were pleasantly surprised. Insurance surveys showed that disabled workers were not more likely to have accidents than unimpaired persons. Premium rates were not determined by the kind of workers hired, but by the hazards in a firm and its accident record. Contrary to what many misinformed employers believed, the handicapped were insured without penalty.

As employment of the disable became more widespread, it was discovered that persons in certain occupations were given definite advantages by their handicaps. The blind were well suited to inspecting parts in an assembly line. Deaf persons had an advantage in situations where noises were so intense that persons with normal hearing were distracted. Amputees found that their artificial limbs facilitated certain precision work.

In our town much can still be done, but a start has been made toward hiring the handicapped. The disabled have made it known that employing them is good business. The idea is steadily growing. By proving their capabilities and effectiveness, the handicapped on the job have opened the door to employment for millions like themselves. They have supplied proof that the handicapped are not handicapped at work. The employed impaired workers are helping themselves and helping others. They have boosted their own morale and lifted the courage of other disabled persons.

Employers who take the extra time needed to place a man where his disability is unimportant are making a sound, businesslike move. They are gaining a steady, dependable employee whose enthusiasm and interest often spread to his coworkers. The employers receive favorable publicity for their firms by promoting programs of hiring the handicapped.

Wise business practices win battles in the economic war. Making the handicapped self-supporting leaves them no longer dependent on the Government for aid. They become taxpayers instead of tax consumers. The impaired worker gladly becomes a taxpayer. He is eager to be on his own, to pay his debt to the Government. He soon returns in taxes all that was spent on his rehabilitation.

The consensus in our town today is that handicapped persons have the right to employment. As an American citizen, the handicapped person enjoys the privilege and responsibility of supporting himself and living his own life. The modern employer has ceased to be influenced by prejudices left over from times when the handicapped were ridiculed or remanded to institutions. The launching of Russia's 10th planet has shown our town's businessmen a further important reason for hiring the handicapped. They know now that only by using all available manpower can we successfully meet the challenge of the cold war.

In our town, hiring the handicapped has grown out of the experimental stage. The experiment was an overwhelming success. The disabled workers have taken their places as valued, trusted employees, and comprise an indispensable segment of our working force. They are contributing to America's welfare as citizens and taxpayers. They are beside us fighting in the economic war.

Because the people in our town were wise businessmen who believed in the American idea of a fair opportunity for all men, no matter what their abilities or disabilities, they tried hiring the handicapped. It worked in our town; it will work in all other towns.

Schoharie County Joins in Opposing Award of TVA Turbine Generator Contract to Foreign Firm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, my mail continues to include expressions of formal disapproval of the recent action of the Tennessee Valley Authority in awarding a contract for a 500,000-kilowatt turbine generator to a British firm, in spite of the heavy unemployment being experienced in areas where American manufacturers constructing such machinery do business.

I hope that these expressions of opinion, presented here formally in the RECORD, may help to impress upon those in authority at the TVA that their action at this critical time in our economic life was unwise and contrary to the best interests of the Nation.

I am sure that the action of the TVA in this regard has not contributed toward public confidence in this agency in many sections of the country, and I think that the leaders of the TVA may soon realize that what they have done in the name of economy will have a long run damaging effect on the future of their organization.

I include herewith the resolution unanimously adopted by the Schoharie County Board of Supervisors and forwarded to me as the Representative of the district which includes the great General Electric turbine manufacturing plant:

RESOLUTION 41, SUPPORT OF LOCAL INDUSTRY

Whereas an agency of our Federal Government has recently awarded a contract for a large steam turbine generator to a foreign firm; and

Whereas many of the employees of the Schenectady plant of the General Electric Co. are residents of Schoharie County; and

Whereas the economy of this country and of all other areas adjacent to Schenectady have been adversely affected by the aforesaid award, and would be adversely affected by any future awards of this nature; and

Whereas the defense effort and capability of our country will be deterred by any future awards of this nature: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the opinion of the Schoharie County Board of Supervisors that appropriate legislation be adopted whereby agencies of our Federal Government would be required to confine the award of contracts to domestic firms when such action will be in the best interests of the economy and defense of our country; and be it further

Resolved, That the clerk of the board of supervisors be and he is hereby directed to forward copies of this resolution to Hon. Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; Senator Jacob Javits; Senator Kenneth Keating; Congressman Ernest Wharton; Congressman Samuel Stratton; and to the clerks of the boards of supervisors of the Counties of Schenectady, Albany, Montgomery, Rensselaer, Saratoga, Fulton, Otsego, Greene, and Delaware.

Dated: March 20, 1959.
Filed: March 20, 1959.

STANLEY A. FRANCE,
Clerk.

Approved as to form and legality.

JOHN S. MAUHS,
Schoharie County Attorney.

Credit Unions: Their Purposes—the Organized Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, on March 28, 1959, Mr. J. Orrin Shipe, assistant managing director of the Credit Union National Association, delivered an address before a group of industrial leaders who were meeting at Alabama Polytechnic Institute in Auburn, Ala. With the thought that Mr. Shipe's address would be of interest to the Members of the Congress, I am privileged to insert the speech herewith in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under leave heretofore granted:

CREDIT UNIONS: THEIR PURPOSES—THE ORGANIZED MOVEMENT

(By J. Orrin Shipe, assistant managing director, Credit Union National Association, presented at Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Auburn, Ala., March 28, 1959)

My job here today, as I understand it, is to give you a general picture of credit union history and the organized movement so that in later sessions you will have a better

understanding of what credit unions are and how we all work together to help people help themselves.

First of all, I'd like to preface my remarks with a few facts about the textile industry and credit unions. They are by no means strangers to each other. Some of the very first credit unions formed in the United States were among textile employees in New England. So when I talk about credit union history, I am not referring to groups of people with whom you have no connection or interest. The textile industry has shared in a large part of the advances that have been made in the history of the credit union movement in this country, and many of our ideas have come from textile employees.

At this time, there are at least 176 credit unions serving textile industry employers and their workers. Sixteen of these textile employee credit unions are located here in Alabama, and 19 of them serve employees of textile mills in Georgia. Chances are you are familiar with many of the plants which have credit unions.

My remarks today will never replace such action-packed classics as "Treasure Island" and "Tom Sawyer," but they do tell a story of adventure. Perhaps this tale should have even more meaning to us than yesterday's fiction stories because it deals with real people, doing real things, in a real world. The main characters are men—like you and me—who grasped hold of an idea, planted it in the minds of other people, nurtured it, and watched it grow, bigger and more mature, until today—like the shade of a spreading chestnut tree—that idea is providing an ever increasing amount of comfort to an ever-growing segment of the world's population.

To start the story, we have to go back more than 100 years to a little farm village in southern Germany, called Flammersfeld. The year was 1849. Times were bad in Flammersfeld and throughout all Germany. The country was deep in a general depression. Cities were crowded with unemployed. Men who before had been able to earn their bread with honest toil were reduced to begging, destitution, and actual starvation. To make matters worse, a drought struck, and ruined the farmers' crops 2 years in a row. The people were desperate. To keep from starving, many of them had gone hopelessly in debt to unscrupulous moneylenders whose interest rates were extortionate.

Fortunately, the people of Flammersfeld had elected as their mayor a man who was destined to take his place in history with other champions of the common man's cause. His name was Friederich Wilhelm Raiffeisen, and he became the father of the credit union movement. Raiffeisen was sick at heart over the plight of his people. He approached the wealthier people of his town and beseeched them to help the starving people, but it was immediately obvious that charity was merely a stopgap solution to the problem. Raiffeisen finally decided that the only way his people could help themselves was by getting together and helping each other.

The idea grew into one of the world's first credit societies. In setting up the society, Raiffeisen draw up three conditions he considered imperative to the success of the organization. They were (1) that only people who belonged to the credit union should borrow from it, (2) that loans would be made only for provident and productive purposes, and (3) that a man's character would be the most important security for his loan. These three conditions still are the foundation of the credit union movement.

The next most important figure in credit union history, as far as Americans are concerned, was Alphonse Desjardins, a Canadian court reporter, who shared Raiffeisen's interest in the economic welfare of his neighbors. Desjardins became interested in credit societies in the late 1800's. The situation in his hometown of Levis, Quebec, was similar to that which confronted Raiffeisen a half century earlier. The people were poor, times were bad, and Desjardins was appalled at the exorbitant rates of interest they had to pay to obtain credit.

After years of studying European credit societies, Desjardins organized in 1900, the first credit union in North America, among the poor fishermen and farmers in his hometown. It was a very modest beginning. The first savings deposit made was only a dime. The first collection among the members netted only $26. Desjardins, however, was not discouraged. He persevered, and within a short time his small credit union was providing its members with more comfort and financial independence than they had ever had.

Meanwhile, the credit union idea had spread to other parts of the world. The first American to become genuinely interested, picked up the idea while on a trip to India.

That American was the great liberal merchant, Edward A. Filene, of Boston, who made a fortune because of his progressive ideas in merchandising, and then used that fortune to promote progressive ideas in many other fields of human activity.

Filene's interests were limitless, but they all had one common goal—the creation of a better economic and civic life for men and women who toil for a living. He was a man who if he had never done anything else but be a merchant would have been outstanding.

Filene's first contact with credit unions came while on a trip to India in 1906. While in a Calcutta hotel, Filene met, by accident, an English civil servant who was paying visits to little Indian villages to help them form credit societies. His curiosity aroused, Filene accompanied the Englishman on one of these trips. That accidental meeting and short trip was enough to instill in Filene a boundless enthusiasm for the development of credit unions, which stayed with him until the day he died.

In 1909, a combination of events took place, sewing together the net that was to eventually draw Filene into a long and active association with the promotion of the credit union idea. One of the most important of these events was a study being made of unauthorized banking practices in Massachusetts by Pierre Jay, then banking commissioner of that State. Jay discovered about a half dozen cases where employees of a business organization had organized themselves into a savings and loan association to receive deposits from one another and in turn to lend them to one another.

To Jay's way of reasoning, here were a half dozen associations, serving a useful purpose in the field of personal loans, but operating with no authority of law. He had to decide whether they should be supervised and perhaps restricted, or encouraged and multiplied.

To help find the answer to this problem, Jay went to the Boston Public Library. There he stumbled across Henry Wolff's book on "People's Banks." In it Jay found about similar organizations which were performing, under a variety of names, the same services in many European and Asiatic countries. Jay also learned of the work Alphonse Desjardins was doing in Quebec.

Jay wrote to Desjardins, and a flood of correspondence began to flow between the two men. As a result, in 1908 Jay recommended that Massachusetts not only authorize but put its prestige in back of these little savings and loan associations by providing for their incorporation and admitting them to the brotherhood of banking institutions in Massachusetts.

Jay's next step was to prepare a bill which would provide a State law authorizing the organization of these groups. To help with its preparation, Desjardins came down from Quebec for a few days. A public hearing was set on the bill by the banking committee of the Massachusetts Legislature. It was at this point that Edward A. Filene added his support to the credit union idea—an action which gained for him the title of father of the credit union movement in the United States.

Up to the point at which Filene entered the scene, most of the testimony before the banking committee came from the Canadian, Desjardins. He was questioned closely by the committee, but, being a citizen of another country, his testimony didn't carry much weight. As Desjardins finished Filene voluntarily appeared before the committee as an interested citizen. Interest immediately picked up. Here was a prominent Massachusetts man who had actually seen credit societies in operation.

Needless to say, Filene's testimony cinched passage of the bill. The Massachusetts Legislature enacted the law in 1909.

On this same journey to Massachusetts, Desjardins made a side trip to New Hampshire, and while there organized the first credit union in the United States in a church parish. Credit unions were now a reality in the United States, but their growth and development during the next 12 years was anything but spectacular, mostly because of the lack of effective credit union laws.

Two things happened in 1912 to help change this, however. The Massachusetts law was improved, and a Federal Commission returned from studying banking practices in Europe. As a result, President Taft wrote a letter to all State governors encouraging them to have credit union law enacted in their States.

Several States followed President Taft's advice, but it wasn't until 1921, when Edward A. Filene again stepped into the credit union picture, that the credit union idea gained the impetus and support it needed if it was to ever be of help to more than a handful of people.

Realizing that the development of credit unions was at a standstill, and would remain so unless proper steps were taken to develop better laws and more leadership, Filene established the Credit Union National Extension Bureau.

The purpose of the Bureau was to seek enactment of effective credit union laws in all States, promote the organization of new credit unions throughout the United States, and to actively organize new credit unions. To accomplish these goals, Filene selected a young Boston attorney to head the Bureau. This man, Roy F. Bergengren, was to become the voice, the heart, and the working mind of the credit union movement for many years to come.

When Filene and Bergengren began their work, there were only 4 workable State laws and 199 credit unions. In the next 13 years, up until 1934, Filene poured more than $1 million of his personal wealth into the development of the credit union idea, and Roy F. Bergengren devoted his full time and energy to the realization of that goal.

Two major accomplishments in 1934 climaxed these two men's crusade. A Federal Credit Union Act was passed, making it possible to organize credit unions the length and width of the United States, and in its possessions; and the Credit Union National Association was established to take the place of the Filene-financed Credit Union National Extension Bureau. The time had finally come for the credit union movement, which preached self-help to stand completely on its own feet.

The growth of credit union service since 1934 has been truly spectacular. At the end of 1934, there were less than 2,500 credit unions in the United States. Today there are 20,000. There were less than one-half million credit union members. Today there

are more than 10 million. Total credit union assets in 1934 were $40 million. Today there are well over $4 billion. Since the end of World War II, we have been the fastest growing financial institution in the world, and at our present rate of growth, it is apparent that we will continue to hold that record for some years to come.

By this time though, you're probably wondering when I'll get around to explaining just what a credit union is. I'm sure many of you already know something about us, but perhaps I can clear up some of the cloudy images.

Credit unions are really a very simple institution. As defined, a credit union is an organization of people, with a common bond, who pool their savings and use these pooled savings as a source of low-cost loans for provident and productive purposes. Each credit union is owned and operated by its own members, and is chartered and supervised by States or Federal Government.

A credit union is one thing to one person, and something entirely different to someone else. To one man it's a source of low-cost loans. To another it's a good investment place for his savings. To one businessman it's a boon to his business. To another businessman it's unfair competition. To a teacher it's a wonderful way to teach people how to save regularly and use their credit wisely. To a sociologist, it's a perfect outlet for group participation. To one employer, it's a useful organization which saves him time and money, by reducing garnishments, wage assignments, pay advances, and company loans. To another employer, it's a headache, and an un-American group that doesn't pay taxes.

So, you can see, a credit union is many things to many people. Which of these are right and which are wrong you will learn in this seminar today.

Next, you might ask what benefits an employer will receive from the operation of an employee credit union. The question is a fair one because in order to succeed the credit union will need the moral support of your company.

CUNA recently conducted a survey of some 2,000 industrial concerns, about half of which had credit unions and half which did not. In each case, the questionnaire was directed to the company's personnel director, and he was asked to give the management's viewpoint on the operation of their employees' credit union.

The responses were exceptionally enlightening, and they substantiated to a large degree, our belief that credit unions are just as helpful to an employer as they are to his employees.

I won't bother to go into full detail about the survey, but let me give you a thumbnail sketch of its results.

Among the companies with credit unions, the concensus was overwhelmingly in their favor. Ninety percent agreed that they were a worthwhile part of their employee relations program, while only 3.5 percent said outright that they did not think credit unions had any value from an employee relations point of view. The other 6.5 percent either did not answer the question or said they did not consider the credit union as part of their employee relations program because credit unions are operated entirely by the employees and not by the company.

Other returns showed that 77 percent of the companies believed that credit unions protected their employees from high-cost moneylenders; 65 percent felt they improved management-employee relations; 58 percent said credit unions eliminated or reduced garnishments, pay advances, wage assignments and employee loans, and 32 percent believed credit unions improved workers' efficiency and safety records.

Although there was no 100-percent agreement on any of these items, the percentages I have just given you do not mean that the rest of the companies said their credit union did not help in these matters. In each instance, there was a large percentage of personnel officers who did not answer the question because they either didn't know or weren't sure of the exact effect their credit union had on these management problems.

As these figures show, the credit union has become a permanent and integral part of the lives of many millions of people. Each year that has passed since 1909 has brought the credit-union movement added strength. What gives it this strength? The answer is a combination of things. In the first place, the credit-union ideas combine man's idealism with the world's realism. His credit union is not just another sounding board for impractical ideas, but a practical and sound solution to a real problem. If it didn't provide a solution, the idea would have died years ago.

The credit-union idea puts into practice the religious principles man has been taught for centuries, and it puts into action the democratic ideals that man has sought for centuries. It creates a situation where no one man can profit at the expense of others, but where all men can profit with the help of others. Although, strictly speaking, there is no profit in the business sense of the word, since all credit unions are nonprofit organizations.

To share in a credit-union's benefits, a member gives up nothing and gains everything. His individual rights are not surrendered, rather they are strengthened, because his share in the benefits is in direct proportion to the amount of effort he, as an individual, puts into his credit union.

In the day-to-day operation of his credit union, a member attains the fruition of his religious principles and democratic ideals in a number of ways.

As an officer or committeeman, he performs the regular duties of a company executive without pay. He gives freely of his time and energy to bring about the proper management of his credit union, and to fulfill his responsibility as a trustee of the funds the credit union's members have deposited in it. Of the elected officials, only the credit-union treasurer is allowed, by law, to accept any pay, and most of the treasurers refuse to accept any pay until they are asked to take on the duty as their full-time job. This voluntary service is the very backbone of the credit-union idea. Without it, credit unions would be unable to operate with their low rate of interest, and would be unable to pay their members a fair dividend on their savings.

As an active participant in his credit union, a member achieves the fruition of his religious principles and democratic ideals through his participation in the credit union and its affairs. He knows that when he deposits $10 he is making it available to his fellow credit union members who may need it more than he does at that particular time. He also knows that when he borrows $100 from his credit union he is not only helping himself obtain a good buy on credit terms, but that his interest payments will help provide his fellow credit union members with a fair return on their savings. He also knows that when he exercises his right to vote at the credit union's annual meeting that he is practicing his undeniable right to share in the control of his own economic destiny.

The strength of the credit union movement, then, as you can see, comes from a number of sources, both through group and individual action. In addition, the credit union idea gains strength simply because it was born of just plain good commonsense. In acting on this good sense, a credit union member is no different than a good businessman.

If one of you needed a product for your company, you would first of all shop around for the best possible buy. If you couldn't buy it at a reasonable price, you either wouldn't buy it at all, or you would try to find other means of obtaining it, possibly by producing it yourself.

This is exactly what credit union members have done. First of all, they shopped around to find a good buy to answer their credit needs. When Raiffeisen started his first credit union, such a product was not available. In fact, such a product is not available to millions of people today, and that doesn't mean only in the so-called underdeveloped areas of the world, but right here in the United States in our own cities and rural areas.

The only course left to Raiffeisen and all of the credit union leaders who have followed him was to produce their own low-cost source of credit. This they have done, for 13 million people, through the 25,000-plus credit unions now operating throughout the world.

Low-cost credit, however, is not the only need credit unions are filling for their members. They also are actively helping their members develop regular thrift programs. They are constantly educating their members in the wise use of their money. And they are helping their members obtain democratic control of their money.

In so doing, credit unions are not only contributing to the economic welfare of their members, but they are contributing to the economic prosperity of Alabama, Georgia, the rest of the United States, and many other parts of the world.

During the half century they have been operating on this continent, our credit unions have helped their members build their savings, from the original 10-cent deposit in Desjardins' first credit union to more than $4 billion. At the same time, these credit unions have provided their members with additional billions of dollars in insurance benefits, have helped their members to buy many more dollars worth of real goods by saving them useless interest charges, have helped them infinitely to improve their standard of living, and have taught them the real meaning of cooperating with their fellow man.

Kansan Seeks End to CAB Stalling on Airline Service Application

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENVER D. HARGIS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. HARGIS. Mr. Speaker, the unexplained delay in a decision by the Civil Aeronautics Board on an 18-month-old application for establishment of airline service to certain Kansas and Oklahoma cities is causing considerable concern to officials of the cities involved. On April 16, I received a telegram from representatives of 17 Kansas communities, including Pittsburg, Parsons, and Independence in my home district, protesting any further delay or continuance in this case, known as the Kansas-Oklahoma local service case, docket No. 5482, et al. Feeling that these citizens indeed had legitimate grounds for protest, and knowing the urgent need for a substantial increase in the area's airline

facilities, I immediately wrote to the CAB, urging an early decision. The case for such action in the Third Congressional District of Kansas is summarized clearly, and in blunt, plainspoken language that makes the causes of dissatisfaction readily apparent, in an editorial that appeared in the April 20 issue of the Independence (Kans.) Reporter, under the title "God's Mill Grinds Slow." The editorial follows:

"GOD'S MILL GRINDS SLOW"

It's been well over a year now, in fact 18 months, that the Civil Aeronautics Board has been considering what airline is to serve a three-State area.

For a longer period than that even, communities in southeastern Kansas—notably Independence, Parsons, Coffeyville, Neodesha, and Cherryvale—have been asking for service at what would be called the Tri-City Airport located northeast of Cherryvale on U.S. 160.

Josh Lee, a former United States Senator from Oklahoma and former chairman of the CAB, was engaged to represent the area communities involved. After careful study it was decided to request that Central Airlines of Dallas be awarded the service at Tri-City.

If approval had been granted by the exemption method, Central planned to make two round trip north-south flights daily between Tulsa and Kansas City via Bartlesville and Topeka. If another application was reecived from any other airline, however, it meant a long and costly hearing.

Because the CAB chose to lump all applications for service similar to the southeastern Kansas group's into what has been known as the Kansas-Oklahoma case other airlines did make application and a long, drawnout, costly hearing has sure enough followed.

And so we here in this area have been delayed in getting this air passenger, freight and mail service while the CAB sits on its collective fannies and twiddles its thumbs.

Whoever it was once wrote, "God's mill grinds slow" apparently never thought there would be anything like governmental bureaus. If the rest of the quotation "but sure" applies, all well and good.

It would be well for the CAB to make their decision now with dispatch instead of additional delay so residents of the area can receive the benefits of commercial air service that has been far too long in coming.

Lewis L. Strauss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most honorable gentlemen, courageous and patriotic men, able and dedicated public servants it has been my privilege to know is Lewis L. Strauss. He is gentle; he is kind; he is humble; he possesses the quality of greatness that in our history such rare men as he have given as a heritage to the Nation. At the moment he is enduring a prolonged and difficult personal trial. It is good that those who know, admire, and respect him speak words of encouragement at this time.

A Centennial for All Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, our former colleague, the Honorable Dewey Short, Assistant Secretary of the Army, whom we greatly admire, delivered a notable and inspiring address in Richmond, Va., on Thursday, April 16, 1959, on the occasion of the Second National Assembly of the U.S. Civil War Centennial Commission. Under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am pleased and privileged to include the following text of Mr. Short's address:

Mr. Chairman, my fellow Americans, ladies, and gentlemen, when I first received an invitation from my good friend, Karl Betts, to address this group tonight, I experienced a series of various emotions. I was honored as well as pleased but nevertheless a little bit frightened. Naturally I felt honored because these meetings are for the purpose of launching our centennial planning. I was pleased because Karl, in his great wisdom, was perceptive enough to know that the ideals and plans of this Commission are objects of some of my fondest dreams. And still I was somewhat frightened because I knew I would be addressing an audience of experts and nothing scares an old political campaigner more than that.

However, my fears are a bit allayed because no expert has yet been born who understands fully the causes, operations, and results of the Civil War. The best and most impartial historian finds it difficult, if not impossible, to plumb the fathomless depths and accurately assess the true meaning of this most terrible of fratricidal strifes. A great philosopher once said, "The day is deep and deeper than the day can dream." Life is deeper than logic and the heart has reason that reason knows not of. Perhaps this is why a study of the War Between the States is so interesting, challenging, and absorbing. As a youngster I was a voracious reader of the accounts of this conflict and the older I grow I become more avid in my study of it. Sometimes I feel the more I know, the less I know about it. In puzzling moments one is tempted to give up in despair, but always there is a tug and a pull that draws one back to the severe task of trying to understand its meaning and profit by its lesson.

In thinking about this speech and this meeting, I was struck with the significance of our meeting place. It seems to me that I first heard about Richmond, Va., about the time I began learning about American history. The more history I learned, the more I grew to know and respect Richmond. It is a city of rich historical significance. It was a little less than 200 years ago at St. John's Church here in Richmond that a dedicated American patriot, Patrick Henry, consolidated the thoughts of all loyal Americans when he proclaimed to the world, "Give me liberty, or give me death." Then 85 years later this country was severed by those who doubted that a loose federation of States could endure and, as a result, Richmond, Va., became the seat of the Confederacy. The people of Montgomery, Ala., still consider their city the capital of the Confederacy and look upon you as Yankees from the North.

Richmond's history is rich with the contribution of great men and women, and the city has been the scene of stirring events. The incomparable author and poet, Edgar Allen Poe, grew up here; Capt. Sally Tompkins became the first modern-day angel-of-mercy during the Civil War hero; and two great armies met in grim deadlock to fight some of the most relentless, daring, and furious battles of history near this city in the spring of 1862 to the spring of 1865. One thing at least is certain: Gen. U. S. Grant III found it much easier and far more pleasant to enter Richmond today than did his grandfather on that April day in 1865. Now we have taken Richmond without firing a shot and Richmond has taken us over completely with her characteristic southern charm and generous hospitality. These mutual bonds of understanding and affection with a unity of heart, mind, and purpose is the richest legacy the Civil War has bequeathed to us.

This week we are gathered here to plan a centennial to commemorate that war. By meeting in Richmond we necessarily must be more sober in our efforts. The weight of history is inescapable in this city and this realization will do much to instill within us the fact that this must be much more than an ordinary centennial; it need be and must be a centennial of commemoration and dedication for all Americans, for out of the drama and strife of the Civil War we may find lessons that will guide us today.

One hundred years ago this Nation was plunged into civil war. Though 1859 was still 2 years away from actual battle, the decision had already been made and America was hopelessly, helplessly, yet manifestly, and inevitably moving toward war. This decision, it is obvious, had been reached sometime before; when no one can say. No specific incident nor event can be singled out for this condition.

Some would point to William Lloyd Garrison, others to John Brown; still others to the intractability of the slaveowners of the great southern plantations. Yet, no man, nor any single event can be named as the causal factor for the dread decision. The decision was the product of the time; a time when America was growing up—bursting as it were, its seams in boundless expansion—a time when America was beginning to realize that individuals must cooperate if this mighty union of States was to assume a position of preeminence in the world. It was inevitable that the Nation should have growing pains in such times; it was unfortunate that they resulted in war.

But out of the holocaust, heartbreak, misery, terror, and tragedy of civil war came unity. Never before had so much hell—both during the war and after—been endured for an accomplishment so magnificent. Never before had America understood and respected herself so well. That this Nation was to become a world power was part of its destiny; that this Olympus was achieved with such honor, integrity, morality, and right is testimony to the strength and determination of the American people.

A century has passed. Today, our problems are much the same as they were then. The details are different, the disputes not the same; yet, the mosaic of events is strikingly similar. Today, we do not have Bleeding Kansas or John Brown's raids, but today we do have Berlin, Korea, Indochina, Lebanon, Matsu and Quemoy, and Hungary.

Today, our outlook is based on a framework of nations within the world structure rather than a community of states within a single nation. But today, the question at issue is the very same that it was a century ago. And that question—as then—is freedom. Before the Civil War it was freedom of men, freedom of States apart from the national whole, and freedom of sections to determine their own ends. In this fight each side believed sincerely, deeply and emotionally that its individual arguments were

completely valid. The South was convinced that it should be allowed to secede from a union it no longer understood and whose laws and attitudes were working to disrupt a system long held honorable and viable. The North, just as determined, believed that a nation deemed for leadership should not be divided at a time when history was preparing the dawn of greatness.

Many historians have sought different explanations for the mighty conflict. This is not the time or place to argue the causes of the Civil War. They were many, complex, and imponderable—but the chief cause, no doubt, was the fight for the unlimited extension of the slavery system. After his election to the Presidency in November 1860, Lincoln wrote to Alexander H. Stephens, of Georgia, with whom he had served in Congress during the Mexican War and who later was to become Vice President of the Confederacy: "You think slavery is right and ought to be extended, while we think it is wrong and ought to be restricted. That, I suppose, is the rub. It certainly is the only substantial difference between us." This same sentiment was clearly, forcibly and unmistakably expressed in Lincoln's first inaugural address.

Today, we are locked in a struggle with an ideology that is attempting to destroy the concept of freedom. When we look at the Russian leadership in the Sino-Soviet bloc, we see a completely uninhibited dictatorship. And when I say uninhibited, I mean just that. There is no act however vile, no risk however great, no course however repulsive that they are not willing to take in order to carry out their avowed intension to bury us. Their philosophy, to our way of thinking, refutes itself before it fully matures into a philosophy. We know and understand that a philosophy with no consideration for humanity is a philosophy that cannot exist.

America's philosophy is one that we have had since the begining of our country. It is a philosophy that we share with our allies today, and it is a philosophy that we can believe in and trust fully. The belief that every man and every country should be free to chose its own course is one of the most basic, yet most noble verities of the world. It is a belief that we have entered war to uphold. And when I think of our Civil War, I think the most magnificent aspect of it was that each side, in its own way, was fighting to uphold the principle of freedom.

The brilliance, the determination and the courage of such men as Lee, Jackson, Lincoln, and Grant must inspire us as we recall their efforts. Often as I sit in my office in the Pentagon, I find myself glancing up at the fine portico of General Lee's mansion to recall the difficult decision that he made there and the strength of character, patriotic devotion, and the great spiritual resources he brought to that trying moment. Certainly for these traits and for the brilliance and humanity of his leadership, he deserves his sacred place in the hearts of all Americans. For these were values found on both sides of the conflict, even when the division it symbolized was at its deepest. That these men and these values should be applauded and held up as truth by this Nation is something that is as fine as it is unlikely. There were few in the Civil War who are now remembered as villains. The unity that derived from conflict had no room for villains; it does have a place to honor great men who were fighting justly and honorably for a cause that they believed in sincerely and deeply.

But these characteristics went well beyond the minds and souls of the war leaders; they extended, to a large degree, to every man engaged in the Civil War. Be they generals or privates, be they one man fighting for the Union and his brother cast as a rebel, be they great thinkers or determined farm boys; they all felt the religiously emotional impact of this struggle. At Seven Pines, the Wilderness, Manassas, and Bull Run, they were compelled by this impact and they fought battles whose description is at once horrible and magnificent.

But, though we can admire and praise the many fine things that sprang from the experience of Civil War, we must never forget that this was America's great essential tragedy. As do all great tragedies, it bred false hope in the form of 90-day enlistments and picnic atmosphere. "One rebel can kill six Yankees any day," they cried in the South, and in the North the people of Washington loaded up picnic baskets to witness the Union easily defeat the South at Bull Run. With banners flying, fifes shrilling, and spirits soaring they touched off what was to become the most horrible war in history. Through incredible hardship, near starvation, and gruelling warfare the men of the North and South fought a war for 4 years that they were promised would be over in 6 months at most. They saw two generations of Americans lose half of its number to death or injury; they saw families split, towns wiped out, traditions wrecked, and records lost. They saw the democratic process losing its force, and in doing so, wrecking the dreams of this country's ancestors. They knew that "war is hell" long before William Tecumseh Sherman told them that it was, for they could see in this war the tragedies of great men becoming doomed and a nation finding itself smashed on the rocks of malcontent.

America, which had historically been so strong, was lost. The fabric of union had been irreparably rent and no one could be found to weave an acceptable pattern. But more than this our Nation was caught up in a conflict that in many ways made no sense, had no pattern or justification. At its nadir it was an emotional experience comparable to the Dark Ages of Europe. There was little hope and less reality. This was compounded by the fact nearly everyone in this country felt the real, personal effects of war.

There were very few in this country that did not have a personal stake in the Civil War. Be it father, brother, husband or nephew; nearly everyone had kinfolk that were day after day risking their lives for something that in many ways because of its scope and impact was confusing and unreal to the American mind.

The totality of this experience shocked America to the point that the memory of the war was indelibly engraved on the American mind. The people of this Nation looked back and saw a 4-year ordeal that might have been avoided, and they avowed that this country would never again become involved in an emotional experience that would lead to the hell that is civil war. Out of ashes, out of terror, out of confusion this country once again became bound together. The weavers of union used a much more viable thread this time and wove a fabric that has withstood the greatest financial crisis, the most devastating depression, and the greatest two wars of history. America entered the Civil War an adolescent and came out mature. She felt the impotence that is war and determined that America could no more afford such folly. The mature America gathered strength and confidence and in a relatively short time parlayed her position of unity and stability into a position of world power. This she has been ever since, and this she became because the Civil War taught her to combine, unify and mature.

Today, America is nearly six times as large in population as she was 100 years ago. In spite of the mass of opinion and fact that has been written about that war, there are still people in this country who are unaware of the implications and lessons of our Civil War. What are the implications and lessons of this darkest chapter in our history? The most astute and renowned historians would perhaps say there are not and can not be any final and conclusive answers as to what the war really meant. As Bruce Catton has so well stated: "We are brooding over a deep, haunting enigma; over a riddle that can never quite be solved." We do know, however, that slavery and secession were the great bones of contention before this savage struggle and we also know that today slavery has been abolished and that the Union has been preserved. Slavery no longer exists, the Union does.

Often I have said, and I still believe, that all beauty is born of pain and that the deepest understanding in life comes through suffering. I hope no one here will think me sacrilegious when I say that at times I feel that the Civil War was America's Gethsemane and Calvary. Of course, there were hotheads on both sides of this conflict, but many good people, both in the North and the South, wanted to avoid bloodshed and earnestly prayed that this cup of woe, if it be God's will, might be taken from them. Yet, if it were necessary to abolish a great evil and particularly if it were necessary to preserve the Nation and save the Union they were willing to go through the tortures of war, the agony of the cross, in order to achieve these goals.

Anyway, the war came with its thrilling and saddening story of heroism and meanness, of wisdom and folly, where the best and the basest in men were born. Through the fiery furnace of the Civil War much of the dross in our national life was destroyed and on the hot anvil of armed conflict were forged the hard links in a chain of unity born through a common suffering and loss. All discord did not disappear with cease firing, but through a shared sacrifice which both sides well understood, there came a sympathy and understanding never known before. Appomattox may have spelled the end of the Confederacy, but it also gave birth to a new united and stronger nation. After the crucifixion came the resurrection of a new purified, unified, and glorified power. The greatest victory General Grant ever won was when he turned back to Lee his sword and their horses to his men. Never before or since in history has the vanquished been treated by the victor in so noble a manner.

So the Civil War that was begun rather gaily and lightly, which many thought would soon be over, was ended only after 4 long years of bloody struggle which had led more than 600,000 men through disillusionment, pain, and hardship, to death. The war did not divide this country because the country was already divided; in a strange, inexplicable any mysterious way the Civil War actually united the North and South through a great common sacrifice and tragic experience. Nations, like individuals, must suffer before they really understand; they must die before they truly live.

Tonight as we meet to exchange ideas about the best method to commemorate the centenary of this war, it seems evident to me that our first task must be to communicate to all Americans these lessons. We must cast our commemoration in the same die that the war was cast. It must be a sober affair; one that will try to define the intensity and tragedy of that great war. We must fight those who would wish to clothe the Civil War in a gown of romance, because if this were to happen we would be prostituting and destroying one of this Nation's finest experiences. We must try to recreate the emotion and intensity that went into this effort and try to explain that the horror of war came because our country was unprepared to tackle the problems that confronted her squarely and honestly.

By following these rules I feel we can achieve a double purpose. First, we will be

commemorating the Civil War in a way which will reflect judgment, sobriety, and determination of purpose. We will be doing much to destroy false notions about the war, and we will replace them with a conception that will give strength and dignity to the event as well as to the people of the Nation. No one can ask, no one will ask, more of us than this.

And by achieving this first purpose we will necessarily achieve the second. I mentioned earlier that we are facing today many of the problems that confronted this country at the outset of the Civil War. We face an enemy determined in purpose; and that purpose is our destruction—moral, economic, physical and intellectual. In this struggle we have the strongest weapon of war—conviction. With conviction weak nations have wrecked mighty empires; without conviction great states have fallen.

America added conviction to her arsenal after she found unity from war. In binding together, in founding an ever stronger nation, she proved to herself and to the world that, by God, under God and with the help of God our American Constitutional Republic in the finest form of government the world has yet seen. Of this we are convinced.

In our centennial, then, let us insure that all Americans learn how we gained this conviction; by doing so we shall be shoreing the foundations of our country at a time when we need all the strength and unity we can muster. We have learned our lesson—and at what a price. Today America is "liberty and union, now and forever, one and inseparable."

Ladies and gentlemen, we have a great and noble task before us; a task that in many ways will help to strengthen this Nation in her purpose and perspective. Surely it is worthy of our most profound effort. God help you and me to preserve America because America is God's best chance to save the world.

Thank you.

High Taxes Cramp Business Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by our colleague, THOMAS B. CURTIS, of Missouri, which appeared in the April issue of Nation's Business. Mr. CURTIS is a distinguished Member of the House Ways and Means Committee and I believe his article will be most interesting and helpful to all Members of the House.

HIGH TAXES CRAMP BUSINESS GROWTH—LAWMAKER SAYS TAX SYSTEM, IF NOT SOON REFORMED, COULD CAUSE NEW RECESSION

(A Nation's Business interview with Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS)

High taxes are stunting America's economic growth.

That's the opinion of U.S. Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, Republican of Missouri and an influential member of the tax-writing House Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. CURTIS, interviewed this month by Nation's Business, says that unless we move soon to reform our Federal tax system we face increasing unemployment and the prospect of a fourth postwar recession in the early 1960's. He is optimistic that such reform can be achieved despite strong opposition in Congress. His views are shared by a growing number of Members of the 86th Congress.

A Representative since 1950 from Missouri's Second Congressional District (St. Louis), Mr. CURTIS also serves on the Joint Economic Committee.

Following are the questions asked of Mr. CURTIS, and his answers:

"Congressman CURTIS, do you believe the present tax structure is damaging economic growth and progress?"

"I certainly do. I feel that the last recession to a large degree came as a result of our tax structure.

"To illustrate: The cutback in economic growth seemed to lie in two areas: business inventory and plans for business expansion.

"Much of the cutback seemed to be in small and growing businesses which rely heavily on retained earnings. Small businesses have faced—in fact, all American business has faced—a situation where our Federal tax structure, corporate income tax, plus inflation, has resulted in a capital levy.

"To illustrate, depreciation allowances in the corporate income tax permit a business to take only the original cost of a piece of machinery, not the replacement cost.

"Say a machine cost $100,000 in 1940. You are only allowed $100,000 depreciation, and yet, because of inflation, to replace that machine you need $200,000. So American industry has to have additional capital for replacement, let alone for growth.

"This is one area where I see the Federal tax structure impeding economic growth.

"The second area involves the impact of inflation.

"The point is that our local communities, school districts, sewer districts, and so on, depend essentially upon real estate taxes for their revenues. The real estate tax in turn is based upon real estate assessments. Most real estate assessments in any county were put on the books before the inflated dollar.

"The cost of wages and materials that the sewer districts, school districts, and municipalities have to pay for has gone up. Their revenue has not gone up the same way. They can't adjust it by increasing the rate of the real estate tax, because all of the new real estate that has gone on the books since 1950 is measured in the inflated dollar, and you would unfairly tax them.

"One way out—although politically difficult to do—is to reassess all real estate.

"The second way, unfortunately the easier of the two, is to ask the Federal Government to help finance community facilities. Communities have come to Washington because the tax structure impedes their growth."

"Do you believe that the Federal tax rate can be so high that increased rates mean less revenue?"

"Yes. I think this exists in many instances in our present tax structure. For instance, the $10.50 a gallon tax on liquor, in my judgment, is largely responsible for the increase in bootlegging. If we would reduce the rate, I suspect we would get more revenue, because we would be cutting into the bootlegging industry, which pays no taxes.

"Such examples are easy to understand. I feel that the rates in our personal income tax and our corporate tax also are beyond the point of diminishing return.

"Rates are so high that they destroy incentive. A great many business decisions are made, not on the basis of good economic judgment, but upon what the tax effect will be.

"To the extent that this is done we are interfering with normal growth and normal operation of the private sector of our economy.

"I might also say this: A 52-percent corporate tax means that the Government is the major partner and business the minor partner.

"If we just reduced the corporate rate to, say, 49 percent, where business would be the major partner, we would have more business decisions made on the basis of sound business judgment."

"Broadening the tax base has been suggested in connection with tax reform. What would this involve?"

"There are many ways of broadening the tax base. The basic way is to have private enterprise performing the services and manufacturing the goods for our people. That is an important point. We have seen Government going into business in a great fashion in recent years.

"When the Federal Government goes into business, it withdraws an operation from the tax base. In 1929, to illustrate, there was $9 in private investment for each dollar of Federal investment. That ratio has declined to a little less than 5½ to 1.

"But that private capital investment is essentially the tax base. If we could broaden the base back to 9, let's say, we could have a tax rate of 3 and a tax take of 27, but if you have a base of only 5½, you have to have a tax rate of more than 5 to produce the same take.

"That's one way of broadening the tax base.

"Another way is by plugging the tax loopholes. Whether a tax exemption is a loophole or a legitimate exemption is a question. The word loophole actually begs the question, but I think there are areas of tax favoritism. If we equalize the tax burden, and eliminate favoritism, we will broaden the base.

"Furthermore—and I am happy that the administration has made a recommendation—some methods of doing business seem to be escaping full tax burden. For instance, the cooperative method. I am not talking about the small farm cooperatives; I am talking about these big co-ops that have gone way beyond any concept of the little farm co-op. The co-op method of doing business certainly should not receive the tax preference it does over the corporate method of doing business.

"That would be another way of broadening the base."

"Would broadening the base raise revenue?"

"Yes, because we immediately apply the going rate to the base. I think we can compute tax revenue in a simple formula: It's tax base times tax rate times what I call a collectibility factor, and it's an important concept that has to be put into the formula.

"Our tax collection system is essentially a voluntary one. Our people cooperate in paying taxes. But when the tax rates become burdensome, we find this factor of collectibility becoming less and less.

"So we gain from increasing the base and reducing the rate, and collectibility is increased."

"Will more business incentive be created if the base is broadened?"

"Yes, because there is more equity. People are willing to put up with burdens if they think everyone else is carrying the same burdens. That bears on incentive."

"If rates are not reduced, do you believe economic growth will be stunted?"

"I think economic growth is being stunted.

"In Western Europe since 1952 the rate of economic growth has been almost twice that of the United States. I believe our tax structrue is the primary villain.

"I would predict that we are going to have more of this slowing down unless we revise our tax structure."

"Do you see recession as possible in the near future?"

"Not in the near future. It is likely that 1959 and 1960 will be the most prosperous years we have had. But I see in all of this the seeds of future recessions because of the burden being placed upon incentive and capital formation.

"Furthermore, I see the seeds of more inflation. As we have more inflation, the impact I have previously described upon business investment—replacement of capital assets—and upon municipalities in areas important to economic growth will be felt.

"I might mention a third area that is causing stagnation. That is this so-called locked-in investment. It's a result of inflation. A holding of common stocks worth, say, $100,000 in 1940 is now worth $200,000 in the deflated dollar. If a person sells, he is subject to a 25-percent capital gain, although it's a fictitious gain. As a result, people do not sell. This investment should be turned over constantly as individuals decide what is a better investment.

"If we are going to have more inflation, locked-in investment will be further accentuated."

"Does the high tax rate contribute to the unemployment rate?"

"There is no question that it does.

"Jobs come from economic growth. When there is economic stagnation, you don't have new jobs. Furthermore, as we advance technologically, and can do more with fewer people, we must find new jobs for those who are displaced.

"To do that, we need capital investment. The only place we get new products, really, is from money invested in research and development. That means more jobs all along the line."

"Are taxes being used for purposes other than raising revenues?"

"Yes, and to me it's one of the most dangerous things in our tax structure. The higher the tax rate, the more economic effect it has.

"Through high tax rates you can actually control the economy. It's a great temptation for lawmakers to use the tax structure for producing supposedly desired social objectives.

"I see more of that every day in the Ways and Means Committee, where we should be thinking primarily in terms of revenue."

"Would you predict whether taxes will be used more and more as regulatory devices?"

"If I predicted that, I would be saying that my own work will not be successful, because I am fighting it. But let me put it this way: The forces I see in motion to bring about the use of the tax structure for regulatory reasons are strong. Unless more people take the view I do, it's going to be used more and more to regulate."

"Would many men in Government like to keep tax rates high to hold on to the tax power to regulate?"

"I feel that some would. I don't think they are a large group, but they are an astute group.

"By increasing the tax rate, you can stunt growth and the private sector of the economy is unable to administer to the people's social needs. That in turn creates pressure for the Government to perform these services. As Government does more for the people, more taxes are needed. This is a vicious circle."

"These people would like to see the tax base narrowed?"

"I think they demonstrate they would prefer to see it narrowed. Any time they can get the Federal Government to do something that private enterprise was doing before, they will do so.

"The tendency of this group is to go to the Government first to solve problems, instead of trying to see if we can solve them through the private sector.

"If we can do the job through the private sector, we keep it in the tax base. If we do it through Government we remove it from the tax base and at the same time have to raise revenue to meet the cost of those social needs."

"Can you expand this idea of using taxes to control the economy?"

"Let me give you a good example.

"During and after the Korean war certain defense industries were granted certificates of necessity to let them write off the cost of new facilities at a faster-than-usual rate. What would a certificate of necessity mean if the tax rates were low? With the tax rates high, to be able to amortize some new equipment rapidly is of tremendous value. So just by using certificates of necessity you can funnel tremendous sums into a given area or take them away.

"Maybe the certificates of necessity are examples of things where the immediate economic results are good. On the other hand, clearly they illustrate the use of the tax structure to obtain what the Government thinks is needed."

"If, in the judgment of these people, the GNP is expanding at a rate which they consider too fast, all they have to do is to raise the taxes and slow it down?"

"That's right.

"If it is going too slow, they can lower rates and speed it up. In fact, they are before our Joint Economic Committee all the time urging exactly that. Last year they urged that we give tax reductions across the board.

"I didn't think that tax reduction was a good idea at the time, because they were thinking of tax reduction in terms of the consumer dollar. I said the way you get jobs for people is tax reduction in the investment dollar area, putting money into economic growth.

"If we wanted to help the people who were hurt in the recession, we would have been thinking in terms of tax relief that would create jobs. I sponsored a small business tax bill that would have done exactly that. My bill said that the only basis upon which small business could get a tax credit was to put that money into economic expansion, which meant more jobs."

"Will increased taxes on insurance companies retard their growth?"

"That is the key issue, in my judgment, particularly as we have the Federal Government going into the same field of providing for the retirement and disability of our people, through social security.

"If we stunt the insurance industry through taxes heavier than the industry can bear, it cannot go ahead in providing for the retirement and disability of our people, the premiums charged the people will have to be too high. That will create pressures on Congress to provide protection through the Treasury."

"Will revenue raised in this manner be significant?

"Yes. We are talking about possibly increasing the tax on life insurance companies from about $300 million to more than $500 million.

"This would have a far-reaching impact on the insurance companies, but no particularly significant impact on total Federal revenue.

"But this $200 million could ultimately cost the Treasury more than we would take in.

"Pressures already are great on the Federal Government to expand and increase social security benefits. If the insurance companies don't continue to expand, the pressures will be such that the Federal Government will extend social security benefits.

"Another thing—and this is a collateral issue but nonetheless important—the States have been permitted to use this industry as a method of raising revenue. States have been getting almost $300 million out of insurance companies through premium payment taxes. I have urged the Treasury Department and the staff of the Ways and Means Committee to bear that in mind, because we have to figure the total tax burden that we place upon any industry, not just that at the Federal level."

"Do you consider social security in competition with the insurance companies?"

"Yes, and the more we raise the wage ceiling on which the social security tax is levied, the more it gets into the field that our private insurance companies are in."

"Do you expect this kind of competition to increase?"

"I hope that it will decrease, but the pressures are such that it will probably increase.

"Not enough people recognize these dangers.

"The challenge is certainly there. In my judgment it does no good to talk about belief in private enterprise unless a person is willing to get down to details, analyze what private enterprise is, and then fight for it."

"Do you expect social security benefits to be broadened further?"

"Yes. I think there is sufficient pressure in this Congress to do it. I hope if we increase benefits we can increase social security taxes. This is the only way we can keep the social security fund solvent. I regret to say the history of the Congress, though, isn't so good. You will find only two or three instances where Congressmen had the courage to increase the social security tax as they increased the benefits. As the tax gets higher and citizens begin to feel the bite of it, Congress is going to be even more reluctant to vote increases.

"I question whether we really can be complacent about the solvency of the social security fund.

"Inflation also robs the social security fund. Therefore, all people who are counting on social security in their old age need to resist inflationary pressures."

"For the years ahead, do you expect the user tax concept to be broadened?"

"Yes, it is being broadened. Increasing user taxes I see as a good method of handling some of the cost of Government. After all wherever it is feasible we should have the people who use a particular Government service pay for the use. If we can increase user charges we will then be able to reduce the general tax rates."

"How do you think Government corporations and institutions such as TVA ought to be financed?"

"I question whether many of them should be in existence. TVA started out as a flood-control project involving dam construction. Some hydroelectric power would be available from the dams, and it would be economic waste not to use it.

"Then it was found that hydroelectric power fluctuates seasonally. Because power users have to have a constant source of power, TVA requested permission to build steam plants to supplement hydroelectric power. Now we find that 70 percent of the power generated in the TVA is from steam.

"Here is a good example of the Federal Government being in a business that is not in the tax base.

"I am suspicious of any Government corporation and feel that the existence of each one should be openly and fully justified.

"But you asked me how they should be financed. I suspect that few of them should be financed other than in the private sector of the economy."

"Do you see any danger in the use of earmarked taxes?"

"I see a grave danger. We think highways are important, so we earmark taxes for them. We think retirement of our people is important, so we earmark social security taxes for them. We think unemployment compen-

sation is an important social function, so we earmark taxes for that.

"You can go down the list of things that are important in our society, and start earmarking taxes, and you will end up without sufficient taxes for the one thing we know our Federal Government must provide—adequate defense. If we keep on with the earmarked tax formula, we can easily get to the point where we will have inadequate funds for defense.

"Although I said that I thought user taxes were good, let's not forget that it's easy to convert a user tax into an earmarked tax—I shouldn't say user tax; user charge is a better expression."

"What principal danger do you see in the growing Federal debt?"

"The principal danger is its inflationary effect. The Federal debt is additional credit imposed upon our economy. It simply means more money, and if you have excess money in a given economy, you are going to have inflation."

"Is inflation inevitable?"

"No. I think that proper fiscal policies can keep inflation from coming about. I think we can have stability, but I think the only way to achieve it is through proper Federal budget and debt management. We are going to have to pay off some of the Federal debt. It is too large now, and it is the primary inflationary force in our economy today."

"Can we pay off some of it in the foreseeable future?"

"The budget we are considering now is based upon the prospect that 1959 or 1960 will be the most prosperous years in history. Yet we are not reducing the debt.

"Surely if we can't do better than that in our most prosperous years, we will have deficit financing again when we get a less prosperous year. The only way to reduce the debt is to put a certain amount in the budget each year to be paid off."

"Would reduction of the corporate tax rate bring in more revenue?"

"I am convinced that if we reduced it, say, to 49 percent, it would increase the revenue. It would increase incentive. More business expenditures would be based on economics than tax consideration."

"Would anything be gained by granting tax exemptions for retained earnings plowed back into capital investment?"

"Very much, particularly in the area of our smaller and medium-sized businesses.

"We get our basic economic growth from small and medium businesses. Traditionally they finance growth through retained earnings.

"If we will permit our businesses to retain a certain portion—not all of it, just a tax credit for what they put back into economic growth—we are going to create more jobs. That is what economic growth is.

"I suggest a third area which is almost as important. Stop uneconomic mergers and acquisitions, where big companies buy up small companies—to a large degree because of the tax structure, and because these smaller concerns, through their inability to finance growth, are helpless.

"I am satisfied that this would do more to stimulate healthy economic growth and bring in more Federal revenue than eliminating the tax loopholes, important as that is, too."

"Do you expect Congress to grant tax deductions for the cost of higher education?"

"I hope so. The budget already includes an expense item for Federal aid to education for loans, scholarships, and so forth. We are already spending the money. I suggest: Instead of the Federal Government spending it and setting up a bureaucracy to figure out how to spend it, let's grant a tax deduction to families willing to send their children to college. It doesn't matter from the standpoint of a balanced budget whether we decrease income by $200 million, or whether we increase expenditures by $200 million.

"I suggest you get more education from allowing individuals to spend the $200 million than from letting the Government spend it."

"Will the depreciation laws be liberalized?"

"I am afraid they won't. They should be, in my judgment. We need liberalization for two reasons. First, the impact of inflation is still heavy. Actually we have a capital levy assessed against American business. Second, in today's rapid technological advancement, a machine is replaced not because it's worn out but because a better machine is developed."

"Will laws involving expenditures for research and development be liberalized?"

"No. I wish they would be. The Federal Government is spending increasing sums directly for research and development. I suggest a more efficient way of spending money is to grant tax deductions for research and development."

"Do you expect the principle of tax averaging to be extended to individuals?"

"No, but it should be. That would again help economic growth."

"Will the tax-exemption features of retirement programs be extended to self-employed individuals?"

"I'm afraid not. I regard this as a short-sighted attitude toward all of these proposals for letting the people rather than the Federal Government spend the money.

"There is tax exemption for corporations providing for the retirement of people, but this same privilege is not extended to individuals who work for themselves. If this unequal process is continued, we will badly damage the professions."

"What is the prospect for tax reform in the foreseeable future?"

"It won't be good until, in my judgment, more people realize that taxes have economic effects, and that we must evaluate our tax laws in terms of economics. We cannot keep the short-range view of looking at specific taxes and saying our revenue depends on the tax rate.

"The tax formula, I repeat, is revenue as the result of the tax rate, times the tax base, times the factor of collectibility. If more people will only agree that this is the formula for revenue, we might get somewhere toward a real fundamental tax revision.

"I am optimistic that as time goes on more people will understand the basic reasons for economic growth. Then we can move toward real progress."

Statement of Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield Before the House Post Office and Civil Service Subcommittee Investigating the Mailing of Obscene and Pornographic Material, April 23, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield:

I deeply appreciate the opportunity and the courtesy of this committee for its invitation to appear at this opening session of the first public hearings and inquiry into the very serious matter of the use of the U.S. mails in the wholesale promotion and conduct of mail order business in obscene and pornographic materials.

Certainly this is not only a matter of joint concern and responsibility, but it is one of vital importance to all decent Americans—particularly the parents of teenage children.

The Post Office Department is gratified that Chairman MURRAY of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee has appointed this subcommittee composed of such able members and headed by a Congressman possessing the sensitivity and good judgment of Representative KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN, to inquire into this important subject.

It is my deep conviction—frequently expressed to individual members of this committee, religious and educational leaders, newspaper editors, and citizen groups that one of the most serious morale and social problems in the United States today is the multi-million-dollar mail order traffic in obscenity.

The records show quite clearly that the Post Office Department, over the years, has diligently tried to keep the mails clear of indecent matter, even though it has been subjected frequently to attack and ridiculed by those who hope to profit personally from unrestricted mailings, or by those who, confusing liberty with license, unwitingly give them assistance.

Ruthless mail order merchants in filth are violating the homes of the Nation in defiance of the National Government. They are callously dumping into the hands of our children, through our mail boxes at home, unordered lewd material, as well as samples soliciting the sale of even more objectionable pictures, slides, films and related filth. Unquestionably, these large, defiant barons of obscenity are contributing to the alarming increase in juvenile delinquency, as many noted authorities have publicly observed on repeated occasions.

Complaints which are flooding the Post Office Department at the rate of at least 50,000 annually come from leading clergymen, parent-teachers associations, high school principals, college presidents, newspaper editors, and alarmed parents by the thousands. All are appalled by the social blight which every American citizen wants stamped out, and which the Post Office Department is determined will be stamped out.

As I am sure this commitee knows, Congress first saw fit to enact legislation March 3, 1865, making it a Federal offense to mail matter of obscene nature. An expanded version of this basic law was embodied in the great Postal Reorganization and Codification Act of June 8, 1872. These were criminal laws. In each of these legislative actions the Post Office Department has lent it fullest support.

Since World War II, commercialized pornography has reached an alarming intensity within the confines of certain geographical areas of this country. It is estimated that $500 million is realized annually in mail order pornography and obscenity.

There appear to be two basic reasons for the increasing volume of filth in the mails. First, the tremendous profits realized from a relatively small capital investment; and second, the very broad definition of obscenity handed down by certain courts, including those in certain metropolitan areas—notably Los Angeles and New York, where most of the mail-order business in obscenity and pornography originates.

These liberal rulings have established, over a period of time, virtual sanctuaries in which dealers in obscenity have operated with impunity and in defiance of the Post

Office Department's best efforts to bar their use of the mails or bring them to justice.

As this committee well knows, prior to last year, controlling decisions of the courts held that prosecutions under the pertinent statutes could be effected only in the district where the office of mailing is located. As this committee further knows, and as the legislative record will show, the Post Office Department strongly urged for the past several years the enactment of legislation which would grant prosecutive venue at intermediate offices and offices of address, where the actual damage undoubtedly occurs. Such legislation in the form of an amendment to section 1461, title 18, U.S.C., was passed by the 85th Congress and signed into law by President Eisenhower.

We are convinced that this new legislation provides an effective weapon for dealing with those dealers in filth who have heretofore operated with little interruption and with comparative security from certain large cities.

The Post Office Department is pressing the use of this new legislation to the fullest possible extent. The first case presented following passage of the amended legislation was at Boise, Idaho, and related to mailings made in California and Oregon, addressed for delivery at Grace, Idaho. The offenders, a man and his wife, each received a 10-year prison sentence and fine. Other cases of similar nature are now pending before U.S. attorneys from whom positive responses have been received.

In order that this committee and the public as well may be fully informed of the fact that the Department has been alert to its responsibilities, and has been bending every effort to meet the challenge of those who use the mails to corrupt, I should like to call your attention to the fact that during fiscal year 1958, postal inspectors conducted 4,000 separate investigations relating to the mailing of obscene and pornographic matter and caused the arrest of 293 persons. This is an increase of 45 percent over the previous year and is the highest of record. Investigations and prosecutions during the current year to date are substantially higher than those of last year. During the same period of time, fiscal year 1958, the General Counsel issued 92 unlawful orders under section 259(a), title 39, United States Code, barring use of the mails.

Within the past 10 days, three simultaneous raids made by U.S. marshals and postal inspectors upon the New York headquarters of three of the reputed largest eastern dealers in obscenity and pornography resulted in the seizure of approximately 15 tons of films, slides, photographs, and trashy literature, and the arrest of the operators. One mailing list alone contained 100,000 names. These dealers have been identified in numerous previous cases. Unlawful orders have been issued against two of them in particular on various occasions. They have been involved in local arrests resulting in negligible fines or other sentences, and they have promptly and defiantly renewed their activities under changed names.

On Friday of last week, the premises of a Santa Monica, Calif., dealer in especially objectionable films and photos were raided. A large number of films and considerable volume of other material were seized, and the operator was arrested. He had been identified only a few days previously through mailings reaching the east coast.

In our determined efforts to clean up the mails, we are receiving increasingly valuable assistance from the public: However, it is clear that there must be a greater, expanded public awareness of the seriousness and the demoralizing results of the wholesale distribution of filth to the children of this country, if we are to deal with this matter in a completely effective manner. It is my opinion that the greatest single need today is widespread and concerted public support of this program, which relates to such a remarkable degree to the welfare of each home in the country, and I feel, too, that an awareness on the part of the courts of the real dimensions of this situation is absolutely essential.

The principal problem facing the Post Office Department today in its efforts to clean up the mails is ruling upon the acceptance of material which is widely regarded as objectionable without violating leading court decisions, which obviously are more liberal in their definition of obscenity than are the views of many thousands of patrons of the postal service.

For example, certain nudist and other magazines are today granted second-class mailing privileges by the Post Office Department, consistent with Supreme Court rulings. Some of these second-class mailing permits are granted only after extensive litigation. in one such instance, the Department's refusal to grant a publisher of a magazine a second-class mailing permit resulted in a court decision holding that the law does not authorize the refusal of mailing privileges upon future, unpublished issues of a magazine, despite the fact that past issues contained allegedly obscene matter. Along with these decisions comes the inevitable, cleverly designed propoganda by dealers in filth, who will cite one or more of the less aggravated cases to argue that the Post Office Department is attempting to set up a censorship, to restrict freedom of expression, or to suppress the distribution of art.

While these allegations are so ridiculous as to require no denial, they point to the problem involved in attempting to meet our responsibilities as we see them, to an American public who, through their urgent and sometimes pitiful protests by the thousands, indicate quite clearly that they have no difficulty in distinguishing between filth and art.

Section 1461 of Title 18, USC, the obscenity statute, provides penalties for the mailing of "every obscene, lewd, lascivious, indecent, filthy, or vile article." Courts in interpreting the intent of Congress have stated in effect that (1) nudity in itself is not obscenity; (2) that a publication is not obscene unless the general content is devoted to what may be termed obscenity; and (3) that obscenity must be evaluated in relation to contemporary community standards. Thus, it appears clear that among such other legislative steps as may appear necessary, the intent of Congress as to what constitutes obscenity is essential, along with a public assertion as to the standards of morality for which it stands.

In spite of the frustrations and the legal complications, and even the court decisions, I feel a responsibility to the public to attempt to prevent the use of the mails for indecent material, and to seek indictments and prosecutions for such offenses, even though it may be argued that it falls in the category of material concerning which there have been previous rulings favorable to the promoters. It seems to me that only by this method can the dimensions of this problem become clearly established before the courts and the Congress and the American public.

The type of material to which I refer can be exhibited to this committee in great volume, and I invite the committee to visit the department for this purpose.

It is our intent to continue to pursue this program to the fullest extent of our investigative and other resources, and the genuine interest of the Congress and the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, and this subcommittee in particular, has been, and I am sure will continue to be of tremendous assistance.

Is It Just?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, the Cooperative Extension Service of the State of Maine periodically publishes a report entitled "Economic Facts Significant to Maine Agriculture."

Contained in a recent report was an article bearing the title of "Is It Just?" which vividly points out how potato farmers unjustly are the victims of their own productive genius. Because the theme of this article has application to the plight of all farmers in America, I submit it to the RECORD:

IS IT JUST?

William Schrumpf, agricultural economist, who does the deeper and more scientific digging into the economic facts and figures of the potato business for the University of Maine, has just come up with the information that in recent years farmers have averaged less for their potatoes (in real value) than they did back in those bad depression years before World War II.

This is true for the entire country as well as for Maine.

In dollars of 1951–57 value, the average price farmers of the United States received for potatoes in 1934 to 1940 was $2.59 a hundredweight. For 1951–57 crops the average price was $2.16. The price had dropped 43 cents a hundredweight.

Maine figures tell a similar story. Figured this way, the prewar price was $2.26. For the last 7 years it has averaged $1.89—a drop of 37 cents per hundredweight.

Comparable figures for a few States are (in 1951–57 dollars):

	Hundredweight		Price drop
	1934–40	1951–57	
Maine	$2.26	$1.89	$0.37
New York	2.84	2.02	.82
Idaho	1.74	1.67	.07
North Dakota	2.24	1.72	.52

Mr. Schrumpf points out, though, that yields have increased so much that the value of the crop per acre has increased while the value per hundredweight was dropping.

Here are some values per acre computed in the same 1951–57 dollars:

	Value per acre		Increase
	1934–40	1951–57	
Maine	$368	$463	$95
New York	219	380	161
Idaho	231	306	75
North Dakota	114	215	101
U.S. average	186	341	155

The yield increases that made the gains in value possible are:

	Hundredweight per acre		Increases	
	1934-40	1951-57	Hundred-weight	Percent
Maine	163	245	82	50
New York	77	188	111	144
Idaho	133	183	50	37
North Dakota	51	112	61	119
United States	72	158	86	119

AGRICULTURE NOT ALONE

What are the lessons to be drawn from all this? Undoubtedly there are many. But first it is worthwhile to remember that what has happened to and in potato production has, to varying degrees, happened to and in nearly all U.S. farming. There has been an amazing increase in productivity while the real value per unit of product has gone down.

We can all be proud of the increase in productivity. It has kept the wolf from the door. It has been indispensable to our boasted national material prosperity.

But at the same time, the figures show that agriculture has not shared equally in that mounting prosperity. That would be possible with this decreasing real value per unit of product only if agriculture's efficiency were increasing at a rate far faster than the progress of other industry. Proud as we are of agriculture's tremendous forward strides, the farming segment makes no claim to be outdoing others.

Frankly, figures like these show U.S. agriculture still suffering from a basic injustice—from a failure to be paid fairly in the marketplace for the work and fast mounting skills that it devotes to the national well-being. In many fields of farming just as in potatoes, agriculture has actually lost ground economically if you measure by whether farming returns have gained at a rate equal to that of the rest of the economy.

Captain Courageous

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on May 8 former President Harry S. Truman will reach his 75th birthday. I take this opportunity to pay a personal tribute to Mr. Truman, whom I believe will go down in history as one of our great Presidents. He was truly a man of the people.

Championing the cause of the common man always brings sharp criticism from powerful special interest groups. Few Presidents during their terms of office had a more hostile press than Mr. Truman. Like other great Presidents, he was a target for all kinds of slander and abuse.

Other Presidents less strong, less able and courageous have been glorified by the special interests and by those who control the major sources of news and information. But history has a way of bringing out the truth and the real character of a man. I am sure that when passing time washes away, as it always does, the mud and whitewash from our Presidents, Harry S. Truman will stand high among our Nation's great.

With each passing day the stature of Mr. Truman grows. His rightful place as a people's President is assured. May he and his good wife enjoy many more years of health and happiness. He has well earned the respect and admiration that has so abundantly increased since he left the White House.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include herewith a salute to Harry S. Truman from the current issue of the Democratic Digest:

CAPTAIN COURAGEOUS

Among the great human assets of the democracy there stands out in living legend the sunny person of our party's premier statesman. He approaches his fourth quarter-century with the ebullience of a colt, the vigor of a champion, the warmth of—well, the warmth of Harry Truman.

Here in one keen intellect and roomy heart are personified the achievements and aspirations of the party, which pays tribute to him once more on this May 8th as he turns 75.

The Nation's debt to Harry Truman, the debt of free men everywhere, is vast. But he wears his honors, like his years, with no trace of pomp. Pride he rightly owns, but not vanity. Self-importance could hardly overtake a man who referred to himself, in the glare of adulation at the White House, as "the two-headed calf" and "the Cardiff Giant."

Nobody expects Mr. Truman at 75 to take to the rocking chair and enjoy a tame serenity among his memories. But what memories.

Of the Missouri boy, turned down by both West Point and Annapolis because of short eyesight, who fought in World War I as captain of artillery and wound up as Commander in Chief.

Of the county official who hoped to be a Congressman, and was drafted to run in 1934 for Senator instead.

Of the Senator, hotly challenged for renomination in 1940, who (in his own words) "went to bed defeated" on primary election night and was awakened in the middle of his sleep to be told he had won.

The memories shift to a larger arena. In 1944 Senator Truman was pledged to support James F. Byrnes for the vice presidential nomination, and was thunderstruck on being informed at Chicago that F. D. R. wanted him, Harry Truman, as running mate. He protested to National Chairman Hannegan "that I wanted to stay in the Senate, and that I would not take the nomination." Hannegan told Mr. Roosevelt by telephone, in Truman's presence, that "he had never been in contact with as mulish and contrary a man." F. D. R. said a few words about "letting the party and the country down in the midst of a war," and Mr. Truman yielded.

According to the late Harry Hopkins, Mr. Roosevelt had had his eye on Senator Truman for a long time. The record of the Senator's Defense Investigating Committee was good—he'd got himself known and liked around the country—and above all he was very popular in the Senate.

There came April 12, 1945, and an urgent summons to the White House. Mrs. Roosevelt, as Mr. Truman described it, "stepped forward and placed her arm gently about my shoulder, 'Harry,' she said quietly, 'the President is dead.' For a moment I could not bring myself to speak. 'Is there anything I can do for you?' I asked at last. I shall never forget her deeply understanding reply. 'Is there anything we can do for you?' she asked. 'For you are the one in trouble now.'"

Mr. Truman's lifelong self-education in history paid rich dividends now. His detailed familiarity with the lore of past Presidents, and of history in general both ancient and modern, gave him a perspective such as few if any other tenants of the office have possessed. This, and his experience as chairman of the Defense Investigating Committee, helped him to absorb quickly the many secret problems of war and world politics which came pressing upon him. Of these secrets the greatest was, of course, that an atomic bomb was in the works.

Vast events unrolled at a breathtaking pace. In a single 4-month period Germany surrendered, the United Nations Charter was signed at San Francisco with Mr. Truman in attendance, he met with Churchill and Stalin at Potsdam, A-bombs were dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, Japan surrendered, and the President submitted in a message to Congress the 21 points of the doctrine that came to be known as the Fair Deal.

The decision to use the A-bomb was, Mr. Truman wrote later, "up to me. Let there be no mistake about it." The decision was supported by his top military, scientific, and governmental advisers, and by Winston Churchill. "I did not like the weapon," Mr. Truman said. "But I had no qualms if in the long run millions of lives could be saved."

The Fair Deal message went up on September 5, 1945. That date lives in Mr. Truman's memory as a symbol of "my assumption of the office of President in my own right. It was on that date and with this message that I first spelled out the details of the program of liberalism and progessivism which was to be the foundation of my administration." The years of uneasy peace were studded with presidential achievements. In his first term Mr. Truman took bold measures that kept the Communists from engulfing all Europe—the Truman doctrine, which rescued Greece and Turkey; the Marshall plan, which lifted free Europe from postwar despair to prosperity; the great Berlin airlift, a cosmic thumbing of the nose at Russian treachery. He brought about unification of the Armed Forces; improvement of social security; advances in civil rights; progress in slum clearance and housing.

The Republican-dominated Congress of 1947–48—the notorious 80th Congress—gave his progressive program little more than the back of its hand, for which the GOP was to get a well-earned comeuppance at the polls. The 80th passed the Taft-Hartley Act over a veto in which Mr. Truman called it "bad for labor, bad for management, and bad for the country." It passed, also over a veto, a tax-relief bill stacked in favor of the well-to-do. It rejected his plans for giving the farm economy more stability. It refused to let him control runaway prices.

HELL FROM A WHISTLESTOP

Then came 1948—a red letter year in any Democrat's memory book, and for Harry Truman a bona fide beaut. Almost everybody—press pundits, poll-takers, politicos—saw an easy victory for Dewey. But Harry Truman had other ideas.

In earlier days he hadn't considered himself much of a speaker. But as President his effectiveness on the rostrum improved—especially when he spoke without formal text. His 2 a.m. acceptance speech at the Philadelphia convention in 1948 was full of fight, and in a hard personal campaign he gave 'em hell before whistlestop crowds and larger rallies over an itinerary that exceeded 30,000 miles. After 356 speeches in 35 days, tearing into the iniquities of the 80th Congress and exhorting labor and farmers to repudiate it at the polls, he went home to Independence. The prophets still said Dewey.

In the late afternoon of election day he sneaked off to a resort hotel in Excelsior Springs, Mo., had a Turkish bath, a ham sandwich, and a glass of milk, listened by radio to the early eastern returns, which showed him a few thousand votes ahead, and went to bed.

TRUMAN VERSUS KALTENBORN

He woke up at midnight and heard H. V. Kaltenborn report Truman leading by about 1,200,000 but still about to lose the election. At 4 a.m., he recalled later, Kaltenborn had Truman 2 million ahead but was still betting on Dewey. It was 10:30 in the morning before the President got Dewey's wire of congratulation.

Although STROM THURMOND'S States' Rights Party made off with four Southern States, Mr. Truman won by 303 electoral votes to Dewey's 189. His popular-vote victory was 24,179,623 to 21,991,290. The prophets have never been quite as glib since, and the President's famous impersonation of Kaltenborn's voice of doom is one of the party's treasured mementoes.

President Truman's inaugural address in 1949 launched point 4—the program for technical help enabling other peoples to help themselves. The second term also saw creation of the Atlantic Pact and NATO, to give military cohesiveness to the free world. And it saw tragically, the Communist invasion of South Korea. The President's instant decision to resist that arrogant incursion was made with vivid awareness of Washington's refusal in 1931 to do anything about Japan's aggression in Manchuria. He felt that prompt action over Manchuria might have averted World War II, and that failure to defend Korea could bring on world war III. Historians tend to agree with him on both counts.

Memory, searching through the years, becomes a kaleidoscope.

"I only had one sweetheart from the time I was 6. I saw her in Sunday School at the Presbyterian Church in Independence * * * and afterwards in the fifth grade at the Ott School in Independence, where her Aunt Nannie was our teacher and she sat behind me. She sat behind me in the sixth grade, seventh, and high-school grades, and I thought she was the most beautiful and the sweetest person on earth—and I am still of that opinion. * * * I am old fashioned, I guess."

The oilfield enterprise he abandoned on going to war—which eventually panned out and could have made him a millionaire; election as grand master of Missouri Masons.

His devotion to music and books—Mozart, Beethoven, Chopin; Plutarch's Lives and Shakespeare and the Bible. (He had a little grudge against Dickens for "dimming the luster of one of the great Biblical names—Uriah" by creating "a character named Uriah Heep, a sniveling hypocrite.")

The loss of his haberdashery business when "old man Mellon's wringing-out process came along." (He and partner Eddie Jacobson eventually cleaned up all their debts.)

The Roosevelt funeral services at the White House, Robert E. Sherwood recalled: "When President Truman came into the East Room nobody stood up, and I'm sure this modest man did not even notice this discourtesy or, if he did, understood that people present could not yet associate him with his high office; all they could think of was that the President was dead. But everybody stood up when Mrs. Roosevelt came in."

The White House "back porch" that he installed over some shrill objections. The total rebuilding of the crumbling Mansion's interior. The attempt on his life while he was quartered across the street in Blair House.

The journey to Wake Island to talk with Gen. Douglas MacArthur; and, later on, the recall of MacArthur because of an inability to take orders from the Commander in Chief. But this could go on ad infinitum.

RETIREMENT

Harry Truman did not seek a third term, although the two-term amendment exempted him. He went into retirement, if you want to call it that. Wrote two fat volumes of memoirs, kept up a heavy schedule of correspondence and newspaper articles and public appearances (but declined a gridiron dinner invitation because "I will not sit at the same table with NIXON"), campaigned lustily for Adlai Stevenson, and became a grandfather—among many other things.

His party remains close to his thoughts. He wrote to Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY not so long ago: "I am always glad to do anything I can to help the Democratic Party, whether in marbles, money, chalk, or time."

At 75—or 85, or 100—Harry Truman will be a hard man to keep in a rocking chair.

On the Oregon Trail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the 20th century On to Oregon Caravan is rolling across country. As my able colleague the Honorable A. S. J. CARNAHAN, of Missouri, reported in the April 20 RECORD, the wagon train was given a proper sendoff by former President Harry S. Truman and hundreds of others, including several from Oregon's Fourth Congressional District.

Four planes carried On to Oregon Cavalcade officials to Independence, Mo. Two were furnished by the Morrison-Knudsen Construction Co. and two by the U.S. Air Force.

Traveling east for the departure ceremonies were Dick Smith, Roseburg, president of the On to Oregon Cavalcade; Eldon Caley, vice president; and Dr. Verner Anderson, secretary. With the group were three directors of the cavalcade, Alan Knudtson, Del Mobly, and Ivan Hoyer. Two Douglas County newsmen, both editors, made the trip to report back to readers. They were Charles V. Stanton, editor of the Roseburg News-Review, and Lowell Anderson, editor of the Drain Enterprise.

Oregonians fortunate enough to attend the Independence celebration saw the cavalcade wagons parade, heard Mr. Truman, participated in a buffalo barbecue and street danced. Sunday, the 19th, they joined the wagon train for a 6 a.m. breakfast and a church service. The wagons rolled westward shortly thereafter.

EARLY TREKS RECALLED

The modern wagon train trek evoked considerable interest. It also pricked memories and many Oregonians recalled stories of the early wagon train trips to Oregon.

One such story was written for Oregon papers last week by Howard Applegate, United Press International reporter, himself the great-grandson of Charles Applegate, who migrated to Oregon in 1843.

His report information was supplied by Mrs. Annie Applegate Kruse, of Yoncalla, Oreg., whose grandmother was in the 1843 migration.

YOUNG AND VIGOROUS AT 83

Annie Applegate Kruse, a young and vigorous 83, is active in community and political affairs of her State. She has a great zest for life. She has a good sense of humor. She is proof that age is no positive single basis for retirement.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Howard Applegate's report which appeared in the April 15, 1959, issue of the Coos Bay (Oreg.) World:

HUNGER, NOT INDIANS, BOTHERED OREGON TRAIL PIONEERS

(By Howard Applegate)

YONCALLA, OREG.—Not all the wagontrains which came to Oregon more than 100 years ago experienced trouble with the Indians.

Mrs. Annie Applegate Kruse, whose "grandmammy" crossed the plains in the great migration of 1843, said today not a single shot was fired in anger between white men and Indians on the covered wagon train which was among the first to bring women and children to the Oregon country.

She referred to the "Cow Column" train, captained by her uncle, Jesse Applegate, then 32 years old. Jesse and two of his brothers, Charles and Lindsay, traveled with their families on that train, which left Independence, Mo., in May of 1843 and arrived in what is now western Oregon about 6 months later.

Mrs. Kruse, a spry 83 years, holds in her mind a vivid picture of the trip as it was told to her by her grandmother, Mrs. Melinda (Charles) Applegate. She was 12 years old when Melinda died in 1888 and as a girl spent many hours listening to accounts of the migration.

FRICTION RECALLED

The "Cow Column" train had separated from other wagons after leaving Independence because of friction among those who had cows to herd on the trail and those who did not.

"There were about 1,000 persons in the cow column," she said, "including 280 men." Four oxen pulled each of the wagons.

"They took along an extra wagon loaded with flour and bacon," Mrs. Kruse said. "At Fort Hall they paid tribute to Indian chiefs who allowed them to cross their land."

At night, as her grandmother related to her, the wagon train would form in the familiar circle and Indian campfires could be seen in the distance. "They often came to the train seeking food."

DR. WHITMAN OFFERS PRAISE

But the food still was among the biggest problems confronting the 1843 pioneers. "The single men would ride ahead on horseback during the day and hunt food and camping sites. My grandmammy and her daughters gathered greens along the trail and cooked them at night. Dr. Whitman told her she had done more for the health of the train than anyone else."

The Dr. Whitman to whom she referred was Dr. Marcus Whitman, famed missionary who had settled near Walla Walla 7 years earlier. He had been back to Washington, D.C., and joined the 1843 pioneers at the Platte River, Mrs. Kruse said.

The trip had plenty of hardships despite lack of Indian fighting. Charles lost a wagon full of supplies when it overturned in a fast river. Tragedy struck the families

of Jesse and Lindsay Applegate after the party reached The Dalles on the Columbia. It was decided to build barges and float the wagons downstream. Then, before the present-day dams, the river was full of rapids. One of the barges capsized. Jesse and Lindsay each lost a 9-year-old son by drowning.

THROWN APPLES MISSED

Mrs. Kruse recalled a pathetic moment after the party reached Fort Vancouver, across from Portland. Food supplies by then had run short and a sailor on an anchored British ship threw down apples to a boat carrying members of the party across the Columbia. "Aunt Lucy (a daughter of Charles) was 13 at the time and missed catching the apples. There were hungry children in that boat. She never forgot that moment."

Mrs. Kruse's grandmother told her that at the end of each day Jesse would dictate to her an account of the day's trip across the plains. "But those notes were later lost," she said.

The Applegates spent that winter with Dr. John McLoughlin in Oregon City and later settled near Dallas. Charles and Jesse came here after the latter had helped locate the Applegate trail which went south from Fort Hall, Idaho, and crossed northwest Utah, northern Nevada, and the Klamath Basin into southern Oregon.

Mrs. Kruse, who said she'd like to go on this year's wagon train "if I felt a little better," recalled a humorous incident after her ancestors moved here.

"There was an Indian called Jollysides," she said, "who visited the log cabin. He had never seen a stove. When he came into the cabin he sat down on the stove. He never came back."

Remarks of the Governor of the State of Alabama Before the Civil Rights Subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary at Hearings on Proposed Civil Rights Bills, Wednesday, April 22, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government has destroyed 100 years of progress in race relations in my State of Alabama. The greatest part of this destruction was caused by agents of the Civil Rights Commission in their investigations last fall. On April 22, in testimony before the Civil Rights Subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee, Gov. John Patterson voiced the objections of the people of Alabama to all Federal intervention, and I would like to include his speech in the Appendix of the RECORD:

Gentlemen, my name is John Patterson. I am Governor of the State of Alabama and I am presently serving a 4-year term which began January 19, 1959. Prior to that date I served as Attorney General of Alabama from January 18, 1955, to January 19, 1959. As attorney general I was the chief law enforcement officer of the State. As attorney general, and now as Governor, it was and is presently my duty to see that the laws of the State are properly administered and enforced, and that law and order is maintained.

I appreciate the opportunity to testify before your committee and I wish to thank you for permitting me to do so. I am here to express opposition to H.R. 3147, H.R. 3148, H.R. 4457, and the numerous other bills setting forth more or less similar proposals as those embodied in the bills enumerated.

First, I would like to state that we enjoy good law enforcement in Alabama. We have a clean State. We are free of organized vice and crime. Our State and local officials are carrying out their duties in a legal and proper manner. The laws are being enforced diligently, equally, fairly and impartially. Our citizens are law abiding and peaceful, and have a deep and abiding respect for law and order. Gangsters and hoodlums are not allowed to operate in the State of Alabama. Vice and corruption will be stamped out wherever it rears its head. The citizens of Alabama will not tolerate mob rule or mob violence in any form. We are making tremendous progress in Alabama in all fields and we are proud of it. I want to make it clear to you that I, as Governor of Alabama, guarantee that the laws will be enforced and that law and order will be maintained at all times. Our splendid record of law enforcement in Alabama speaks for itself, and if you gentlemen check you will find Alabama to be one of the cleanest States in the Nation. We in Alabama resent deeply any inference or accusation by anyone that we are not law-abiding people.

The relationship between the members of the FBI and our State and local officials has always been excellent. The FBI agents have cooperated to the fullest with our local law enforcement agencies in the interest of crime detection and law enforcement. The agents of the FBI have been courteous and cooperative at all times, but I cannot say the same for the agents of the Civil Rights Commission. They made no effort to cooperate with us, but, on the contrary, seemed to go out of their way to harass and intimidate our officials. They obviously were seeking publicity instead of facts.

I am proud to say that Alabama has an excellent public school system. It is one of the best in the United States. Relying on decisions of the United States Supreme Court prior to 1954, that separate but equal school facilities were constitutional, we invested billions of dollars in a modern, up-to-date public school system for both races on a segregated basis. Had the schools not been segregated, it would have been impossible to have had a public school system at all. The Negro schools are as good as the white schools and in many localities are better. Our Negro school teachers are well qualified and receive a higher average pay than the white teachers. The Negro has made tremendous progress in Alabama in recent years. No one can dispute that. In fact, the Negro has made more progress in the South in a shorter length of time than any other minority race in the entire world. However, now the advancement of the Negro is being hindered by the actions of the Federal Government in the field of race relations. If the present activities of the Federal Government continue along the course it has taken in recent years in trying to force integration of the races upon the people of the South, the Negro will suffer irreparable injury and the splendid progress that he has been making might well come to a halt.

We have always enjoyed good race relations in Alabama. The white and Negro citizens have worked together in harmony over the years for the betterment of our State. However, due to the school segregation cases decided by the United States Supreme Court in 1954 and subsequent Federal court decisions striking down as unconstitutional the State laws and city ordinances requiring segregation of races in public transportation, golf courses, swimming pools, parks, and beaches and other action taken by the Federal Government to force integration of the races in public schools, race relations have deteriorated to a sad state. Trust has been replaced with distrust and understanding with suspicion. The relations between the races in Alabama today are worse than at any other time in my lifetime. The breach between the races is widening every day and there no longer is any common ground upon which the leaders of the races can meet and work out their difficulties.

This unhappy state of affairs has been brought about by the questionable decisions of the Federal courts and other actions of the Federal Government. The Federal Government obviously encourages the activities of race agitators and such organizations as the NAACP, who have done nothing for the Negro in the South, but, in fact, have seriously damaged his cause. Good race relations can be brought about only by local people working together in a spirit of cooperation and good will without outside intereference and agitation. The customs, mores and traditions of the people cannot be swept away overnight by legislation, court decrees and Federal troops. The instruments to force integration of the races upon us, which are embodied in these so-called civil rights bills pending now in Congress, will be as ineffectual as trying to sweep the ocean back with a broom. The people will not do that which their conscience tells them not to do. In the final analysis that which the overwhelming majority of the people want will be the law of the land.

No one can question the fact that the people of the South have dealt with the race problem with more patience and tolerance and good will than any other people on earth who have had a similar problem. The people of the South should be commended for the manner in which they have handled this problem. We should not be condemned by those who attempt to sit in judgment over us who know nothing of our problems and who have far more serious race problems in their own localities which they have not attempted to solve. I do not feel qualified to sit in judgment over the citizens of the State of New York or Illinois. They have far greater race problems, in my own opinion, than we do in Alabama. I feel that they are better qualified to handle their own affairs without interference by me.

If the Federal Government continues its present course of trying to force integration of the races in public schools in Alabama and in other States of the South, the relations between the races will grow worse and our public school system will be destroyed. The citizens of my State will not tolerate or support an integrated school system. If the Federal Government attempts to integrate our schools by force, we will have chaos, disorder, possible violence, and we will be forced to close our schools. If such occurs it will be a calamity. Our Nation will lose in the long-run because our children will suffer the consequences. The people of Alabama will turn to private schools. In fact, moves are underway already to do so, and if such occurs the Negro will find himself in a very bad position. The overwhelming majority of the Negro citizens are opposed to the integration of the public schools in our State, and they realize better than anyone else that their schools will be destroyed if the Federal Government continues to press for integration. Most white citizens could afford a private education, but few Negroes could do so. In spite of this threat of destruction of our schools, we are going ahead in Alabama and embarking upon a new and progressive school program for the coming 4 years, trusting that our national leaders will see the error of their ways before it is too late, and not

destroy our school system. However, I want to make this clear—the citizens of Alabama will scrap their public school system rather than submit to integration of the races.

The operation of public schools is purely a local function. The Federal Government has no authority to interfere with the State and local governments in the operation of their public schools. Our schools are financed chiefly by State and local funds, and no school can survive and carry out its proper function of giving the students the best education possible without the support and good will of the citizens in the community where the school is situated. The proposals set forth in H.R. 3147 and S. 810 constitute an unwarranted interference by the Federal Government in the domestic affairs of the States. Such interference can only lead to disorder, chaos, distrust, and disintegration of the school systems. This is just another example of the unlawful encroachment of the Federal Government into a field reserved exclusively to the States.

Even though these bills are aimed at the South today, every person in the United States should be worried and concerned, for there is no end to these types of force measures once the barrier is let down. The proponents of these bills are today trying to ram integration of the races down the throats of the southern people, but tomorrow they will be trying to use the same devices to ram something else down the throats of citizens of other sections of the Nation. When the Federal Government arrogates unto itself powers such as are proposed in these bills and attempts to take away the right of the citizens to manage their own local schools, every individual in the Nation suffers and loses a little more of his freedom.

No school could possibly operate and benefit the students with such interference as is proposed in S. 810, H.R. 3147 and related bills. H.R. 3147 and S. 810 attempt to give the U.S. Attorney General power to force integration of the races in the public schools through the courts. If you pass this bill and the Attorney General attempts to carry out its provisions, public education in Alabama will come to an end. You will destroy our public schools. You must bear the responsibility. The power which H.R. 3147 and S. 810 attempt to give the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare constitutes an unwarranted meddling in our domestic affairs. We do not want or need his help in operating our schools. The bill seems to be an attempt to pay us to integrate. We cannot be bought. There is not enough money in the world to get us to integrate our public schools. Surely the Federal Government does not intend to operate and finance our schools. It has no authority to do so, and in any case such a plan would result in utter failure.

The constitutionality of section VI of said bills which authorizes the U.S. Attorney General to institute legal action to vindicate rights of individuals or legal action against individuals to redress alleged wrongs is questionable. Similar provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 were struck down as unconstitutional by a Federal court in Georgia last week. In any case, this attempt to give the Attorney General such broad and sweeping powers is contrary to our laws and borders on socialized law. This provision attempts to put the Attorney General in the position of practicing law on behalf of individuals and is another example of the encroachment of the Federal Government onto the rights of the citizens.

It is fundamental in our law that every individual who wishes to accuse his neighbor must stand up and make his accusations publicly. Every accused has a right to be confronted by his accuser. One reasons for this is that a person is less likely to bring false or malicious charges against another if he must make his charges openly and in the eyes of the public; however, this bill is designed to make it possible for individuals to bring their charges and not disclose their identity and not have to account to the community for their conduct. Such a law would not be in the best interest of the people of this Nation and is contrary to the principles of American jurisprudence. It smells of a secret police force where the citizens inform on each other to the Government and where the citizen accused may never know who his accusers are nor even what he has been accused of. This portion of the act comes very close to creating a Gestapo system.

I am opposed to the passage of S. 810, H.R. 3147, H.R. 3148, H.R. 4457,, S. 955, and other similar and related bills, and I urge this committee not to give these measures favorable consideration.

I am absolutely opposed to the extension of the life of the Civil Rights Commission created under the Civil Rights Act of 1957 or the establishment of any new Civil Rights Commission. S. 960, S. 435, and H.R. 4457 provide for the extension of the life of the Civil Rights Commission. The recent actions of the Civil Rights Commission seriously damaged race relations in the South and further injured the already strained relations between the Federal and State Governments. The Commission failed to do anything constructive, but, on the contrary, further widened the breach between the races. The action of the Commission in Montgomery, Ala., was reprehensible. It harassed and intimidated our State and local officials. It attempted to sit in judgment over the manner in which our officials conducted their offices. It interfered with the operation of our courts and our judicial officers. The actions of the Commission have made it difficult to get people to want to serve in public office. In fact, due to the actions of the Commission we do not have a board of registrars in one county and are finding it difficult to get responsible people to want to serve on this board and on boards in other counties.

The Commission attempted to arrogate unto itself powers which it did not and could not constitutionally possess. It claimed to be a roving grand jury with the powers of a common-law grand jury—a position absolutely untenable. We all know that the grand juries came from the English common law and belonged to the people. Historically, the grand jury has served two purposes—first, to investigate and indict for crimes; and, second, to protect the people from tyrannical actions of the government. The Commission attempted to go on fishing expeditions in the records of judicial officers, and it subpenaed our State officials to hearings in Montgomery, Ala., and put them on the witness stand under spotlights and before batteries of nationwide television cameras. No room or seats were provided in the hearing room for counsel of the public officials and the Commission would not even allow attorneys for the officials to make objections. In effect, the State officials were placed on trial and publicly harassed and intimidated. The Commission attempted to go far beyond its factfinding powers, and the hearings were conducted in a circuslike arena, and no semblance of due process was accorded our State officials.

I want to make it clear that our officials have done nothing wrong and have carried out their duties in a legal and proper manner. I know this to be a fact. They have treated both white and Negro equally, fairly, and impartially. They have nothing to hide. They resented the unwarranted and unlawful actions of the Civil Rights Commission. They felt as I felt, that we could not as citizens of this country sworn to uphold the Constitution and the laws of this Nation, stand idly by and allow the Civil Rights Commission to trample on our rights and attempt to exercise power not granted to it by the Constitution or any law.

I wish to point out that members of the Board of Registrars in Alabama are judicial officers and constitute a part of the judicial branch of the government. The attempt on the part of the Civil Rights Commission, an agency of the executive branch of the Government, to seize the voting registration records and interfere with these judicial officers was an unconstitutional encroachment by the executive branch on the judicial branch. Under the laws of Alabama, as in most States, if a person is refused the right to register to vote by the board of registrars upon proper application, he can appeal to the circuit or district court, where he will receive a trial. In Alabama he can appeal within 30 days and is entitled to a jury trial. If he loses in circuit court he can appeal to the State supreme court. If he loses there, he can appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court. In all cases the rights of the individual are protected, and through the courts, and that is as it should be. I know of only one such case during the last 5 years in the whole State of Alabama where a person has appealed the decision of a board of registrars and that was a white person. The U.S. Supreme Court has held that class actions cannot be brought to vindicate voting rights and that each individual case must stand on its own facts.

In view of these decisions, the purpose of the civil-rights legislation becomes obvious. It is to use the injunctive device to force the Boards of Registrars to register large groups of Negroes whether they are qualified or not. This use of the injunction to force registration of Negroes is designed to get around the prohibition of class actions in voting cases. Congress and the Federal Government is trying to do in this manner what the courts have held cannot be done. This action on the part of the Federal Government in interfering with our registration machinery is nothing more than an indirect attempt to force integration of the races upon us. In bringing actions to force county Boards of Registrars to place the names of Negroes on the voting lists, US ht e.A .tt Cawan ie the voting lists, the U.S. Attorney General is attempting to substitute his judgment for that of our State officials charged with the duty of passing on the registration of voters.

If the Federal Government continues its present course, a breakdown in our whole election machinery might result. The actions of the Federal Government in this field are only creating a feeling of bitterness and hostility between the State and Federal governments. I can see no useful purpose to be served by the continuance of the Civil Rights Commission, and I strongly urge the committee not to give favorable consideration to the extension of the life of the Commission.

I am strongly opposed to the passage of the pending measure designed to prohibit any opposition to Federal court decrees pertaining to school integration. Adequate laws are now on the books for courts to enforce their decrees. It is obvious that these measures are aimed at ramming integration down our throats and gagging us so that we go to jail if we raise our voices in protest. I doubt the constitutionality of these bills, and if anyone thinks that such measures would bring about integration of the schools of Alabama, they are sadly mistaken. It seems strange to me that anyone would advocate such a measure and not include prohibitions against obstruction of all types of court decrees, including labor decrees. The fact that these measures are restricted just to integration decrees shows that it is punitive legislation, political in nature, malicious and

aimed at destroying the customs and traditions of the people of the South. The manner in which the bills are drawn shows that it is just another crude attempt to use the South as a whipping post for political reasons.

Alabama, as well as all States, has strong laws punishing persons convicted of willful destruction of public and private property. Any person apprehended for committing such an offense in Alabama will be prosecuted and punished to the full extent of the law. There is no necessity for additional Federal laws in this area. It should always be remembered that law enforcement is a local problem and is largely a matter of local responsibility. We are carrying out our duty in reference to enforcing the law and we do not need any more Federal interference.

Under Alabama law any person who willfully sets off or explodes dynamite or other explosives in, under, or near any public or private building which is inhabited or occupied by another person shall on conviction be punished at the discretion of the jury by death or imprisonment in the penitentiary for not less than 10 years (title 14, sec. 123, Code of Alabama, 1940). If the public or private building is not occupied by another person, upon conviction the accused would be subject to imprisonment in the penitentiary for not less than 2 years nor more than 10 years. These laws are adequate to protect the lives and property of the citizens in this State, and I assure you they will be strictly enforced. Title 18, section 1073, U.S.C.A., as amended April 6, 1956, chapter 177, section 1, 70th Statutes at Large, page 100, provides as follows:

"1073. Flight to avoid prosecution or giving testimony. Whoever moves or travels in interstate or foreign commerce with intent either (1) to avoid prosecution, or custody or confinement after conviction, under the laws of the place from which he flees, for murder, kidnaping, burglary, robbery, mayhem, rape, assault with a dangerous weapon, arson punishable as a felony, or extortion accompanied by threats of violence, or attempts to commit any of the foregoing offenses as they are defined either at common law or by the laws of the place from which the fugitive flees, or (2) to avoid giving testimony in any criminal proceedings in such place in which the commission of an offense punishable by imprisonment in a penitentiary is charged, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

"Violations of this section may be prosecuted only in the Federal judicial district in which the original crime was alleged to have been committed or in which the person was held in custody or confinement. As amended April 6, 1956, chapter 177, section 1, 70th Statutes at Large, page 100.

This statute has proven very helpful to us in apprehending felons who commit crimes in one State and flee to another to avoid prosecution. This statute enables the FBI to enter a case when the felon has fled from the State where the crime was committed and assist in apprehending the felon who is usually returned to the State where the crime was committed for prosecution.

There is pending at the present time before the Committee on the Judiciary in the Senate, bill S. 124, which is designed to amend title 18, section 1073, supra, so as to include within said section crimes involving the "willful destruction or damaging of any building or structure." I do not know what the attitude of the U.S. Department of Justice will be toward this amendment; however, I feel that S. 124 should be given favorable consideration. Such an amendment would be helpful to us in bringing persons to trial in the State courts who might unlawfully destroy or damage public or private buildings and flee from the State to avoid prosecution. Such an amendment will enable the FBI to assist us in tracking down the guilty parties and returning them to the State for prosecution.

In conclusion, I wish to state that I do not think that the aforementioned so-called civil rights bills are in the interest of the citizens of this Nation. They will certainly do nothing to better the lot of the Negro citizens in the South. They are not in the interest of national unity or solidarity. They are not in the interest of eliminating crime. They will bring further chaos and disorder and possible violence to the South. They will destroy our public school system. The brief history of the operations of the Civil Rights Commission in the South has proven that it has utterly failed.

I urge that these so-called civil-rights measures be given unfavorable consideration by your committee.

In 1957 I testified before the House Judiciary Committee in opposition to the so-called civil-rights bills pending at that time and many of them were similar to the bills before us today, and I stated at that time:

"It is my opinion that if these so-called civil-rights bills are passed and the Attorney General of the United States proceeds to enforce them in the terms that they are written he will meet with failure. There will be considerable discord and unrest. We will have a reluctance on the part of State, municipal, and county officials to want to serve in office if all of their actions are reviewed by the Attorney General of the United States and by the Federal district courts. I doubt the wisdom of giving the Attorney General of the United States and the district courts this tremendous supervisory power over our State and county officials."

What I had to say then in reference to the creation of a Civil Rights Commission came to pass. I reiterate and reaffirm that statement again today. I do not claim to be a prophet; however, I do feel that I know the feelings of the overwhelming majority of the people of my State, and I have tried today to convey to you their feelings and the facts as I believe them to exist. I believe that it is my duty to speak to you truthfully and frankly and that I have done to the best of my ability.

Thank you.

Passover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, today is the first day of Passover. It is celebrated by the Jews for it marks their deliverance from Egypt by Moses. Through the generations the Passover has taken on even greater significance. It has become a solemn reminder of the struggle of a people for intellectual and religious freedom against oppressors whether their names be Pharaoh, Torquemada, Hitler, or Stalin. Passover should be a solemn reminder to all of us whether we are Christian or Jew to fight against oppression and bigotry while championing the cause of freedom, equality, and justice for all men regardless of race, creed, or color.

Federal Crop Surpluses Not Due to Irrigated Acreages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER.. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a thoughtful and persuasive editorial from the Oregon Daily Journal of Portland of April 20, entitled "Our Surpluses Are From Dry Land." This able editorial effectively punctures the old argument that Federal reclamation projects contribute to national crop surpluses. It quotes La Selle E. Coles of Prineville, Oreg., national vice president of the National Reclamation Association, to the effect that the surplus commodities such as cotton, corn, and wheat do not result from impounding water and diverting it to the soil.

I believe this editorial should be printed in the RECORD for the information of both friends and foes of the Federal irrigation program.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR SURPLUSES ARE FROM DRY LAND

When La Selle E. Coles, of Prineville, vice president of the National Reclamation Association, finished speaking at the Portland Chamber of Commerce forum the other day, a member rose and asked why, in the face of tremendous agricultural surpluses, it is necessary or wise to bring additional lands under irrigation.

Coles had already answered the question, but the fact that he needed to repeat his answer is indicative of the high degree of misunderstanding which exists in the minds of many people. And his explanation deserves wider distribution than is possible in a single audience.

Most of the crops which are in surplus, such as wheat, corn, short-staple cotton, and tobacco, come from dry lands, he said. Overproduction of these commodities is not the result of putting more water on our soil.

The fact is, additional reclamation in many instances removes some of these lands from the production of surplus crops. Irrigated land is of too high value to be devoted to wheat, for example.

The crops which come from irrigated land are mostly those needed for human consumption and are not in surplus. The rapid rate of population growth insures an expanding market. At the same time tremendous acreages of agricultural land are being removed from production by the spread of cities and towns, the construction of freeways, military bases, and other land-consuming installations. Reclamationists are convinced there wil be no letup in the need to bring life-giving water to more and more western lands.

Portland's stake in this is clearly seen, for the wealth which has been brought to eastern and central Oregon, eastern Washington, and southern Idaho through reclamation is an essential part of the wealth of a region which is Portland's trading area.

Many smaller Oregon communities close to irrigation projects owe their economic well-being to the existence of these projects,

and so does Portland. Our own Willamette Valley, as well supplied as it is with rainfall, will not reach its full agricultural potential without irrigation.

Coles and other reclamationists believe that the soundness of reclamation's future lies in the establishment of what they call a Pacific Northwest account plan whereby power revenues from Federal projects could be used on a regional basis to help pay reclamation costs.

This is a question which we have not fully resolved in our own minds, but no one in this city should have any doubts as to the part which reclamation plays in our own economic good health and as to the need in turn for the future good health of reclamation.

John Foster Dulles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, there is not much more that can be said about the great loss our Nation has suffered and, indeed, the entire civilized world by the resignation of John Foster Dulles as Secretary of State, but I cannot resist the temptation to express my feelings concerning this great man, and his service to our country. I have known Foster Dulles for a number of years, and was not at all suprised that a man of his great attainments and consecration to duty should finally be recognized as the outstanding statesman that he is. He came to the service of the Government with an extraordinary mind, keen perception and knowledge of human nature, trained in the law and experienced in human relationships. He gave of these talents unstintingly and without reserve and with it all showed a determination and a spirit of courage which will always be an inspiration to everyone. The record shows clearly that he was highly respected by those who were in disagreement with him because of the incisiveness of his arguments, backed by a determination and conviction of the righteousness of his cause, he became unconquerable in the field of diplomacy. It would be hard to find any former Secretary of State with such a positive and strong personality and there is no man in the history of our country who ever even approached the same wholesome, determined and brave spirit which he has shown so conspicuously.

At the same time during this period of change, men and women everywhere who believe in the cause of freedom and justice may take heart in the knowledge that Christian Herter is a worthy successor to Foster Dulles. Practically all his life Christian Herter has been engaged in the operations of international diplomacy and political activity and because of this training he brings to the Office of Secretary of State a contribution which is unique and of great significance.

It is not often that a Secretary of State is endowed with the qualities that Mr. Herter has and his lifetime experience brings much confidence to the future handling of our international affairs. Cordell Hull was a great Secretary of State because he was a keen politician though he was not noted for his knowledge of diplomacy. Dean Acheson was blessed with an agile mind trained as a lawyer and was proficient in international law but as a politician he did not qualify at all. Even Foster Dulles, great Secretary of State that he was, never had the politician's training others have had and certainly he is not to be compared with Christian Herter in that category. The new Secretary of State was at one time a member of the State Legislature of Massachusetts and speaker of the house; a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives for 10 years; Governor for two terms of the Commonv ealth of Massachusetts; an active member of former President Hoover's Food Administration in the distribution of relief after World War I. A constant student of international problems all over the world and endowed with a brilliant mind and a sterling character, he will protect the best interest of our country and will promote the cause of peace with honor throughout the world.

Employment of the Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, recently a young high school student in the Second Congressional District of Oklahoma, which I represent, received an award for writing an essay entitled "Hiring the Handicapped in Our Town". This young lady, Miss Conchita Cantrell of Stigler High School, has done a beautiful and moving job of capturing in words the spirit of her subject and pinpointing to her own community not only the contributions of the handicapped, but also the need for more fully utilizing their abilities and for providing them with greater opportunities.

Due to the high merit of this essay, I should like to insert in the RECORD at this point an article which appeared in the Oklahoma Legionnaire for April 1959. This article includes the text of this essay by Miss Cantrell, and I personally recommend it as being good reading for anyone.

EMPLOY THE HANDICAP LEGION AWARD WON BY STIGLER GIRL

Miss Conchita Cantrell, Stigler High School student, was named third place winner of the Governor's committee on employ the handicapped statewide essay contest to be the recipient of the American Legion's $100 bond.

A number of organizations in Oklahoma provide the incentives for high school students to participate in the Governor's committee contest of which the American Legion awards a $100 bond to the third place winner.

Department Commander Tom B. Clark presented the bond to Miss Cantrell at a meeting of the contest winners and the Governor's committee in the Blue Room of the State capitol on March 25.

The American Legion salutes Miss Cantrell for the outstanding essay which reads as follows:

"HIRING THE HANDICAPPED IN OUR TOWN

"The name of our town is Stigler, and we are its people. Although our town is small, we have our share of the disabled. Most of us are beginning to understand that it doesn't matter what a person has lost, but it is what he has left that counts. It is the beginning of a new era for us, as well as for the handicapped. Once these impaired people could not get a job; instead they had to depend on charity which no one enjoys. Today, they can pay their own way. Most of us in our town are giving the handicapped a chance to live a normal life. These people came to us not asking for pity, but for a chance to prove their ability to compete with others.

"As people come to our town, they see our handicapped at work. They see that in charge of the meat department in our largest super market is a young man disabled by polio. They go to our school and see that one of our teachers has a crippled arm. When they go into the court house, they see that our county clerk is handicapped with only partial use of both legs. Until recently our State senator was a man who suffered a severe spinal injury causing him to be paralyzed in both legs. The voters in our district showed their belief in his ability by electing him to this office until his death. Yes, anyone can see that in Stigler the handicapped are taking their rightful place in society.

"Someone passing through our town might ask us why we hire the handicapped. In reply we say, 'As the blind, the deaf, the crippled, and the mutes come to us, we know they are people.' Maybe fate has made them different in some respects, but they are people that must earn a living, too.

"We put the disabled to work. Soon we discovered that they are among our best employees. We couldn't ask for more loyal, courageous, or determined workers. Their work means everything to them; nothing is good enough but their best. These people are not only good workers but also good people. For most of them, their disability did not take from them their happiness, hope, or faith in God.

"Then after answering the visitor's question, we in turn ask one, 'Why shouldn't we hire the handicapped?' Not many can give an acceptable answer.

"Most of the people in Stigler know that there is no reason why we should not hire the handicapped. To us these people have proved themselves fully capable of doing the job they have been trained to do and doing it as well as anyone. We feel that we are doing ourselves a favor by hiring these brave people who we admire.

"In spite of the good qualities of the handicapped, there are some in our town who will not hire the disabled worker. These people are still blind to the fact that the handicapped are capable. As time goes on, more and more of the people of this town will wake up and see the opportunity of acquiring qualified and capable workers in the handicapped. Then more people will hire them. Soon everyone will know that the handicapped are no longer helpless people. They will see just how much our handicapped are contributing to the American business, science, politics, and American way of life.

"To the people in our town who will not hire the disabled, we say, 'We are all a part of a great nation which was founded on the belief that all people are created equal. Who has the right to turn away one of these less fortunate than we just because that person cannot walk, talk, hear, or speak? Ability is not measured by physical qualities alone but by a person's capability and determination to succeed.' "

Consecration of New Methodist Church at Kingston, Pa., Replacing One Destroyed by Fire 2 Years Ago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Record of Saturday, April 18, 1959, and a newsstory from the same newspaper on Monday, April 20, 1959:

[From the Wilkes-Barre Record, Apr. 18, 1959]

CHURCH CONSECRATION

A chief event on Wyoming Valley's religious calendar is scheduled for tomorrow. Members and friends of First Methodist Church of Kingston will have the satisfaction attending the consecration of the new edifice. It is a triumph of abiding faith and generous giving.

The beautiful Georgian colonial structure, built at a cost of nearly $700,000, replaces a building destroyed by fire on February 5, 1957. From the beginning supporters of the church have never faltered in their determination to build a new home worthy of the proud history and enduring service of the congregation. As a result the edifice represents architecturally the last word in its field.

At the services tomorrow, the first of a series continuing all next week, will be those recalling that the congregation stems back to 1790 when a small band of Christian people worshiped in homes and barns of members. The first church built in 1841 was destroyed by fire in 1872. A new church was dedicated in 1874 and lasted until the fire of 1957. The congregation has worshiped in Nelson Chapel of Wyoming Seminary while the new church was being erected.

The new edifice will be consecrated on Sunday with the minister, Rev. Dr. Alfred L. Crayton, preaching at 9:45 and Bishop Fred Pierce Corson, head of the Philadelphia area, consecrating the church at 11:15.

Many must share the credit for the successful reconstruction effort. Among other leaders, Arthur L. Strayer, building committee chairman, had the untiring support of many loyal aides.

[From the Wilkes-Barre Record, Apr. 20, 1959]

NEW CHURCH AT KINGSTON CONSECRATED—BISHOP F. P. CORSON OPENS METHODISTS' WEEK-LONG PROGRAM

Kingston Methodist Church congregation yesterday morning opened and consecrated its new church on Market Street. A capacity attendance of members and friends participated in the opening services of a week's program of consecration.

The congregation began its 9:45 a.m. service at Nelson Chapel of Wyoming Seminary, where it has worshiped since the church was destroyed by fire on February 5, 1957. After a hymn and prayer, a procession was led by clergy, church officials, and the choirs to the new church. An opening ceremony was held at the main entrance.

Bishop Fred Pierce Corson, of Philadelphia area, together with Dr. Wilbur H. Fleck, chairman of the trustees, and Arthur Strayer, chairman of the building committee, participated in the act of consecration at the 11:15 service. A large class of young people and adults was accepted into membership at the early service, and infants were baptized at the 11:15 service.

Speaking about the sacrifice of all who had part in building of the new church, Bishop Corson asserted responsibilities make things, such as a new church, much better.

He told the congregation, "What you have done is another symbol of the hope of the world. The most important institution in the world is the church of Jesus Christ.

"Unless we live up to our responsibilities, there is no hope," the bishop declared.

The church was filled to capacity for both morning services. Some of those attending sat in rooms near the sanctuary and heard the service over a public address system.

Rev. Dr. Alfred L. Crayton, pastor, preached on God's temple at the 9:45 service. Quoting the Apostle Paul as saying, "Ye are God's temple," he reminded the congregation that Paul at that time was critical of the people of Corinth for having split into factions, forgetting Christ. The minister said, "We now have a beautiful building, and it is up to us to make it a church."

Rev. Dr. Crayton thanked people of the community of all faiths who gave to the church at the time of the 1957 fire. He noted that at a time of emergency, people forget about differences and aid the afflicted persons.

Rev. Dr. Crayton led the call to worship at the early service. Rev. Dr. Milton F. McKenney, associate minister, read the responsive reading and Rev. Dr. Ralph W. Decker, president of Wyoming Seminary, read the Scripture lesson. Pastoral prayer was by Rev. Dr. Leon W. Bouton, Wilkes-Barre District superintendent.

Rev. Dr. Decker gave the call to worship at the 11:15 service. Rev. Dr. McKenney led the responsive reading and Rev. Dr. Bouton read the New Testament lesson. Rev. Dr. Norman W. Clemens, superintendent of Binghamton District, gave the pastoral prayer.

The choirs sang special music at both services, the Junior Choir singing "Thanks Be to Thee" by Handel and the combined choirs singing "Psalm 150" by Franck. The quartet sang "How Lovely Is Thy Dwelling Place" by Brahms at the 9:45 service. Arlene Biesel Rood was organist and Helen Harding was pianist.

Knights Templar service of worship was held last night at the church with a capacity attendance. Rev. Dr. Crayton, grand prelate of the Grand Commandery of Pennsylvania, preached the sermon on "Bless the Lord, O My Soul." He stressed the importance of home, church and school, all of which are supported by the Knights Templar as part of their principles.

Approximately 120 uniformed Knights Templar from seven commanderies as well as members of the auxiliary and 40 DeMolay members in their capes attended the service. David M. Schooley, potentate of Irem Temple, and his Divan were present representing the Shrine.

A 40-piece band directed by Peter J. Kleinkauf played an offertory, the processional and recessional. Rev. Dr. Bouton gave the call to worship. William L. Laude, PC, prelate, led the responsive reading. Greetings were extended by B. Everett Lord, commander.

Walter Marriott, Jr., representing Susquehanna chapter, Order of De Molay, presented Christian and American Flags to the church.

Those at the service included Robert W. Michael, Scranton, right eminent grand commander, Knights Templar of Pennsylvania; Mark L. Raymond, grand marshal; Peter G. George, commander of 11th division; Frank T. Ely, commander of 13th division; Harry Younger, commander of Coeur de Lion Commandery, Scranton; Russell Radler, commander of Wyoming Valley Commandery, Pittston. B. Everett Lord, commander of Dieu le Veut Commandery and also an accepted supply in the Methodist church, pronounced the benediction.

Service of prayer and thanksgiving will be held tonight at 8 at the church. Rev. Dr. McKenney will preach the sermon at the worship which will be followed at 8:45 by a reception in the fellowship hall. Members of Methodist Churches in Wyoming Conference, former ministers of the Kingston Church and district superintendents will be special guests. Official board members will be hostesses at the reception.

Community day in appreciation of gifts and services will be held Tuesday. Service will be held at Wyoming Seminary Chapel at 11 a.m. Public tours of the new buildings will be held at 7:30 p.m., and a reception will be held at 8:15 in the fellowship hall.

Greetings will be extended at the reception Tuesday by Rev. Dr. Crayton. Responses will be by Rev. Herbert E. Pickett of Kingston Presbyterian Church, Rabbi Abraham D. Barras of Temple Israel Synagogue and Rev. Dr. Decker. Special guests will be representatives from Wyoming Valley Churches of all faiths, trustees of Wyoming Seminary, Independent Hose Co., and Columbian Hose Co. members. Building committee and trustees will be hosts and the Women's Society of Christian Service will be hostesses.

Return Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Peoria, Ill., Journal Star:

RETURN VISIT

What may have much more effect than a summit conference in the improvement of relations between Soviet Russia and the United States is the visit Vice President NIXON is going to pay to Moscow in July.

The Vice President ostensibly is going to Russia to officially open an American national exhibition but his visit is likely to have a much greater impact than that.

It is, in essence, a return of the visit Deputy Premier Mikoyan paid to this country a few months ago and which both Russia and the United States must have considered a success. It is unlikely that the Russian man in the street will have as much contact with Mr. NIXON as Americans had with Mikoyan or that the Vice President will be given as free an opportunity to contact Russians as Mikoyan had in this country. He will be able, however, to form an impression of Russia which he can't gain reading official reports in Washington and the very fact that some Russians will meet the United States

No. 2 man should be helpful in an improvement of relations.

The Vice President will be a more effective public servant for having come in close contact with Premier Khrushchev and the hierarchy of the Kremlin.

The possibility that a visit to Russia will help his presidential chances also probably played a part in the decision to send him there. Senator Humphrey got quite a bit of mileage out of his chat with Khrushchev; Nixon might reap a similar profit.

It is a good idea, anyway, to send a high official to Russia as long as we are conducting diplomatic relations with them. The NIXON visit may help to prepare the way for the summit conference, not that anyone should expect much to result from that.

Mr. NIXON and the United States and possibly Russia all should profit from his visit to the Red capital. If they all come out ahead the cause of peace will have been advanced.

Firm Bipartisan Berlin Policy Already Paying Off

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, the other day, together with other members of the House Armed Services Committee, I returned from an inspection trip of our military defenses in Western Europe, Western Germany, and specifically Berlin, with a view toward surveying our readiness to meet any developments that may occur as a result of the May 27 ultimatum which the Soviet Union has directed against us.

Because the Berlin situation is such an important matter in our overall foreign policy, it may be that some members of this House would be interested in the observations of one member of this group. For that reason, I request unanimous consent to insert an article which I published recently on this Berlin trip and on my views as to the effectiveness of American policy toward Berlin in the Appendix of the RECORD.

FIRM BERLIN POLICY PAYING OFF, RETURNING REPRESENTATIVE SAYS

(NOTE.—Representative STRATTON, former mayor of Schenectady, has just returned from a flying trip to Berlin. With nine other members of the Armed Services Committee, he went to get a first-hand look at the crisis area. The Congressman is unusually qualified to write this exclusive report for NANA. He is a military intelligence expert. A combat intelligence officer on the staff of Gen. Douglas MacArthur during World War II, he was recalled to teach at the naval intelligence school during the Korean emergency.)

(By Hon. SAMUEL S. STRATTON, Representative from New York)

Berlin is a fantastic city. Four days there and I came away convinced that the status quo can be beautiful. I returned not only impressed by the high degree of training of our troops in Germany, but also by the obvious fact that the American policy of standing firm is the soundest possible policy and is in fact already paying dividends.

There's far less agitation about the Berlin crisis in Berlin than in Washington. But this calmness is no accident. It is based first on a conviction that America means what it says about standing firm. Already Berliners are convinced the May 27 deadline set by Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev will pass without any thing unusual happening.

That doesn't mean that the Berlin crisis will be over. But it does mean that the firm U.S. position has already forced an adjustment in Soviet policy and has at the very least postponed any actual showdown. As far as Berliners are concerned every extra week of living successfully under Soviet pressure without cracking is another step in the right direction.

Also behind this unexpected calmness in Berlin, as we found, are some of the finest fighting troops that America has stationed anywhere in the world.

ESSENTIAL SHIELD

We saw these troops, talked with them, and watched them carry out their combat maneuvers, not only the two battle groups located inside West Berlin, but also the five American divisions poised along the Iron Curtain line in West Germany and ready to go, if, as they say in Europe, "the balloon goes up."

These ground troops are performing a highly essential function in West Germany as important elements of our so-called NATO shield. Their job is to keep the Soviets from overrunning Germany in the event of war until we can bring our superior nuclear power to bear against an aggressor.

I came back from Berlin just a bit concerned about what the current efforts to economize in the field of national defense might do to those NATO shield forces. Certainly we can't possibly permit any reduction in American forces in Western Germany now, whatever happens to overall Army strengths. Many of us were frankly disturbed to learn that budget cutting at home already has forced some reduction in the regular training alerts and maneuvers of these forces, which is, in my judgment, considering the circumstances, a very dangerous brand of economy. Even our normal rotation policy has created some problems; for example, when a large number of trained soldiers wind up their 2-year hitch together and move back home to civilian life. New men are moved in quickly to take their places, of course, but there is still an uncomfortable delay before the unit as a whole can be brought back up to the same combat-ready pitch.

For myself, I'd feel a lot better, and I think some of our field commanders would too, if we had at least one and maybe two more American divisions in West Germany as strategic reserve. If our ground forces are going to play any role in our defense picture, Europe is the place they are most likely to play it. Five American divisions, even highly trained, still have their hands full facing 20 or 25 Soviet divisions. We need at least another reserve division to back up the forces already committed along the border.

OUR DEPENDENTS OVERSEAS

One question that bothered some of us when we left Washington for Berlin was the status of American dependents in that exposed outpost. Shouldn't we perhaps evacuate them all well before the May 27 deadline? After talking with Army officers, men, and with many of the dependents themselves, I came away convinced it would be a mistake for us to undertake any evacuation of American dependents, except as a last-minute and extreme measure. In fact, I was amazed to find that there's almost no desire on the part of any of these people to return home.

These folks are firmly convinced that the future of our country is closely bound up with holding onto this great free city. They wouldn't want to be the first to betray any nervousness at carrying out American overseas commitments. If we were to begin to move back our dependents, this would be an immediate signal that Americans had decided the future of Berlin was hopeless, and that is one thing we certainly don't intend to do.

Atcually, Berlin is more a war of nerves rather than a war of guns. That's why I am so convinced we can win just by standing firm on the status quo. And yet what about the future? Can we live with this kind of situation indefinitely? Even assuming that the West weathers the May 27 deadline, isn't there always the chance of another crisis any time the Russians feel like crying "wolf"?

You can get one clear-cut answer to that question from the youthful, able, and highly impressive mayor of Berlin, Willy Brandt. We had an hour's talk with him. Mayor Brandt says Berlin's position is anomalous, tied in economically, emotionally, and (eventually, he hopes) politically, with West Germany 110 miles to the west. Yet he points out that there have been anomalous political situations like this before which have continued indefinitely. He points to Pakistan, divided into two sections on the continent of India. If Pakistan can survive, he says, why not Berlin? Indeed, one thing that keeps Berlin alive today is the hope that some day she will again be the capital of Germany.

PATIENCE IS NEEDED

But perhaps the best answer of all to this question of the future of West Berlin came from an American officer stationed there. He put it to me this way: "Let's not get impatient and feel that we've got to find overnight some neat and simple and easy solution to this Berlin problem. These apparently neat solutions, arrived at around the conference table with the Soviets, can often spell disaster. Maybe we've spent too much time reading those fairy stories where people get into trouble, then somehow resolve the troubles, and everybody lives happily ever afterward.

"That isn't the way life goes these days," my officer friend went on. "We can't expect to live happily ever after in today's world. We're going to be facing Communist tensions and pressures for a long time to come. Our job is not to try to find some easy, fairyland solution that will let us 'live happily ever after,' but rather to prepare to live with the tensions and pressures of this real world of ours without letting them get us down."

I think my officer friend was right as we talked that last night in Berlin. The Russians are betting we can't stand the heat. But when you've seen Berlin, as we saw it, you know in your heart that we can't possibly abandon this fantastically attractive outpost of freedom 110 miles inside the Iron Curtain and continue to hold up our heads. If Berlin ever goes, then Western Europe goes with it. I'm convinced of that.

Challenge to America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield made a significant address before an overflow audience at the Ro-

tary Club luncheon in Seattle on April 15. I believe his comments deserve careful reading by every thoughtful American.

He discussed four great problems and called for firm public opinion and action on them in the best interests of all Americans. They are the need to resist the Communist threat to our national safety; the need to intensify our battle against inflation and extravagant Government spending; the necessity of curbing the destructive monopoly power now lodged in the hands of a few union leaders, and finally, the desirability of progressive tax reform to encourage incentive and provide capital expansion to assure more jobs for more people.

Mr. Summerfield urged businessmen and community leaders to devote more of their time and effort to unselfish politics, directed to the greatest common good, to assure government for the people and not government by pressure groups.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I ask that this courageous speech be printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks:

It is a great pleasure to come to Seattle, and to have the opportunity to meet with this distinguished group of business and civil leaders.

I am always fascinated by the scenic beauty of the State of Washington. And more, I am deeply impressed by the development and growth that have taken place.

All my life, I have thrilled to the story of the pioneers who opened this great Pacific Northwest. Nothing could stop them from gaining the better life they saw for themselves and their children. They left a magnificent heritage for you—for all Americans—to ponder and to uphold.

Today, you are a dynamic region. You have assumed great responsibility in this Nation's economic and political leadership. You face opportunities that are virtually unlimited in scope.

But this you also know—that the very essence of real opportunity is challenge. And meeting today's challenge is so fundamental to the progress you would make, so basic to the ends we must achieve as a nation, I am deeply anxious to talk with you about it. I want to bring to you, today, a clear picture of the urgent nature of the challenge we face, and how we can meet it.

Earlier this morning, I spoke as your Postmaster General. I had the privilege of announcing major improvements, providing next-day first-class letter service for almost 2 million people throughout the Seattle metropolitan area, embracing the cities of Seattle and Tacoma, and 14 nearby counties. This improved mail service is now being given in 25 major metropolitan areas throughout the country. It serves nearly half of the people in the United States. Ultimately, every major metropolitan area will have this service, and we shall mark a long step forward in our goal of next-day delivery of a letter anywhere in the United States.

This noon, however, I want to speak to you, not just as your Postmaster General, but as a member of President Eisenhower's Cabinet and a member of the President's Cabinet Committee on Price Stability for Economic Growth.

I come with firsthand knowledge of the problems facing our Nation, and the steps your Government is taking to solve them. But I come with more than a report. My purpose, above all, is to talk with you about action. For, my friends, we are at an extremely crucial stage in the progress of America. We have a choice of paths to follow. We have momentous decisions to make.

The ultimate responsibility for these decisions is with the American people. And I am confident that, if the people apply their real genius, and determination, and devotion, the final decisions will be the right ones.

There are four specific problems I should like to discuss today, and then, if I may, I should like to suggest the vital part you can play in meeting each of them. They are:

1. The Communist threat to our national safety.
2. Our battle against inflation.
3. The destructive monopoly power of a group of union leaders.
4. The urgent necessity for tax reform.

All of these, of course, are interrelated.

Our national defense depends upon a strong economy, and our economy is acutely responsive to what we do about inflation, about production costs and prices, and about taxation.

The Communist challenge is many-sided. It is military, political, spiritual and economic. We and our allies have steadily rebuffed the military and political threats. Wherever the Communists have probed, they have found us standing firm—at Lebanon, in the China Sea, in the unity of our NATO alliance, and now in the Berlin issue, we have met the challenge with unmistakable evidence of the strength of our purpose.

We shall continue to keep our military power equal to any test. Our overall might in planes, missiles, ships, and other equipment must always be capable of deterring—and if ever necessary, defeating completely—any attack upon us.

We shall continue to meet the Soviet political challenge. We shall lead the way in exploring every avenue of reasonable hope for justly solving the issues that divide the world.

In the battle of spiritual values, we cannot lose so long as we preserve the freedom and moral strength on which our way of life is built. The Soviets know all this very well. Why, then, are they as confident of ultimate victory as ever? Because they are concentrating on all-out economic war, and they believe they can defeat us in such a war without risking their own total destruction. They intend to become the world's one first-class economic power, forcing us into second-class status. And for us, such an outcome would be just as tragic as nuclear devastation.

We are well in front now. But they believe we have not the system or the will to maintain and expand our economic strength. They expect our economy to explode, while theirs continues to grow.

And, my friends, let me say that we dare not look lightly on their great expectations. For here we do indeed stand at the crossroads of decision. The soundness of our economy is threatened by deadly forces that have wrecked other nations in the past. They are the forces of inflation and onerous taxation, and we have not united as a people to overcome them. I suggest to you that there is urgent reason for us to do so.

Let us look at some basic facts about inflation. I am sure we all agree on what inflation is and what it does. Certainly we have had ample opportunity, over 20 years, to see it in action.

To most Americans, inflation means higher costs of living. It means more and more struggle to try to make ends meet. We have inflation when the cost of what we buy keeps rising while the value of the dollars we have to buy it with keeps dropping.

Since 1939, our cost of living has more than doubled. The value of our dollar has dropped until the 100-cent dollar of 1939 is now worth just 48 cents. How much lower would you say we dare to let it go?

Inflation feeds on the income and the savings of every individual, every enterprise in America. It eats away the savings we cherish for family's security. It robs us of the real value of the dollars we earn. It destroys the will to work and the desire to save.

I suspect almost everyone in this room knows of someone whose savings, or insurance, or social security—carefully nurtured through half a lifetime—now is tragically inadequate to meet his needs. As businessmen, you are only too well aware of what inflation brings in rising costs and stifling taxes.

And finally, I would point out that the problem affects, in equal measure, the cost of maintaining the operations of the government.

In short, inflation puts every part of our society in deepening jeopardy—the individual, our business enterprise, and our Government.

Now, what are we doing to meet this deadly force? We are waging a battle, led by the President of the United States, which in the past year has succeeded in bringing the rise in the cost of living under control.

We are fighting to accomplish the stability of the dollar we must have to go forward soundly. We are striving to continue our economic growth at the rate of which we are capable, with its expanding opportunity for every citizen.

But we are also facing tremendous pressures for a resumption of the inflationary process. There are vast pressures for extravagant government spending, and for a sharp new uptrend in the spiral of wages and prices. Amazingly, these spending drives are actually being led by some Members of the Congress—and by some leaders of State administrations.

They are practicing government by pressure group rather than for the people. And they will only be dissuaded by public opinion strong enough to impress its will upon them. For this reason, it is vitally important for our people to understand some plain, straight facts.

Government, in our system, is constituted to serve the people. It must meet all the legitimate needs of all its citizens. It must do all it can for the good of the people, within the means the people are willing and able to provide.

But there are those in and out of government who stoutly observe that we are a big Nation of great wealth, and therefore, we should put no limit to what we do in public projects, whether or not the people are able to pay the bills.

Nothing could be more crassly misleading—for the fact is, the people have no choice. Who else will pay?

The Government has no wealth of its own. It is the agency of the people. And when it spends more than it collects in taxes, every citizen has to pay the excess, in one way or another. If it is not in higher taxes, then it is in suffering the inflation that deficit financing by any government inevitably brings.

More than 7,000 bills have been introduced in this session of the 86th Congress by the people's representatives, including your own. Only a small handful of these are major measures of broad national interest. The vast majority would provide benefits of one kind or another to individuals or groups. And in no instance are new taxes proposed to offset these new costs.

Their backers are encouraged by the fact that the spending majority of the present Congress is committeed to Federal spend-

ing—and to deficit financing—as an economic policy.

Chairman BYRD of the Senate Finance Committee, has noted, with alarm, that the effects of that policy already are plain. The Senate, he reports, has voted to increase President Eisenhower's budget proposals by 24 percent, and the House has voted increases averaging 12 percent. These increases represent billions of dollars.

The third problem we face—the effect of the huge economic power exercised by union monopoly leaders—must also be solved if we are to have sound economic progress. This is a power that ranks among the highest accumulations of vested interest to be found in history. It is a monopoly that draws upon huge financial resources, that permits a few perennial labor leaders to spend millions of dollars of dues money for political purposes, exactly as the leaders see fit, with no choice given the men and women who pay the dues. It is a power capable of imposing at will an ever-rising cost of living upon our people.

There is no question but what the legitimate function of every labor leader is to ask for, to negotiate for, higher wages. This is a rightful purpose of union leadership.

But union members—with all other Americans—have every reason to insist that their leaders, as well as the leaders in management, exercise a high order of responsibilities and statesmanship. It is up to union leaders to recognize that if they use their monopoly power to force wage increases and employee benefits too high, they bring about fewer jobs and greater unemployment, and thereby miserably fail in their duty to their members.

Why do excessive wage costs have such powerful impact upon inflationary forces. Because, after exclusion of all taxes, up to 83 percent of all income generated in the national economy goes to the payment of labor.

For a $3,000 automobile, for example, the required steel costs about $290. Even this price at the steel mill, in turn, includes labor cost as its main component.

What this means is that an unearned rise in employment costs has four times as much inflationary effect as a corresponding rise in all the remaining costs of production put together.

With this in mind, let us note that 154 major wage contracts come up for negotiation this year, including the steel industry, with its nearly 1 million workers. The cumulative effect of excessive wage-cost increases on this scale I leave to your imagination. There would be no way to describe it other than to call it a national calamity. Everyone would suffer. The blow, as we have noted, would fall hardest on the millions whose incomes have not gone up, the people on salaries, fixed incomes, and pensions.

But let none assume that he would escape—least of all the wage earner himself. He would soon find that the newly won increase had evaporated in higher living costs. Worse, he could find that even his job is gone because the product he makes has been priced out of the market, no longer able to compete effectively at home or abroad.

We should—and do—look to the increasing of job opportunities here at home through the expansion of our production capacity. We should take every step to encourage, not sap, the growth power of industry and business.

But we can hardly say we are giving full encouragement if we permit wage-push inflation that deprives our industry of adequate earnings to plow back into new products, equipment, and plants.

Every thinking American, I believe, will agree that the decline has gone far enough when the ratio of profits to sales, for all industry, drops from 7 percent in 1948 to 4.8 percent in 1958.

Especially is this true when we recognize the burden our taxation is placing on the accumulation of capital for investment, and on the personal incentive and earning power of every citizen.

The tax foundation tells us the average earner of $4500 a year works 22 days each month. Seven days of this total—nearly one-third of his working time—is taken from his income in taxes. And as he may succeed in building his income, he can look forward to the tax chunk becoming larger. We need to relieve this stifling tax load being carried by the individual citizen and by our business system.

Our population is growing rapidly. Business can create new jobs to meet this growth only as billions of dollars are invested in new tools and capacity. Now, where is this money to come from?

Today, Federal taxes alone can take more than half of many companies' net income. Then follow State and local taxes. There are over 100,000 taxing authorities in our country. Their weight can literally crush the ability of business to meet its job-creating capital needs.

Our present tax structure is seriously outdated. It is a set of laws reflecting largely the conditions of the past, especialy World War II, when the goal was the confiscation of war profits, not the building of a sound peacetime economy. A sensible, equitable, dynamic tax program is needed in its place. Such a program will keep revenues up, not by taxing away incentive and means of growth, but by steadily increasing the tax base.

These problems I have discussed this noon can be clearly stated. But how clearly do we see the answers that can be given to them? This is our task.

And I believe we cannot emphasize too heavily the answers that are being provided by our national leadership, and by leaders in many States. These answers add up to a program of full employment with stable prices and tax reform, a program offering greater opportunity for every American.

It is because we have pursued such a program that our economy has bounded back from the recession to a dynamic new level. The signposts are clearly visible and our program is well underway.

First of all, we have established a sound and sensible philosophy of government. The set of principles we are following deserve enumeration. They are:

First. Agree on sound and productive fiscal policies. Set realistic budgets and stick with them.

Second. Meet the full needs of our defense program.

Third. Meet all the legitimate needs of our people.

Fourth. Refuse to give away taxpayer money to nonessential projects, lavish spending schemes, and welfare state activities intended to curry favor with special groups rather than to meet the needs of all the people.

Fifth. Operate government on a pay-as-you-go basis. Avoiding the fatalistic deficit philosophy so easy to get in but so desperately hard to shed.

Sixth. Encourage a higher order of statesmanship in union-management wage negotiations—create public opinion so that union leaders work for the real welfare of their members and the Nation, rather than trying to outdo each other in wringing inflationary wage packages from industry.

Seventh. Establish adequate laws to control abuses of union leader monopoly power. Such laws were established for business, correctly and firmly, when some businessmen abused the public trust in years past. Give union members their rights to pass on the action of their leaders and the use of their dues.

And, finally, move forward as rapidly as possible to achieve progressive tax reform.

I believe that heartening progress is being made in all these eight areas.

The sound fiscal program of the President, with his insistence upon balancing the budget, is rapidly gaining wide support.

In the wage-price area, we can only hope that the statesmanship we so urgently desire will be forthcoming. It is not immediately apparent in the announced intentions of demands we have seen. It is clear that union members themselves want responsible union leadership—responsible to their welfare and to the national welfare. With the great majority of the public at large, they want laws that will help to assure responsible leadership.

In regard to taxation, we are working to carry forward a program of tax reform and reduction. The President's stress on a balanced budget is related directly to this goal. Steps in the right direction already have been taken with the Revenue Act of 1954.

The time is approaching for another bold and imaginative breakthrough on tax policy that will benefit and encourage all taxpayers, large and small. Obviously, this program cannot call for immediate and sharp reduction in all income tax rates. It calls for gradual reform. And it calls for equitable reduction for all taxpayers.

The public, more and more, is rallying behind the President in his fight to maintain a balanced budget, to achieve tax reform, and to bring the extravagances and excesses that feed inflation under control.

But let me not overstate this premise. The battle is far from won. The special interests bent on spending, taxing, and deficit financing still are riding high—still have the ears of the majority of our Federal legislators and State administrations. Washington is swarming with representatives of the special interest groups, each concerned with favoring legislation for his pet project.

The fight for fiscal sanity is being waged by the President, members of his administration, and some Members of the Congress. It is this group—almost alone—that is bearing the brunt of the battle.

My appeal to you today, and to the American people, is to join this battle, to meet this challenge.

Remember that, in the struggle with Russia, we are strong militarily, we are strong politically, we are strong spiritually. We must continue to strengthen ourselves economically. We can no more appease inflation than we can appease Soviet aggression. I believe we shall continue to build the strongest, freest way of life the world will know.

But I also believe that, to do so, America must maintain a sound economic philosophy, and sound policies firmly based on that philosophy. We must never accept the premise that our fiscal problems cannot be solved.

Inflation, deficits, high costs of living, and oppressive taxation all are man made. There is nothing sacred about them or the destructive monopoly power of a group of union leaders.

By attacking these problems with intelligence, determination, and perseverance, we shall overcome them. May there be a reassertion, by all of us, of the courage and strength and faith of the Americans who opened the great Northwest.

I am confident that the business leadership of the State of Washington, which is so well represented here today, will play a vital part in keeping our free-enterprise system strong.

As civic leaders in a key city and State, your views and actions are vitally important to your own progress, to your State, to the Nation, and to the world.

I would dare to suggest that you assess what you are doing individually. If you

believe that we must attack the causes of inflation and onerous taxation and union monopoly firmly and intelligently, ask yourself if you are doing all you can to support that belief. Your belief in America can be effective only as you let it be known.

I urge you to take your place among those who will speak, work, and fight for sound policies and a stronger America in the years before us.

There is nothing more important to you, your family, your future, and your Nation than that you take your stand now. Speak up; let your representatives in Congress know what you think. Let them know you understand that a Government big enough to do everything for its citizens from cradle to grave is also big enough to take everything from them in taxes during the same time.

Every businessman must understand that the political party of his choice is what he makes it, either by his participation or lack of participation in its affairs and in its choice of candidates.

Unless responsible businessmen and citizens devote more of their time and effort and organizing ability—as well as their money—to unselfish politics, directed to the greatest common good, government by pressure groups will continue to grow.

Only by universal participation can we be sure that the Government will serve all the people—not some special interest—and assure the greatest opportunities for all our citizens.

My friends, this is the banner of true liberalism. Advancing under it, we shall meet the Communist economic challenge as surely as we shall meet the military and political challenge.

We shall assure that the golden era of unlimited opportunity lies ahead.

We shall preserve the great free and growing economy which is the foundation of all our freedoms, our security, our prosperity, and our future, in a strong, free, and better world.

The Memorable War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following reduced version of an address delivered at the annual luncheon of the State Historical Society in 1958, by Dr. Bell Irvin Wiley. Dr. Wiley is a native of Halls, Tenn., in my congressional district and is now a professor of history at Emory University in Atlanta, Ga. He is a member of the Civil War Centennial Commission and on April 13 was presented here at the Press Club the Gold Medal award by the Civil War Round Table of the District of Columbia. He is one of the outstanding authorities of this country on Civil War history and has achieved many honors not only in the field of history but in literature as well. Dr. Wiley served in World War II and was awarded the Legion of Merit in 1945, and was discharged at lieutenant colonel in 1946. In view of the coming Civil War Centennial, I feel that the following is timely and appropriate:

THE MEMORABLE WAR
(By Bell Irvin Wiley)

Specialists in the field of the Civil War are frequently asked, "Why all this interest in a conflict that took place a hundred years ago?" and "Isn't the current interest in the Civil War something that has been artifically worked up by writers, dramatists, and others who have a vested interest in keeping the memory of that struggle alive?"

First, it should be noted that interest in the Civil War is not something new. A trip to that part of the Library of Congress where books about American wars are shelved will reveal several times as many volumes about the Civil War as about all prior American wars combined. According to a recent estimate, which can be no more than a rough guess, over 100,000 volumes and pamphlets exist which relate in some manner or other to the Civil War. From the early 1860's down to the present the Civil War has had tremendous appeal for Americans, and many people, some of much talent, other of little talent, and still others of average ability, have written about it through the medium of reminiscences, scholarly history, popular history, fiction, plays, and music. Now a comic strip, "Johnny Reb and Billy Yank," is running in many of our newspapers.

Lincoln is the most written about of all Americans. A bibliography published in 1945 litsed 3,958 books and pamphlets concerned in major part with Lincoln's life. A steady outpouring of writing in the past 7 years has raised the aggregate of Lincoln books to a figure that must be in the neighborhood of 5,000.

Undoubtedly there is a revival of interest in the Civil War dating back to the late 1920's. Publication of Stephen Vincent Benet's "John Brown's Body," Douglas Southall Freeman's excellent books on Robert E. Lee, and especially Margaret Mitchell's "Gone With the Wind," which has outsold any other book in the history of American publishing, are partly responsible for this resurgence of interest.

But the seed planted by these and other authors would not have produced bumper crops if it had not fallen on good ground. In other words, the reading public was receptive. Their minds were ready. American participation in World War II assisted the revival, as the 14 million Americans who donned the uniform in that struggle had a natural curiosity about participants in former wars, and the complexity of recent conflicts made people yearn for the simplicity of an old fashioned war. Revival of interest also coincides with the growing popularity of automobile travel, and among the favorite resorts of the tourists are picturesque and beautifully preserved battle sites such as Gettysburg, Shiloh, Vicksburg, Kennesaw Mountain, and Chattanooga.

Interest in the Civil War is growing, as witnessed by the enormous popularity of MicKinley Kantor's "Andersonville" and the proliferation of "Civil War Round Tables," which now number about 70. This interest will probably continue to mount, certainly through the centennial years, 1961–1965.

The attraction of the subject for talented writers has undoubtedly helped to build up interest in the Civil War. But the roots of this interest reach so deep into the American character and tradition that it is improper to regard it as something which has been artificially worked up by gifted writers.

What, then, are some of the reasons for this deep-seated and continuing appeal of the war of the 1860's for today's Americans?

In the first place, the Civil War was an all-American war, or, as R. S. Henry has aptly put it, "it was our war." The war was fought by Americans over American issues. It was waged on American soil. The battle sites are here and, thanks to the splendid work of the National Park Service, these sites have been well preserved. They are attractive places. Shiloh is a beautiful site. If one goes there in April, the month when the battle was fought, he will note woodland and open fields, hills and valleys, and an atmosphere redolent with the fragrance of peach blossoms. And he will ponder the irony of Americans, of similar background and culture and speaking the same language, choosing this beautiful scene in which to slay each other in what was at that time the biggest and the deadliest battle that had ever been fought on the American continents. Beautiful also are many other battlefields that help to commemorate this great conflict of the 1860's, and in 1957 over 6,500,000 people visited 25 Civil War battlefields, memorials, and forts maintained by the National Park Service.

This war was and is an intimate affair for Americans. Many, if not most, present-day northerners and southerners have close ancestral ties with people who fought in the war and have learned from oral accounts or from reminiscences, letters, or diaries the experiences of kinfolk in that terrible conflict. These experiences have helped to impress the memory of that struggle indelibly on the American mind and have made it a prominent part of our living past.

The heroes of this great war are ours, and they occupy a conspicuous place in the hall of our memories. Those of Southern background cherish with deep affection and enormous pride the names and deeds of Robert E. Lee, Stonewall Jackson, Jeb Stuart, the two Hills, Nathan Bedford Forrest, John Morgan, and the gallant Pelham. Those of Northern origins recall with equal reverence the names and exploits of Abraham Lincoln, U. S. Grant, Phil Kearny, John B. McPherson, and David Farragut.

In the second place, the Civil War was a big war—bigger in most respects than any that the world had ever known. It was big with respect to the distances involved. The land operations extended over a vast area. Naval operations were even more farreaching. One Confederate cruiser, the *Alabama*, was sunk by a Federal ship, the *Kearsarge*, in the English channel; another, the *Florida*, was captured in the neutral harbor of Bahia, Brazil.

It was large with respect to the number of engagements. The U.S. Government's chronological list of battles enumerates more than 2,200 engagements, and a Bureau of Pensions compilation extending to minor actions contains over 6,800 separate contests.

The Civil War was big in terms of the number of participants. About 3,500,000 men served on one side or the other. It was also very large in terms of casualities. In all the major American wars, beginning with the Revolution and coming on through the recent Korean conflict, excepting only the Civil War, some 606,000 Americans lost their lives from battle and nonbattle causes. In the Civil War alone more than 618,000 American servicemen lost their lives. In other words, more American servicemen perished in the Civil War than in all our other wars combined. This is a startling fact.

An interesting commentary on camp conditions of the time and on the backward state of medical science is afforded by the fact that more than two men died of disease for every one that died of hostile bullets. In World War II nearly three times as many Americans died from enemy action as from other causes.

Civil War battles—the major ones—were big battles. At Shiloh on April 6 and 7, 1862, for the first time on the North American continent as many as 100,000 men were assembled for battle. Lee's and Burnside's forces at Fredericksburg totaled about 200,000. At Austerlitz, on the other hand, the

contending forces aggregated only 150,000 and at Waterloo only 170,000.

Casualties in the principal Civil War engagements were astoundingly large. At Balaklava the Light Brigade, whose charge was immortalized by Tennyson, suffered a loss in killed and wounded of only 37.7 percent. But at Gettysburg the First Minnesota Regiment sustained a loss of 85.5 percent, nearly all of which came in an assault the second day; and at Antietam the First Texas sustained a loss of 82.3 percent. During the war 63 Union and 52 Confederate regiments suffered losses of more than 50 percent in a single battle.

Moreover, the American conflict of the 1860's was the last of the old-fashioned and the first of the great modern wars. It was the last war in which participants observed on a large scale such niceties as borrowing shovels from the opposing side to bury the dead, as the Confederates did at Munfordville, Ky., in the autumn of 1862; succoring wounded foes lying helplessly between the lines, as occurred in a number of engagements; cheering acts of bravery on the part of enemy combatants, as did the Federals who watched the Confederate charge on Cemetery Ridge at Gettysburg, July 3, 1863; joining together in songfests and swimming parties; calling informal truces to enjoy the luscious berries ripening in the "no man's land" separating entrenchments, as at Vicksburg; getting together of the men in blue and the men in gray to swap coffee for tobacco or northern for southern newspapers or to gamble, drink, or just gab, as was done from time to time on every front.

One writer has referred to the conflict as the "polite war," and numerous acts of chivalry on both sides indicate the appropriateness of the term. When George E. Pickett of Gettysburg renown became the father of a boy late in the conflict, Grant and other northern leaders who had known Pickett in the old army sent him a message by flag of truce, offering congratulations on the arrival of the "young recruit." And when Lewis Armistead died at Gettysburg his watch and his spurs by his dying request were sent to his old friend, Winfield Hancock of the northern army, who received these tokens of an undying affection as he was being borne wounded from the ridge at which the Confederate assault was directed.

But this was also a modern war in which factories, railroads, the telegraph, and many other developments of the industrial revolution played a conspicuous part. It was the first conflict in which a battleship was sunk by a submarine; in which ironclad men-of-war participated; and in which a soldier was killed by a machinegun. Other modern devices employed in this struggle include flamethrowers, rockets, incendiary shells, repeating rifles, land mines, grenades, and observation balloons. Not all of these were new with the Civil War, but they had much more extensive use during this conflict than ever before.

Several questions of a similar type are often raised in regard to the war. Is it not a mistake to keep alive the memories of this war? Does not all the writing and the talking about the conflict of the 1860's tend to perpetuate intersectional hatred and rub salt in old wounds? Would it not be better for North, South, and Nation to forget the whole business?

The answer to these questions is an emphatic no. It is good for the Americans to study this war and to keep alive and active the memory of it. The Civil War was a time of greatness for the North, for the South, and for the Nation. Both sections were called upon to make enormous sacrifices, and the manner in which the people—especially the common folk—endured the hardship and suffering reflected great credit on them and the society of which they were a part. Johnny Rebs and Billy Yanks both displayed enough gallantry to enable descendants to look back with tremendous pride on their participation.

Contestants on both sides were sincere in their motives and purposes. It is a pity that Americans deemed it necessary to resort to arms to settle their differences, but since the fact of their having done it is a matter of history and since the people of both sides sustained their causes with great earnestness, sacrifice, and heroism, it is right and proper that we should commemorate their deeds.

Americans are far enough away from the war now so that they should be able to regard it with a certain degree of detachment and, while it is right that they should deplore the hatred which preceded and accompanied it, the cost in blood and treasure that it involved, and the bitterness that came in its wake, there is no reason why all of them should not derive great satisfaction from the good that came out of it.

The Civil War settled the question of the nature of the American Government. It decided the issue of National and State sovereignty. It determined that the United States would be one great country rather than a loose confederation of many separate and competing entities. The American nation came of age with the Civil War.

The Civil War also settled the issue of slavery. It brought to an end the outmoded and wrongful practice of men holding fellow human beings in bondage. Southerners of the 1860's and since have denied that slavery was an issue of the war. Letters and diaries of Union soldiers indicate that very few—no more than 1 in 10—of those who wore the blue were fighting primarily for the emancipation of slaves. The dominant concern of the Federal soldiers was the preservation of the Union. The letters of many Billy Yanks indicate a deep devotion to the ideal of union. Even so, it is difficult to believe that this war which cost so much in blood and suffering and property would have ever taken place had it not been for the institution of slavery.

The Civil War, as Prof. Allan Nevins has pointed out, marked the emergence of modern America. Enormous demands of the war caused North and South to increase their productive capacities. People became accustomed to new ways of thinking and acting. The war stepped up industrialism, urbanization, mass production, and other developments that are a part of what we know as modern America.

The Civil War was without question the most dramatic and most outstanding episode in the career of the American Nation. We, as Americans, North and South, would be remiss in our responsibilities if we did not keep the memory of the war alive and observe on a large scale and in a constructive and impressive manner the 100th anniversary of this momentous and thrilling chapter in our history.

Late Victor Herbert Honored by American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers at Washington Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following splendid address made by Mr. Paul Cunningham, president, American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers, at a dinner held in Washington, Monday, April 20, 1959, in honor of the late Victor Herbert. Mrs. FLOOD and I were privileged to have attended this most impressive affair.

The address follows:

My friends, distinguished guests, on this dais, and in our audience, fellow songwriters, ladies and gentlemen, it is a double honor that the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers enjoys tonight. We are honored in the privilege of offering reverent tribute to the greatest name on the roll of our membership, a name that will live as long as there is a song in the heart of mankind. And we are honored by the presence in our midst of the distinguished music lovers and lawmakers who have joined us in paying homage to the glorious memory of Victor Herbert.

It is, I believe, quite appropriate that this centennial commemoration of this great American's birth is being held in our Nation's capital; and it is equally appropriate that there is, in this assemblage, a notable representation of the most prominent lawmakers of our country. Because there is, in fact, a kinship of purpose and accomplishment between those who write the Nation's laws and those who write its songs. Laws are created for the weal and welfare of humanity, to promote the well-being and happiness of those who live by them. Music, likewise, is created by those blest with heaven's gift to give it form and expression, to enhance and augment the happiness of mankind, to give voice to the joys of life, to bring comfort and solace in moments of sorrow and sadness. Without laws society would revert to the barbarism of the jungle; without music, man would be without the charms that sooth the savage breast.

There is yet another reason why the writer of laws is a befitting and most welcome guest at the festive board of the writer of songs. Because it is by virtue of the lawmaker's appreciation of the musicmaker's contribution that the musicmaker is able to pursue his art and live by the fruit of his labors. Without the beneficent protection afforded him by the laws of copyright, the composer and his collaborator, the lyricist, would have no incentive to struggle and strive in the precarious calling of wooing the capricious muse. And their fellowmen would be listening in vain for the sound of songs born without wings. Without the lawmaker's bestowal of the copyright, our great Victor Herbert might today be lying like some mute, inglorious Milton in the churchyard of Gray's "Elegy." It was that copyright which fostered and encouraged the genius of Victor Herbert by the promise and assurance of due reward for his efforts; and that thereby brought to the American public, and to the entire world, the joy and happiness that countless millions have found, and will continue to find everlastingly, in his glorious, immortal music.

History records that from time immemorial the rulers of government have been the patrons of the composer and the lyricist. It was under the sponsorship of King David, himself, as the Bible records, a musician, that the Psalms were written and set to music by the lyrists and composers sheltered in the royal court of ancient Israel. Skipping over the pages of history to a less distant era, we find that the genius of Mozart, Schubert, and other such composers, budded and bloomed under royal patronage in the many kingdoms which dotted the map of Europe. With the advent of constitutional government, the fortuitous benevolence of the monarch was replaced by legislative acts of copyright, which, I might observe, today in European countries favor the

songwriter much more generously than we do here in the United States. It was in 1790 that the Congress of the United States enacted its first law for the protection of the American songwriter. I am happy to report that since then there has been, and is, a continuing progression in the interest of our lawmakers in that direction. And it was the man whose memory we honor tonight, a great, unselfish genius whose love of his calling embraced a warm affection for the lowliest of his fellow craftsmen, who played an important role in augmenting the scope of our copyright laws.

Let us take a glance at this master of melody who is our unseen guest of honor. All of you have tasted the luscious fruits of his illustrious talent. What heart in this audience has not, at some time or other, thrilled to the sweet sound of "I'm Falling in Love With Someone," or of "Slumber On, My Little Gypsy Sweetheart"? How many yearning eyes have exchanged meaningful glances to the strain of "Sweetheart, Sweetheart, Sweetheart, will you love me ever"? How many lonely lovers have found the voice of their own longing in the wistful refrain of "When you're away dear, how weary the lonesome hours." And how many lips have sighed tenderly to the rapturous plea of "Kiss me, kiss me again." Perhaps, in other, younger days, or nights, some of you who are here whispered that plea to the accompaniment of Herbert's music. If you did, I'm sure the result must have been gratifying.

Many of you doubtless enjoyed, and still recall nostalgically, those wonderful evenings in the theater when you saw and heard Fritzie Scheff in "Mlle. Modiste," Montgomery and Stone in "The Red Mill," and the many, many other great stars in those 40 unforgettable musical comedies—like "Naughty Marietta," "The Only Girl," "Eileen," which Victor Herbert composed on that Broadway of bygone days to which he added such luster and brilliance. Some of you gentlemen who have long served your country in its Senate and House of Representatives doubtless remember him personally, for he came to Washington frequently on pilgrimages in the interest, not so much of himself, as of the lesser members of his craft. Victor Herbert needed nothing for himself. His success was as great materially as it was artistically. He wanted only fairness and justice for the men and women who labored in the same vineyard and he did and who were not so fortunate as he was.

And if you remember Victor Herbert, you recall a robust, handsome, jolly good fellow, with a warm smile of affection for everyone, a smile that reflected the ardor and tenderness of his music, such music as could come only from a heart overflowing with love for all mankind.

Those of us who pleasurably trace our ancestry back to the Land of the Shamrock are prone, as are all sons of Erin, to claim a bit of a shore in every Irishman's glory; and sure no one will begrudge us the morsel of pride we take in the fact that Victor Herbert was born in Ireland. And we like to think that the melodious ripple of the waters of the Shannon and the lilt in the gentle waves of the lakes of Killarney are echoed in the music that came from the lad born with the blessing of Saint Cecelia, Ireland's patron saint of music who put a song into every Irishman's heart and a tenor voice into his throat. For what Irishman is not a man who loves or makes music? If he isn't, we strongly suspect some sort of shenaningans somewhere in his ancestry. Who but a most ardent lover of music could detect melody and harmony in the skirlings of an Irish bagpipe? And what Irishman doesn't sing—especially on Saturday nights?

It is the town of Dublin that boasts of being the birthplace of Victor Herbert—a hundred years ago on the first of last February. He was born to an artistic heritage. His maternal grandfather was Samuel Lover, a man of diverse talents, equally famed as a painter, composer, and author. At the age of 7, Victor's well-to-do parents sent him to Germany for his education. So far as is known, he suffered no serious consequences—except that he spoke German fluently with an Irish brogue, and acquired an understandable fondness for Pilsener beer. Herbert's parents hoped that their little Victor would become a great doctor of medicine. Instead, he became a cellist. Needless to say, a very excellent one. At the age of 23 he was already first cellist in the famous Strauss Orchestra in Vienna. And 4 years later he was playing his favorite instrument in the Metropolitan Opera House in New York City. Thereafter, he rapidly climbed the heights in the realm of symphonic music as a cello soloist, as a composer of symphonies and rhapsodies, and finally as a great orchestra conductor. Many of you, I am sure, recall the magnificent Victor Herbert Concert Orchestra which was heard in every large city in the United States.

I shall not attempt to name his numerous symphonic masterpieces. Herbert was a prodigious worker and a prolific writer in a wide range of composition. He composed two notable grand operas, "Natoma" and "Madeline," both of which were successfully produced at the Metropolitan.

But the public at large remembers him best and loves him most for the delightful, enchanting music which he composed for the musical comedy stage—those beautiful songs which devotees of classical music, and those whose preference is for the popular song can enjoy together. Victor Herbert loved the theater, perhaps more than he loved the concert stage. He loved its people, its glamour, it life, which he lived joyously and expansively, in the picturesque Broadway of the gay nineties and the first two decades of the present century. I believe one of his happiest tasks was composing the music for a Ziegfeld Follies, a task which he shared with a former singing waiter from Chinatown, our equally beloved Irving Berlin.

Classicist that he was, famed and successful as he was, Victor Herbert was not above associating himself with the lowliest writer of the so-called popular song. Many of us who wrote the humble rhymes and tunes of Tin Pan Alley can, individually and collectively, give testimony to that fact. The world may sing Victor Herbert's songs. We sing his praises and our blessings to his memory. Without Victor Herbert, there might never have been an ASCAP; without an ASCAP many a songwriter today would be without sustenance.

There are nine names on the list of the founders of the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers. Ladies and gentlemen, it has been my great privilege to occupy the chair of president of that society for 3 years, and, based on my knowledge and experience in that office, I say, without hesitation or fear of contradiction, that the first name on that list is, and forever will be, that of Victor Herbert. Yes, even above the names of our great legal strategist, Nathan Burkan, and the unforgettable Gene Buck.

It is Victor Herbert's spirit—his humaneness and benevolence, his love and concern for the welfare of his fellow composers and authors, that pervades the aims and purposes of our society today. It was that spirit which brought him into the struggle to obtain for the songwriter a just and due reward from the public performance of his songs in theaters, cafes, and other places of amusement—and today on radio and television. Victor Herbert did not live to enjoy the full fruits of his efforts. Radio was in its infancy when he died in 1924. He never saw a television show. But those of us who knew him knew that he made the good fight so that others might not be deprived of what had been denied him. His dream was twofold: to establish for the songwriters the right to compensation from public performance, and to have that compensation collected and distributed by an organization in such manner as to protect the composer and author from the wavering fortunes and oftime violent financial vicissitudes of his career.

Not so many years ago, but before there was an ASCAP, the raggedly attired and pain-wracked form of a songwriter was carried into Bellevue Hospital. In his pockets were 26 cents and a slip of paper on which was scribbled the title of an unwritten song. He died a few days later, a lonely, friendless stranger in the big city. The name on his burial certificate was Stephen Foster.

Ladies and gentlemen, because of men like Victor Herbert, ASCAP is dedicated, unswervingly, unchangeably, to the cause that such tragedy shall never happen again—to anyone, whose talents, great or small, are embodied in the notes and syllables on a page of music manuscript. Ours is a most unique association. From the handful of 9 founders in 1915, ASCAP has grown to a membership of more than 5,000, and is growing rapidly—as rapid as the birthrate of our country. Every visit of the stork brings a potential songwriter and member of ASCAP.

Perhaps some of you in listening to the radio, or viewing television, have of late frequently heard a song which has attained high popularity. The title of that song is "It's All in The Game". And I think you will be surprised to learn that its melody, presented in the prevailing popular idiom, is from a classic composition penned by a former member of the Cabinet of the United States—the late Secretary of the Treasury William H. Woodin, who served under President Franklin D. Roosevelt, and who was a member of ASCAP. This is indicative of the vast divergence in the personalities which make up our membership. No one is immune to the urgings of the Muse of Music. And I mention it—only as a word of encouragement to all in this audience. Perhaps, between sessions of the Congress, and the calls of your constituents, some of you Senators or Congressmen may find time to give expression to a long latent talent. Wouldn't it be wonderful to hear a great popular song which would be a most harmonious blending of the words of a Democrat and the music of a Republican.

We are proud to number among our members not only the most successful writers of popular songs and musical comedies, but also the composers of America's increasingly important contribution to the classic music of the world—such illustrious names as those of Deems Taylor, a former president of our Society, Dr. Douglas Moore, Leonard Bernstein, Norman Dello Joio, and others. But the names of most of our members, those who gave you so many songs that are enshrined in your hearts and memories, are far less well-known and, in fact, totally unknown. Everybody knows that Irving Berlin wrote "Alexander's Ragtime Band" and that George Gershwin wrote the "Rhapsody in Blue". Widespread is the fact that Richard Rodgers and Oscar Hammerstein gave you "Some Enchanted Evening" and that Hammerstein and the late Jerome Kern penned "Ole Man River" and that Cole Porter wrote "Night and Day". Anyone who has been enchanted by the music of "Blossom Time" and "The Student Prince" is aware that they were composed by my dear, departed friend, Sigmund Romberg. But who remembers who wrote "Down By The Old Mill Stream"? "Dear Old Girl"? "Missouri Waltz"? "Sweet Adeline"? "Meet Me Tonight In Dreamland"? and all those other great old songs that you used to harmonize in those merry moments at your club or down at the corner tavern;

songs that your grandchildren are singing today; and that their grandchildren will sing in the years to come? Our million-song treasury contains hundreds of such beloved songs, and it is for these little-known or unknown songwriters that ASCAP exists, as well as for their world-famed colleagues.

For such writers, ASCAP collects the royalties for public performances and distributes these royalties to them or to their heirs. The money is distributed to afford them an income not only in the immediate present but in the somewhat dubious future, in the lean years that every songwriter is inevitably confronted with. And how is this done? In a most extraordinary manner. I don't believe there is another agency in the whole world that functions as ASCAP does.

Our membership is divided into classes based upon the number of public performances. And, ladies and gentlemen, the top echelon, such members as those I have named, and others like Jimmy McHugh, Harry Warren, Johnny Mercer, Otto Harbach, Ira Gershwin—and about 60 more—voluntarily, I repeat, voluntarily, accept a limitation on their earnings, so that a goodly share of their money can me distributed among the less successful songwriters in the lower classes. I am tempted to tell you how much Irving Berlin, of his own volition, gives up each year, but he would prefer I didn't. The fact is that 73 members of our society each year deprive themselves of a substantial share of their earnings and permit their dollars to roll down the ladder into the pockets of their less fortunate brethren. To the age-old question, "Am I my brother's keeper?" ASCAP's answer is an emphatic, unalterable "Yes."

To compute how much is due each member there are I. B. M. mechanical devices—machines with a so-called brain. We have and use these machines with a brain. But ASCAP has what no machine has or ever will have. ASCAP has a heart—a heart which is the heritage left to it by Victor Herbert and the other great souls who founded our society. Yes, my friends, if I may repeat myself, you sing Victor Herbert's songs. We songwriters sing his praises and our blessings to his memory. And, especially now, as we affectionately commemorate the centennial of his birth, we bow our heads in deep reverence to our great, immortal colleague, and say, "Happy birth year, Victor. Rest in peace. And for all you did for the happiness of mankind with your music—and for all you did for your fellow writers in ASCAP, from the bottom of our grateful hearts—we thank you."

And for so patiently listening to me, ladies and gentlemen, I thank you.

Some Right and Wrong Thinking About American Foreign Assistance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an informative and well-balanced discussion of some of the common charges and countercharges one frequently hears or reads regarding the mutual security program and its projects and personnel in other countries. The address was given before the American Association at Bangkok, Thailand, on January 27, 1959, by Mr. Thomas E. Naughten, Director of U.S. Operations Mission in Thailand of the International Cooperation Administration:

SOME RIGHT AND WRONG THINKING ABOUT AMERICAN FOREIGN ASSISTANCE

(By Thomas E. Naughten, Director, U.S. Operations Mission in Thailand, International Cooperation Administration)

I believe that it would be profitable and timely to discuss some of the philosophy involved in American foreign assistance generally, not merely in Thailand. This idea of nations working together for economic and social advancement is perhaps the most important development in international relations in several hundred years. The concept is still new, although it has become a firmly imbedded policy of most governments and of international bodies. But we have much to learn about it. We are still engaging in a lot of right and wrong thinking about it. That is what I'd like to discuss today.

I want to speak to you as an American discussing matters of vital interest with fellow Americans. I am glad that so many of our friends of other nationalities are here to listen in, and I hope that this will interest them. It is our habit to discuss public problems in public, because we believe that truth will find acceptance in a free marketplace. A philosopher once said that when the public thinks long enough about something it usually thinks right. My purpose is to have us all think together about some matters that concern us all.

Most of American foreign assistance today goes into what we call—for want of a better term—the "developing nations." This term has the merit of giving credit to the efforts being made by these nations to overcome whatever has held them back and to make better use of their resources for the benefit of their people.

Americans in general have consistently supported technical and economic assistance to the developing nations since we began it some 16 years ago. They have supported it for many reasons; indeed, each of us has his own personal reasons. It may be simply that we feel an obligation to share our own abundance with countries that have been less fortunate than we. It may be a sense of our duty to work for the common good of all people. It may be a feeling that this is the best way to prevent communism from taking over weaker nations. It may be that higher levels of economic activity throughout the free world mean more prosperity for all nations. It may be that it is a small price to pay for insuring against a major war.

For whatever reasons we offer assistance to other nations, we must have objectives and principles to guide us or we shall simply fritter away our resources and no one will be the better off for what we have done.

The United States has gradually evolved an objective in its foreign assistance programs. It did not come all at once, and even now it is not entirely clear to all Americans. I shall try to put it in a few words, although it deserves a fuller statement than this.

Our objective is to help other countries develop political and economic systems of their own which will achieve enough dynamism to create the human and physical resources to sustain further progress under their own power. These systems should be based upon the desires and participation of an ever-widening circle of people in each country. They should lay the foundation for stability, and they should tend to strengthen the common defense against aggression of any type.

The problems come when we try to work out meaningful connections between this broad objective and the specific actions that might be taken to attain it in a given country.

One of the first problems is to find and work out with the government of each country common objectives which we both seek. This always involves a certain compromise between what we Americans think should be done, or done first, and what the cooperating government wants to do.

Another problem in working out a program of cooperation is that we wish to help the country become economically independent—less dependent upon our assistance, not more dependent. Sometimes a government, when assured of American support, tends to relax its own efforts, seeking more help from us, doing less itself. We encourage governments to employ American assistance as a tool, not as a crutch.

SOME MISUNDERSTANDINGS

We not only have problems in the operation of our foreign assistance programs. We have problems that stem from misunderstandings about it among the American people themselves.

As you know, our Congress reviews the entire foreign assistance program each year and appropriates money for it, with some policy guides as to how it shall be spent. Congress reflects the attitude of the whole American people.

I have pointed out that the American people have supported these programs for many years. Nevertheless, there is opposition to various aspects of foreign assistance; and many people who support the grand principle of helping other nations have strong opinions about how we do it and what we do.

It is not surprising that there is opposition. What is impressive is that the bulk of the American people have supported foreign assistance year after year, costing billions of dollars which they must pay out of their own pockets.

Some of the criticism stems from misunderstanding. Some comes from people who have been misled by false information or wrong thinking of one kind or another. And, of course, some comes from people who oppose it simply because it costs a lot of money. Misunderstanding and misinformation are widespread, even among Americans overseas and close to the program, and extending even, I am afraid, to people employed in the program itself.

I wish to deal with some of these misconceptions.

There is a widespread belief among Americans that all human beings are motivated mainly by aspirations for a better life and that they will pursue these aims steadily and with good sense when the opportunity is offered to them. This ignores the fact that there are passions in men which are more powerful than the simple aspiration for a better life—passions based upon religion, nationalism, pride, prejudice, tradition, and so on. More of the world's conflicts arise out of emotions than out of economics. War itself is very bad economics. Still, we cannot seem to get it through our heads that offering people a chance to improve their standard of living does not in itself cause them to behave consistently in a purely rational manner. Man is not content with material things alone, and economic opportunity is only one of his aspirations.

Closely related to this is our tendency to believe that a rising standard of living produces political stability and steady growth of democratic institutions. We have been shocked time and again by outbreaks of violence in countries we have been assisting and by the setback of democratic processes, if only for a time. It is necessary to have an expanding economy and rising standard of living in order to support strong democratic systems which will in time produce political stability. But an expanding economy does not by itself produce these ideals—particularly in its early stages—any more than dem-

ocracy or political stability by themselves produce a higher standard of living.

In fact, progress comes about through a process of conflict, sometimes peaceful, sometimes not. A certain dissatisfaction is essential to progress, but it cannot always be controlled and channeled. It takes time and discipline for social dissatisfaction to direct itself into democratic action. We must remember this and not lose patience. Above all, we must not feel that our efforts to help nations improve themselves have failed merely because they do not produce immediate and steady progress toward democratic political stability.

Another widespread misconception among the American people is overestimating the extent to which our assistance can influence the course of event in a country. Actually, our oversea programs are not intended to produce specific political results. One of the virtues of American assistance is that we do not attach political conditions to it. There is a vast political awakening going on in the world today. Millions of people have suddenly become politically aware and politically active—people who for centuries have had little more on their minds than their farms, their shops, and their families.

Most of these millions are in countries that have lagged behind the industrialized nations for one reason or another, and they are impatient to catch up. They have a natural distrust of the rich and powerful nations. They have an intense desire to attain nationalistic as well as personal aspirations. This inevitably results in impulsive, popular actions, some of which may seem to us against American and free-world interests.

It is the process of learning to find one's own way. Nations as well as individual persons learn self-reliance only by practicing it, and this involves making some mistakes and even resenting people who try to help if they interfere with self-expression.

ECONOMIC ADVANCEMENT REQUIRES TIME

That brings me to one more source of misunderstanding, which is the tendency to underestimate how long it takes to accomplish significant results through foreign assistance. When you are dealing with the accumulated problems of centuries, it takes more than a couple of years to start a steady progression of economic and social advancement. At the root of this is the fact that we are not dealing primarily with economic problems. It is necessary to deal with the organization and functioning of a society in every aspect of its existence. It is not only physical resources that are needed, although these needs may be large. Even more important is the necessity of transmiting ideas and atitudes and having them accepted and, along with this, the building of institutions and the training of individuals to carry on the process of selfpowered growth. This is a sound approach, but it takes time. Some years may be devoted to institution-building and training before dramatic results are seen, either by Americans or by the people we are helping.

Recently a book has appeared which bears directly on what I have been talking about. This book, called "The Ugly American," is causing many Americans to do some heavy thinking about our foreign programs. From this point of view, the book is doing a good thing. We ought to be thinking about our oversea efforts quite seriously. There are imperfections in our programs, and we should constantly examine them to see where we can improve them, where we are doing wrong.

If this book merely started you thinking, I would say no more about it, other than to urge you to read it. Unfortunately, many people will let the book do their thinking for them, and the book is quite unsatisfactory for that purpose. It presents only one point of view, most unfavorable to all we are doing. It gives no opportunity for balanced judgment, and it contains many egregious errors of thinking and of omission. I cannot say that it contains errors of fact, because the authors say the book is fiction, while they also claim it is true. It is difficult to disprove anything which is offered to you under the labels of both fiction and fact.

My greatest concern about this book is that it seems calculated to destroy some of America's confidence in itself. It keeps repeating that our representatives overseas are incompetent, even stupid. It insists that all the good Americans working abroad are defeated and frustrated by the bad Americans and that all the career people in foreign service are bad people. It shouts that we have failed, the Communists are winning everywhere. We must quit. Asia is lost.

In summing up the argument of the book, which is directed primarily against our foreign assistance, our information program, and our diplomacy in southeast Asia, the authors make a major point that 700 million people have been brought under Communist domination since World War II. That is regrettably true, but it is not clear what this proves about our foreign aid, information, or diplomacy. The fact is that of all these people, the only ones who had received any economic assistance from us were the Chinese—and the argument has been going on ever since that we did too little too late. This was one reason for stepping up our assistance and information programs throughout the Far East, and not one single area where these programs have been operating has come under Red control. This may not prove that our efforts have insured the survival of these free nations, but it certainly does not prove that our efforts have failed.

I think it might be said here that as far as America is concerned any nation of people who want communism can have it. But we shall not stand by and see communism forced upon any country from outside or from within. Our assistance is offered to free nations whose governments and people wish to remain free. If they do not wish to remain free, that is their business. If they wish to maintain their independence and they want help and need help to do it, we will assist them, and not merely because of a threat of communism. We do not try to dictate their form of government, nor force them into military agreements, nor interfere in their internal affairs.

Let me remind you that we are not engaged in a popularity contest with anyone. If America simply wanted to be popular with Asians, we might spend less money in quite different ways—on lollipops and games and circuses and free trips around the world. No, we are engaged in a much more serious business. Bringing economic and social progress to millions of people is a hard job, without drama and with little sign of progress from day to day.

It has been argued that we should put our Americans out in the villages where they can work with the people directly. This sounds appealing, but there are 40,000 villages in Thailand alone—in the whole of free Asia there are well over 1 million. How many American technicians would it take to reach them all? How would they cope with nationwide problems such as malaria, electric power shortages, the lack of highways, the vast needs for teacers to man the schools, the lack of hospitals, the absence of marketing facilities? The officials now in the villages lack resources to cope with such problems. Where would the Americans obtain them? I am sure that the village people would respect an American who devoted his life to helping them, but I do not believe that hundreds of such Americans could make a significant improvement in the economy of Thailand or of Asia in many years.

RUSSIAN AID VERSUS U.S. AID

It has been argued that the Russians have made a bigger impact with their aid in one country by giving things like a sports stadium, a hospital, and a graduate school for doctors and engineers. Actually, the Russians have given Asian nations very little but have for the most part only extended credits for doing such things, for which they expect to be reimbursed. These offers create excitement for a few weeks, which might be taken for a great propaganda victory.

American aid is less noisy, but it is considerably more generous and the benefits spread farther and last for many years. For example, the United States has actually donated to Thailand large quantities of hospital equipment; every province in Thailand has received some. We are building a new medical school at Chiengmai, having already given a lot of help to Siriraj and Chulalongkorn medical schools, and we are making a major contribution to the new graduate school of engineering at Chulalongkorn University under the auspices of SEATO. We have not built a sports stadium, and I doubt if the Thai people—especially those 18 million in the rural areas—would be grateful to use if we did do so. On the other hand, we have built many, many other things—a technical institute in Bangkok that now has 5,000 students, many new buildings for Kasetsart Agricultural University, three regional technical institutes, a new highway to the northeast, a railroad extension to the Mekong River, water systems in six northeastern towns, scores of water tanks in the northeast, any number of laboratories, teacher training buildings, concrete bridges on major highways—the list is almost endless.

Why do some people say that when we do such things it is stupid and wasteful, but whatever the Russians promise is clever and effective?

I think that what angered me most about "The Ugly American" was its failure to acknowledge that our efforts had done one single bit of good. That is why the American who lets this book do his thinking for him will believe that we have failed in all our efforts.

No honest and intelligent man could look at the free nations of Asia and Africa today without seeing verywhere enormous evidence of the effectiveness of American cooperation.

We have not done all we would like to do, not even all we have tried to do. We are glad to have criticism that will help us do a better job. But there are certain principles from which we cannot expect either the American taxpayer or the Thai people to depart.

First is that the U.S. Government extends its technical and economic cooperation through the cooperating government, not directly to the people. The Thai Government has a responsibility to fit American economic assistance into Thailand's own plans where it will do the most good. We try to help the Thai Government prepare itself better to deal with its problems in the future—better equipped, better trained, better organized.

INSTITUTION BUILDING

Second, we aim at institution building. This means improving the existing organizations of the country or helping establish new ones. For example, it is not enough to bring American teachers to Thailand merely to add their services to the 90,000 Thai teachers. Instead we concentrate upon strengthening the Thai Ministry of Education so it can improve the educational system throughout the kingdom. We follow the same principle in working with many other agencies of the Thai Government.

Instead of accomplishing a little and claiming all the credit for it, we help the

agencies of Thailand accomplish a great deal more, and we share the credit with them.

A third principle is that American assistance should be devoted mainly to projects which require outside help. The Thai Government naturally prefers to do with its own resources the things it can do and to use American assistance for things that need equipment, skills, training, or commodities that are not available in Thailand.

This leads me to a fourth principle: The projects we are working on are projects the Thai Government itself selects and wants. There is nothing gained by our undertaking a project just because we think it is a good idea, if the Thai do not think so too. The Thai Ministries propose projects, and they are screened by the Thai Technical and Economic Committee. We select those we will help carry out; we may modify them in discussions as we go along. We need to obtain the full cooperation of the Thai Ministries in carrying out the work, to assure that the Thai will carry on, extend, and improve these projects in the future after American aid has ceased.

Fifth, the emphasis in all our efforts is on training executive, technical, and professional people. In cooperation with the Thai Government, we have sent more than 1,500 Thai abroad for specialized and advanced training. Together, we have provided opportunities in Thailand itself for training many more than this; for example, most of the teachers in Thailand have received some type of special inservice or preservice training as a result of Thai-American cooperation. Every American technician will, we hope, some day be replaced by many Thai who are better trained as a result of his efforts.

There are other principles that guide us in working with the Thai Government to devise the best application of American assistance, but there is only one more that I wish to single out for special attention. That is, that we are dedicated to the broad economic advancement of Thailand. We want to see the whole economy of Thailand grow, and we want it to grow soundly, steadily, and in good balance. If we were simply engaged in doing good, this principle would not matter. If we were trying only to promote friendship, this would not matter. But we are trying to do some real and lasting good for all the country. If we can do this, we can count upon friendship that will endure for generations, not just a transitory period of good will.

The economic and social progress of a nation is a complex thing in which every element is dependent upon others. For example, for the farmer to make more money he must produce more; to produce more he must be able to sell it; to sell more he must have better marketing facilities; to have wider markets he must have highways and communications; to build these there must be industries; for industries there must be capital, equipment, and skilled manpower to run them; for skilled manpower we need more and better schools; for schools we need more and better teachers; and for all of this to work, the people must be in good health.

The interconnections of an advancing economy are almost endless. We cannot deal with all of them. We would reach the point where our efforts were so scattered and spread so thin that they would do little good. We must keep them concentrated on the main things, but these are necessarily varied and diverse, because Thailand's aim is a balanced and diversified economy that will insure a better life for its people.

I think you could say that all of our activities must meet at least one of two tests: They must contribute directly to the increased productivity of the nation, or they must result in improved public services and better Government. Our aim is to help Thailand reach a degree of self-reliance in which she will not be dependent upon any outside assistance.

America is a hardheaded, practical Nation. It is also a generous and sentimental country. It is a country that has confidence in its strength and does not lack for courage, but it has a soft heart. It wants to be liked and it wants to be respected, too. What it really longs for is a world of nations among whom there is understanding, prosperity, friendship, and mutual confidence. Our foreign assistance program is a part of our effort to be a true friend and a good neighbor to other nations of similar good will.

I ask you to think about these things and to judge our work with Thailand and other countries in the light of the basic principles and objectives I have talked about. If we all think about these matters, I feel confident of better understanding, and with better understanding all Americans and all people can work togehter more effectively for the kind of world we all seek.

Retirement From Naval Service of Comdr. Ann A. Bernatitus, of Exeter, Pa., First To Receive Legion of Merit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news story which appeared in the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of April 8, 1959:

LEFT CORREGIDOR BY SUB—NAVY NURSE RETIRES; HAS LEGION OF MERIT

Comdr. Ann A. Bernatitus, Nurses Corps, U.S. Navy, a Navy nurse who served through the battles of Bataan and Corregidor, escaping from each of the Philippine strongholds just before their fall, retired after 23 years service on April 1 at the U.S. Naval Hospital in Philadelphia.

Those many months spent in the Philippines earned Miss Bernatitus the Legion of Merit and made her the first person in the naval service to receive the then newly created award.

In July 1940, Miss Bernatitus arrived in Canacao, Philippine Islands, for duty, and was on duty at that station at the outbreak of the war. As the war progressed, she was sent with an operating team into the Manila area to aid the wounded soldiers. She retreated to Bataan with the Army units and was later evacuated to Corregidor.

When Corregidor was on the verge of surrender, a submarine, the U.S.S. *Spearfish*, came through enemy defenses and she was taken aboard. Seventeen days later she arrived in Australia, having made the entire journey with the submarine submerged. She was later transferred back to the United States and served at various naval hospitals.

While serving at the naval dispensary in New Orleans as a lieutenant (jg.), on September 10, 1943, Miss Bernatitus was awarded the Legion of Merit, the first person in the U.S. naval service ever to receive the honor. The presentation was made for her "courageous and outstanding performance of duty during the Manila-Bataan campaign, December 1941 to April 1942."

Commander Bernatitus was born at Exeter, January 21, 1912, and resides at 334 Battle Avenue, Exeter. Attending public schools in Exeter, she graduated from high school in 1928. Entering nurses' training at the Wyoming Valley Homeopathic Hospital Training School here in 1931, she graduated in 1934. Shortly after she took a post-graduate course in operating room technique at the University of Pennsylvania Graduate Hospital at Philadelphia and continued duty in that hospital in a surgical assignment.

In September 1936, Miss Bernatitus was appointed to the Navy Nurse Corps, and ordered to duty at the Chelsea Naval Hospital, Mass. Two years later she was reassigned to Mare Island, Calif., and served aboard the U.S.S. *Chaumont*. In July 1940, Miss Bernatitus arrived in Canacao, Philippine Islands, and assigned to the naval hospital there.

During her 23 years as a Navy nurse, Miss Bernatitus served at various hospitals and on hospital ships during World War II. She reported for duty at the U.S. Naval Hospital, Philadelphia in October 1954 and served as Chief of the Nursing Service.

On April 1, 1959, Miss Bernatitus received her orders transferring her to inactive duty on the retired list, ending a truly illustrious career. She will reside at Exeter.

Washington Board of Trade Anniversary Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I include a statement by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia concerning the Washington Board of Trade anniversary week.

I should like to state that the Washington Board of Trade is one of the outstanding organizations in the United States, and I presume that its membership includes more of the leading citizens of the Nation's Capital than any other one organization. Practically all the members of this great organization are property owners and taxpayers here in the District of Columbia and have a deep interest in the city government.

I have leaned heavily upon this organization for information and advice during the 20 years I have served as a member of the House District Committee and especially during the 10 years I have served as its chairman.

I hope every Member of Congress will take time to read the following statement and will also check the activities of the board of trade in connection with District affairs here in the Nation's Capital:

WASHINGTON BOARD OF TRADE ANNIVERSARY WEEK, APRIL 15–22, 1959: A PROCLAMATION BY THE COMMISSIONERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Whereas on Wednesday, November 27, 1889, a small group of prominent Washington businessmen met at the Ebbitt House to discuss the need of a civic association; and

Whereas 1 week later on December 2 the Washington Board of Trade was incorporated with a membership of 200 under the leadership of Mr. M. M. Parker, first president of the organization; and

Whereas for the past 70 years, the Washington Board of Trade has kept pace with

the growth of the community and numbers in its membership over 7,000 public-spirited citizens and business firms of metropolitan Washington; and

Whereas the members of this outstanding organization have unselfishly dedicated themselves to the improvement of the District of Columbia and have been instrumental in assisting in the successful conclusion of regulations and projects beneficial to all as witness a few of their many achievements: formulation of original zoning laws, establistment of the public library system, establishment of a family court for the District of Columbia, construction of the National Airport at Gravelly Point, initiation of the successful program for the new stadium, the establishment of the District of Columbia General Hospital, and the authorization for a cultural center; and

Whereas because of the phenomenal growth of metropolitan Washington, and in the interest of the entire citizenry, the Washington board has now expanded its activities and maintains 32 standing committees dedicated to solving the complex problems confronting the area, as well as its promotion, such as: adequate traffic control, water pollution control, port improvement, the Cherry Blossom Festival, tourist visitations to the Nation's Capital and new businesses for metropolitan Washington:

Now, therefore, we the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, in recognition of outstanding meritorious service in the public interest do hereby declare the week of April 15 to April 22, 1959, Washington Board of Trade Anniversary Week in honor of the 70th anniversary of this outstanding, dynamic organization and add our personal felicitations for its continued growth and progress.

ROBERT E. MCLAUGHLIN,
DAVID B. KARRICK,
A. C. WELLING,
Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

Sterling Silver Week in Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK KOWALSKI
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the House to the fact that the distinguished Governor of Connecticut, the Honorable Abraham A. Ribicoff, has designated the current week as Sterling Silver Week in my home State.

I take particular pleasure in Governor Ribicoff's action because my home city of Meriden is proudly known as the Silver City.

Sterling silver products of the skilled craftsmen of Meriden and its adjoining sister town of Wallingford are famous all over the globe. The silver industry is one of the most important in our State, providing employment for thousands of men and women. The industry has grown with our State, and since colonial days it has maintained the high standards of excellence which have made Connecticut silver a treasured family possession in every corner of the globe.

I am happy to insert in the RECORD news accounts of the proclamation of Sterling Silver Week from two of New England's outstanding daily newspapers, the Meriden Record and the Meriden Journal:

[From the Meriden Record, Apr. 18, 1959]

RIBICOFF HONORS SILVER INDUSTRY

HARTFORD.—The silversmiths of Meriden and Wallingford were honored yesterday morning when Gov. Abraham A. Ribicoff proclaimed the week of April 19 to 26 as Sterling Silver Week at ceremonies in his office at the State capitol.

Attending were John B. Stevens, vice president of the International Silver Co., Meriden, and Donald W. Leach, executive vice president of Wallace Silversmiths, Inc., Wallingford, who gave the Governor a pair of sterling silver candelabra to commemorate the occasion.

The sterling silver industry, one of Connecticut's, and America's, oldest industries, was given a brighter polish in the proclamation issued by the Governor.

CENTER OF TRADE

Governor Ribicoff pointed out that fine craftsmanship, as typified by silversmithing, is traditional to Connecticut industry, and that three centuries after the craft was introduced in America, Connecticut remains an important center of silversmithing contributing greatly to the comfort and grace of American life.

Governor Ribicoff cited the industry as intertwined with our Commonwealth's historic past and our progressive present."

Date for the opening of the week coincides with the 184th anniversary of the ride of Paul Revere, America's most famous silver craftsman.

The silversmith's industry today employs about 5,000 men and women in the State. Among them are craftsmen whose skill takes years of apprenticeship, for sterling today combines mass production methods with the touch of the artisan.

AVAILABLE TO ALL

Sterling silver, which once graced only the tables of the wealthy, has become, in 352 years, a combined mass production artisan industry to the extent that sterling has become the hallmark of gracious living in all walks of American life.

In 1607 when Capt. John Smith set sail for the New World, his small band of colonists included two silversmiths. The name "sterling" was derived from the name given to the silversmiths in England in the 12th century. Because these smiths came from eastern Europe they were called "easterlings."

Usage wore off the first two letters of the name "easterling," but the product itself defies time. In fact, the longer sterling silver is used the more beautiful it becomes. Usage improves the patina, the soft, lustrous finish silver acquires through the years.

In a statement issued yesterday, Bernard D. Kasack, president of the Meriden Chamber of Commerce, said:

"The chamber of commerce salutes the silver industry which accounts for two-thirds of the manufacturing jobs in Meriden.

"During Sterling Silver Week, the people of the Silver City of the world, should note the blessings which the silver industry has brought to Meriden. Our schools, parks, and so many of our civic assets come from the taxes and payrolls provided by this industry.

"We wish our silver industry well and during this week we pledge our most diligent efforts to serve it and to help it prosper."

[From the Meriden Journal, Apr. 18, 1959]

STERLING SILVER WEEK PROCLAIMED BY GOVERNOR

Gov. Abraham Ribicoff yesterday proclaimed the week of April 19-26 as Sterling Silver Week, bestowing honor on the silversmiths in Meriden and Wallingford at ceremonies held in the Governor's office.

The ceremonies were attended by John B. Stevens, vice president of the local International Silver Co., and Donald W. Leach, executive vice president of Wallace Silversmiths, Inc., Wallingford.

The two silver officials gave the Governor a pair of sterling silver candelabra to commemorate the occasion.

Governor Ribicoff cited the silver industry as "intertwined with our Commonwealth's historic past and our progressive present."

In a statement issued by Bernard Kasack, president of the Greater Meriden Chamber of Commerce, the chamber expressed its best wishes to the silver industry.

Foreign Aid Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an interesting compilation by Paul O. Peters, well known to most of us as a skilled analyst of Government affairs, revealing the tremendous cost of foreign aid:

Report on wartime and postwar foreign aid programs of the United States, period, July 1, 1940, through Mar. 31, 1959

WORLD WAR II PERIOD

Fiscal 1941:	
Grants	$203,000,000
Credits	115,123,052
Dollar outlay	274,443,834
Total	592,566,886
Fiscal 1942:	
Grants	6,205,122,095
Credits	476,699,333
Outlays	1,273,716,986
Total	7,955,538,414
Fiscal 1943:	
Grants	9,165,977,760
Credits	47,894,356
Dollar outlays	2,730,758,500
Total	11,944,630,616
Fiscal 1944:	
Grants	16,650,353,676
Credits	122,948,106
Dollar outlays	3,827,988,633
Total	20,601,290,415
Fiscal 1945:	
Grants	15,758,641,526
Credits	90,818,352
Dollar outlays	2,926,153,103
Total	[1]18,775,612,981
World War II totals	[1]59,869,639,312

POSTWAR FOREIGN AID

Fiscal year 1946:	
Grants	3,288,535,118
Credits	1,412,400,910
Other	2,203,186,778
	6,904,122,806

Footnote at end of table.

Report on wartime and postwar foreign aid programs of the United States, period, July 1, 1940, through Mar. 31, 1959—Con.

POSTWAR FOREIGN AID—continued

Fiscal year 1957:	
Grants	$2,074,982,401
Credits	4,766,374,998
Other	1,682,120,213
	8,523,477,612
Fiscal year 1948:	
Grants	2,583,000,000
Credits	2,802,000,000
Other	1,702,000,000
	7,087,000,000
Fiscal year 1949:	
Grants	5,169,000,000
Credits	1,138,000,000
Other	1,295,029,206
	7,602,029,206
Fiscal year 1950:	
Grants	4,617,000,000
Credits	405,000,000
Other	1,316,536,000
	6,338,536,000
Fiscal 1951:	
Grants	4,280,286,000
Credits	419,000,000
Other	1,925,000,000
	6,624,286,000
Fiscal 1952:	
Grants	4,440,000,000
Credits	658,000,000
	5,098,000,000
Fiscal 1953:	
Grants	6,283,000,000
Credits	747,000,000
	7,030,000,000
Fiscal 1954:	
Grants	4,073,000,000
Credits	1,120,000,000
	5,193,000,000
Fiscal 1955:	
Grants	4,529,000,000
Credits	—16,000,000
	4,513,000,000
Fiscal 1956:	
Grants	4,688,000,000
Credits	—40,000,000
	4,648,000,000
Fiscal 1957:	
Grants	4,116,000,000
Credits	—208,000,000
	3,908,000,000
Fiscal 1958:	
Grants	4,049,000,000
Credits	612,000,000
	4,661,000,000
Fiscal 1959:	
Total to March 31	2,681,582,350
Postwar foreign aid to March 31, 1959	80,812,033,974

Footnote at end of table.

Report on wartime and postwar foreign aid programs of the United States, period, July 1, 1940, through Mar. 31, 1959—Con.

SUMMARY ON FOREIGN AID

Grants and credits World War II period	$59,869,639,312
Grants and credits postwar period	80,812,033,974
Total reported cost	140,681,673,286

[1] NOTE.—Dollar outlays include sums spent by our Government and its agencies for materials and equipment for foreign allies during the war period.

Against the gross foreign aid there were allowable deductions consisting of reverse lend-lease amounting to approximately $3 billion and repayment of credits for surplus property and installments on loans of approximately $8.5 billion.

Not to be overlooked in the total cost of foreign aid is the interest on the moneys borrowed during periods of deficit financing to carry on the foreign aid programs. The interest cost from the beginning to the present time is estimated conservatively at $20 billion total.

This bulletin compiled from statistics issued by the Office of Business Economics, and predecessor agencies, in the Department of Commerce.

"Ket" Kettering Said: "Think of the Future"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, one of the most significant statements ever to come from the pen of any man was written by Charles Francis Kettering—better known as "Boss" Kettering to many at General Motors and as "Ket" to his friends in my 17th Ohio Congressional District—and I want to repeat it now:

We should all be concerned about the future because we will have to spend the rest of our lives there.

I thought of this when I read an article in the new magazine section—known as Weed-End magazine, in the Mansfield (Ohio) News-Journal last Sunday, April 19, 1959, written by my good friend, Ken Woodman.

In this "Memo for Americans," Ken Woodman, who knew "Ket" well, gives a little-known episode in the life of the great inventor and industrial genius, of whom our district is so proud. As you and I know, Mr. Speaker, not only is my district proud of "Boss" Kettering's life and works, but the whole Nation is indebted to him in many ways. A tree is best measured when it is down. Although Mr. Kettering has been dead for many months, it is obvious that he has not been forgotten and that his memory will continue to inspire and to help this generation and generations to come.

Under leave granted me, I am inserting the story by Ken Woodman in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

MEMO FOR AMERICANS
(By D. K. Woodman)
CHALK ONE UP FOR BOSS KETTERING

An old, old friend of the late C. F. "Boss" Kettering tells this story about the intrepid inventor.

Boss Ket had just perfected in his laboratories in Dayton a new quick drying paint for automobiles. On a trip to Detroit he described it to his friends at General Motors, explaining that it would save many hours in the time required to complete a passenger car for delivery.

GM and Ket had worked together closely for years. It was agreed that a top GM official would go to Dayton with a group of paint experts and look over Ket's newest invention. The man selected a good friend of Kettering's. He was also highly skeptical.

When the VIP's arrived at his laboratory, Ket made them welcome and explained his new product brusquely and thoroughly as was his wont.

It soon became obvious that the visitors were not impressed. They felt that either the paint could not possibly dry as fast as Ket claimed or that if it did, it would not make an enduring car finish.

So Ket simply changed the subject. In a short time he excused himself for a few minutes and when he returned suggested that they make a social day of it. They did. They toured all the labs, listening to Ket's stimulating ideas for new inventions.

They had a fine lunch followed by good cigars and some business chitchat with no mention of paint.

At 4 p.m. Ket suggested that since it was a long drive back to Detroit the men might want to get an early start. They all strolled out to the parking lot.

"My car," the top GM executive exploded. "It's gone."

"What kind was it?" asked Ket.

"A black Cadillac."

Ket sighed, "Too bad. But you've got lots of Cadillacs at General Motors. Besides your wife told me once she was tired of black cars. She's like a nice pale green—like this one." He pointed to a newly painted green Cadillac on the lot.

"Why, you * * *." The GM executive stared, and broke into a grin. It was his own car, newly painted and dried during the time Ket had been chatting idly with him about other matters. He examined the paint job carefully. His experts were even more careful.

General Motors adopted Ket's quick drying paint and the executive announced he would never again let Ket excuse himself from a conference without having him followed.

Rev. Placid Hennessey, O.F.M.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of Monday, April 6, 1959, upon the death of Rev. Placid Hennessey, O.F.M., of St. Joseph's Monastery at Georgetown, Wilkes-Barre, Pa.:

REV. PLACID HENNESSEY

It has been written that man takes with him when he dies only that which he has

given away. Under those circumstances, the Reverend Placid Hennessey, O.F.M., of St. Joseph's Monastery at Georgetown, left on the last journey with untold treasure, for he had given away during the past 36 years as a member of the Franciscan Order everything he had, including his life. He devoted his entire career to religion and to charity in keeping with the teachings and example of St. Francis of Assisi, founder of the order, known as Friars Minor.

In the 13 years he was stationed here, Father Hennessey became one of the best known men in the community, evidence of the success of his mission. As director of novenas and charitable works, he labored diligently in line of duty.

But he was not satisfied to limit his ministry to the formal discharge of his church obligations. He took an interest in the Red Cross, serving on the board of directors and as representative of the Wilkes-Barre area, in which capacity he acted for the organization in emergencies. He also found time to lend a helping hand to sports, especially professional basketball.

His kindness, generosity, and unselfishness were matched by a keen sense of humor. A life, dedicated to good works, came to an end all too soon, so far as this community was concerned. And it is safe to say other towns, where he labored, shared that sentiment.

To Live Within Our Means

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following article from the Chicago Daily Sun-Times of April 22, 1959:

TO LIVE WITHIN OUR MEANS

A straight-from-the-shoulder and timely lecture on inflation, economics, and morality was given by Treasury Secretary Anderson to 1,250 newspaper publishers and editors assembled in New York Monday.

We were gratified to hear him lay down a tough anti-inflation line—one with which we have been in complete agreement.

He rejected the false assumption that a little inflation is good for economic growth. He rejected the twin false assumption that putting the Government deeper into debt does not cause further inflation.

Some Congressmen reject the economic principle that creating printing press money by deepening the Federal debt causes inflation. Some go so far as to say that it is necessary for the Government to spend more than it takes in to keep prosperity going.

Anderson rejected these notions for both economic and moral reasons. He pointed out that the Nation is presently enjoying high incomes, record production and unprecedented business profits.

"If, in a period like this we say to ourselves and to the world that we cannot live within our means, everyone has the right to ask why," he said.

In periods of high prosperity, he went on, the Nation should do even more than balance the budget and break even. It should try to achieve a surplus to pay off some of the national debt.

"To ignore the obligation of paying off some part of our debt during prosperous times is contrary to all of our American traditions of good faith and performance," he reminded. "Failure to reduce any of our debt when we can means passing on the problems of the debt to another generation which I verily believe we have no moral right to do."

President Eisenhower has said that those Congressmen who want to spend more money than he has budgeted should have the courage to levy higher taxes, Anderson carries this a step further; he is saying that in good times spending should be reduced or taxes raised so that an attack on the mountain of Government debt can be made.

These are fundamentals of economics that were subscribed to as axiomatic by those who advocated deficit spending to ease the depression of the thirties.

Deficit spending must not become an accepted part of the American way regardless of the business climate. Anderson's voice of reason must be heeded.

The Hidden Dangers of Increased Trade With Soviet Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALLEN SMITH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, it has now been several months since Soviet Deputy Premier Mikoyan visited the United States. I think there are some facets of his visit which have been overlooked. For this reason, I want to direct the attention of my colleagues to what I consider a most important danger arising from his grandiose plea for increased trade between the United States and Russia.

We remember Mikoyan. There he was—a smiling, dashing, mustached man from Moscow, speaking sweet words and displaying broad smiles. Everywhere he went he exuded friendship, telling of the glories of Soviet communism and urging Americans to accept him as an apostle of peace and good will.

His words were so enticing—to those who did not know the truth. The Soviet Union, he said, is gradually being "democratized." "Now there are no arrests for political reasons." The Iron Curtain is a "fable." We stand for "peace," "freedom" and "brotherhood."

Mikoyan did achieve a considerable propaganda success in this country. He was accepted by important business leaders and select social circles. He gained audiences with high political leaders. One reporter, commenting on his visit to the west coast, stated:

The 63-year-old Russian official has been winning friends and influencing people all over the place.

Hundreds of students, for example, at a university warmly greeted him. One coed ran up to shake his hand. Other students followed. His interest in education was praised by the university president. After lunch at a fashionable restaurant, Mikoyan went to a movie studio, there to inspect the plant and meet some of the actors and actresses. Later, as featured speaker at a dinner arranged by business officials, this faithful disciple of Stalin waxed eloquently on how America was botching up international relations.

From all the publicity and showering applause, you would think that a conquering hero from a friendly country had come to our shores—a hero whose ideals of government and personal living were similar to ours, a hero whom we could admire and incorporate into our national consciousness.

Rather this individual is one of the world's highest-ranking Communists, the No. 2 man in the notorious and iniquitous tyranny of Soviet Russia. He is the sworn opponent of everything we cherish and hold dear. His so-called hand of friendship is a hand stained with the innocent blood of literally millions of men and women. The smile—which captivated so many in the United States—is actually a satanic smirk which smugly watched entire families liquidated by the Communist secret police. The Soviet democracy he so blithely hails is the democracy which has made all Russia a prison house—where freedom of speech, thought, and the press are muzzled. Let us make no mistake: Mikoyan, despite his genial smiles and gracious outward demeanor, is a deadly enemy of America and our democratic way of life. Not to recognize him as such is to jeopardize our security.

I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues an important but generally overlooked aspect of Mikoyan's visit—namely, the dangers to the internal security of the Nation inherent in the Soviet Deputy Premier's call, among other things, for closer trade relations between the United States and Communist countries. Increased trade may have some beneficial aspects for America, but we would be foolish not to recognize that it will also pose severe problems for agencies of our Government, such as the FBI, charged with protecting the internal security of the Nation.

One of these problems, most frankly, would be the increased danger of Soviet espionage. Over the years the Soviets have systematically used trade contacts, business relationships and other commercial transactions as covers for illegal espionage activities. This remains true today. Any Soviet trade organization established in the United States automatically becomes a workshop for espionage. We must recognize that to allow more Russian technicians, business experts and trade consultants into our country will greatly multiply the FBI's problems.

Let us look at a few facts and see how the Soviets—ever since the Bolshevik Revolution—have manipulated trade contacts for spy purposes.

In March 1919, for example, an individual by the name of Ludwig C. A. K. Martens arrived in New York City. As told in Don Whitehead's most excellent book, "The FBI Story," Martens was ballyhooed as the official trade representative of the Soviet Union. He set up an office in New York City, even though the United States did not diplomatically recognize Moscow. Under this trade "cover," the very first Soviet espionage

was conducted—very crude and inept, of course, as compared with later Soviet efficiency, but already the first prick of the knife blade of treason into our national life. Very interestingly, an individual by the name of Arthur Alexandrovich Adams was a member of Martens' staff. This same Arthur Adams was later to be identified as an espionage agent in atomic matters during World War II.

In 1921, Martens and his staff were deported from the United States. The Soviets, however, already were working to perfect the technique of using commercial activity as a cover to steal valuable information from this country. In 1924, a Soviet Government trade agency by the name of Amtorg was set up in the United States. Ostensibly this organization existed for commercial purposes, such as purchasing American products for delivery to the Soviet Union. Under this cover, Russians were able to travel, make contacts with Americans, gain access to industrial facilities and gather intelligence data from business firms, trade journals, and so forth.

Most important, however, Soviet espionage for the first time had a legal base in the United States—legal in that the Soviets now had a legal cover—Amtorg was officially recognized by the American Government—for their nefarious activities. Amtorg, which still exists, served for many years as the backbone, so to speak, for Soviet espionage in the United States. After diplomatic recognition of Russia in 1933, Soviet spies started operating from diplomatic establishments, supplementing the work of Amtorg undercover agents.

The importance of Amtorg is reflected by a comment made in 1926 by G. Bessedovsky, defected Russian official in Paris, to the effect that Gen. I. Berzin, a key leader in Moscow's espionage apparatus, had stated that the Russians were operating two illegal organizations in the United States and that Amtorg's offices served as a means of contact with them.

The activities of Gaik Badalovich Ovakimian, one of Moscow's master spies, reflect the extent of Amtorg's involvement in Soviet espionage. Ovakimian was associated with Amtorg. His chief activity, however, until his arrest by the FBI in 1941, was the operation of an extensive group of espionage agents. These spies gathered industrial information of all types, as well as military, economic, and political data.

Amtorg also helped recruit Soviet espionage agents. Take the case of Simon A. Rosenberg. Born in Poland, Rosenberg came to the United States in 1925. He accepted employment with Amtorg in 1930 and the next year went to Soviet Russia as an engineer. These were the days when Russia was trying desperately to increase industrial production. While in the Soviet Union, Rosenberg was contacted by the secret police who threatened to kill his sister, who was living in Russia, unless he agreed to become a Russian agent on his return to America. Rosenberg agreed and for the next 6 years he served as a spy collecting information for the Soviets. The master spy of his operation was none other than Ovakimian.

The story of Amtorg and Ovakimian has tragic overtones for America—leading, for example, to some of the Russians' most active espionage rings. Ovakimian was in contact with Jacob Golos, another Russian master spy. Golos operated World Tourists, Inc., like Amtorg, a commercial front for the Russians. World Tourists, like the U.S. Service and Shipping, Inc., another firm headed by Golos, was ostensibly a legitimate business—namely, a travel agency. Actually it served as a legal cover for Russian espionage. Among its notorious activities, for example, was the recruitment in late 1930's of Americans for military service in Spain for the Abraham Lincoln Brigade. Associated with Golos was Elizabeth Bentley, self-admitted courier for an entire ring of Communist agents in Washington, D.C., such as Nathan Gregory Silvermaster.

The influence of Amtorg can be directly traced in the theft of our atomic bomb secrets, culminating in the Harry Gold-Klaus Fuchs-Julius Rosenberg cases. Ovakimian, while employed at Amtorg, recruited Thomas Lessing Black who in turn brought Harry Gold into contact with the Russians. During World War II Gold was to serve as the intermediary between Fuchs, German-born atomic scientist, and the Russians. Most revealing is the fact that Semen M. Semenov, one of Gold's Russian superiors, had himself been an employee of Amtorg. This trade organization indeed sowed seeds of treason which brought bitter fruits against the United States.

Examples of how the Russians have exploited trade relations for espionage are many. I want to mention, however, just one more—the name of Andrei V. Schevchenko, a Russian aviation expert who arrived in the United States in 1942 assigned to the Soviet Government Purchasing Commission. This commission, established during World War II, ostensibly was a Soviet agency designed to promote Russian purchases for the war effort. However, like Amtorg, it was a cover for Russian espionage.

Schevchenko was assigned as a contact between the Soviet Purchasing Commission and Bell Aircraft Corp., Buffalo, N.Y. At this time Bell Aircraft was carrying out top-secret experiments in jet propulsion for air travel.

In pursuing his legitimate duties, Schevchenko was also alert for any possibilities of gathering information to which he was not entitled. He frequently used the company library and gradually made the acquaintance of the librarian. Step by step he indoctrinated her in the glories of Russia—and, then came the request for classified information. The librarian and her husband, fortunately, contacted the FBI—and that efficient investigative agency carefully supervised contacts between Schevchenko and the librarian. The Russian was even paying for information he could have secured free of charge.

The point, however, is that the Russians—though they were guests of this country and receiving vital lend-lease help—did not hesitate to steal information from our factories. In this instance, as so often happened, their cover was a Soviet trade mission.

In Mikoyan's plea for increased trade lurks the hidden danger of Soviet espionage. This danger is not something theoreitcal, but a concrete fact, substantiated by 40 years of Soviet exploitation of trade relations for illegal espionage purposes. So-called Soviet trade experts arrive in the United States. Among them, you can be sure, will be trained espionage agents, instructed to carry out prearranged contacts. They will endeavor to develop new subagents, new sources of information, new techniques of communication. Experience, moreover, has taught that trade fronts, such as Amtorg, provide the Russians with mail drops, a chanel for financing and opportunities of infiltrating legitimate American firms.

Victor A. Kravchenko, former employee of the Soviet Purchasing Commission in Washington, D.C., who later defected from communism, in testimony before the House Committee on Un-American Activities in 1947, identified Mikoyan, then Russian Foreign Trade Minister, as engaging in economic espionage against the United States. He told how Mikoyan sent a secret order, by Soviet diplomats, to Russian officials in this country on this subject. Kravchenko adds:

> This document was delivered to special secret agents in Washington and, it goes without saying, was delivered thanks to diplomatic immunity.

Kravchenko continues:

> In the same way, secret party orders were delivered to Washington from the central committee of the party.

Hence, when calls are heard from Americans for expanding our trade with Russia and other Communist countries, we must face up frankly to the security problems which automatically will arise. Not to do so is to live in a fairy land of dreams and fable.

Camp Drum Should Be Kept Open Year Round

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, Camp Drum in New York State is one of the most famous and most important military installations in our country. It has served the national defense throughout our Nation's history and continues to occupy an important part in our overall training picture.

I have been greatly disturbed to learn that the Defense Department has gradually cut back its utilization of these important facilities and that further cutbacks are being contemplated. In my judgment, this is not only an unwise move, but is poor economy and may even jeopardize the training which our forces ought to receive in northern areas of our country where the climate is more

nearly like that which might be encountered in future operations abroad.

For this reason, I believe that Camp Drum should be utilized on a year-round basis, and am happy to include here the resolution formally adopted by the State Legislature of the State of New York urging Congress to take action to insure that this camp remains open on that basis.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION 89

Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to provide for the utilization of Camp Drum in Jefferson County on a year-round basis

Whereas in recent years the facilities of the United States Army installation known as Camp Drum in Jefferson County in New York State, have been utilized only during certain months of each year; and

Whereas the commanding general of the First Army and the commanding general of the Continental Army of the United States have recommended that training troops should be stationed at Camp Drum during the entire year; and

Whereas the above-mentioned commanding generals as well as many other army officers who are familiar with the situation have stated that the above stationing of troops at Camp Drum would not only be beneficial to the morale of the officers and troops who are trained there but would also improve their training and efficiency; and

Whereas the carrying out of such recommendation would eliminate much shifting and transportation of troops and would not involve any increased expenditure of funds: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (if the senate concur), That the Congress of the United States be and it hereby is respectfully memorialized to take such action as may be necessary to provide that the above-mentioned Camp Drum shall be utilized and kept in operation during the entire year; and be it further

Resolved (if the senate concur), That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Senate, the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Army and to each Member of Congress duly elected from the State of New York.

By order of the assembly:

ANSLEY S. BORKOWSKI,
Clerk.

Concurred in, without amendment.

By order of the Senate:

WILLIAM S. KING,
Secretary.

Kennedy's Bogey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the Washington Daily News of April 21, 1959. This editorial in plain language tells you who is trying to fool whom, and I agree with it:

KENNEDY'S BOGEY

Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, principal author of the union-reform bill now being debated in the Senate, has cut loose with a blanket slur on every Senator who thinks the Kennedy measure needs tightening.

He says categorically that such lawmakers simply are out to destroy labor unions.

We don't think the Democratic Senator directly would so accuse Democratic Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, chairman of the rackets investigating committee, who advocates far stronger legislation, but Senator KENNEDY's generalization obviously includes him too.

The truth is:

That any legislation which fails to protect union members against hoodlums, embezzlers, and betrayers falls short of the needs.

That any legislation which fails to protect the public against blackmail, violence, and freedom of commerce doesn't do the job.

Senator KENNEDY's bill attempts to reinforce the inherent rights of union members. But it is not the answer to corruption, collusion, and abusiveness which Senator MCCLELLAN's committee has been spreading on the record for 2 years.

This scare talk about curbing honest union leaders is hot air. No honest leader would think of engaging in the practices a strong bill should curb.

The surest way to destroy labor unions is to let known criminals and thugs continue to run some of them. No legislation which broadens the power of members to control their own unions will destroy unions. Nor will any law which protects the public from the widespread abuses which have been exposed.

The difference between the attitude of Senator KENNEDY and the attitude of Senator MCCLELLAN lies in the difference of their aims. Senator KENNEDY is a candidate for President and Senator MCCLELLAN is not. Therefore, Senator KENNEDY is currying the support of union labor's bosses. Senator MCCLELLAN is not. One wants votes, the other wants reform.

Address by Representative Emanuel Celler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague from New York, the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, surely needs no introduction to the Members of this House nor to the people of America. He enjoys a national reputation because of his wise leadership, his ability as a parliamentarian, and most of all because of his sagacious views and opinions on matters of national interest.

To us, his colleagues from New York, he is the beloved dean of our delegation in Congress to whom we all look for guidance and counsel. His service in Congress—and that means service in the best interests of the American people—extends over a period of 37 years. This is exceeded only by our distinguished Speaker, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, and the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee the Honorable CARL VINSON.

MANNIE CELLER, as he is affectionately known to myriads of people, is a warmhearted person and a great humanitarian. Even as chairman of the House Judiciary Committee he is not the stern individual that many would expect of a person in that position, but friendly and cooperative in every way.

Recently, Congressman CELLER was the recipient of a Gold Medal Award presented to him at a dinner in his honor by the Jewish War Veterans. This took place last Saturday evening, April 18, at the Statler-Hilton Hotel in New York. On that occasion he delivered an address which, I am sure, all of our colleagues would enjoy reading because of the views expressed and the philosophy of life of this present-day sage. I deem it a privilege to have his address inserted into the RECORD so that the American people may have the opportunity to read it and enjoy it for its wisdom and ripe thoughts.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of Congressman CELLER'S address:

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE EMANUEL CELLER BEFORE THE JEWISH WAR VETERANS, APRIL 18, 1959, STATLER-HILTON HOTEL

How can I thank you? Yet, in a measure, this award, which I both proudly and humbly acknowledge, belongs to all the gallant and fighting men of the Jewish War Veterans. For that which the Jewish War Veterans have accomplished in the years of its existence and which I, in response to the inspiration of the Jewish War Veterans, have in my own small way done derive from the same source, and that source is the Bible. The Jewish War Veterans have fought for the preservation of civil liberties; for the preservation of liberty itself; for equality of opportunities for all peoples; for civil rights; for liberal immigration policies. The Jewish War Veterans have done this, not only by way of pamphlets and resolutions, but in the very frontlines of war—in the trenches, in the air, and on the seas. And in so doing, they echoed and reechoed the living words of the Testament.

I am not a student of the Bible; only a reader. And yet as I read I find with considerable excitement—always—that those questions that agitate us in this age—in this very day—have been explored in the Book. All around me, particularly in the work I do as a Member of Congress, I find the influence of Jewish law—not recognized as such, but unquestionably so—bears with great impact upon the way of the free world.

Lest I become too abstract, let me illustrate. Take the question of civil liberties and civil rights, with which we are wrestling today. It is a commonplace to trace the beginings of the battle for individual rights—that is, protection against the tyranny of the state—to the Bill of Rights, then through many centuries to Anglo-Saxon law, woven into the first 10 amendments to our Constitution. Yet this concept appears again and again in the Bible. It is not amazing that the concept of the dignity of the individual should be grounded in Western civilization, but it is truly amazing that in the culture of Biblical days, such concept should have been formulated and carried forward throughout the centuries. For example, listen:

Leviticus, chapter 25, verse 10: "And ye shall hallow the fiftieth year, and proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof: it shall be a jubilee unto you; and ye shall return every man unto his possession, and ye shall return every man unto his family."

Hearken also to Leviticus, chapter 19, verse 18: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

Interesting is the fact that this voice of Leviticus is engraved on our Liberty Bell in Independence Hall, Philadelphia.

How well the members of the Jewish War Veterans must understand this holy injunction. Thus, began a line reaching into the

present, a line which marks today the struggle between democracy and totalitarianism.

I want to quote one more passage which goes to the very heart of freedom, equality of opportunity, the American traditions of asylum and charity. These traditions have roots and the roots reach far down. We find them in Deuteronomy, chapter 24, verses 17 through 22:

"Thou shalt not pervert the judgment of the stranger, nor of the fatherless; nor take a widow's raiment to pledge. But thou shalt remember that thou wast a bondman in Egypt, and the Lord thy God redeemed thee thence; therefore I command thee to do this thing. When thou cuttest down thine harvest in thy field, and hast forgot a sheaf in the field, thou shalt not go again to fetch it; it shall be for the stranger, for the fatherless, and for the widow; that the Lord thy God may bless thee in all the work of thine hands. When thou beatest thine olive tree, thou shalt not go over the boughs again; it shall be for the stranger, for the fatherless, and for the widow. When thou gatherest the grapes of thy vineyard, thou shalt not glean it afterward; it shall be for the stranger, for the fatherless, and for the widow. And thou shalt remember that thou wast a bondman in the land of Egypt; therefore I command thee to do this thing."

The Jewish War Veterans forget neither the dead nor the living. When my bill to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans National Memorial became Public Law 903 of the 85th Congress, it was for me a proud moment. It was not an earth-shaking piece of legislation; it could not, of course, have the national impact as did the passage of the Celler Civil Rights Act of 1957, but it was a little bill, big in meaning, but a little bill, nonetheless, which I had nursed through to enactment. There was no widespread interest, but you and I know it honored the dead and how it inspired the living to dedicate themselves anew to the freedoms for which these brave souls had died.

You will forgive, I know, the reminiscing of a man of threescore and ten who, during his 37 years in Congress, bears the scars of many a lost battle and the healing memory of the few that were won. When I first came to Congress, prohibition was the burning national issue. How young, how naive, how uncomplicated that era seems now, despite our having fought only 6 years ago a World War. And the 6 years that followed were years of abandon, too many running riot to catch up with the easy money, the real estate booms in the swamps. Six years they were of flagpole sitters, marathon dances, the flapper, and the Charleston. But the tests of our maturity, unforeseen by most, were marching forward—the crushing depression, the rise of Hitler, World War II, the Korean war, and now the cold war with its day to day crises. We have known few moments of ease since 1929. But what we lost in ease we gained in conscience. And this is the central point. And through organizations like the Jewish War Veterans, we gave voice to that conscience both collectively and individually. The spur of conscience is not easy to live with, but having once come alive, we cannot put it to rest. For all is not well in this best of all possible worlds, and the severest tests are yet to come, tests of patience, understanding, and even sacrifice. I talk this openly to you because I know from our years of association together, the Jewish War Veterans will meet these tests with the same courage they have met them before. The roots of this courage, as I said a few moments ago, lie deeply embedded in racial memory and whether consciously or subconsciously—I do not know which—the poetry, the strength, and the depth of the Great Book are with you.

I have had a life full of content. It has been an existence of much happiness, not however, unmixed with some sorrow and suffering. But when trouble came I drew upon the Great Book once more and repeated the words of Job, "Thou shalt forget thy misery and remember it as waters that pass away."

Long ago, an Eastern monarch palgued with misfortune and harassments called his wise men together. He asked them to invent a motto containing a few magic words that could help him in his time of trial. He wanted a motto small enough to be engraved on a ring. He wanted it to be endlessly enduring. The wise men thought and thought, and finally came to him with the magic words, "This too shall pass." The motto has survived century after century. I have sought refuge on occasion in these words of rare wisdom, "This too shall pass," and they have proven precious to me and to countless others.

I do not wish to become maudlin or cheaply sentimental but with the years have come considerable wisdom and sound sense. I have learned the value of persistence. Consider the postage stamp. It secures success through its ability to stick to one thing till it gets there. I have shunned the ways of the cynic—the one who knows the cost of everything, but the value of nothing.

I remember what Disraeli once said to a Jewish lad, "You and I belong to a race that can do anything but fail."

I have learned from sad experience that anger rarely pays since it warps the judgment and that one must ever be armed with the breastplate of a good temper and that life is short but there must ever be time for courtesy.

I grow a bit weary too, of those stiffnecked ones who prate of their superior or nobler blood. I say to them, "Take your superior blood to the marketplace and see what it will buy you." Years ago, I read Mark Twain, that truly indigenous author. He says in "Puddinhead Wilson": "Training is everything; the peach was once a bitter almond; cauliflower is nothing but cabbage with a college education." How true is the importance of training. There is little of importance without it.

I recall the words of the Talmud on gratitude—"Into the well which supplies thee with water cast no stones."

Life, too, is not merely having and getting, it is rather being and becoming. And good character is what you are when no one is looking.

And life would be barren and dreary without good, genuine friends. I do not mean synthetic friends, so-called friends that are like sundials, useless after the sun sets. I have been blessed with many real friends. They are all about me tonight.

Forgive my moralizing. I do not want to appear like David and Solomon, who were in their youth rather wild and unbridled but who, in old age, were given to much philosophizing. I remember the doggerel:

"King Solomon and King David led very merry lives
With their very merry concubines and very many wives;
Till old age came upon them with its very many qualms,
Then Solomon wrote the proverbs and David wrote the psalms."

Finally, my greatest joy has been my wife and family—my wife, Stella, daughters Jane and Judith, my son-in-law, Sydney, and my grandchildren, Sue and Jill. All have brought me a harvest of happiness.

Stella has been over the years my earnest love and inspiration—inseparable from me as the tree from its roots or tongue from mouth or ship from rudder. She has brought balm to wounds, smoothed off the rough edges of adversity, darned up the raveled sleeve with care, and brought into our home loving kindness. She has been my shield, my sword. "Her price is far above rubies—strength and honor are her clothing."

There is no need for me to say more here and now; it is rather for all of us—you and me—to continue to do battle against the forces of evil; against oppression in man's inhumanity to man in whatever way each of us best can do.

Thank you. God bless you. God keep you.

Of Men and Marble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, our colleague the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] reports regularly to his constituents on the activities of Congress as well as on other matters, and these thought-provoking reports are widely quoted.

His most recent report cited the tasteful and impressive memorials to Presidents Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln, and the new bell tower memorial to Senator Robert A. Taft as examples of what can be achieved in the way of honoring our statesmen and leaders.

He made the excellent point that the fashion in memorials is changing. It is, indeed, and perhaps we can look forward to memorials having utility as well as beauty. Let them speak to the living about persons and events which are a living part of our Nation's heritage.

I include this challenging report for the information of my colleagues:

OF MEN AND MARBLE

(By Representative STEWART L. UDALL)

Spring is here, and for a change thoughts turn to other than legislative things.

As with most national capitals, Washington is a city of statues and memorials. They look down on the passerby from the parks and public places, and even Washington's famous L'Enfant traffic circles are dominated by generals astride horses, or half-forgotten statesmen.

According to the Library of Congress the last official inventory (in 1937) disclosed that 192 statues, monuments and memorials dot the Washington landscape. It is a safe guess then that there are now well over two hundred, as patriotic societies and zealous friends are constantly hatching new plans which keep the sculptors busy.

In fact, next week will mark the dedication of a Memorial to the late Senator Robert A. Taft of Ohio who died in 1953. This newest tribute in marble is not a statute but a bell tower, and is located a stone's throw from the Senate.

If the Taft bell tower is testimony that statues have gone out of fashion, one can be thankful. There are few Washington statues I have seen which do credit to art. Daniel Chester French's noble figure which dominates the Lincoln Memorial is one of the exceptions, but most Washington statuary is poorly conceived both as a work of art and a personal tribute to its subject.

I suppose the practice of erecting monuments to distinguished citizens came to its full flower during the Roman Empire. Earlier of course, the Greeks executed great works of public art but for the most part these were devoted to abstract conceptions of beauty or truth and were uncorrupted

by personal taints. But the desire of men for personal glory burst forth under the Romans when every Emperor and his lieutenants sought immortality in marble, and their practices continue to dominate us today.

Thus, America is following ancient tradition by cluttering its capital with statues of the great, near-great, and forgotten who have helped make its history. Nevertheless, I have wondered lately whether we shouldn't pause to reconsider the means we choose of perpetuating our esteem for distinguished citizens.

I may be wrong, but it seems to me that if we would adopt a simple rule of thumb the whole problem would solve itself. This week I introduced a resolution which provides that no statue or memorial shall be erected in the system of Capital Parks to commemorate an individual or event until at least 50 years have elapsed.

A man's contemporaries are notoriously bad judges of his place in history. Proportion comes only with the passage of time, and it is an act of foolish presumption for any generation to pass judgment on its leaders.

It is highly significant, I think, that the Lincoln Memorial was finally dedicated nearly 60 years after his death. We have all gained by the fact that his contemporaries did not have the impulse to rush out and erect a lesser tribute. Nor was it an accident that the other superb Washington memorial—Jefferson's, nestled beside the Tidal Basin amid an arc of Japanese cherry trees—assumed form nearly 125 years after his death.

My point is that those memorials which have the most meaning—and artistic integrity—were conceived and carried out by posterity, and not personal friends. I mean no dishonor to the generals and political figures whose busts dominate the landscape here, when I suggest that their memories would be better served if a later generation selected the means and place of honor.

After all, we cannot escape history and no marble edifice will add 1 cubit to the stature of the good and great of our country.

Perhaps the wisest words ever spoken on this subject were uttered by the Roman Senator Cato (apparently in protest against the fad of his day) when he said: "I had rather men should ask why my statue is not set up, than why it is."

Should There Be a World Plan for Rice?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article entitled "Should There Be a World Plan for Rice?" by Claude R. Miller, president, Comet Rice Mills, 710 Gulf States Building, Dallas, Tex.

Without prejudice for or against world planning of rice, I am glad to submit this study for the information of my colleagues and those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Naturally anyone recognizing the faults and failures of the planned agricultural economy of the United States may understandably take a dim view of the expanded planning throughout the world. Also strong constitutionalists shy away from one-world activities. Yet these doubts do not preclude our thinking about problems confronting us. It is for this reason that I submit for the RECORD this study by a gentleman whose ability and sincerity is unquestioned. Not the least interesting is what might be a surprise to some that rice is the world's most important food, providing food for one-half of the world's population:

SHOULD THERE BE A WORLD PLAN FOR RICE?
(By Claude R. Miller)

Rice is the most important food in the world; rice supplies the major food requirements for more than one-half of the world's population.[1]

In 1840, rice production in the United States was only 842,530 hundredweight. The production had grown to 47,038,000 hundredweight by 1958, yet there was no more overall planning in 1958's production than there had been back in 1840.

Is better planning necessary, desirable and practical? Before attempting to answer that question, suppose we look at the chaos that has resulted from inadequate planning.

SCARCITIES AND SURPLUSES

Since its inception, American rice has, in most years, had adequate markets only during emergencies. Generally in times of peace and prosperity, rice production has glutted the market; prices have fallen; mills have been bankrupted; and rice people have suffered. Usually only during the travail of wars and famines have rice producers and processors been paid adequately for their efforts.

During World War II, American rice farmers and millers courageously met their country's call for increased rice production, but when the foreign countries that were saved by the war returned to productive capacity afterwards, they quickly cut rice prices and preempted world markets. This left U.S. rice producers and processors with millions of dollars of investment that lay idle and rusting because of cutthroat competition from abroad.

Legislation was hastily enacted to ease the loss for producers, but it did little for the millers who had millions invested in idle mills.

On July 1, 1959, total U.S. Government funds in farm commodities will total $9,100 million. This is more than the cost of operating the U.S. Government from its inception through 1875, and during that time three major wars were fought. During the present fiscal year, the net outlay for farm stabilization programs will be nearly $5½ billion, and that staggering sum is for 1 year only.

WHILE LIVING COSTS ROSE, RICE PRICES FELL

The Rice Journal, volume 61, No. 4, carried a report we prepared, entitled "The Price of Rice Is Too Low." The facts are reviewed showing that while living costs rose 19 percent, rice prices fell 15 percent in the decade from 1947 to 1957. Table I from that article is shown here:

TABLE I.—*Percentage of change*

	Percent
Rice	−15
Potatoes	11
Sugar	12
Cornmeal	14
Round steak	21
Milk	24
Pork chops	26
Bread	39

[1] Efferson, "The Production and Marketing of Rice," the Rice Journal, 1952.

(NOTE.—Other factual statements will not be footnoted. Statements of fact are predicated upon authorities deemed adequate.)

While rice prices fell 15 percent in decade 1947–57, other food prices rose 11 to 39 percent.

It is interesting to note that while rice has had the benefit of Federal legislation to support prices, actually the price of rice fell while the cost of living rose. Without the benefits of such protective legislation, beef has risen in price faster than has the cost of living index. Cattle growers have traditionally rejected protective legislation. One of the benefits of the protective legislation for U.S. rice has been the loss of foreign markets; another benefit has been millions of dollars loss to America taxpayers.

GOVERNMENTAL PROTECTION

Since 1934, American rice has been controlled in various ways by Federal legislation. For 25 years, rice has at various times been allotted, conserved, had quotas, enjoyed parity adjustment, been deposited in soil banks, and had price supports, but—except for wartime and world famines—U.S. surpluses have grown and rice prices have usually remained below the cost of living index.

Here is what President Eisenhower said, in part, with reference to rice problems in his message to the Congress on January 9, 1956:

"Rice production in this country is the most efficient in the world. However, our rice is rapidly being priced out of world markets and is being diverted into Government warehouses and even into the feed markets."

Three years later, in the 1959 farm message delivered on January 29, 1959, the President stated, in part:

"The price-support and production-control program has not worked * * *

"The control program doesn't control * * *

"The program is excessively expensive."

ARE PLANS WORTHWHILE?

Planning has been vocally done by so many self seekers, totalitarians and communists that the word plan is sometimes mistrusted. Because people whom we do not trust make 10-year plans, we are tempted to distrust long range plans. Such a reaction is unjustified.

Plans are needed to build buildings, to operate businesses, and to make progress in any endeavor in an organized way. The Constitution of the United States is, in the broad sense, a plan for governing a nation for the protection of each individual and the benefit of the whole population.

ARE THERE PLANS FOR RICE?

Every Agricultural Act is a plan for protecting farm products, but these plans are usually intended to ease immediate crises.

The rice industry, composed of American rice farmers, millers, and others interested in rice, is making great strides forward in planning consumer research, and in advertising and publicizing rice. This organization is concentrating on its efforts to sell more rice.

The U.S. Congress, U.S. Department of Agriculture, State experiment stations, State associations, the Rice Millers Association, the International Rice Commission, American food merchants, American farmers, and various rice groups, through wise planning, have made valuable contributions to rice research, promotion, and progress. These efforts, organizations and individuals all deserve applause and appreciation.

Despite the fine work done by numerous individuals and organizations, so far as we know, there has never been an effort made to formulate worldwide long-range plans for rice production, processing, distribution, marketing, and use.

If such a worldwide plan could be made for rice, it might be a guide for other commodities.

A WORLD RICE CONGRESS

We are not attempting to suggest the details of the plan; rather, we ask: Would such a plan be beneficial, and how could it be created?

The U.S. Constitution is a plan that has proved itself to be one of the world's most successful endeavors. We see that provision was made there for action through the Congress by representatives of all the people, with safeguards to protect individuals, areas, and political subdivisions.

One way that a world rice plan could be made would be by having a world rice congress. To spell out the methods of organization and procedure, perhaps a world rice constitution would be an essential instrument.

The world rice congress could be composed of representatives of producers, millers, suppliers, brokers, distributors, financiers, exporters, importers, wholesalers, food retailers, consumers, legislators, governmental agricultural administrators and research workers, governmental statesmen, and all others who are interested. Every rice producing and consuming nation, and various areas within nations, could be represented. The world rice congress could operate through committees who devote attention to specified activities. In one body, all those who are interested in rice would have representation, and would give all of mankind the benefit of their combined wisdom.

From the interchange of knowledge, experience, and expectations, those who attend the world rice congress could disseminate their findings to every country on earth. All of the world's people would enjoy the fruits from this effort.

As improvements were proposed, discussed, considered, and eventually adopted, the world rice congress could make long-range plans for rice that would benefit everyone who is concerned with the most important of all foods.

Other methods for creating a world rice plan may prove more appropriate. No doubt many improvements upon the basic idea will evolve. Our aim is to propose a positive approach in the hope that interest will be stimulated and appropriate action will ensue.

WHAT IS OUR INTEREST?

Comet Rice Mills was organized in 1902. Comet was the first packaged rice offered for sale in American grocery stores. Through the years, Comet Rice Mills has helped improve the growing and milling of rice in Texas, Louisiana, Arkansas, and Mississippi. In addition to the milling of rice, Comet's activities include the manufacture of rice bran, rice polish, rice oil, rice flour, and other rice products. Comet's products are distributed throughout the United States. Comet is a leading rice exporter to all the world.

Comet Rice Mills has been active in all rice cooperative efforts. We are interested in every phase of the world's rice production, processing and distribution. We are anxious to work in the closest spirit of cooperation with our own and other governmental authorities, and with all rice farmers, millers, food merchants and users everywhere to improve the world rice situation.

Comet Rice Mills wants to make the most rice available to the most people on the most economical basis. We want to expand rice use, cut surpluses, reduce taxes, and bring nutritious food to hungry people all over the world at the lowest possible cost. We are convinced that since rice is the world's most important food, any contribution Comet Rice Mills can make will be universally beneficial.

Numerous rice producers and millers have indicated a desire to see some movement undertaken to bring about improvement in the general rice situation. We have been urged to initiate the activity. The interest shown proves that the need is widely recognized.

A WORD OF CAUTION

We do not hope for an early nor an easy solution for so great a problem as planning world rice production, distribution and usage.

Perhaps it will be necessary to initially have a U.S. rice congress that can act as a nucleus from which the world rice congress can grow. Even so, it would seem that all people who are interested in rice—regardless of their country or nationality—should be invited to participate in the initial meeting.

The present conditions in world rice are such that any progress that is made toward worldwide rice planning will be an improvement over the existing situation.

WHAT CAN YOU DO?

If you are interested in any phase of the world rice situation, or in reducing surpluses, or in reducing taxes, or in more orderly commodity distribution, or in helping to eliminate famine, we shall welcome your views.

If you disagree with the thoughts expressed here, please write and tell us wherein you believe they can be improved. If you agree that a worldwide plan on a long-range basis for rice would be beneficial, please tell us how such a plan can best be made. Are there needs for world standards for rice varieties, types, terminology, and designations? Are there needs for better methods of distributions? Are there needs for educational work as to the benefits of rice as a nutritious, wholesome food? Are there needs to use surpluses to feed hungry people? Are there other needs that you are convinced a world rice congress could fill?

Please send us your views now. All correspondence received will be studied, filed, and ultimately made available to the members of the first rice congress, unless the writer requests otherwise. We probably will be unable to answer communications, but we feel certain you will not expect a reply.

CONCLUSION

If you are interested in seeing progress made in world rice, please write to us, stating your views, your suggestions, and your advice as to how advancement toward the goal can be accelerated.

If a rice congress is called, all of those from whom we have had communications will be notified of the time and place. Please indicate your name and address in full, to facilitate your receipt of the notice.

Please address us: Claude R. Miller, president, Comet Rice Mills, 710 Gulf States Building, Dallas, Tex., U.S.A.

The Medical Education Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am interested in the medical education situation in the United States, particularly because the University of Texas Medical School is in Galveston, my hometown. With no little concern I have noted in recent months that the medical profession has been under attack in several areas of the press. As a result, I conferred with Dr. John Truslow, director of the Texas University Medical School, and then prepared seven questions dealing with medical education throughout the country, with a view to ascertaining whether sufficient qualified doctors are being produced to meet the needs of our rapidly growing population. I submitted these questions to Dr. F. J. L. Blasingame, of Wharton, Tex., an old friend and constituent of mine who went to Chicago a year ago to assume the responsibilities as executive vice president of the American Medical Association. I have complete confidence in Dr. Blasingame and his answers to the questions I submitted are very gratifying to me.

I was pleased to learn that since World War II there has been an increase in approved medical schools; that there is a substantial increase in medical students; and that, contrary to certain reports, the American Medical Association exercises no control over the number of students admitted to medical schools. There is much other valuable information in Dr. Blasingame's reply and I believe it will do much to eliminate certain misconceptions about the medical profession. Under leave previously granted, I insert my letter to Dr. Blasingame and his reply:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 9, 1959.

F. J. L. BLASINGAME, M.D.,
Executive Vice President,
American Medical Association,
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR DR. BLASINGAME: My attention has been called to a number of bills introduced in the 86th Congress affecting directly, or indirectly, the medical profession.

As a result, I wish to obtain certain information on the present supply of doctors in the United States and to ascertain as far as possible the prospects for an adequate supply of physicians to meet the needs of our growing population.

So I am calling on you, not only as executive vice president of the American Medical Association, but as my old friend and my loyal constituent to supply me with the information. On a separate sheet, I am submitting questions that occur to me in this connection. I know you can provide the facts; facts that should be made known to Congress before action is taken to consider legislation affecting the medical profession.

I am writing this after a conference with our mutual friend, Dr. John Truslow, head of the University of Texas medical branch in Galveston, who called on me today.

I will appreciate your answering these questions and will further appreciate any other information you might give me that is relevant.

I want to say that I think you did a courageous thing in sacrificing your substantial private practice in Wharton to take over the direction of the AMA. I wish you great success.

Dr. Truslow joins me in sending you our best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

CLARK W. THOMPSON.

AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, Ill., April 16, 1959.

Hon. CLARK W. THOMPSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: Thank you for your recent letter and your interest in medical education.

It is indeed a pleasure to bring you an up-to-date report on the status of medical education in the United States. As you know, I am proud of the accomplishments of our medical schools and have great faith in their ability to train enough physicians to meet the needs of our growing population.

You asked seven important questions about the medical education picture. Let me answer them one by one.

First, has the number of physicians graduated from approved medical schools kept pace with the growth of the Nation's population? Over the long haul, the increase in medical graduates is much greater proportionately than is the increase in the population. From 1920 to 1958, the percentage of increase in medical graduates from approved schools was 125 percent, compared with a 64-percent increase in population. In the past 20 years, the percentage figures are fairly comparable: 32.1-percent increase for medical graduates; 33.4-percent increase for population.

The future, I believe, looks bright. Each year, for the past 11 years, the number of students enrolled in approved medical schools has increased. This boost in enrollment amounts to 29.6 percent (from 22,739 to 29,473).

Your second question was whether medical schools seek to restrict the number of medical students. Two factors make it necessary for a school to establish an arbitrary top enrollment figure: facilities and budgetary funds available to operate the school. Each school faculty determines the number of students who can have a sound education with the faculty personnel and the facilities available to the school.

Medical education is a graduate educational experience following the completion of the regular college course, and because of the subject matter covered requires individual and small group instruction. To turn out well-trained, highly-qualified physicians the school requires a large faculty of skilled educators, plus sufficient teaching and research laboraties, hospital beds and clinical patients. The number of students that can be taught must be necessarily restricted to fit the facilities so that the emphasis can be en quality of the graduate rather than on the quantity of students.

Third, you asked: What is the ratio between applicants to medical schools and those accepted? The answer is 1.97 (15,791 applicants for first year medical school to 8,030 places available). This ratio has remained about the same for the past 5 years.

Incidentally, a common confusion that arises in discussing applicants to student ratio is mistaking applications for people (applicants). Each person applies, on the average, to four medical schools. Thus, for the 1957–58 academic year, the 15,791 applicants filed a total of 60,946 applications.

Next, you asked if it is true that only students with an A college academic record are accepted into medical school. That has never been true. About one-sixth of the entering medical students for the whole country have A college records; about two-thirds have B records and about one-sixth have C records.

Your fifth question was: Is the number of medical schools increasing in the United States? In 1944, there were 77 approved medical schools, including eight 2-year schools from which students had to complete their final 2 years of medical education in any of the 69 4-year schools. In 1958, there were 85 approved medical schools. Eighty-one are 4-year schools; only four 2-year schools.

Two other schools are under development. As a step toward still further expansion of medical school facilities, the American Medical Association last year urged "institutions of higher education where medical education has not been undertaken in the past to give serious consideration to the development of opportunities in the field."

Sixth. Has the American Medical Association anything to do with the number of enrollments in medical schools? Enrollments are strictly determined by each individual medical school. Neither the universities nor their medical schools would permit an intrusion into their academic freedom by a national professional association.

Your final question asked whether I think it is necessary for Federal funds to be provided for medical schools. The medical profession welcomes one-time Federal grants for medical school construction and renovation as well as Federal grants for basic research. The profession has been opposed to continuing Federal aid for operating expenses because of the potentialities therein for Federal control.

I should like to point out that the National Fund for Medical Education, which raises funds from industrial sources, and the American Medical Education Foundation, which raises funds from the medical profession, have made grants in excess of $10 million to medical education over the past 8 years.

I hope this information will aid you in analyzing bills introduced in the 86th Congress which pertain to the training of physicians. As further background, I am sending along a copy of the most recent annual report prepared by our council on medical education and hospitals, which was published in the Journal of the American Medical Association, November 15, 1958. It provides additional data that you might find useful.

I am happy that you wrote me after conferring with our mutual friend, Dr. John Truslow. If I can provide any additional information, please make your wishes known.

Sincerely yours,

F. J. L. BLASINGAME, M.D.

Ohio Is Proud of Mary Eddy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, the 17th District of Ohio, which I am honored to represent in these hallowed halls, has many fine, generous, and talented individuals, and I and the people for whom I speak are proud of them. We want to help them, in every good way, to receive the recognition they so richly deserve.

Just a few weeks ago, we in this Chamber had the thrill of hearing Carl Sandburg, who has been called America's poet laureate, and most of us, at one time or another, have read one of his books, or recited one of his poems.

It has come to my attention—through a news story in the Mansfield, Ohio, News-Journal, for Sunday, April 19, 1959, that Mary Eddy, of Perrysville, Ohio, has received tributes from Carl Sandburg because of her longtime work in collecting American ballads. In fact, according to this article, Carl Sandburg used a number of ballads from Miss Eddy's collection in his two volumes "American Song Bag" and "New American Song Bag."

Because of the interest in Carl Sandburg and Americana of all kinds among Members of Congress, and in order to allow more Americans to learn of the fine and meritorious work of Miss Eddy, under leave granted me, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the article by D. W. Garber entitled "Mary Eddy: Her Ballads Caught Sandburg." The article is as follows:

MARY EDDY: HER BALLADS CAUGHT SANDBURG

(By D. W. Garber)

"May the road to Hell grow green waitin' for you." This ancient Irish toast, offered by Author Carl Sandburg as a tribute to Mary O. Eddy, of Perrysville, illustrates the warm friendship that has existed between them for many years.

Carl Sandburg discovered Mary Eddy. Impressed with a collection of ballads he obtained from her, Sandburg forwarded some of the material to the late Henry Ford, another enthusiast. A check for $200 and the publication of an article which she had written in the Dearborn Independent was the first real recognition she received for her collection of folksongs and ballads gathered from the old people on the Forks of the Mohican.

Carl Carmer, H. L. Mencken, and others have used her ballad material, but it is Sandburg who often expressed his admiration for her persistent efforts in preserving these fragments from the past. Writing to thank her for the use of original material he once said that they "have been priceless possessions, particularly 'Quarker Wooing' which I have given * * * for several hundred audiences."

In both of his books, "American Song Bag" and "New American Song Bag," Sandburg used a number of the ballads from Miss Eddy's collection, including "the Drunkard's Doom," "The Lily of the West," and "The Nurse Pinched the Baby."

Born at Perrysville of pioneer ancestry, she recalled some of the songs from her own childhood. Her interest in collecting ballads was stimulated by special studies with Dr. Albert H. Tolman, professor of epic and ballad poetry, at the University of Chicago, in collaboration with Dr. Tolman some of her collection was published in American Folk Lore for 1922 and 1923.

Forty-eight years ago she began her search for the all but forgotten ballads. Traveling by horse and buggy through the byroads of the Mohican area she located descendants of English, Scotch, and Irish ancestry who remembered ballads that were sung by the cabin fireside. Mary considered it a pleasant diversion, but her collection is an important contribution to Ohio folklore.

Encouraged by Sandburg and by the friendly reception she received from lectures, and from published articles and poetry, her book "Songs and Ballads of Ohio," was published in 1937. The demand for the book surprised the author. The edition was quickly exhausted and is now eagerly sought by collectors.

At the Ashland College commencement in 1951, Miss Eddy received the honorary degree of doctor of letters. It was well merited recognition for her work on Ohio ballads. Standing at her side was the then Governor of Ohio, FRANK LAUSCHE, who received comparable honors. It was a notable event in the life of the retired schoolteacher from Perrysville. She recalls with amusement the negative reaction of the local people at the time the honor was conferred. The morning following the commencement she was walking from the postoffice when a neighbor passed her. Without turning his head he casually greeted her out of the side of the mouth, "Hi Doc!" She enjoyed this, the only congratulation she received.

This dearth of recognition must not be misunderstood; people in small towns do not express themselves freely. They greatly admire her, in fact, their pride in Dr. Eddy has often been manifest.

When Sandburg first became acquainted with Mary Eddy through correspondence he was intrigued with the material she had collected and made a special trip to Canton to meet her. Then a teacher in McKinley High School, both Mary and the student body were pleasantly surprised one day when Sandburg walked into the cafeteria searching for her. The balance of the day she spent entertaining her guest, singing folk songs and discussing the origin of Ohio ballads. She recalls with pleasure how they sat together at a drug store counter enjoying ice-cream sodas.

Frank in expression, and mildly ironical, Miss Eddy is still a student. Although past four score years any question which commands her interest is the subject of serious research. Her views are refreshing and original.

Imported Livestock and Products Continue March Through Our American Ports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE BROCK
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, on February 24, I stood on the floor of this House and warned the membership of the threat to our national economy by the continual increase in imports of livestock and livestock products.

Despite the false claims that our exports of these commodities balance the imports, the increase marches onward. Meanwhile, the very existence of those engaged in this enterprise throughout the Nation is being worn thin.

Proof of this continued increase in imports is contained in an article written by Mr. Earle G. Reed, recognized expert in this field, and published in the April 9 issue of the Omaha Daily Journal-Stockman.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I therefore offer the article for inclusion in the RECORD:

IMPORTED MEATS AND CROP SURPLUSES

(By Earle G. Reed)

During the week of March 10 there were received and inspected at the three large west coast ports, from New Zealand, 3,409,291 pounds of beef cuts and boneless beef, 64,442 pounds of veal and 143,386 pounds of lamb carcasses and mutton; from Australia came 2,135,296 pounds of beef cuts, boneless beef and veal, and 44,818 pounds of mutton and lamb carcasses.

Meat imports are increasing despite the claims of some persons that the actual percentage of total meats we consume that come in from foreign countries is so small as to make little count when all is added up, and our exports of other commodities more than offset the meat imports.

Every boatload of meat that comes into the West Coast or any other place in this country adds up to reduced use of our own products, whether it is just common mutton, bull beef, canning cow beef or canned pork. It cuts into the volume of our packing plants, reduces the amount of our labor employed in packing plants and, most of all, it reduces the amount of grains, hay and other feeds used up in feeding livestock by reducing prices of meat products and curtailing the number of head that can be sold of our own production. Just another, but roundabout way of increasing our surplus of feeds and other crops.

Excerpts From Remarks of Hon. Charles A. Halleck, of Indiana, House Republican Leader, Before the Indiana Republican Editorial Association Dinner, Saturday Evening, April 18, 1959, at Indianapolis, Ind.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. ROSS ADAIR
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I am submitting a statement of excerpts from an excellent and timely speech made by the Honorable CHARLES A. HALLECK, minority leader of the House of Representatives, before the Indiana Republican Editorial Association dinner meeting at Indianapolis, Saturday evening April 18.

In addition to Mr. HALLECK's speech, I also wish to include in the RECORD the formal resolutions adopted by the Indiana Republican Editorial Association at this meeting. I believe they will be of interest not only to my Republican colleagues but to those Members of the House on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. HALLECK delivered an important address to the editors of this association which is the oldest political editorial association in the United States. The occasion was the annual spring meeting of the association. In addition to the Hoosier editors present, the Governor of the State, the Honorable Harold Handley, and my Republican colleague in the House of Representatives, the Honorable WILLIAM BRAY, were among those outstanding dignitaries who attended the banquet.

The excerpts from our minority leader's address are as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS OF HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK, OF INDIANA, HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADER, BEFORE THE INDIANA REPUBLICAN EDITORIAL ASSOCIATION DINNER, SATURDAY EVENING, APRIL 18, 1959, AT INDIANAPOLIS, IND.

The Republican press of Indiana receives my heartfelt thanks for fighting the good flight, year after year, to build the progress of our State and Nation on a sound and sensible basis. You carry on our Hoosier tradition of effective personal journalism, bringing further honor to Indiana which is known nationwide as the State where good newsmen are born.

The Republican press has a vital role in the campaign for the Republican victory we will win in 1960, in presenting the facts on State and national affairs to the public, giving them the fullest possible coverage day after day, week after week in their news columns, and in properly interpreting these facts through pertinent editorial comment.

We Republicans deal in truth, while too many Democrats peddle distorted propaganda. We must redouble our efforts to combat fiction with fact.

As you battle for Republican principles in your home towns, Republican Congressmen and Senators are fighting the same battle, shoulder to shoulder, in the Nation's Capitol.

In spite of the unpleasantness last November, morale and party unity among Republicans in the Congress are at a high pitch and are constantly increasing. We are not hyphenated Republicans. We are Republicans, period.

We are fighting the efforts of the Democrat spenders to wreck the Nation by their extravagance.

We stand united behind President Eisenhower in his efforts to balance the budget, the provide a sound and well-balanced national defense, and to stand firm against the Communist menace.

Rollcall votes show how Republicans, representing different sections of the Nation, often with diverse interests, are standing together and voting together.

This display of unity should be an example to party leaders. A party which has just lost an election cannot afford faction and fratricide. All over the Nation, the hatchets should be buried deep underground, and party harmony must be the watchword. But in this process, every effort should be made to evaluate properly and correct any mistakes of the past, if any there have been. The views of all responsible people in our party should be solicited and considered as we prepare for the future.

As we Republicans move forward together, the Democrats and their party move farther and farther apart. The differences between the Democrat conservatives from the South, and the labor-boss-dominated radical wing of their party are now in the irreconcilable stage. They have nothing in common but their party label.

The Democrats are both the party of the repudiator and the budget buster.

Democrat leaders are repudiating each other right and left. Paul Butler has repudiated the southern Democrats, and they have washed their hands of him with a very strong detergent.

Senator LYNDON JOHNSON and Speaker SAM RAYBURN have just about repudiated the programs of the Democrat advisory council.

LYNDON JOHNSON has been repudiated by Senator PROXMIRE and other Democrat Senators. Mrs. Roosevelt has repudiated Senator KENNEDY, and so on indefinitely. Democrat Senators are playing politics as they jockey for position in the presidential race.

In contrast, Republicans are working together.

The Republican minority in Congress is building a record, a Republican record, to present to the voters in 1960—the year in which another Republican President will assume his duties at the White House, and after which Democrat ex-Congressmen will no longer be able to collect Government rent for their front porches.

The first part of the Republican record for 1960 is our valiant fight against reckless, wasteful spending—the Republican fight to keep the cost of living down for the low-income family, for the American farmer who has so long been the victim of Democrat inflation and Democrat farm policies.

Balancing the budget is a right thing in itself. Every Government unit, just like every family and every business, should live within its income.

You can get by with overspending for a short period, sometimes, but the time soon comes when it catches up with you. After more than two decades of Democrat extravagance, it has caught up with our Nation.

Democrats have controlled the Congress which controls the Nation's spending for the past 4 years plus, and for 22 years of the

past 26. Only the Republican Congresses have cut Government spending and reduced taxes.

A balanced budget now offers the only hope for tax reduction in the future. Unbalanced budgets will lead inevitably to a further crushing burden of taxation.

I have received thousands of letters, from those the Democrats would call "little people," but whom I prefer to designate as thinking, articulate American citizens. I have been heartened by the overwhelming support of these people for President Eisenhower's program of a balanced budget, to hold down the high cost of living. People are appalled by Democrat extravagance. They place the blame where it should rest and call the Democrats the spenders.

We stand firm for a strong foreign policy, the Republican policy of John Foster Dulles. We clearly recognize that the world's best hope for continued peace is a policy of strength toward Russia and Red China. We realize that weakness and appeasement will lead inevitably to war.

The Republican Party believes in a strong national defense and trusts the judgment of President Eisenhower, the Nation's greatest military expert, in regard to the kind and amount of defense that is needed, over that of such armchair strategists as Paul Butler, Jake Arvey, and Adlai Stevenson.

We recognize the need for effective labor-management reform legislation to protect the rank-and-file union worker, the small businessman and the general public from the abuses which have been so vividly uncovered at the McClellan Committee hearings. But we know that it is going to be an uphill fight to get such legislation this year when so many of the Democrat majority in Congress are so deeply indebted to COPE and other like organizations.

As Republicans, we are firm believers in the individual enterprise system.

We know that it is the system that has made our Nation great and has resulted in the highest standard of living ever known in the history of the world.

We have built a record of resistance to the wild-eyed schemes of leftwingers who would lead us further down the pink path toward socialism. We are sincere optimists with confidence in the future of America. We will never sell our Nation short. The United States is at peace. And it is a Republican peace with honor. We are enjoying good times, with a strong economy and a secure defense.

Democrat runaway inflation has been slowed to a turtle crawl.

The vast majority of American citizens is sharing the benefits of prosperity and security. Our Republican record is one to which we can point with pride. Let's brag about it.

With the cooperation of the Republican press we will put our message across to the people. The public will judge correctly, and the result will be a Republican victory in 1960 from the courthouse to the White House.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE INDIANA REPUBLICAN EDITORIAL ASSOCIATION

The Indiana Republican Editorial Association, in convention assembled in the city of Indianapolis, on Saturday, April 18, 1959—

Resolves, That unity and harmony in the party are essential to the success that its principles deserve and for which all loyal Republicans stand, above self and selfish interests; and that therefore we urge our members to support a unified party, and insist that all elements lay aside differences if any in support of the traditional unity and party principles.

We take pride in the resolute course throughout the recent session of the General Assembly of Indiana by Gov. Harold Handley, Lt. Gov. Crawford Parker, the Republican majority and leadership in the State senate, and the house minority, which working together preserved a degree of economy, a record of accomplishment, and solvency for Indiana's State government. To Republican leadership and organization our State owes today the fact that ours is one of the few States where no new taxes were created, and that we will continue to have an enviable record of low taxes per capita.

Republican State administration and assembly are congratulated on their successful effort to continue making Indiana attractive to industrial expansion and more employment, and in continuing the freedoms and rights of organized workers traditional to America. We submit that the guaranties to workers of unfettered organization and to employers of favorable tax rates and a minimum of dictatorial government create a favorable climate for industry and industrial employment, and therefore a growing population in direct contrast to other States which are being abandoned by industry.

The Republican leadership of State and assembly has been able to support and improve the educational system without damaging the State solvency, and to provide for the constructive improvement of flood control on a permanent and workable basis for the first time.

We note the bankruptcy that threatens at least one neighboring State under principles and controls of a type repugnant to Americans, and propose that no effort shall be spared to resist encroachment of vast political slush funds and alien idealogies across State lines to prostitute and enslave Hoosier voters, and our government.

We applaud the wise and experienced counsel of President Eisenhower and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, that has charted our successful course through troubled international waters by a foreign policy that has avoided with dignity threatening conflicts throughout the world.

We declare our confidence in the Republican delegation in Congress, and congratulate its dean and able leader, the Honorable CHARLES A. HALLECK, on his well-merited election as Republican leader, the responsibility that he has shared with distinction for many years.

We approve the efforts to assist the individual farmer on the family-sized farm in working out his economic ills, and we particularly urge that the farmer's freedom and independence be protected. We recognize that the farmer is an important segment of Indiana economy and that the general prosperity is greatly affected by the farmer's receiving fair prices for his large investment and hard work. Sound, workable solutions to the changing farm problems should be sought and would be found feasible by a Republican Congress, to protect and encourage an agriculture that has provided the most abundant supply of food and clothing in the world's history. We cite and approve the search for new markets and new uses for farm products as proposed by our own U.S. Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART.

We resolve that our national strength must be preserved by balanced budgets and tax economy achieved by wise and careful reduction of irresponsible cash gifts at home and abroad that have continued for years, except under a Republican Congress, to place unbearable burdens on the shoulders of our unborn descendants; thus to free private earnings for reinvestment, to provide jobs and build production.

We urge that all Americans testify to their pride in American leadership in the world, and in our way of living that means a better life for everyone, rather than dictatorship that excels in a few token but often meaningless feats and easy life for a chosen few, but deceit and hunger for the people.

We recall that 100 years ago when the infant Republican Party sustained severe losses at the polls, and Abraham Lincoln lost election to the U.S. Senate, there followed the opening of a new era of usefulness for the principles for which they both stood. This year of Lincoln's sesquicentennial illuminates this example, and the events of neither year are accidental. Victory rode, and will ride on the affirmation of principles. The country needs the firm foundation of the Republican Party, which saved the Nation with Lincoln and still stands ready to serve an ideal immeasurably higher than the gratification of personal wants and personal ambitions. Elections are lost because of failures to stand for something. What a Republican Party offers and must stand for are constitutional responsibility, fiscal stability, exaltation of freedom as a way of life, all of which have been guaranteed through the Republican Party in history, and by its record of administration today: So finally we

Resolve, That this organization call upon Republicans of all shades of opinion to place party above self, to shun expediency, embrace principle and stand immovable against influences that would dislodge them from the unrepealable political truths that are the beacons of our party's service to the Nation. Likewise we would call upon all citizens of all shades of political beliefs to applaud with their support the party of the people's rights and of world peace, and American freedom from the tyranny of the petty as well as the strong, the party of achievement today, rather than of weak dependence on a better tomorrow.

Resolutions committee: William Murray, the Bicknell Daily News, the Lawrenceburg Press, the Aurora Journal-Bulletin; Howard Houghton, the Huntington Herald-Press; Howard Grossman, the Salem Republican Leader; R. Thomas Mayhill, the Knightstown Banner, the Eastern Indiana Farmer.

Inflation—Prize Letter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following prize-winning letter about the danger of inflation:

INFLATION—PRIZE LETTER

(Is inflation a remote danger—something that can happen only in Europe or Asia? A Chicago woman answers with a bitter "No!" in this first in a series of $25 letters from Tribune readers on inflation experiences. Her name is withheld by request.)

I know how a family can suffer from inflation. We have suffered—not in Europe—but right here at home.

In 1940 we bought our own home. We planned to live in it all our lives, and bring up our children there. We paid $9,500 for it, making a downpayment of $5,000, which was our entire savings plus a small inheritance.

Three years later we had cut the mortgage to $2,500. We had added landscaping, blinds, carpeting, a new refrigerator, and other furnishings that contributed to our joy of ownership.

Then, in January 1943, my husband received an invitation from Uncle Sam to join the Navy and help defend our country. I was left with four small children and a difficult choice. Finally, after my husband was assigned to a base with prospects of re-

maining there at least 10 months, I made plans to join him.

We thought about renting the house, which we couldn't afford to let remain vacant, but feared it would depreciate rapidly if we were out of the city. We decided it would be best to sell and buy another home after the war.

We were happy to get $9,500—the same price we had paid 3 years before. We put $5,000 in postal savings, as we felt nothing could be safer than trusting our money to the Government. We paid off the mortgage and put the remainder in a bank.

In March, 1946, with my husband's ribbons and medals, we returned to Chicago, hoping to take up where we had left off.

But our dreams were shattered. The house we had sold for $9,500 now had a price tag of $23,500. A smaller house that some friends once had bought for $5,000 now was priced at $14,500.

The terrible fact was that the $5,000 we had entrusted to postal savings now had decreased in purchasing power till it was worth less than half of what it was 3 years before.

The result is that our children never have had the joy of living in their own home. Although our income is above average, we have never been able to save enough after paying expenses of a growing family to buy a home. Instead, we paid rents of $125 to $175 a month for apartments.

This is how inflation cheated us and our children.

Our Liberties Versus Responsibilities in a Free Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, several days ago I listened with great interest and pride when you told a group of young people from my congressional district that you did not subscribe to the idea that high intelligence and strong moral character is the exclusive birthright of another generation. I certainly want to associate myself with your statement, Mr. Speaker, for everyday I see heartening evidence that our present generation of boys and girls are of the highest caliber and give reassuring promise of their ability to assume the serious responsibility of citizenship in the perilous days ahead.

One specific example, to which I proudly refer is a young man from Sunbury, Ohio, in my congressional district. He is Danny Compton, a freshman at Big Walnut High School. This boy is one of the winners of the Ohio American Legion's high school essay contest. I had the pleasure of meeting and talking with Danny on the occasion of the contest winners' visit to the Nation's Capital on April 21, and it is my opinion that this typical American youth is a real credit to his home and fine parents, his school and its teachers, as well as the American Legion and the American Legion Auxiliary that deserve our highest commendation for having sponsored this Americanism essay competition for the past 25 years.

The subject of Danny's winning essay is "Our Liberties Versus Responsibilities in a Free Society."

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call attention of my colleagues to this thought provoking essay, which follows:

OUR LIBERTIES VERSUS RESPONSIBILITIES IN A FREE SOCIETY

More than a century and a half ago, 39 able men compiled a code of fundamental laws, a Constitution, by which this thriving country, the United States of America, was to be governed. Ten amendments were added to the Constitution to further safeguard the rights of the citizens, and to direct and control the actions of those that governed us. It is these 10 amendments that give all of us our liberties or freedoms by which we were able to live and grow in our free society.

There is little difference between the term liberty and freedom. In the framework of our Constitution they used the word "freedom" which I understand to mean my "liberties."

The Bill of Rights, as these first 10 amendments are called, give me the right or freedom to worship as I please, write what I choose, and speak what I like in an assembly or crowd. No one has the right to come into my home and take advantage of me or my family as is the case in many other countries of today. I have the right to counsel and a fair trial by jury when I am charged with a crime. I can keep and bear arms for protection of life, limb, or property. Where else but in America does any individual have liberties as I

But with these liberties comes great responsibilities to oneself and to the Nation. What are the responsibilities that I as an individual need to understand and promote in a free society. First, I think it means freedom of choosing. To choose between good and bad, and right from wrong. In a free society one can not do as he pleases but should consider others. There are times when one must give up freedom to gain freedom, for freedom is earned. Then I say choosing wisely is my responsibility for liberty in a free society.

Freedom also means restraint. By this I mean I can not trample the liberties of others or make untrue statements of my fellowmen. To safeguard freedom for others I safeguard freedom for myself and those I love. Restraint means not doing selfish things but thinking of the welfare of others. Then I say that restraint is my responsibility for liberty in a free society.

Freedom involves other people. All alone a man is not free. This is because it is a shared responsibility which involves our schools, churches, homes, and the community. If everyone understands the responsibilities of our society then we can work together to keep liberty strong. Then I say that working with others is my responsibility for liberty in a free society.

Freedom is also specific. There is no such thing as being free in general. While we have laws that restrict us they also give meaning to our lives. We understand what we can do from the Bill of Rights and our State laws. They are specific about what freedoms I can use. The reason for these rights is to give everyone equal opportunities. I enjoy these liberties because my forefathers assumed the responsibility of keeping them. They have handed down to us a heritage that we must guard well, if need be, with our lives. Then I say that these specific freedoms are my responsibility for liberty in a free society.

"My County 'Tis of Thee, Sweet Land of Liberty, Let Freedom Ring" I say for it is my responsibility to keep these liberties, for I am an American.

Career Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago we heard at the dedication of the Taft Memorial that excellent band from Indian Hill High School which is near the home of the late Senator Taft. During the same week that band was here in Washington, one of Cincinnati's outstanding citizens, Mr. M. C. Hemsworth, delivered a splendid address to Indian Hill High School on the occasion of its celebration of Career Day. Mr. Hemsworth's remarks follow:

I certainly appreciate this opportunity to be with you today. Not only because I'm pleased to have a part in this very important day in your lives, but because I feel that I am visiting with friends and neighbors since we live only a short distance from your school.

A week or so ago, when I started making some notes of the things I'd like to talk about today (and frankly wondering a little about the advice I could give you), I couldn't help thinking of Jim Hansen, who was a classmate of mine in high school algebra. Our teacher had tried for 10 minutes in vain to get Jim to understand a problem and finally in exasperation he said, "Jim, I just can't understand why you can't understand this simple problem; why, when George Washington was your age he was a licensed surveyor," to which Jim added, "and when he was your age he was President of the United States."

But seriously, this can be one of the most important days in your lives. Today many of you will take a major step in making a decision that will vitally affect the rest of your lives, the selection of your life work.

In this age when the work of the world is so highly specialized, it is particularly important that you set your occupational goal early and wisely. Certainly, one would not try to build a house without a blueprint. It is even more important that you have a blueprint, or plan, for your life work so that all of the elements that contribute to success will fit properly. This is far too important to leave to chance and it is too important to be decided at the last minute. Perhaps you are not ready to make a final decision in this regard yet, but it is certainly not too early to begin considering it. And today offers you an excellent opportunity to make a major step toward that direction.

On your decision will hinge a great deal—not only your future economic success but to a great degree your personal happiness during the rest of your lives. This is much more important than dollars.

There are with you today men who have faced the decision of a career as you do today and, judging by their success in their chosen fields, have made wise choices. They are here today to give you the benefit of their experience, to counsel you in your decision.

I emphasize that they can only counsel. Drawing on their experience, they can help you, but the choice itself must be yours and yours alone.

Let's look at some of the factors that you should take into consideration in making this important choice.

First of all, pursue a career in a field in which you have a deep and sincere interest. Do not decide to be a lawyer or an engineer just because your father is one or a doctor because your mother has always wanted a

doctor in the family. If you decide to be a lawyer, or an engineer, or a doctor, do so because you believe you will be a good lawyer, etc., and will enjoy the work. You will please your folks a lot more in the long run by being a success, than simply by following in their footsteps.

By the same token, do not be unduly influenced by glamor or what appears to be an easy road to riches. A person, who decides to be a doctor simply because many of the doctors he knows drive Cadillacs, may end up riding the bus.

The real key to success is being happy in your work. Only if you are happy and stimulated by your work can you apply the energy and effort of which success is made. You have little chance of success, or personal satisfaction, in a job in which you cannot be happy.

Another factor you should consider is your basic ability in the field in which you are interested. Don't decide to be an engineer if you get 6½ each time you add 4 and 4. Chances are you will never make it. Don't decide to be a nurse if you can't stand the sight of blood. That is part of the job.

Today, you have the opportunity to discuss careers in several fields with experts in those fields. They can tell you just what the elements are of their particular vocations. But you will want to go further. Seek out other experts—other men who are successful in their field—and talk to them. Visit the places they work and watch them at work.

You will find one thing that successful men in all fields have in common—they always welcome the opportunity to give guidance to young people interested in their work.

Most important, be sure that you do not overlook another excellent source of advice and counsel right at hand—your teachers. Teachers are in the field of education because they are vitally interested in helping you achieve the highest possible degree of success in your life. Young people like you are their business. They are never happier than when helping you.

In their day-to-day association with you here at school, they have learned far more about you than you might suspect. They have assessed you against their dreams for their students. You can be sure that they are shrewd and effective judges of your potentialities. Their knowledge of, and interest in, you coupled with their broad appreciation of many fields of life can be tremendously valuable to you in helping you select your life work.

Of course, there are many other sources of information that should not be overlooked either in considering a career. Magazine articles and books are available on all types of work. You should seek them out and gain the insight they will give you.

There are many ways in which you can supplement the advice you receive with a practical taste of the type work that interests you. Many of you can find summer or part-time jobs in these fields. And by all means do. For example, if you want to be a civil engineer, get a job on a construction project.

Of course, you should realize that you must start at the bottom and that it will be a long time before you really know very much about the work. Do not be like the young man who quit a job in an architect's office after 3 days and told the architect that he did not like the work, adding as an afterthought, "In fact, I am sorry I learned the business."

You girls, who are interested in a nursing career, and I hope that many of you are, should not overlook the fact that you can gain exciting first-hand experience in this field while being of real service to your fellow beings by doing volunteer work in a local hospital.

After you have determined the career that interests you, you should begin to equip yourself to make the most of it. Decide, in consultation with your parents and advisers, what education you need to attain your goals and direct your schooling to that end.

In some instances, you can get the necessary amount of training and education in high school to be a success in your chosen field. In others, you will want to go on to take further training in trade schools or college.

Whatever the educational requirements of the career you decide to follow, be sure to make the most of your opportunities. Now, this may sound like old stuff, but I'll say it anyway because I believe it is very important. Do your best at every step so that you will be satisfied with your accomplishment. If you do less, you will surely regret it in the years to come.

Select your courses to contribute to your long range objective. Here your teacher's advice can be of particular value. The frequency with which we in business hear our associates remark that they wish they had taken a particular course in school attests to the fact that adult counseling in the selection of courses can be of tremendous value.

If the career that interests you can best be served by a college education, begin now to study the college entrance requirements for the courses you wish to follow. Take courses that will qualify you and help you in college. Now is the time to build the basic foundation of knowledge on which you can later construct a tower of success.

In this regard, never lose sight of the fact that learning is hard work and that it is a never ending job.

I heard the story of a misguided young lady in high school who asked the man seated next to her at a dinner party the nature of his work. He, a famed astronomer, replied, "I study astronomy," to which she commented with disdain, "Oh, I finished that last semester."

Education must be regarded in its proper perspective, however. The role of education is not to teach you everything you need to know to do your job. Its role is to teach you to think and to give you a basic knowledge of fundamentals. Education does not take you by the hand all the way to attainment of your goal—it takes you only part way and points the way you must travel on your own.

It has been said that an educated man does not know all the answers, but he knows how to find them.

During your lives, the world has made tremendous strides in every field of human endeavor. We have propelled manmade planets into space. We have found cures for diseases that cursed the world a few years ago, and closer to home—we're testing jet engines today at General Electric in Evendale, which will propel aircraft from New York to Los Angeles in one and one-half hours. But the strides that will be made during the remainder of your lives will be even more exciting.

Charles Kettering, a man who had an amazing insight into the future, has said: "With willing hand and open mind, the future will be greater than the most fantastic story you can ever write—you will always underrate it."

You are going to be a part of that future, and only you can decide what role you will play in it.

One of the deciding factors in your role will be your choice of a career. That is the stone that will rest on top of the foundation of willing hands and open mind. The next stone you can place in building your pedestal for the future is the preparation you make to play your role. And, the final stone will be the enthusiasm and vigor with which you follow up.

The future is unlimited for each one of you. It will be what you make it. Remember that you gain in proportion to what you give to the world and your fellow man—set your goals wisely and work hard and you will attain the success and satisfaction for which we all strive.

That is my wish for you on your Career Day.

U.S. Racism and Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following address was delivered in Ireland on March 3 by our Ambassador there, Mr. Scott McLeod.

In these days when we hear so much criticism about "ugly Americans," some of it quite justified, it is a relief to read these words of an Ambassador of the United States to an intellectual group in a friendly country, explaining our country to them in an intelligent and sympathetic manner.

We are fortunate to have men of Ambassador McLeod's caliber in our Foreign Service. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to say that we have many such men serving our country all over the world and interpreting the American way to our friends by both precept and example.

The address follows:

U.S. RACISM AND COMMUNISM—ADDRESS BY AMBASSADOR SCOTT MCLEOD BEFORE THE CATHOLIC ASSOCIATION FOR INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Mr. Chairman, the title of this paper was more or less assigned in the invitation to participate in this enlightening, at least enlightening to date, series of lectures. My assigned task is to discuss both communism and racism in the United States, but I hope you will forgive me if I fail to correlate these items as you might wish.

I have not been in my country for nearly 2 years. I leave in a few days to be in Washington when President Eisenhower greets President O'Kelly. Perhaps I would have been better prepared to deliver this paper had it been postponed until my return. With this reservation, I must tell you that a great deal of the information about the United States which I have read in recent months indicates that some of our most thoughtful citizens are taking turns discussing the question of whether or not the American people have what has been called the will to survive.

My thesis tonight is that the American people do have the will to survive, the will to defend freedom, and the knowledge that our responsibility does not end at our own territorial limits.

My thesis, I believe, needs some historical support, so let us review some historical facts. The United States is a rather young nation—yet it was born in a spirit of nationalism and we are, in my view, still nationalistic.

My country has never known the rule of men. It has always operated under a rule of law. This is ingrained in our people. It makes an understanding of totalitarian dictatorships most difficult.

We have a tradition of individual freedom which we cherish. I believe the way our social structure was built has contributed to what I might describe as a fierce resistance to being pushed around. Recall that the colo-

nies which won their freedom at the end of the 18th century were populated with less than half the number of people who then lived in this island. They were a cross section of national and racial backgrounds—the natives, the Red Indians, had been pushed back from the seaboard by a conglomeration of dissident Englishmen and adventurous Englishmen, by Dutch merchants, by Spaniards and French of an earlier wave of settlers, by Scots and Welsh and Irish, by Negroes originally brought to the continent as slaves—by polyglot men, some little better than pirates.

Along with the sectional prides, prejudices, and conflicts there appears to have emerged from our Revolutionary struggle a considerable amount of good will; for the Founding Fathers, not without great difficulty and not without invoking the assistance of the Almighty, managed to achieve a form of government which is a compromise between the twin dangers of a potential overpowering Central Government and a loose confederation of strong local governments.

Throughout the debates of our Constitution makers runs the thread of not how best to govern, but how best to maintain man's individual liberties. I do not contend that the system they devised is foolproof, nor that suceeding generations of Americans may not dissipate this birthright. I do contend, however, that our system has withstood the ravages of nearly 200 tumultuous years and that this generation, my generation of Americans, will not only defend, but perpetuate this system.

There are a number of generalities about this generation of Americans of which Europeans should be aware. We are often pictured by our friends as completely materialistic, uncultured, inept socially, immature politically, and prone to loudmouthed arrogance. Our enemies picture us as gangsters, hooligans, and greedy imperialists manipulated by a crowd of completely unprincipled capitalists lurking in lurid Manhattan offices, each of us so preoccupied with profits or personal ambition as to be unable and unwilling to take joint action for our own welfare or that of the rest of the world.

In my judgment such generalities concerning the average American indicate a good deal less of understanding of us than we are alleged to have of the rest of the world. I would not be candid if I did not confess that there are vestiges of each of the types I have enumerated among our people. Perhaps we are all doomed to be known by our excesses. I must admit that the stage Irishman is patented in the United States to the same degree the stage Yank is portrayed hereabouts.

It is most difficult to depict the truly average American because the composite in one section is so complicated by inroads from another section and because each is so unlike the other.

Having been somewhat critical of generalities, I now take the liberty of using one. The old blueblooded Yankee of our past—the New Englander—was, and where he still exists is, quite cultured, quite straight-laced, quite serious in both demeanor and purpose. But he has been changed in the last hundred years by succeeding generations of Irishmen, Italians, Portuguese, Greeks, and French-Canadians. In addition to the immigrants from overseas he has been twice invaded by Americans from other sections as manpower shifted to meet the necessities of World Wars I and II.

Take my own case. Both my wife and I were born and reared as midwesterners. During the Great War we were shifted to New England, a distance of 1,300 miles—about as far as from Dublin to Rome. I was often asked by the inhabitants if I were a native and found the best answer to be, "No, unfortunately, but all three of my children are."

I am trying to convey that my country is truly, if I may use the cliche, a melting pot for humanity. The pot continues to boil because between 300,000 and 400,000 immigrants come to our shores annually and because our own population continually shifts. These movements of people keep our social structure from becoming solidified and our practice of political freedoms keeps it from becoming stratified.

I find that a good many people judge the United States on the basis of New York City as portrayed by Hollywood, where accuracy sometimes is a secondary consideration. New York is a fine city, but not nearly as typical of the United States as Dublin is of Ireland. However, it is here that our melting pot really boils—Irishmen, Italians, Puerto Ricans, Chinese, Negroes—all races and all colors but all Americans.

I cite these examples of new Americans—our immigrants—to indicate that we do not have the opportunity to forget the blessings of liberty as older more solid societies have done in history because these newcomers, such as the 38,000 Hungarians admitted since the fall of 1956, will not let us forget.

A study of the intelligence reports furnished to home governments by our enemies in the last two great wars indicate a pitiful lack of understanding of the dedication of our people to liberty. In both cases the practice of our liberties of free thought and free expression led our opponents to conclude that we would be unable to get together to fight. The record demonstrates that instead of the predicted disunity the United States closed ranks to produce miracles of production leading to victory during both of these conflicts.

Casual observers upon visiting my country for the first time are confronted with the immense size, the mountain ranges, the broad plains. They are confounded by the changes in topical interest as they traverse the sections from heavy industry to vast fields of grain to barren lands to rich irrigated fruit lands to forests of oil derricks. They become aware of the changing mood of political and economic climates. They hear dissident voices protesting either government action or inaction with respect to either domestic or international problems. In one section the visitor finds the accent on domestic affairs and in another on the international scene. The immediate reaction often leads such a visitor to question the cohesiveness of the American people. The thoughtful visitor will not accept a conclusion based on casual observation. He will probe and penetrate until his reflections lead to the inevitable conclusion that the real strength of the American society springs from the very elements that at first glance seem divergent. The insistence upon freedom—the freedom, for example, to be critical of Government policy and Government officials—is a right for which my fellow countrymen have fought and died and if called upon would fight again. Many Europeans have told me that they have heard many critical expressions about the administration of Government or Government officials, but never about the system of our Government. The belief and faith in our way of government constitutes the common thread that binds our people and gives us our national unity. This determination of all Americans of every origin or religious persuasion to remain free is an underlying factor which unites us.

There are a few points which I shall make to contribute to an understanding of these matters. First, it is not accurate to picture the conflicts between our races as arising from hate prejudices. To the contrary, that section of the country which is alleged to be most bitter toward the Negro—the South—is actually the section where there is greater understanding and affection for Negroes than is found elsewhere. Like discrimination anywhere in the world, so much of the problem in the South stems from fear, among other things, of economic competition and a feeling that persons from other sections are interfering. The resentment, therefore, is directed not so much toward the Negro but toward the carpetbaggers—the term of derision coined after our Civil War to denote the exploiters who came along, living out of carpetbags and taking advantage of conditions in a war-ravaged economy. The carpetbaggers were white men.

A parallel here may be familiar, the condition of the Negro since our Civil War. The Negro who has in some areas and to some extent been deprived of the franchise and other civil rights is analogous to the position of the Roman Catholic here in past years. According to popular belief the race prejudice is concentrated in the South, but this is not true. New York has had its problems with apartment buildings; Chicago and Detroit have had riots. And the problem, as you know, is not confined to the United States.

Old prejudices die slowly. The giant strides made by the Negroes in the United States in terms of education, social, and economic gains in the last 100 years, particularly when compared with the strides of nonwhite races outside the United States during the same period, are often obscured by the news reports of the difficulties arising from the Court decision of 1954 directing that schools must be integrated.

From 1896 (the Court decision on *Plessy v. Ferguson*) until 1954, the American Federal Government adopted a hands-off policy toward the actions of the State governments in relation to their Negro citizens. Therefore, the 1954 Supreme Court decision was a departure from previous policy and Court decisions. This Court decision, as you might suspect, proved a considerable shock to that section of our society which had become accustomed since 1896 to a segregated school system based on a court approved scheme of separate but equal facilities.

That the shock was not greater, the reaction more pronounced, and the attending violence more widespread seems to me to be of far greater significance than the rather isolated events reported in the press in the last 3 years. The significance, to me, is that here we have evidence that freemen, at least the vast majority of our citizens, have learned to live in our society under a rule of law.

And now I shall speak about communism. There is no doubt as to where the United States stands in this struggle. We find ourselves through force of circumstances a leader among the peoples of the earth who are in opposition to the Communist thrust. While we have not sought this role, we undertake to play it willingly. Some of the critics of world drama do not subscribe to this willingness but I say it is there.

Let me discuss a few of these criticisms. I will deal with an era in our recent past which has been greatly criticized by Europeans. I refer to the discovery by the American public that Communist conspirators or their dupes had penetrated to the inner circles of our Government.

It is hard to discern the beginnings of a storm. Although American intelligence agencies had been greatly concerned about the inroads of Communist agents during World War II it was, as you can appreciate, most of us that the Soviet-American alliance even though it was perfectly evident to most of us that the Soviet American alliance of the World War II was primarily a marriage of convenience, primarily convenient to the Communists. Consider this background—Americans, traditionally, are almost notorious for their lack of security consciousness. It is hard for us to believe that some men are driven by genuinely evil ob-

jectives. Since the days of red Indian wars most Americans have not known what it is to experience an enemy in their midst.

Throughout the two Great Wars there were no enemy battalions on our soil. The efforts of saboteurs and espionage agents—at least those of the enemy with whom we were at war—were singularly unsuccessful. We had a feeling of being safe in our homes. Many of us never locked our houses. I suppose most of us left our automobiles unlocked. We enjoyed a complacency regarding enemies in our midst which may be unique in history.

I recall my reaction when I first visited outside the United States and observed high walls, two-story doors and shuttered shops. It then occurred to me that such construction was evidence of a security consciousness going back centuries. I have often reflected that our discovery of the need for security precautions was utterly incomprehensible to people who had always known such precautions.

After public disclosure of the Gouzenko defection to the Canadians and the Alger Hiss affair, American public opinion became more aroused and demanded some action. It was only natural that the American Congress would reflect this attitude. Scores of Congressmen and Senators demanded action and in so doing focused public attention on the overall peril of communism. Today the United States has a security program carried out under President Eisenhower which is just as effective as those of the other Western Nations.

But the evolution of a workable security program in a society newly security conscious involved growing pains. Some of these growing pains were misconstrued by our friends to be hysteria. There was no such hysteria in the United States. There was rapid and effective action, which brought about in 24 months the more effective program we have now. The necessity of public discussion of the security program has passed. But the concern of the American people—their consciousness of the continuing pressure of the Communist thrust—remains.

Evidence that this consciousness exists today is to be found in the widespread support for our foreign policy on the part of all segments and sections of the population of the United States. The evidence is that we are spending an average of $40 billion a year on defense and an average of $4 billion more for an aid program to enable the rest of the free world to stay free. I contend a democratic people would not submit to such a program of spending their tax dollars if they were not convinced that their survival is at stake.

Of course, the Communists themselves have continued to arouse public awareness of the menace which they constitute not only to peace, but also to freedom. Their technique of moving from one crisis to another as they continually test the will of freemen to resist them is a pattern which is all too familiar. Today they are issuing ultimatums about Berlin, or denouncing Iran or Sweden. A short time ago the pressure was on Quemoy and Matsu and before that on Lebanon.

The latest leader of the proletariat, Mr. Khrushchev, appears to have consolidated his dictatorship if one is to judge from the 21st Congress of the party, just concluded. To accept his implication that he is a popular leader among his fellow party workers is fantastic. If any leader receives over 98 percent of the popular vote, we may assume the election is rigged. I suspect no man since Adam has managed to achieve such a percentage, including our own George Washington. Methinks Mr. Khrushchev doth protest too much. How could any leader who harangues a captive audience for 6½ hours be very popular?

However, I find in Mr. Khrushchev's program some very hopeful signs. For example, he appears to have introduced that old capitalist trick of incentive. He is offering his people materialistic glories to equal that of my country—which is an incentive Mr. Stalin never thought of and quite a compliment to our industrial machine. I believe he expects to achieve this result in 7 years. Let us hope he does. The Russian people certainly deserve a better life, better food, and better housing. If his incentives are successful it may lead some of his people to question the value of other aspects of capitalism, perhaps even adopt them.

Communists indulge in fantastic figures without basis of fact. In their attempts to describe the growing strength of communism as a world movement, they speak of the wave of the future. In his opening speech, to which I alluded above, Mr. Khrushchev stated the total membership of Communist parties in the world is "over 33 million people." He claimed that "this is an enormous victory of Marxism-Leninism, and a great achievement of the working class." In a speech on November 6, 1957, Mr. Khrushchev stated that the world Communist Party membership totaled 33 million. Thus more than a year later he was unable to cite an exact figure which would indicate an increase in the intervening period and therefore comes up with the vague figure of over 33 million. The fact of the matter is that 88 percent of Communist Party members (over 29 million) are in countries ruled by a Communist Party. Elsewhere there has been a significant decline in party adherence in recent years. Just to cite a few figures: Communist Party membership has declined in the United Kingdom by 30 percent to a new low of 25,000; in France from around 800,000 in 1946 to some 430,000 in 1958. Italy, according to Communist figures, from 2 million in 1956, to 1,820,000 in 1958. Norway, from 40,000 in 1945, to 5,000 in 1958. Among the countries where the Communists have suffered losses in recent elections are: in Belgium, where Communist candidates received 184,000 votes (3.57 percent) in 1954, as compared with 100,000 (1.89 percent) in 1958. In France, Communist candidates received 5,492,000 votes (25.6 percent) in the national election of 1956, as compared with 3,882,000 votes (18.9 percent) in the election of November 23, 1958. In Australia, the Communist percentage of the vote in 1958 fell below 1 percent as compared with 3.6 percent for the Senate and 1.2 percent for the House in the 1956 elections. It would be difficult to envisage communism as "the wave of the future" in terms of these declines.

Of course, the real weakness of communism is its lack of a solid spiritual rock on which to build. We all know of the historic religious fervor of the Russian people, a fervor which has not been extinguished. Pasternak is the latest to make that point clear. I doubt that freedom can be extinguished since it is inherent in the human spirit that man seeks freedom, that finding freedom man seeks truth, and that seeking truth man finds God. As God-loving people, we are first interested in the welfare of man. The Russians are building a society similar to the ancient dynasties or the later monolithic states based on force, and it is probably just about as safe—that is, safe enough to terrorize the world for a while but ultimately quite fragile.

It has always struck me that the great fallacy of the Communist system is that it is based on a presumpton that all men, particularly party members, are men of good will. Yet it denies the existence of the Prince of Peace our only true example of a man of good will on earth. For this reason alone their system doesn't work the way Marx said it would. No Communist government has ever withered away. It is still necessary to coerce those who mistakenly or purposefully fail to follow the party line, thus they continue to justify a dictatorship and to deny their people even the most elementary freedoms, as the Hungarian people will testify.

The course we pursue has been clearly mapped by President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles. We have tried to make clear to the Soviet leaders, in order that there will be no miscalculation of our intentions, that we seek peace with justice by any honorable means. Only a fortnight ago President Eisenhower restated our intentions when Mr. Khrushchev was rattling his Berlin saber and the President told him simply that if there is to be any trouble he will have to start it.

I'd like to say just a word about Mr. Dulles for whom I have the very highest admiration. His critics have often complained that he is inflexible. The will to survive as a freeman is an inflexible principle in the character of Mr. Dulles. Of course, he has always indicated a willingness to modify or change his methods when necessary to achieve this objective. His inflexible adherence to principle is well known. To me this is one of his finest attributes. I can hardly think of any single aspect of character in a foreign secretary which is more admirable. He is inflexibly attached to his principles which I believe the world can discern to be principles grounded in a high order or morality.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, I make the following points:

In the United States today we face many problems—both foreign and domestic. While there may be serious differences which divide us domestically, we are nonetheless facing up to our domestic problems, our racial problems, for example, and we are making progress toward solutions. I think I can say that we do have a racial problem and that we are doing a fairly good—not poor and not excellent—job with it. The progress is gradual, but the progress is there.

In our foreign problems I submit that we have exhibited a unity of purpose seldom achieved in a democratic system of government. We have persisted in maintaining a unity in the western alliance despite siren calls to go it alone, to sit down with Soviet Russia and divide up the world in the interest of peace irrespective of the interests of other freemen.

As we look around the world today there is only one threat to the peace of the world—the Communist thrust for world domination. Other problems in the world, even one as knotty as the matter of Cyprus, are, it is demonstrated, susceptible to solution by reasonable men of good will.

Perhaps, as has been alleged, the western alliance opposing the Communist front is merely a repetition of the old balance of power concept in world affairs. What other choice confronts us? Shall we surrender our free way of life to Communist dictatorship? Shall we permit Communist subversion and Communist force gradually to reduce the perimeters of freedom? And, remember this, not once in history, to this day, have a people freely chosen communism. In every case it has been imposed on them by a combination of subversion and force or force alone. The Communists know this as well as we do—the main reason they utterly refuse to permit free elections for self-determination.

Our course is clear—and we have the will to pursue it. We must continue to oppose threats of force. We must wait patiently for the inherent evil of communism to prove the undoing of communism. We must maintain our spiritual strength, our will to be strong.

We of the West have a heritage of freedom and an obligation that it will not die with us. We must devote ourselves with all our energies to the proposition that this freedom shall be our legacy. I tell you: We have the will to do just that.

West Side Bank of West Pittston, Pa., Observes 50th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news story which was featured in the Pittston (Pa.) Gazette on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the West Side Bank of West Pittston, which was celebrated early last month:

The Pittston Gazette joins with residents in the area to extend sincere congratulations to the West Side Bank on its 50th anniversary of excellent service to the community. During these years, the institution has been held in high esteem and considered one of the most valuable institutions in the borough. It has maintained a high quality of service which is recognized in all banking circles throughout the country. It has shown steady increase through these years, and its success can be attributed to the excellent, courteous and qualified services which are offered.

As the borough of West Pittston expanded and flourished, its people realized the need for banking facilities within its boundaries. The first meeting to consider the organization of the bank was held in West Pittston Town Hall, on October 21, 1908. T. B. Mitten was appointed temporary president; R. G. Bennett, temporary secretary; and W. C. Brenton, temporary treasurer. Temporary board members were: T. B. Mitten, B. W. Tennant, W. J. Lewis, W. C. Brenton, M. R. Keeler, R. G. Bennett, W. W. Hall, L. B. Hillard, and A. L. LeGrand. At this organization, the proposed name of West Side Savings Bank was approved, and was later changed to West Side Bank when the charter was granted on March 2, 1909.

The first banking quarters were at 36 Luzerne Avenue in the Carr Building, next to the present Obrzut's Drugstore. Business was transacted at this location until the bank moved to its present location in 1913.

The first directors meeting was held May 26, 1909, with the following directors: L. B. Hillard, president; T. B. Mitten, vice president; R. G. Bennett, secretary; M. R. Keeler, W. C. Brenton, W. J. Lewis, John G. MacHenry, and F. L. Coursen.

B. W. Tennant was the first cashier of the bank, assuming his duties March 24, 1909. Mr. Hillard served as president until 1924 when he resigned and was succeeded by Mr. Keeler, who served 1 year. Dr. R. S. Brenton was elected president in January 1925, serving until 1946 when Joseph T. Jennings assumed the presidency, a position which he still holds.

The tremendous industrial development in the Garden Village in the past few years has contributed greatly to the progress of the bank. Because of this industrial expansion, the directors saw the need to enlarge the institution's quarters, and on October 13, 1958, purchased the valuable Brandon Building, adjacent to the bank. A few years ago, the bank also purchased the former Mosier property at 17 Luzerne Avenue, corner of Race Street and Luzerne Avenue. Plans are to use this plot as a parking area for patrons.

The bank is most fortunate to have the services of top trained personnel as cashier and assistant cashier. Charles S. Remington, cashier of the bank, joined the institution's personnel on February 4, 1924, and was made cashier in January 1942. He has served under every president of the bank.

Ralph D. Norris, assistant cashier, began his career with the local bank in May 1929 and assumed his present office in 1942.

Joseph T. Jennings, president of the board of directors, became a director in 1925, was elected vice president in 1930, and elevated to the presidency in 1946.

Harold D. Kasper, vice president, became a director in 1938 to fill the vacancy caused by the death of his brother-in-law, Dr. J. R. Beaver. He assumed vice presidency in 1946

William G. Brenton, also vice president, was appointed a director in 1948 to fill the vacancy caused by the death of his father, Dr. Richard S. Brenton, a former president of the board.

Attorney Charles J. Bufalino, secretary of the board since 1957, became a director in 1940.

Other directors are: Allan W. Smiles, a director since 1931; Roy K. Stackhouse, since 1929; J. William Snowdon since 1937; Santo Volpe, Jr., who was appointed in 1958 to fill the vacancy caused by the death of his father, Santo Volpe, Sr., and Carlton H. Stauffer, who was appointed in 1957 to fill the vacancy caused by the death of O. E. Schobert.

The directors and officers of the bank invite the public to an open house tomorrow from 11 a.m. to 2 p.m. to acquaint them with the fine facilities which are offered.

REA in Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from a 1-week trip to Puerto Rico with my colleague, H. CARL ANDERSEN, of Minnesota, in connection with the operation of the rural electrification program. As members of the House Appropriations Subcommittee of Agriculture, we are deeply concerned about the operation of the rural electrification program and the efficacy of its administration. We are pleased to report that the rural electrification program in Puerto Rico is making tremendous strides, is being completely administered, and is opening up a new world to the hill people and farm residents. While the electrification work has reached 50,000 rural homes in Puerto Rico, the Puerto Rico Water Resources Authority expects to accomplish the electrification of approximately 100,000 farms and mountain homes within the next 4 years.

Having visited the island 5 years ago, I can compare the present-day conditions and construction with those of 5 years ago. My colleague and I visited the hills of Narranhito and mountains of Barranquitos, the farms of Corozal and agricultural stations of Lojas. We have examined generating plants of Guayanilla and many transmission lines throughout the islands. We have observed the startling effects of electrification, not only on the physical aspects of the countryside, but also on the attitudes of the people and the appearances of the children.

Puerto Rico is undergoing a peaceful revolution, an economic and social revolution. Just as Christopher Columbus opened up a new world when he discovered Puerto Rico in 1493 so has the Puerto Rico water resources authority, assisted and aided by our loans from our Rural Electrification Administration, opened up a new world for the people and children in the hills and on the farms. No longer does nightfall bring darkness and boredom to the inhabitants of the farms and denizens of the hills. Rural electrification has brought light, activity, and opportunity for study. With electricity has come the use of various electrical appliances and expanding interests and activities. Television antennas sprout from mountain shacks and farm homes, and radios and musical boxes interrupt the stillness of the night. Freezers and refrigerators abound in homes and stores, thereby, preserving meats and food supplies which formerly spoiled and perished, because of lack of refrigeration facilities. Clean-faced and sunburned schoolchildren, immaculately dressed despite sultry weather, display an alertness not formerly seen.

Several residents of New York, who formerly lived in my district, have returned to the mountains and resorts because electrification has brought a less burdensome way of life. Comforts and services which we take for granted on the mainland are slowly but surely coming to the Puerto Ricans in the hills and on the farms. The light which illuminates the home is also electrifying the spirits of the people, who do their chores willingly. When day is done, the farmer, the worker, and the schoolchild, with electricity in their homes, have an evening to look forward to. We observed purveyors of electric light bulbs and equipment demonstrating in the evenings the workings of simple electrical gadgets to an open-mouthed and interested gathering of weather-beaten men and inquisitive-looking youths. Even jukeboxes, with their raucous songs, put springs into the legs of a tired people after they have worked hard all day. Cares have disappeared with the banishment of darkness. These essential services are new to these people on the farms and in the hills. In the cities, and we drove through many, sprout many appliance stores, which sell these instruments and gadgets.

We also observed an expansion and improvement in the cattle industry, especially in the southwestern part of Puerto Rico. Herds of cattle, mostly Holsteins, lazily and leisurely scatter about the farmlands. The sugar production is still the most important industry in Puerto Rico, and we inspected various sugar plantations where young men and old in the blazing sun cut down with

their machetes the sugar stalks to extract the juicy and succulent sugar.

In addition to the foregoing, my colleague, Congressman ANDERSEN, and I participated in a seminar on rural electrification. Representatives from Costa Rica, Panama, Brazil, Puerto Rico, and the United States delivered talks on various phases of rural electrification. This seminar provided not only a valuable interchange of ideas and information, but provided an opportunity for promotion of better pan-American feeling. Each country was ably represented and made a fine contribution. This seminar took place at La Parguera on the southern coast of Puerto Rico, which is an enchanting island, 40 by 100 miles.

Among those present and delivering prepared talks were Mr. David A. Hamil, Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, who demonstrated that he is an informed and able administrator, dedicated to his work; Sol L. Descartes, executive director of the Puerto Rico Water Resources Authority, who showed vision, grasp, and administrative ability; Clyde T. Ellis, general manager, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association; Brig. Gen. Herbert Davis Vogel, Chairman of the Board of Directors, Tennessee Valley Authority; Rafael R. Ramirez, head of the power division of the Puerto Rico Water Resources Authority; Victor M. Cataldo, head of the power utilization division of the Puerto Rico Water Resources Authority; Jorge Manuel Dengo, general manager of the Institute of Electricity of Costa Rica; Ricardo Arosemena, from Panama, chief engineer of the Inter-American Cooperative Service of Economic Development; Luiz Claudio de Almaida Magalhães of Brazil; Milton A. Chase, Assistant Chief of the Electric Engineering Division of the Rural Electrification Administration; Herman D. Plavnick, Assistant to Assistant General Counsel, Agricultural Credit and Conservation, U.S. Department of Agriculture; Dr. Jose Mariano Rios, sociologist and William H. Eastman, Director, Southeast Area, Rural Electrification Administration.

On April 16, Congressman ANDERSEN and I traveled to Ponce and Guayanilla to participate in the inauguration of the second unit in the South Coast Steam Electric Station. We represented the Congress and spoke to the large gathering attending the opening of this unit, which has a capacity of 50,000 kilowatts. Already in the outlying areas can be seen the spires of industrial plants ready to use this power.

Because of prior commitments, Governor Muñoz-Marín could not attend and was represented ably by Robert Sanchez Velilla, secretary of public works; Mr. Sol. L. Descartes, executive director of the Puerto Rico Water Resources Authority; and Mr. David Hamil, Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration. The chairman for this function was Harold Toro, head of the Water Service Division, a man with a capacity of attending to many details.

Shortly after, we returned by plane to San Juan and visited the school lunch warehouses. Inasmuch as the school lunch appropriation program is within the jurisdiction of our subcommittee, we examined into the types of food which are being served to the 240,000 schoolchildren of Puerto Rico. Our contribution of $3 million for school lunch is matched by the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. Dried eggs are a great source of satisfaction to the schoolchildren and to those in charge. Wheat, flour, cornmeal, powdered skim milk, dried milk and egg solids are served in abundance. The fact that these dried eggs were being produced in Minnesota, the State of my colleague, H. CARL ANDERSEN, and were preferred to products from other States, was of great satisfaction to Congressman ANDERSEN. It was with regret that we observed that corned beef was being obtained from Paraguay and not from the United States.

In both the electrification program and school lunch program, we asked for and were shown evidence that the United States contribution was recognized and publicized.

Despite a busy schedule, Governor Luis Muñoz-Marín found time to spend 3½ hours with us at his summer cottage. We discussed the past, present, and future of Puerto Rico and its relations to the United States. Inasmuch as Puerto Rico is excited today about its present and future status, we shall not set forth the Governor's thoughts and predilections. We did observe that many Puerto Ricans, proud of their United States citizenship, are encouraged by the admission of Alaska and Hawaii to the United States Union. They feel that the economy of Puerto Rico is adequate for them to take their place with us as a sister State. There are some who believe that the status of Commonwealth is at present the only realistic attitude. Others, and these seem to be a small minority, clamor for independence. Public officials feel that a plebiscite should be held to determine the desires of the people. Others feel that a plebiscite raises false hopes and is unrealistic.

I, for one, feel that we do not seek colonies, but wish our territories and possessions to have common interests with us. However, what the people want should be our standard and their desires should be indicated through a plebiscite and then through their representative bodies.

This trip proved informative, interesting and helpful. We trust that lights shall continue to eliminate the darkness and that the light of understanding shall brighten the lives of Americans all, on the mainland and on the isle of Puerto Rico.

Boleslaw F. Karpinski Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK KOWALSKI
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, a few nights ago in the city of New Britain, Conn., several hundred friends and admirers from all parts of my State gathered at a testimonial dinner honoring Boleslaw F. Karpinski—a man whose story is one of real Americanism.

"Professor" Karpinski, as he is saluted with affectionate respect in Connecticut, was born in Poland in 1881. He came to America as a youth and has lived in New Britain for the past 60 years.

Imbued with a deep love for his adopted country, "Professor" Karpinski spent most of his free time, after long days as a factory worker, in studying the history of the United States. It was a proud moment for him when, in 1911, he was granted American citizenship.

Once he became a citizen himself, this great American began devoting himself to the cause of helping other immigrants secure their citizenship. For the past 48 years, he has been conducting Americanization classes in New Britain and in that time he has helped prepare more than 5,000 men and women for the duties and responsibilities of American citizenship. Since 1930, his citizenship classes have been conducted under the auspices of the Pulaski Democratic Club.

Of the thousands of men and women trained for citizenship by "Professor" Karpinski, many have gone on to distinguish themselves in the business world, in the arts and sciences and in the profession. All who studied citizenship under his guidance are the better for having known him.

It was only appropriate at this testimonial dinner that "Professor" Karpinski should receive a gift from his former students and a gold medal from the Polish National Alliance, an organization which he has served devotedly for many years.

Mr. Speaker, when any of us hears doubts expressed about the future of this great country, let him remember that we have men like "Professor" Karpinski—a man whose whole life has been dedicated to our country.

It gives me great personal pleasure to add my salute to "Professor" Karpinski for his accomplishments. He truly represents the stuff of which the best of America is made.

We, in Connecticut, are proud to have "Professor" Karpinski as one of us. His life has been an example of what love of country can really mean.

Discrimination Against the Indian People of South Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, February 10, 1959, Robert Burnette, chairman of the tribal council of the Rosebud Indian Reservation in South Dakota, testified before the Indian Affairs Subcommittee of the House Interior Committee, making various statements

regarding discrimination against the Indian people in South Dakota.

On March 19, 1959, Mr. Burnette supplemented and amended his previous remarks before the subcommittee.

Recently the Todd County Taxpayers' League, Inc., prepared an answer to the charges of Mr. Burnette. Both excerpts from the modified statement of Mr. Burnette and the statement of the Taxpayers' League were published last week in the Winner Advocate, a weekly newspaper published at Winner, S. Dak., which is a portion of the open area of the Rosebud Reservation.

That Members of Congress may be fully informed as to the question of discrimination against the Indian people on the Rosebud Reservation, I have asked unanimous consent to insert both articles from the newspaper in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD: First, the modified charges by Burnette, and, second, the modified charges by the Taxpayers' League:

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST INDIANS HAS BEEN CHARGED

Robert Burnette, president of the Rosebud Sioux tribal council, has brought charges of discrimination against Indians of the area. Charges were leveled during testimony which Mr. Burnette gave during a hearing before the House Subcommittee on Indian Affairs. Those charges have been denied by the Todd County Taxpayers League, Inc. That organization's side of the controversey appears in page one of the third section of this week's Advocate.

Part of Mr. Burnette's lengthy testimony includes the following:

"Exclusion of Indians from jury duty: In the South Dakota State courts, Indians systematically are excluded from jury duty.

"Sentences: I made the point that sentences were not issued with an even hand, that Indians received heavier sentences than whites for the same or lesser offenses.

"I was given a report that in the jail at Winner on the Rosebud reservation, police officers have gone into the cells with their clubs and beaten up Indian prisoners. One example is John Fire, a Rosebud Indian, whose face is still partially paralyzed from a beating administered by a Winner policeman in the prison cell.

"I am informed that in small towns on the various reservations, the practice in South Dakota is to arrest Indians on the pretense of intoxication or disorderly conduct, and separate them from their money by fines, although non-Indians in the same place are not bothered. This applies, among other towns, to Rapid City, Pierre, White River, Winner, Mission, Martin, Mobridge, Chamberlain, Sisseton, and Fort Pierre.

"I made the statement that in South Dakota there were statutes on the books which discriminated against Indians in the matter of voting and mixed marriages but I made clear these laws had not been enforced.

"Up to 1951, the law of South Dakota specified that so long as Indian residents within the State maintained tribal relations they cannot vote or hold office. In 1951 the law was repealed. Up to 1957 the law made void marriages between persons of the African, Korean, Malayan or Mongolian race and persons of the opposite sex belonging to the white or Caucasian race. Many Indians were under the impression that this statute forbid marriages between Indians and whites. In any event the statute was repealed in 1957.

"I stated no Indian was a member of the South Dakota State police but that I knew several Indian applicants for the position. Since then I have learned there is one State patrolman, who is an Indian. In these circumstances I am reluctant to name individual applicants who were rejected for positions and asked to be excused from this assignment.

"Indians will not appreciate the United States giving Federal money to States to enforce State law and order against Indians. This would only encourage States to assume jurisdiction since the major deterrent up to now has been the lack of funds. The idea back of Public Law 280 was not to transfer a Federal obligation to the State. Its purpose was not to have the State perform a Federal chore. If Indians are ready for State law and order, it should be administered with respect to Indians the same as it is administered with respect to non-Indians of the State. If Indians are not ready for State law and order, the Federal Government has not fulfilled its obligation.

"Indians are not ready.

"Finally, following my testimony before the subcommittee, Sheriff James Shoemaker of Todd and Tripp Counties, appeared on the reservation with his deputy and William Day, Jr., the State's attorney and ordered the radios on the tribal police cars to be cut off the police channel used by the sheriff's office. This leaves the tribal police cars without police radio communication. Significantly, the sheriff applied his order to the tribally owned police cars but not to the police cars operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. We regard this as an effort by the sheriff's office to discipiline the tribe for my exposure of the discrimination problem.

"We at Rosebud have no desire to have justice administerd to us on the reservation by State and local judges, sheriffs, police or jailers who have been raised in an environment of ill feeling toward Indians."

INDIAN DISCRIMINATION CHARGES DRAW DENIAL

EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following information was prepared by the Todd County Taxpayers League, Inc., in answer to recent statements by Robert Burnette, head of the Sioux Tribal Council at Rosebud.

Re true facts concerning the Indian affairs of the State of South Dakota.

To the Members of the Congress of the United States of America, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The members of this association have been shocked upon our attention being called to statements and accusations made by one Robert Burnette, head of the Sioux Tribal Council at Rosebud, S. Dak., concerning the treatment, discrimination, and prefabrications which this man made when testifying before the House Interior Subcommittee on Indian Affairs in Washington, D.C.

This association and many citizens of South Dakota, including Indian citizens, are desirous of setting the matter straight and to clear any wrong impression which Mr. Burnette may have left with the Members of Congress as well as the residents of every State in the Union.

First. Mr. Burnette testified under oath: South Dakota has laws making it illegal for Indians to marry non-Indians.

Let this association set the record straight. Since the time South Dakota was made a State in the year 1889, Indians have intermarried with non-Indians. There was a law in the State of South Dakota which stated in effect as follows: 14.0106: (4) The intermarriage or illicit cohabitation of any person belonging to the African, Korean, Malayan, or Mongolian race with any person of the opposite sex belonging to the Caucasian or white race were void.

There is nothing in the above section, as Mr. Burnette states, which prevented Indians from marrying non-Indians. In chapter 38 of the session laws of South Dakota, 1957, even the above mentioned section was repealed. Thus, Mr. Burnette was not well informed and did not quote correctly the law in this respect.

Second. Mr. Burnette testified under oath: Only one Indian in South Dakota ever served on a State jury and none has served on State grand juries.

To this, this association states that Mr. Burnette should examine his home county and more particularly the jury panel which was called for Tripp and the attached unorganized county of Todd (where incidentally Mr. Burnette is a resident). Among the members of the jury list for the February term of 1959 was the name of William King, who is an Indian man. Among the members of the jury list for the February term of 1959 was the name of Charlotte Greaves, who is an Indian lady.

These Indian people have not been the only ones ever called in a jury panel in Tripp County, and we say again that Mr. Burnette is not well informed and did not quote correctly the facts as they stand in this matter.

Third. Mr. Burnette testified under oath: Indians in South Dakota get heavier fines and stiffer jail penalties in State courts than non-Indians.

This association states again that Mr. Burnette should again look to his home county of Tripp and the unorganized county of Todd. After talking this matter over with law enforcement authorities, we are advised that this is not the case. As a matter of fact, the Indians get the benefit of the doubt and if anything, their fines and jail penalties are less severe than those of non-Indians.

Law enforcement authorities in the home county of Mr. Burnette state that they would welcome any investigation conducted by any commission into any such charges by Mr. Burnette stating that Indians are treated differently or worse than non-Indians.

It would seem again that Mr. Burnette is not well informed and has not quoted correctly the facts as they stand, not only in the State of South Dakota, but more particularly in his county.

Fourth. Mr. Burnette testified under oath: They (Indians) are not permitted to serve as State, county, or municipal policemen.

This association respectfully requests that again the House Interior Subcommittee on Indian Affairs need only look into Mr. Burnette's home county and more particularly the town of Mission, S. Dak. Up until a short time ago, the chief of police for the town of Mission was an Indian man. Rapid City, S. Dak., has in its employ an Indian who is serving on the police force.

This association must apologize for repeating itself; however, again Mr. Burnette is not well informed and has not quoted correctly the facts as they stand even when this information could be obtained in his own backyard.

Fifth. There are statements which Mr. Burnette made to the effect that the Rosebud Sioux have no desire to have "justice administered to us on the reservation by State and local judges, sheriffs, police or jailers who have been raised in an environment of ill feeling toward Indians."

This association states that this statement, in itself, is a good statement; however, Mr. Burnette again is wrong in stating that these officials have been raised in such an environment. We members believe that at such time an investigation is made that the Sioux Indian would prefer to be under the jurisdiction of State and local courts. We believe that the Commission will find that the tribal courts are not adequate and cannot handle such volume as they have at the present time, and that the Sioux Indians themselves are not satisfied with such a system.

The Todd County Independent School District, Todd County, being where Mr. Bur-

nette resides, has integrated the Indian children with the white children. The Indian children are in a majority, comprising 65 percent of the school population. The school enrollment is approximately 1,093 and there is a faculty of 64 teachers, several of whom have some degree of Indian blood. This school system feels that there is absolutely no partiality or discrimination shown in their school system.

This association respectfully submits that the Indian people have their problems. There has been a problem since the white man came into this country. The Federal Government has recognized this problem and has taken some measures to help correct it. The Government has instituted a relocation program, whereby Indians are encouraged to move to different parts of the United States and are provided jobs. According to some sources, this program is about 80 percent successful.

Although programs such as this are started, it appears to this organization that the Federal Government has started other programs which, if carried out, will work not to the furtherance of helpful programs such as relocation. We feel that an example of this is the idea of consolidating blocks of land on the reservation. In effect, this will force the red man on the reservation where it is conceded that there is not much chance of them getting ahead. Actually, this type of program is segregating the Indian instead of integrating him. This method breaks down the relocating system that is being instituted, thereby defeating the program.

One of the great needs of the Indian is proper education. In fact, many Indian people in this area have not had a grade school education. Therefore, they are forced to work at common labor. Due to the fact that there is a large number of Indians in South Dakota and more particularly in this area, jobs are few even in the areas of common labor. As it has been shown time and time again, the better educated a person is, a better citizen he is and a better degree of earning power he has. Therefore, due to the fact that Indians are not able to work because of lack of jobs, the spare time which they have on their hands may get them into trouble. Therefore, the people of this organization are fully behind these programs such as relocation and other programs which will further the education of the Indian.

We again submit to you ladies and gentlemen, that the Indian people have their problems. However, we are interested in helping them. We, therefore, desire that you know the truth. We know that no good can come to these people when one of their own. Mr. Robert Burnette, misquotes the facts, prefabricates, and uses these tactics for his own publicity and private purposes instead of the alleged purpose that he is champion of his people.

We of this association will welcome any investigation concerning the Indian people and more specifically the charges which Mr. Burnette has made to the House Interior Subcommittee on Indian Affairs and any other group to which he has made these statements. We know that you must be acquainted with the true facts in order to help this country, and its citizens—both the white man and Red man—thus the reason for this letter.

Attached hereto for your information is a series of affidavits given by Indian people of the State of South Dakota, which will be self-explanatory and which will further show our genuine interest in this matter.

Respectfully submitted.

R. L. LAPSLEY,
Chairman, Todd County Taxpayers, League, Inc.

KEITH SCHLUETTER,
Secretary, Todd County Taxpayers League, Inc.

"I, Thomas Whiting, Sr., residing at Hidden Timber, County of Todd and State of South Dakota after being first duly sworn on oath depose and state that I am a registered Rosebud Indian; my wife is a white woman; I was elected by the Todd County voters to serve on the Todd County Road Board for three terms, each consisting of 6 years, part of the last term which I am now serving; I have never been refused any of the constitutional State rights; that I have had the same opportunity as my neighbors and I have no knowledge of being treated differently from any of my fellow citizens."

"I, Henry Haukass, residing at O'Kreek, county of Todd and State of South Dakota, after being first duly sworn on oath deposes and states that I am a registered Rosebud Sious Indian; I was elected by the Todd County voters to serve on the Todd County Independent School Board for a term consisting of 6 years, part of the term which I am now serving; I have never been refused any of the constitutional State rights; that I have had the same opportunity as my neighbors, and that I have no knowledge of being treated differently from any of my fellow citizens."

"I James Didier, residing at Mission, county of Todd and State of South Dakota, after being first duly sworn on oath, deposes and state that I am a registered Rosebud Sioux Indian; my wife is a white woman; I was appointed by the State as brand inspector for Todd County about 1945 and am still acting; I was deputy sheriff for Todd County for 9 years, until I resigned in May 1957; I was on the police force in Mission from July 1947 until I resigned January 1, 1959; I have never been refused the right to vote; that the conditions of my employment are good, and that I have no knowledge of being treated differently from any of my fellow workers."

"I, Ben Lundeman, residing at Rapid City, S. Dak., county of Pennington and State of South Dakota, after being first duly sworn on oath, deposes and state that I am a registered Rosebud Sioux Indian; that I am now retired, employed by city police, and have been working there for 22 years; that the conditions of my employment are good, and that I have no knowledge of being treated differently from any of my fellow workers."

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Mr. Lundeman is now retired.)

The Individual in America—Let's Keep America Successful

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. R. HULL, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, an essay contest on "The Individual in America" was recently sponsored by the Quaker Oats Co., in St. Joseph, Mo., for high school students.

The winner was Miss Connie Jean Voss, a student at Central High School in St. Joseph. Her winning essay earned her a trip to Washington, D.C., with her teacher, Mrs. John Frazier.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the essay by Miss Voss:

LET'S KEEP AMERICA SUCCESSFUL

What has made America so successful? The answer to this question seems to hinge on individual freedom. Rugged individualism is the signature of our civilization. This term has been used by American leaders for over a half century in eulogy of those God-fearing men and women of honesty whose stamina and character and fearless assertion of rights led them to make their own way in life. It is they who have born their burdens and given leadership in their communities. Rugged individualism is indeed a distinguishing and enduring quality ever found among Americans. It gives lifeblood to such basic principles as freedom of speech, conscience, press, and equality before the law, regardless of race or religion. It contributes to the saving of our souls and character from the deadening pressure of conformity and false ideals.

Thus, it may be said that individualism has played a major part in making our Nation what it is today. In an attempt to better understand why it has led to the success of America, let's examine it in relation to socialism. After a clear explanation of each of these theories, we can more easily plunge into the effects of each upon the individual.

In general, individualism is the theory of government which favors the noninterference of the State in the affairs of individuals, while socialism is a theory of government which favors the interference of the State in the affairs of individuals. More specifically, the economic quintessence of the socialistic program is a method of production which would introduce a unified organization of national labor, on the basis of collective or common ownership of the means of production by all members of the society. This collective method of production would remove the present competitive system, by placing under official administration such departments of production as can be managed collectively, as well as the distribution among all of the common produce of all, according to the amount and social utility of the productive labor of each. Economic individualism would then be the system of production by means of private capital (held by single persons, firms, corporations, or cooperative associations): this method of production demands a free labor contract, open competition, and distribution to individuals. The utopia of the individualist is an approach to anarchy: the utopia of the Socialist melts into communism.

As I have just plainly shown, the main difference in these two theories is their effect on the role of the individual. Each existing government differs from every other in the degree to which it intervenes in the affairs of individuals.

This Socialist-Communist idea of from each according to his ability to each according to his need definitely discourages individual aggressiveness. The person with the ability would feel no necessity to work for something that would be taken away from him while the person in need would be relieved of any incentive to work if he would receive what he needed regardless of whether he earned it or not. This socialistic theory of equality of reward for services is denounced by the majority of Americans who believe in equality at birth, equality before the law, and equality of opportunity. It is known that any society to be successful must secure the effort and initiative of its citizens. Otherwise it will stagnate or degenerate. To meet its needs and to advance its civilization it must encourage the impulses which motivate the individual to action and achievement. Therefore, any workable philosophy of society or framework of government must take account of the raw materials of human nature, from which its motivations or human drives arise, if it would build for the betterment of the nation.

It is also important for us to keep in mind that socialism advocates government intervention in the affairs of individuals. Government interference always means either violent action or the threat of such action. Government is in the last resort the employment of armed men, of policemen, gendarmes, soldiers, prison guards, and

hangmen. The essential feature of government is the enforcement of its decrees by beating, killing, and imprisoning. Those who are asking for more government interference are asking ultimately for more compulsion and less freedom.

Freedom is the most valuable of all human possessions, next after life itself. It is more valuable, in a manner, than even health. No human agency can secure health; but good laws, justly administered, can and do secure freedom. Freedom, indeed, is almost the only thing that law can secure. Law cannot secure equality, nor can it secure prosperity. In the direction of equality, all that law can do is to secure fair play, which is equality of rights, but not equality of conditions. In the direction of prosperity, all that law can do is to keep the road open. That is the quintessence of individualism, and it may fairly challenge comparison with that quintessence of socialism. Socialism, disguise it how we may, is the negation of freedom. This may also be observed when we stop to think that a planned life is not free. Ludwig von Mises states it this way, "A man has freedom as far as he shapes his life according to his own plans. A man whose fate is determined by the plans of a superior authority * * * is not free." Socialism definitely employs authoritarians, or persons in command of the instruments of compulsion.

As a result of little or no freedom and lack of incentive under socialism, the individual suffers greatly. Living standards are much lower, prices are sky high, and life is miserable for the majority of them. This results because socialism aims at economic goals and ignores individual personality. They, however, must not be aware of that, "Only personality can create wealth, but wealth cannot create personalities."

America, on the other hand, has stressed freedom of the individual and considers him an important link in the chain of its great democracy. He is not just one of the masses but somebody important to the survival of the Nation.

Instincts, character, and the divine spark in the human soul are the property alone of the individual. There can be no human thought, no impulse to action, which does not arise from the individual. A free people maintain as many potential centers of enterprise, leadership, and intellectual and spiritual progress as there are individuals. We might as well talk of abolishing the sun's rays if we would secure our food, as to talk of abolishing individualism as a basis of successful society. It can well be said that it is what made America so successful.

Today, the problem that confronts us is keeping the spirit of individualism alive. To throw away what our forefathers fought and died for would be a catastrophe. They planned the Constitution so carefully to make sure it wouldn't interfere with individual freedom. To make doubly sure, they added the Bill of Rights which lists certain personal freedoms that the Government cannot infringe on. To give two examples, amendments 9 and 10 state respectively, "The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparge others retained by the people" and "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." We cannot let the spirit that caused this great document to be written fade away. Most of us Americans believe this strongly but still our spirit of individualism is slowly dying. I don't believe we are fully aware of what is happening. On the whole, we claim to support individualism. Yet we clamor for Government price controls, Government housing, social security, agricultural control, and many other similar plans. All such plans are steps in the enslavement of individuals, even though they voluntarily vote to surrender their responsibilities and freedom to the State. Our heritage is being lost more through weakness than through deliberate design. The Bill of Rights still shines in all its splendor, but many of us are looking in another direction. Many of us are drifting back to that old concept of government that our forefathers feared and rejected. Many of us are now looking to government for security. Many of us are no longer willing to accept individual responsibility for our welfare. Yet personal freedom cannot exist without individual responsibility.

We, the American people, should constantly guard against letting our Nation swing toward socialism. The spirit of individualism caused America to be founded and has marked our success. We must preserve our precious individual freedom and to do so we must be responsible citizens fully aware of our country's condition and not ignorant of what's happening. Let's not be just one of the masses. Let's be individuals who are proud of our country and its glorious heritage. Let's keep America successful. The only way is to keep the flame of individualism forever burning.

Our Liberties Versus Our Responsibilities in a Free Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an essay written by Carolyn Tipton, 2541 Casey Drive, Springfield, Ohio, a junior in the Springfield High School, on the subject of "Our Liberties Versus Our Responsibilities in a Free Society." This essay was a winner in the statewide American Legion essay contest in Ohio; and, as a result, Miss Tipton was 1 of 12 such essay contest winners honored by the Ohio delegation in the Congress at a luncheon held here in Washington on April 21. I am sure the House of Representatives will join with me in congratulating Miss Tipton on her excellent essay, which is as follows:

OUR LIBERTIES VERSUS OUR RESPONSIBILITIES IN A FREE SOCIETY

(By Carolyn Tipton)

Hello. My name is Liberty and I would like to tell you a story about me. This is my life. I have always been present and I always shall be, from the time the first man drew in his first breath even until the last man forces out his last. You see, I am a vital part of man, as vital as his heart. Man could not exist without me; yet, as you will later see, I can be his destruction. I can flourish in any climate, in any country, and among any race for I cannot feel differences in weather conditions, I am not impressed by names of nations, and I do not prefer one color to another. Although I am an unprejudiced soul, I am strong in few places. I am most prevalent in one place, my shrine, the United States.

It has commonly been said that there are two sides to everything, and I am no exception to that statement. My second side is unfairly thought of by many people as my dark side, this dark side being my shadow. Responsibility. In many ways Responsibility is my shadow; still, in other ways I am its. It is true that without me Responsibility could not be; however, it must never be forgotten that without responsibility I could not long endure. People praise me but curse my shadow. Can they not see that we are one; each dependent on the other for an assurance of existence?

Many citizens of the United States boast of their great freedom of voting, a chance to elect the candidate who they think will fill the qualifications of a certain office best. Yet, how many of these boastful citizens ignore my shadow when election time approaches? The number is startling when one stops to consider what might happen. Most of these people who fail to perform their voting responsibilities feel that just one vote will not change the outcome of the election. However, what they do not conceive is that if everyone felt as they did, soon there would be no chance to exercise such a wonderful freedom, for it could not exist. Negligence on the part of the public allows the wrong men to obtain recognition in the Government. Could not these men take the long ago fought for freedoms away from them?

The United States is known for her many public schools, libraries, parks, and roads. The citizens are proud of these public facilities and institutions; yet, they are reluctant to assume the responsibility of supporting them by paying taxes. My shadow, accompanied by a rare assortment of vulgar words, is thrown into a corner while these same proud citizens are driving on tax-supported roads, sending their children to public schools, and taking advantage of other comparatively free privileges. Don't they understand that without tax money the rich would be the only ones to enjoy such luxuries?

I have told you only a fragment of the possibilities to be obtained through me and my shadow. Now I hope all can see that I alone could destroy myself and mankind along with me. My shadow serves as a weight to tie me down to earth. No matter how high I jump to escape, responsibility is still on the earth pulling me back like a magnet. Any generation may decide to disregard my shadow; however, they may well be the last to have the chance to make any decision.

Atlantic Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, Joseph Alsop's column in the Washington Post, April 17, has a striking statement of a disturbing fact:

Ideas, at bottom, are what make an era; and the dearth of seminal and fresh ideas in these last years has become downright frightening.

Senator THEODORE F. GREEN—Senate Calendar No. 1499, Report No. 1470, 85th Congress, 2d session, p. 3—when he was chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, pointed out a possible source of new ideas:

All wisdom does not lie in government, and it is worthwhile to stimulate efforts to bring private talents to bear on the complex problems which confront NATO.

I am quoting these two statements, one exclaiming about the great need for

new ideas and the other pointing to a possible source of them, in order to call attention to a resolution already before Congress that has for its purpose an exhaustive exploration for new ideas to achieve Atlantic unity; and to do this on the unexplored level of private talent. This is Senate Concurrent Resolution 17, House Concurrent Resolution 107–108. I commend it earnestly.

Instead of bemoaning the lack of new ideas, we should put through this resolution without delay, in order to get together at the earliest possible moment a group of NATO's outstanding private citizens, so that when the brief Atlantic Congress which meets next month has adjourned, some exhaustive examination of the problems can be made, in the hope that they will come up with something not only new but practical to increase western unity and invigorate western policy.

The Alsop article follows:

THE OLD MEN GO

(By Joseph Alsop)

Within a short fortnight, Konrad Adenauer has accepted transfer from the chancellorship to the persidency of West Germany; and John Foster Dulles' illness has at length driven him to lay down the office of Secretary of State of the United States.

The Dulles resignation, climaxing an amazing display of stoic fortitude, coming at a desperately critical moment in our affairs, is a deeply poignant episode. The most ordinary human sympathy compels one to wish that this astonishing old man might have achieved his grimly pursued aim.

It was a modest aim, after all. It was no more than to hang on, still in harness, still pulling the coach, until the West had turned the Berlin corner. Man's fate is often cruel, but it seemed extra cruel, somehow, that the few months of extra time that Dulles wanted so badly—that he bore such suffering to gain—were not in the end granted to him. By the same token, it is a great misfortune for the western allies.

For the short run, in truth, the loss of Dulles means the loss of the greatest single element of strength in the Eisenhower administration and the departure from the stage of the one western leader whose knowledge and authority could not be challenged, even by his most bitter enemies. Viewed in a longer perspective, however, the departure of Dulles has another meaning, directly linked to the meaning of Adenauer's intended half-retirement.

These two great changes in the West's leadership mean the beginning of the end of a whole era. Dulles and Adenauer, like Eisenhower and Macmillan and De Gaulle, were old enough to experience the first World War, not as mere boys, but as grown men. Dulles, who rose in the world more rapidly than the others, was even a fairly significant junior member of the cast in the drama at Versailles. The present ear's tone has been set, its outlook has been determined, its leadership has been provided by these and other men who saw the first war, made their careers in the interwar years, and reached command positions as a result of the second war.

That is the era which is now ending. It will come to its real close, for all practical purposes, when Dwight D. Eisenhower steps down from the Presidency. In many respects, it has been a great and fruitful era, particularly marked by a total revolution in the relations between the United States and the rest of the world. But a new era has been long overdue, nonetheless.

Ideas, at bottom, are what make an era; and the dearth of seminal and fresh ideas in these last years has become downright frightening. In our domestic politics, the conservatives will sound like parodies of Herbert Hoover, while the leftwingers are still pale and timorous imitations of Franklin Roosevelt. In foreign affairs, the great innovations were made after the war ended; but the first Truman administration was the cutoff point. NATO, for which the keel was laid in 1948, was the last big ship to go down the long abandoned ways.

The second Truman administration was wholly barren of fruitful new departures (for the brave response to the challenge in Korea, though admirable in itself was only a decision to cope with a disaster which had been invited by the preceding Truman-Louis Johnson disarmament program). Under Eisenhower, despite the talk of a dynamic new foreign policy, the barrenness continued. With all his stature and energy and angry determination to hold the line for freedom, John Foster Dulles offered no fruitful new inventions—for there was nothing novel in such devices as SEATO, which mimicked NATO, but lacked NATO's substance.

Time did not stand still after 1948, however. On the contrary, the last decade has witnessed a gigantic upset of the world balance of power, owing to the Soviet Union's military and economy growth. It has witnessed, too, a long series of upheavals in the ex-colonial areas like the Middle East, on which the Western Allies are still heavily dependent. Yet no reasonably safe and sure and reliable way of coping with either of these huge and ominous processes has even been suggeted by any of the existing Western leaders.

In short, Secretary Dulles carried on a holding operation, not always successfully but with great courage and self-sacrfice. It is downright tragic that he should be removed from the scene at the very moment when the need is greatest for his special talent and his unusual strength of character. But the need is also great for fresh ideas that are always born when a new era starts, under the auspices of new men with fresh outlooks.

Panama Canal: Part of Communist Drive for Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in previous addresses to the House, I have covered at considerable length the vital question of control and jurisdiction of the Panama Canal, which since 1956 has gradually mounted in gravity. It was early apparent that the situation in Panama was not isolated but hemispheric in scope. The subsequent unfolding of events affecting the canal has more than justified my fears, and the end is not yet.

Already the forces of international communism have become intrenched in Cuba and Venezuela—both flank on the Atlantic approaches to the Panama Canal. These forces are now converging on the isthmus in furtherance of their long-range plan, with repeated evidences of revolutionary activity in Panama.

Thus, it was with great interest that I read in the Chicago Sunday Tribune of April 12, 1959, a most informative news story on the Communist drive for Latin America, by Jules Dubois, whose wide travels in Latin America, long residence in Panama, and service in the Panama Canal Department of the U.S. Army in World War II enable him to write from extensive observation.

The indicated news story, which follows, is commended for reading by all concerned with the problem of U.S. security:

REDS STEP UP DRIVE FOR LATIN AMERICA—GOAL OF KREMLIN NOT CHANGED, SAYS DUBOIS

(By Jules Dubois)

HAVANA, CUBA, April 11.—The advances which the Communists are now trying to make in Cuba bring into focus once again the fact that the plans of the Kremlin to dominate Latin America never have changed.

The objectives of the Soviet Union with regard to Latin America are clear cut. When the leaders of the Kremlin consolidated their hold after the Russian revolution, they included, in the early twenties, the subversion of Latin America as an integral part of the global master plan of the Communist conspiracy.

The spitting and stone-throwing incidents against Vice President NIXON in Peru and Venezuela last year were inspired, organized, and directed by the Communists.

WORSE THAN NAZI PERIL

The Soviet shadow over the Americas is a much more serious menace than the threat offered by the Nazis before and during World War II in the same area. The Nazi ideology was the fruit of the German agents and their satellite nationals in the Latin American nations. Not too many of the native Latin Americans fell for it.

The Kremlin, on the other hand, counts on a far more potent and dangerous fifth column. The Communists and fellow travelers in Latin America are nationals of those republics and, as such, enjoy considerably more freedom of action as they perform their roles of traitors to their countries and reserve their first and only loyalty for the Soviet Union.

WOULD UNDERMINE UNITED STATES

The immediate goal of the Communists, acting under directives from Moscow, is to undermine and destroy the prestige and leadership of the United States in Latin America. The ultimate goal is to convert the republics south of the Rio Grande and of the Florida keys into Red dictatorships.

To achieve the immediate objective, the Communists successfully directed campaigns to deny to the United States bases required for the defense of the Panama Canal. This has been done through the stimulation of nationalistic movements to defend the "sovereignty and territorial integrity" of the country.

SEEK TREATY REJECTION

The Communists whip up patriotic, nationalistic sentiment against commitments to cooperate with the United States in continental defense in accordance with existing treaties.

They infiltrate, control, and agitate in labor movements, student movements, the universities, the high schools, the arts and letters, and in all mass media of communications.

They strive to gain influence in government through so-called "national democratic" or "national unity" fronts and through the election of candidates acceptable to, and willing to support the party strategy.

Thus, without any of their party members obviously appearing on the surface, the Communists gain a most influential voice, not only in the dictation of foreign and domestic policy, but especially in negotiations with

the United States over delicate matters of continental defense.

ALWAYS CENTRAL CONTROL

To achieve the ultimate objective, the Communists work hand in glove with the executors of the immediate goal. There is central direction at all times.

A chain of operating bases contiguous to the United States and to American interests has been established by the Communists. These are located in Cuba, Mexico, Guatemala, Honduras, Costa Rica, Panama, Venezuela, and in Martinique in the French West Indies.

Important centers of Communist operations and agitation are located in Argentina, Uruguay, and Chile, and other gains have been made in Bolivia and Peru.

Numbers mean nothing in the strategy of Communist master plans. Results are what count, and vociferous, militant minority usually provides enough Red fire to produce a telling impact.

THRIVE UNDER DICTATORS

Communism has thrived under dictatorships in Latin America. The drama of desperation under dictatorship in some of the countries, notably Venezuela, drove the non-Communist, harassed, and oppressed opposition into an unholy alliance with the Reds in order to depose the tyrant, Gen. Marcos Perez Jimenez.

The Communists were most vocal and active in the Venezuelan presidential election campaign that ended last December. The candidate they endorsed, Rear Adm. Wolfgang Larrazabal, was defeated by Romulo Betancourt, who divorced himself from communism more than 20 years ago.

The Kremlin today is giving a higher priority to the cultivation of communism in Latin America than ever before. There is a noticeable increase in total Communist activity such as propaganda, political and labor agitation, economic infiltration, foreign language broadcasts, cultural operations, and labor, student, and cultural exchange.

THREE PRIMARY TARGETS

Three areas are listed at this moment as primary targets by Moscow. These are Cuba, the Panama Canal, and Venezuela.

Cuba, because it lies only 90 miles from the United States and depends on our country for most of its income through purchase of its sugar crop, has long been ticketed as the fulcrum for operations in the Caribbean.

Our large naval base at Guantanamo Bay, near the southeastern tip of Oriente Province, is a communist target. A campaign may be expected to be waged to urge Premier Fidel Castro to denounce the basic treaty which grants us the rights to that base in perpetuity.

RED LEADER IN MOSCOW

Juan Marinello, president of the Cuban Communist Party—which uses the name Partido Socialista Popular— is in Moscow receiving the latest orders from the Kremlin. It is reported that the entire Cuban Red command will be shaken up and younger men will take over.

Castro has said he is not going to persecute the Communists. Some of his underlings have been persecuting anti-Communists. The Cuban people would like to hear assurances from him that that practice will stop.

A rising star in the Cuban Communist fold, Alfredo Guevara, has been appointed director of the newly organized government-sponsored motion picture institute. As such he will have sole supervision over the production of motion pictures in the island and it is not yet known whether this will include television films.

CANAL DEFENSE HURT

The Panama Canal, despite the space age, nuclear submarines, and giant cargo aircraft, continues to be a vital link in our national defense. It is almost totally defenseless, thanks to agitation germinated by the Communists in 1946 and 1947. This helped to mobilize public opinion in Panama and prompted the rejection of a postwar defense pact with the United States by a unanimous vote of the national assembly.

When Panama was not invited to the Suez Users Association conference in London in 1956, both Nationalists and Communist sectors stirred up anti-American sentiment anew on the banks of the canal. The cry arose for the internationalization, or inter-Americanization, of the Panama Canal.

NO STUDENT PRANK

It was no mere student prank when 75 Panama flags were planted last May 2 by university students inside the U.S. Canal Zone in a maneuver that caught both the American Embassy in Panama City and the officials in the zone by surprise. The university students called their maneuver Operation Sovereignty.

Venezuela is a prime target because of the more than $3 billion in American investments there, most of it in the prolific oilfields and mountains of iron ore.

Mexico, whose thriving economy under the capitalist system cannot be tolerated by the Communists, is a principal secondary target. The Communists have been trying to cripple the economy of that country through paralyzing railroad and other strikes.

PARTY LEGAL IN MEXICO

Mexico is one of the few countries in Latin America in which the Communist Party is legal. The others are Cuba, Venezuela, Argentina, Bolivia, and Ecuador.

The Communists retain their alliance with the Peronists in Argentina, a situation that obtained throughout the rule of the exdictator, Juan Peron. They are making a bid to overthrow President Arturo Frondizi, whom they backed in the presidential campaign last year.

Because of the Communist-Peronist alliance, Frondizi has been forced to govern under a state of siege since last November. Recently, organized mobs of Reds and Peronists turned downtown Buenos Aires into a battlefield as they burned transportation, destroyed stores and fought the police.

CONGRESS BARES ADVANCES

The advances made by communism in Latin America were reflected by the attendance of 158 delegates at the third Latin American Communist Congress held in Moscow in October 1957. There were only two countries which had no delegates there. These were El Salvador and the Dominican Republic.

This does not mean that there are no Communists in either country. Apparently Moscow was not interested in their attendance, else ways and means would have been found to get them there.

The delegates from the other 18 countries were as follows: Argentina, 16; Cuba, 11; Brazil, 39; Chile, 21; Bolivia, 9; Peru, 6; Uruguay, 6; Colombia, 5; Costa Rica, 5; Guatemala, 5; Mexico, 22; Ecuador, 4; Venezuela, 2; Honduras, 2; Panama, 2; Haiti, 1 Nicaragua, 1; Paraguay, 1.

TO CONTINUE POLICY

That congress decided to continue the policy of autonomous action by the Communist Parties in Latin America but ordered them to remain subservient to the Communist Party of the U.S.S.R.

The delegates were instructed to accentuate the nationalist problems within their countries to foster the impression they are sincere patriots.

They were also instructed to make a concerted drive to enlist the youth into the party and to adopt the following strategy and tactics:

Communists should work covertly, infiltrating into all the democratic organizations, advocating national unity fronts without Communist colors or Soviet names; sabotage the national economy by affecting the commercial and industrial lives of the people; step up the campaigns against the policy of the United States and prepare the mentality of the people for the world revolution; all Communist parties shall be completely subservient to the U.S.S.R., and take orders only from the Kremlin.

ONE MODERATION ORDER

The delegates were ordered to moderate their battle against capitalism in general, but to attack the North American trusts and to build increasing resistance against the United States, its policy, its economic, cultural, and social intervention.

"National fronts will have to be formed with the purpose of supporting the sectors most hostile to the United States," the directive to the delegates emphasized.

It is that hostility against the United States which the Communists are trying to keep alive in Cuba as an aftermath of the anti-American resentment that was built up because of our military aid to the ex-dictator, Fulgencio Batista, during the civil war.

Our Economy and the Unemployed Need Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal of Monday, April 20, 1959, reported that in March 1959 American industry produced at the record rate of 147 percent of the 1947–49 production—slightly higher than production 2 years ago, March 1957. This sounds like a record of economic recovery until you read further: This March—with higher production—we had 1,460,000 more people unemployed than we did 2 years ago.

In manufacturing, alone, we produce more goods with 1 million fewer workers. Inside these figures is the fact that periods of unemployment for individual workers are longer and exhaustions of unemployment compensation are running at record rates. And because our Federal-State unemployment system is out of date, only about one-fourth of the wage loss from unemployment is restored to the unemployed and to the communities they live in.

Mr. Speaker, much of the work of this Congress must be addressed to the solution of the basic problem of expanding our rate of economic growth and to put America's manpower and factories back to work and to keep them at work.

One important piece of work we can do toward this end is to set Federal standards of duration, benefit level, and coverage in our unemployment compensation system to reduce the economic deterioration which results from unemployment.

I submit for the RECORD this enlightening appraisal of current trends in business and finance from the Wall Street Journal, which gives stark economic facts and analysis which again remind

us of our grave responsibilities to the economic future of the Nation:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 20, 1959]

APPRAISAL OF CURRENT TRENDS IN BUSINESS AND FINANCE

(By George Shea)

Publication of the figures for March on industrial production and total employment in the United States points up a lagging trend in employment. But a study of population trends suggests that, while the lag may continue this year and possibly next, there are forces which over a period of years will tend to offset it.

The two figures that look worst in relation to the state of general business are nationwide unemployment and the total of jobs in manufacturing. Industrial production in March, as announced just a few days ago, was at a new record high of 147 percent of 1947–49, the previous top having been 146 in February 2 years ago. Since we're talking about employment, which varies with the season as well as with production rates, let's compare the latest March figures with those for March 1957, when output was almost as high, at 145.

Today unemployment is 4,360,000, compared with 2,900,000, 2 years ago, even though production is now higher. In manufacturing, which accounts for by far the greater part of industrial production, jobs are down to 15.9 million from 16.9 million 2 years ago.

Nationwide job figures are more encouraging. The total is at 63.8 million or practically as large as the 63.9 million of just 2 years ago. The reason why it shows up so well in the face of the decline of 1 million in manufacturing jobs is that service occupations, including Government jobs, have become more numerous and have taken up the slack. And the reason unemployment shows up so badly even though jobs are nearly as high as 2 years ago, is that there are more people in the Nation, especially more people of working age. The civilian labor force is up to 68.2 million from 66.7 million 2 years ago.

As for the decline in manufacturing jobs, it is simply a result of increased efficiency. Manufacturing production, a component of total industrial output, is actually up a bit more from 2 years ago that the total, at 150 percent of 1947–49 against 147 in March 1957. More is being produce with 1 million fewer workers.

Within these figures, furthermore, lies a hint that more of the same may be expected if production rises further. The sector of industry which seems to hold greater possibility of increased output than any other is plant and equipment spending. Its 1959 rate seems so far to be between $31 billion and $32 billion, a very small gain over the 1958 recession rate of $30.5 billion, and well below 1957's record total of $37 billion. This particular lag is reflected also in the component of the production index that covers manufacture of durable goods; at 160 percent of 1947–49 in March it was 3 points lower than 2 years ago.

Obviously, if plant and equipment spending, and the durable manufacturing sector generally, forges ahead later this year and next year, employment will increase. However, if this group of industries repeats the experience of the rest of the industry and also produces more per worker, the increase in employment will continue to be slower than gains in output.

The question that these facts raise is whether similar trends may be expected in the longer future, with a growing unemployment problem facing the Nation for many years to come even if business and production continue to rise to new highs. Somewhat the same thing took place immediately after the 1953–54 recession.

The 1953 high in industrial production was 137 percent of 1947–49, reached in May. After the recession, the index recovered to higher than that level as early as 2 years later, with a May 1955 figure of 138. But employment in manufacturing industries never recovered the September 1953 high of 17.5 million. The largest figure it reached following the 1954 recession was 17.2 million late in 1956.

Unemployment, similarly, has never recovered the lowest figure of 1953, which was 1.2 million in August. Best since then: 1.9 million in October 1956.

However, trends in population promise to work towards a slow improvement in this situation. While the birth rate has slipped a little from the levels reached in the middle 1950's, it is still high by comparison with the rates of the last 30 years. At the same time, the long-time trend for people to live longer is continuing, as a result of improving health conditions. The result is that the proportion of the very young and the old in the population is growing; and by the same token the proportion of workers is falling even though the number of workers rises.

In 1950 the proportion of youngsters under 20 and oldsters over 65 was 42 percent of the population. In 1955 the proportion was up to almost 45 percent and in 1960 it promises to be around 47 percent with further increases towards almost 50 percent indicated in the subsequent years to 1965. Thus the number of consumers who don't produce increases in relation to the number of producers, which means an increasing call on the efforts of the producers.

It is true that unemployment has tended to grow since 1950 in spite of this population shift. And it is impossible to calculate which of the two forces—increasing efficiency and a rising proportion of nonproducers—will overcome the other in the years to come.

But it is clear that the solution to the problem of unemployment is an expanding economy. And it is also inevitably true that an expanding economy requires growing efficiency. So, while unemployment may well continue to exist and demand solution for political as well as humanitarian reasons, as long as it takes the form it has in the majority of recent years—a lag in jobs behind production gains—it will not be an economic threat but rather a reflection of basic economic health.

Cloistered Scholarship Has Limited Value

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Florida Times-Union entitled "Cloistered Scholarship Has Limited Value," does a dual job of admirably praising the outstanding president of Jacksonville University, Dr. Franklyn A. Johnson, while at the same time pointing up the subject of the general need for emphasis upon utility in scholarship. It is true that there are some values in academic studies unrelated to observable, practical considerations, but in the long pull the studies which generally have the most value to the individual and society are those which assist human beings along the slow but sure progress to higher levels of attainment. I am very happy indeed that Jacksonville University has at its head a man who is not only a scholar, but also a very practical and human individual. I include here the editorial referred to:

CLOISTERED SCHOLARSHIP HAS LIMITED VALUE

An academic administrator who is a scholar is getting to be a rare person, and a scholar with practical experience in his area of concern may be rarer still.

But Dr. Franklyn A. Johnson, president of Jacksonville University, seems to refute the trend in both instances. He has found time to author two books, the second of which, "Defense by Committee," is slated for publication this spring by the Oxford University Press of England, a recommendation in itself.

The book deals with the role of British foreign and military policymaking of the Committee of Imperial Defense. Since our National Security Council, Department of Defense and Joint Chiefs of Staff are patterned after the British system, it can help our understanding of our own military setup by having some acquaintance with its model.

Dr. Johnson's own military experience adds weight to his findings and arguments. It's more than an academic matter with him, for he has had to wrestle with military problems personally. He came out of World War II with a distinguished combat record, including being wounded three times.

Too often scholarship is not backed up with frontline experience, be it in the arts of war, politics, economics, or what-have-you. Scholarship divorced from reality has limited value.

Ideas can look so good on paper, be cogently advanced in well-turned phrases and still not be feasible, when they have not been tempered by some practical experience by their author.

We certainly need an endless stream of scholarship and research on the problems that beset us today, particularly to this one that Dr. Johnson adresses himself to in his book, the challenge of huge military establishments to popular democracy.

We must examine the extent that the military is shaping our thinking and our lives today. We must think about what unnecessary restraints a bickering democracy places on the agency entrusted with defending us against those who would destroy our way of life.

Are we less free than our forefathers because of the rise of militarism? How much freedom must we sacrifice in order to survive?

It seems that these vital issues in all their complexity will be more fully and fairly presented by a person of versatile experience and scholarship, as is represented by the author of this book.

Dulles: A Great American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include an editorial from the Grand Haven (Mich.) Daily Tribune of April

17, 1959, entitled, "Dulles: A Great American." Mr. Almon W. McCall is the editor of this Ottawa County newspaper, and I am sure that his comments express the sentiments of all Americans at the loss of Secretary Dulles' services.

The editorial follows:

DULLES: A GREAT AMERICAN

Sincerity is one of the highest human virtues. Devotion to a good cause is another. John Foster Dulles possessed both of these qualities to a generous degree.

The disease that forced Secretary of State Dulles to resign may also prove fatal to him in a matter of weeks or months. Thus in a sense his retirement as Secretary of State has produced his "obituary" while he is still living.

History marches into the future with seeming indifference to the suffering of the individuals who make it. Secretary Dulles may find little comfort in the fact that while he is being praised by free people everywhere, he is fighting a painful battle against cancer. Words of sympathy help. But they do not compensate for the grim toll exacted by a leading killer.

Perhaps no man in history has covered the mileage which John Dulles has to his credit in troubleshooting by all kinds of transportation all over the globe.

A few months ago there was some dissatisfaction with the Dulles brand of diplomacy. He seemed to be fighting a losing battle against a ruthless enemy that kicked up little rows and stole additional acres of territory.

All that has changed now. Dulles may have been inconsistent but he more than made up for this failing by a willingness to meet any friend, and even the Communists, halfway.

More than anything, he sold the idea that Americans want peace. At the same time he convinced a doubting world that Americans would also fight if sufficiently provoked—and if endangered would use all the weapons at their command to turn back the enemy. This was his version of the soft voice and the big stick.

There probably has never been a diplomat like Dulles. Some are more suave, others are more gifted in diplomatic doubletalk. Others may be more consistent and sure of themselves. But none ever worked so hard. And few could have done a better job in keeping the world from blowing up in its present state of tensions.

John Foster Dulles is not indispensable. But he is being forced to the sidelines when the ticklish Berlin crisis could still erupt into something serious. While it is wise that he retires at this time, it places a heavy responsibility on President Eisenhower in picking his successor.

Millions of us may owe our very lives to the man who felt that he owed more to his country than his personal health. God spare him undue suffering in his ordeal.

What "Unemployed" Really Means

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, the following article appears in the current issue of U.S. News & World Report and does much to explain why Walter Reuther's much-heralded "unemployment march" was such a dismal flop. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include this article for the benefit of my colleagues:

WHAT "UNEMPLOYED" REALLY MEANS

Take a closer look at "the 4.4 million unemployed."

You'll find surprises. Only about 1 million represent families whose sole breadwinner is out of work.

Others listed as jobless include workers shifting to new jobs, the temporarily laid off, the sick.

These are just a few of the facts that figures alone don't tell about unemployment now.

When you read that nearly 4.4 million workers in this country are unemployed, the question raised is this: What does "unemployed" really mean?

Are 4.4 million people walking the streets, destitute, looking for work? Are these millions as badly off as the unemployed of the early 1930's, living in families where there is no breadwinner and no income?

Start digging for answers and you find many things. You discover, first of all, that even in the best of times 3 million persons or so are classed as unemployed. These include people who are shifting from one job to another and are temporarily without income. They include young persons looking for work for the first time. They include workers laid off, but expecting to be rehired within 30 days. They include the temporarily sick and a considerable number of people who could be called "unemployables"—alcoholics, handicapped persons, those untrained for any kind of work.

So there are about 1.4 million people out of work now, over and above the number that would normally be classified as unemployed.

LOTS OF JOBS

You also find that, in March 63.8 million people had jobs. That was an increase of 1.1 million workers over February and a gain of 1.5 million over March 1958. Actually, employment now is almost as high as it ever was.

Does this mean that unemployment is not serious?

Being out of work is always serious for those who are unemployed. But the figures suggest that unemployment is not now a major national problem calling for a crash program to create jobs.

Actually, just what is an unemployed person?

By official definition, anyone over the age of 14 who is looking for a job and cannot find one is counted as unemployed. That includes a wife who would like to earn a little money, even though her husband is employed. It includes students and young people looking for temporary jobs. It counts retired people with pensions who would like to add to their incomes. It even includes a farmer who may be looking for an off-farm job to add to his earnings.

How are the unemployed counted?

The unemployed are estimated through samples taken each month by the Census Bureau. The sampling covers 330 areas embracing each State and the District of Columbia. Approximately 35,000 households are checked each month. Statisticians believe that estimates of unemployment are accurate to within 100,000.

Are most of the unemployed destitute?

By no means. For example, among the total number of unemployed, 1.7 million are married men who are heads of families. In these families are 500,000 working wives and 200,000 sons or daughters who have jobs. That leaves about 1 million families without a breadwinner—less than 25 percent of the total unemployed.

Then some people counted as unemployed still have incomes?

Probably most of them have incomes. An unemployed father, for example, may be drawing $30 a week in unemployment benefits, and his wife may be earning $60 a week. That's an income of $90.

Does a jobless person have to take another job when it is offered or lose his unemployment benefits?

Not always. Most State laws say that a jobless person need take only a job that offers work and pay comparable to the job he lost. A skilled machinist, for example, can refuse a job as a common workman.

How about the million families without a breadwinner? Are they destitute?

Probably not many of them are. A large proportion of the unemployed are entitled to benefits that provide some income up to 26 weeks. Others may be getting some direct relief. Still others are getting emergency benefits. Not many have been without jobs long.

How long have the jobless been out of work?

The average is 4 months for all of the unemployed. Chances are that most married men with families have been unemployed for less than the average period.

Then, for most people, unemployment is not permanent?

That is correct. Unemployment usually has been temporary for most workers. The Government estimates that, of the 1.5 million men aged 25 and over who lost their jobs during the recession, 1 million had been rehired by this spring.

How many people have been out of work for a long time?

The official figures show that 1.5 million persons have been unemployed for 15 weeks or more. About half of these—around 800,000—have been jobless for 6 months or more. That's a small percentage of the total labor force.

Why don't these long-term unemployed take jobs elsewhere?

A good many of them probably don't want to move because they have their homes and are settled in their communities. There probably are others who hope to be rehired, and don't want to lose seniority rights.

Then there is some rigidity in the working force in this country?

Yes, probably quite a bit. Many workers have built up seniority and pension rights and don't want to lose them by switching jobs. Also, some employers hesitate to hire a person who may quit as soon as his former job opens up again.

Is that why casual labor, such as household servants and yardmen, is hard to find even when unemployment is reported as large?

The explanation for the scarcity of casual labor probably stems from a number of causes. In the first place, unemployment, for most people, does not last long. Then, as the figures show, all but a few families usually have some member employed.

The unemployed, then, are a shifting rather than a steady group?

That is quite true. This country's labor force grows year after year by about 700,000 people. That means that each year a lot of young persons are looking for jobs for the first time. They are counted as unemployed until they find work. The latest figures for example, show that the percentage of unemployment is highest among people who are 24 years of age or younger.

Does a growing labor force mean that unemployment will be a permanent problem?

Not necessarily. In times of recession it's hard for newcomers to the labor market to find jobs. But, over the years, the country has managed to provide jobs for people able and willing to work.

Is unemployment worse for men or women?

More men than women are without jobs, both in actual numbers and as a percent

of the working force. In fact, the Census Bureau notes that total employment of women changed very little during the recession.

How serious is unemployment among Negroes?

On a percentage basis, unemployment is about twice as high for Negroes as for white workers. That is the usual situation in periods of business recession. Also, the percentage of unskilled workers is higher among Negroes than among others, and it's usually the unskilled who are laid off in larger numbers.

What happened to skilled workers in the recession?

The official report on the labor force indicates that, even during the recession, the number of professional and technical workers increased about as usual. There also was an increase in the number of clerical workers, people in service industries and salespeople. This does not mean that there was no unemployment in these groups, but it does indicate that demand for such workers stayed high, as it did for managers and business proprietors.

How many people are being forced to work only part time?

The number working less than 35 hours a week because of reductions in schedules is smaller now than a year ago, smaller than before the recession began.

However, the number of people who normally work part time has increased over the last 2 years. The trend apparently is for an increase in part-time workers. This group consists largely of housewives, students, and older persons who do not want full-time jobs.

The increase in part-time workers is another indication that the recession was accompanied by a rather small amount of actual distress among workers.

Is unemployment general throughout industry?

No. Unemployment is and has been spotty all through the recent recession. Unemployment in March was heaviest in manufacturing. About 1.2 million factory workers were without jobs in that month. And most of the unemployed factory workers usually are employed in industries that make "hard" goods—autos and machinery.

Is this situation improving?

Decidedly. In autos, for example, 1 worker in 10 is now unemployed, compared with 1 in 4 a year ago. For the hard-goods industries as a whole, unemployment has dropped from 11.6 percent of the labor force to 7.4 percent.

In what part of the country is unemployment most serious?

Latest official surveys show that unemployment probably is most serious in the coal-mining regions of West Virginia and Pennsylvania. Then there are persistent unemployment problems in some textile centers in New England.

Unemployment is still heavy in Detroit and other automotive centers, and in some steel centers.

JOBS TOTAL STAYED HIGH

Actually, the country weathered a sharp recession with very little severe distress among workers. And total employment never dropped below 62 million.

FAMILY BREADWINNERS OUT OF WORK

Here are the latest figures:

Out of nearly 4.4 million unemployed people, about 1.7 million are heads of families.

But, of these, in round figures, 500,000 have wives who are working; 200,000 have sons, daughters, or other family members who work.

Leaving, out of all the families counted in the labor force about 1 million in which nobody has a job.

Dr. Adams, of Moses Lake—It's Surprising the Amount of Setbacks a Good American Can Endure and Still Love His Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I here recite an interesting life story of a great American, Dr. Lytle S. Adams, of Moses Lake, Wash., as he told it to me, documented. I have had the rare privilege and great pleasure of knowing Dr. Adams for many, many years, and can vouch for his patriotism, honesty, and integrity.

His life is an outstanding example of the kind of mettle in man which has made America great. To date, his contributions to American progress have brought him small recognition and little compensation, except the personal satisfaction in knowing he has fought a good fight. Regardless of his many setbacks at the hands of individuals, as well as by his Uncle Sam, he still carries on at the age of 77 years young.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope and pray the day will soon come when Dr. Lytle S. Adams will receive just recognition and compensation for all his good works. Surely he is rightfully and justly entitled to no less, even at this late date, for there has scarcely been a time in Dr. Lytle S. Adams' 77 years when he was not thinking of ways to serve others. Though an ambitious young man, he was thinking of the service he could render when he left his home in Kentucky to work his way through dental school at the St. Louis University.

Trained for service and filled with idealistic ambition he took his first bride to Parsons, Kans., and opened his first dental practice in 1906. On a visit to Los Angeles in 1911 he envisioned a thriving metropolis as it is today, instead of the orange groves and wheat fields before him. He stayed on to enter real estate. He saw on the rolling Palo Verde Hills, beautiful home sites as they now exist, when as an agent he sold that great estate.

It was the commission of that sale that enabled him to purchased the beautiful Pauma Valley Ranch of 13,500 acres in San Diego County; and he set about immediately to clear, subdivide, and develop it. During a dry season on the ranch he observed how small cactus plants sprang up in areas where they were not native from seeds contained in rabbit droppings. A germ of an idea thus conceived was to keep coming back to his inventive mind for nourishment and growth for years to come. Good fortune smiled but briefly. A flash flood in 1915 swept all evidence of his efforts away to sea, and his investment as well.

Dr. Adams was undaunted. He had designed a plow for bringing the rich subsoil to the surface for plant use. It was a good plow and adaptable to many uses. Dr. Adams went back to St. Louis, organized a company on limited capital to manufacture plows but was never able to produce and market them in sufficient quantities to make a go of it.

About 1922 Dr. Long, of the Long Bell Lumber Co., said to Dr. Adams in St. Louis, "I'm going out West to the State of Washington and start a new town. How about coming along to help?"

The call of the wild was too much for Dr. Adams. He moved his family bag and baggage to the new lumber town site of Longview, Wash., on the Columbia River. There was no means of transportation except by boat from the neighboring coast town of Long Beach. Dr. Adams thought they should have a road. He went to his friend, Mr. Long, who supplied dynamite, tractors, and other equipment, and with all volunteer labor, they built 65 miles of road through the wilderness from Longview to the sea, along the north bank of the Columbia River. This road though greatly improved is known today as the Ocean Beach Highway.

Watching the hook and grapple mechanism of a tractor during logging operations in the building of this road, another idea was born. Dr. Adams brushed it aside for a time as he sought to replenish a completely dwindled bank account. He took the examination before the State dental board to practice oral surgery and dentistry in the State of Washington and opened an office in Seattle.

That ball and grapple continued to haunt him. He was sure it could be used to pick up and deliver packages from an airplane without landing the plane. For several years he spent all his spare time and spare cash perfecting this device. Air Transport magazine records the first successful pickup tests in 1928:

PICKUP DEVICE PASSES SEATTLE TESTS SUCCESSFULLY—WILL ELIMINATE NECESSITY OF LANDING TO TAKE ON AND DISCHARGE MAIL

SEATTLE, WASH.—Successful tests of an air-mail and general cargo pickup device for planes have been completed at Gorst Field here by Dr. Lytle S. Adams, the inventor, under the observation of William P. McCracken, of the U.S. Department of Commerce Division of Aeronautics, and C. M. Perkins, Seattle postmaster.

Trailing a steel cable catchline into the pickup chute, a Travel Air OX5 biplane piloted by Clayton Scott, of Seattle Flying Service, snagged a 35-pound pouch of airmail without lowering the speed of the plane or causing it to settle. Tests with heavier loads will be conducted later.

With a little more than a handful of letters of introductions, Dr. Adams took the crude-looking device to New York and Washington, D.C. He had many setbacks, but if God ever gave the man anything more than a good supply of ideas, it was ample determination to carry out those ideas.

The Newark Star-Eagle in its Friday edition, December 14, 1928, carried a picture of three pilots, Don Brown, Capt. John O. Donaldson, and L. V. Rawlings, with the plane called the *Postmaster*, which they proposed to fly in an en-

durance test at Roosevelt Field, N.Y., refueling in the air and using the Adams pickup device which has been installed there to refuel their Travelair cabin monoplane while it is in flight. These trials are believed to be the very first refueling to be done while in flight.

Mrs. Harry S. New, wife of the Postmaster General, christened the Travelair cabin monoplane the *Postmaster*. At the christening ceremony Postmaster General New paid tribute in these words:

This is the last word in the land of invention for the benefit of the airmail. The realm of prophecy is always a dangerous one upon which to enter. No man can foretell the exact result of an experiment, and yet all progress is the result of invention and experiments. This plane, which has been adapted through the genius of Dr. L. S. Adams, of Seattle, to pick up fuel and useful loads from the ground while the plane is in motion, is an entirely new note. If successful, as we all hope it may be, and as it bids fair to be, Dr. Adams will have made a most substantial contribution to the transportation of useful loads through the air. We wish him all success.

Interested observers of these tests took Dr. Adams to the United States Lines. The pickup device was installed on the deck of the U.S.S. *Leviathan* and on June 7, 1929, the New York Journal issued a special aviation edition inaugurating the first ship-to-shore and shore-to-ship service by air. This special edition quoted men of prominence as saying on the occasion:

Ship-to-shore and shore-to-ship services by air offer many possibilities for expediting commerce and travel. The inauguration of this service in conjunction with the arrival of the *Leviathan* is an event worth commemorating. (Wm. P. MacCracken, Jr., Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Aeronautics.)

Inauguration of shore-to-ship mail service is but another example on the long step forward in fast mail service made possible by the utilization of the airplane as an agency of rapid transportation and American initiative in taking advantage of its possibilities. I wish this undertaking every possible success. (F. Trubee Davison, Assistant Secretary of War.)

The Wall Street financial crash of 1929 wiped out all the plans for the new Adams Air Express Co. that had just gotten under way and Dr. Adams had to start over again.

Many people believed in the pickup and helped Dr. Adams. Before an airmail contract could be obtained a company had to prove its ability to perform. Clifford Ball Airlines was interested and put in an installation on the Cleveland-Pittsburgh route No. 11 at Youngstown, Ohio, in 1929. Other installations were put into use at New Castle and Beaver Falls, Pa., along the same route in 1930.

At the World Fair in Chicago, Ill., 1932 to 1933, the airmail pickup made daily flights carrying souvenir mail cachets from the fair. This was done to raise funds to augment the necessary finances to carry on the demonstrations. Dr. Adams carried on his demonstration work for the Postal Service trying to obtain an airmail contract for more than 10 years. Dr. Adams' records show that on May 5, 1937, two companies were formed—Tri-State Aviation, an operating company, and All American Aviation, a patent holding company. Arthur P. Davis, Lytle S. Adams, and W. Edgar Leedy, Jr., were the incorporators. They also show that at the first meeting of the board of directors, May 1, 1937, "Dr. Adams was elected president and Mr. Davis, vice president and chairman of the board."

The service was taken to the remote areas in West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Kentucky, and Ohio, and an impressive experience record had been built up by 1938. During the 75th Congress a bill, H.R. 7448, was introduced; and in the hearings on this bill, March 1938, Dr. Adams' statement is of public record and show his untiring efforts to obtain an airmail contract.

Dr. Adams was forever in debt as was the operating company Tri-State Aviation. He was put in touch with Richard C. du Pont and after Mr. du Pont flew the route with Dr. Adams, he was most enthusiastic about the pickup and immediately put up the necessary money to keep Tri-State Aviation operating. Dr. Adams offered a 40 percent interest in both the companies. Although, Mr. du Pont had made a substantial loan—$45,000—to keep Tri-State operating, when it came to making a deal, Dr. Adams says Mr. du Pont was interested only in buying into the debt free patent holding company All American. This was a source of grave concern to Dr. Adams, for All American had no experience record with which to legally qualify as an airmail contractor.

At the time the contracts were finally awarded by the Post Office Department, the Du Pont company, according to Dr. Adams, used their influence to have the contract awarded to the patent holding company of All American Aviation. Over Dr. Adams' strenuous objections, the contract was awarded to the more financially stable company—but a company without the necessary performance record to qualify under the law.

Dr. Adams tried to keep alive the debt ridden Tri-State Aviation but it could not compete. All American had the airmail contract, which Dr. Adams felt had been earned by Tri-State and was financially secured by the Du Pont wealth.

Many differences arose from these two companies trying to operate over the same route—differences, legal and otherwise with which Dr. Adams' inventive mind had not been trained to cope. He claims he was finally forced to sell his complete interest in the All American Aviation, Inc. to Mr. du Pont, September 26, 1940. The terms of the contract were not simple, and by the time Dr. Adams gathered all the stock in the company to satisfy their requirements, considerable expense was involved and his receipts show that what he actually received from his interest was exaggerated by Mr. du Pont's following statement to the press:

The company in obtaining additional financing sold its treasury stock at $3 a share. Dr. Adams has obtained the same price for stock he has disposed of. On this basis he was paid $360,000 for his contribution to All American Aviation, Inc., which I believe is fair and adequate.

Dr. Adams says his net from the transaction amounted to only $37,000.

Dr. Adams again showed his ability to turn his back on disappointment by starting to work on a new service to mankind and another use for the airplane. That little germ of an idea of the little rabbit carrying cactus seeds around and distributing them on the land in pellet form could be made to serve mankind. He devised a machine for making the pellets of seed, soil, and fertilizer and a machine for distributing them from an airplane. He again approached the Government with the idea of revegetating the western rangeland.

World War II interrupted these plans, but Dr. Adams was sure he could help out in the war effort. He came up with the idea of using live bats as carriers for incendiary bombs. He communicated the the idea to President Roosevelt, who gave the "go ahead." Dr. Adams went right to work, ever confident that he was serving his country and that he would be paid for his services. All the money he could borrow from every source available he put into this project. He even mortgaged his home in Irwin, Pa. He recalls that he was assigned military men, equipment, and top priorities to carry out the project. He was certain his Government meant to pay him. He was sworn to secrecy and assured over and over that something was "being worked out for him financially." The war ended. He presented a claim for payment but the claim was turned down. Dr. Adams has not received payment of salary and expenses for work on this project.

The Internal Revenue Service had been busy while Dr. Adams was on his secret war project. He had not explained to the Bureau's satisfaction the money Mr. Du Pont had told the press Dr. Adams had received from the sale of the All-American Aviation, Inc., stock. When he was available to answer their questions, they arrived at their own figure of $165,113.02 as an assessment. This figure seemed so fantastic, Dr. Adams was sure there would be no problem in explaining his situation. Explain? Yes. But proof was another thing. His wife was a good bookkeeper and kept all the records, but shortly thereafter she died. He hired a lawyer and an accountant and after going over the records they wrote Dr. Adams that they were "sure that you do not owe the Government anything." I will return to this later.

The pellet seeding was no longer an idea. The Interior Department was interested. Congress believed in it and appropriated $100,000 for an experimental contract in 1945. Seeds in such large quantities as required for the job were not available, a draught made seeding impractical, abrasives wore out the pellet wheels at a rapid pace, but a simple and flexible contract allowed for these setbacks and by 1947 over 50,000 acres had been seeded. The project received wide acclaim and publicity. Although, still in the experimental stage, the International Seed Pellet Co., formed to do the work, looked forward to a bright future.

The 1947 appropriation was for $200,000 to carry on this important work. Some 80,000 acres were seeded under this appropriation with a total expenditure of $112,844 of the $200,000 appropriated.

Congress further indicated their confidence in the aerial reseeding program by appropriating another $200,000 for 1948. Competition developed and two other companies with coated seed entered the field and private fliers wanted to bid. Dr. Adams says that restrictive specifications written to make possible these other companies to enter the field, ran up the International Seed Pellet Co.'s operating costs until it was impossible to carry out their contracts with any sign of profit. A letter from the bank financing Dr. Adams and the International Seed Pellet Co. protests this situation:

Because of certain restrictions imposed by the Interior Department under these contracts as to time limit, delay in selection of areas, and final award of the contracts, the great distance of the seeding areas, the almost impossible weather conditions, and the necessity for unforeseen expenses in building roads, airstrips, etc., the contractor has operated at a loss.

We are writing this letter in the hopes and because of your interest in the outcome of this enterprise, you will use your influence to have these contracts so drawn that it will enable the contractor to carry them through with a minimum of expense and with a sufficient time to do the work, taking into consideration all the factors as above stated.

Over 70,000 acres were seeded with earthen pellets and an expenditure of $98,225.25 was made. Due to the competitive bidding, contracts were let to coated seed companies and private flying organizations for aerial seeding. There was $65,000 left as a carryover of the appropriation. Near the completion of the final contract the equipment was snowed in and had to be left on the job until spring through the 1949 blizzard. The stranded men were dropped food supplies from the air. This contract was canceled and with it was dealt the crippling blow to the International Seed Pellet Co.

However, the Congress still had faith in this practical means to make the desert bloom and appropriated another $200,000 plus the balance of the 1948 carryover of $65,000 for the specific purpose of earthen pellets. The bids for this appropriation were never let. Dr. Adams carried on for nearly 2 years trying to salvage something from the operation. Finally, the bank foreclosed on the International Seed Pellet Co.'s equipment and all was lost. In addition, a deficiency judgment was obtained against Dr. Adams by the bank in the amount of $72,000.

Of the $700,000 appropriated for earthen pellets, only $297,366.25 was actually received by Dr. Adams, according to him hardly enough to pay for the equipment loss.

In August 1951 Dr. Adams again entered the practice of dentistry in the city of Seattle, after being away from it for nearly 25 years. He worked with other dentists, took refresher courses at night and opened his own office in Moses Lake, Wash., in the fall of 1953.

The tax account had not been resolved, liens were placed on the doctor's deceased wife's estate and it was sold at forced sale. Although the attorney and accountant were "sure the tax department does not have a case," they had to have payment to process the case.

Without funds to execute properly the tax case, he finally had to throw himself upon the mercy of the court. The case was sent to Seattle but the judge in Washington, D.C., refused to have his papers returned from the accountant. Dr. Adams did not have the $10,000 fee that the accountant was demanding. So without papers of proof the court in a stipulation reduced the claim from $165,113.02 to $17,240. In signing the stipulation, Dr. Adams states he was led to believe that in so doing the tax department would undoubtedly be persuaded to accept the money, held in the court in Pennsylvania from the sale of his deceased wife's estate, in the amount of $12,911.94 as a compromise settlement for the whole thing. Dr. Adams wrote the Internal Revenue Service to this effect. They have not answered his letter.

They did write Dr. Adams' creditor and dental supply houses indicating they had first priority on all of Dr. Adams' earnings. This though perfectly legal, falsely represents the facts, according to Dr. Adams. Dr. Adams had remarried in 1949 and the new community, under the laws of a community property state, is not subject to this old debt.

Ill health befell Dr. Adams in Moses Lake. He had two surgical operations within a 3-year period. Other taxes accumulated. Since his illness, however, he has paid off more than half of the new accumulation, leaving a balance of about $3,200. A heart attack in November last year has made it impossible for him to carry on his dental practice. It appeared that he would not be able to work again and a compromise offer was made to settle the old tax account which has now grown with interest from $17,240 to $42,000. He felt that if he could remove the stigma and worry of this old account that he would in some way find it easier to pay off the balance against this community. The following from a letter received from the internal revenue department last week indicates the strain he is now laboring under as he tries to regain his health:

Failure to reply promptly to this Office regarding the above-mentioned matters may result in our placing a lien and levy against your social security benefits. You are, therefore, respectfully advised to give this matter your immediate attention.

Dr. Adams has three small children, ages 5, 7, and 9, and he feels his social security is something he has earned for them. This could be a final blow from the Government, but, no, there is more.

Dr. Adams' one consolation has been that he has accomplished much and that these accomplishments would be recorded by history and live after him.

This hope was shaken last week by a visit Dr. Adams made to the Smithsonian Institution, to take a picture of a plane given in 1949 by his former pilot, Norman Rintoul. The plane was used in the airmail pickup system and was given as a memorial to Dr. Lytle S. Adams, inventor. The plane is still in storage, awaiting the construction of the new Aviation Building he was told, "but, a model of it is on display in the Aviation Building." The model, given by "All American Airways, in memory of Halsey R. Bazley, former president" has a plaque with data depicting the airmail pickup as dating 1939 to 1949.

The question was brought up in the office of the Smithsonian Institution, as to information they might have on the airmail pickup prior to its purchase by Mr. du Pont. He was told, "Oh, there wasn't any airmail pickup before All American, as far as we know."

Now Dr. Adams has no desire to detract anything from anyone who has contributed to the success of the air mail pickup service and there were many who gave unselfishly of their time and money to help develop the pickup system. He concedes that Godfrey Cabot, Richard C. duPont and Halsey R. Bazley have earned a place of honor for their many, many contributions to society.

Still it is a matter of public record that the patents on which the All American Pickup System was originally based were those of Dr. Lytle S. Adams and he spent more than 12 years perfecting and proving them—1927–40. These 12 years surely have their rightful place in the air mail history, not only as a necessary supplement but as a complement as well to the 10 years of All American.

As shown by his fully documented papers, Dr. Adams organized the first All American Aviation Co., and was the first acting president of it, long before Mr. duPont was approached for financing.

If we cannot count on history being more accurately recorded, what can our future generations hope for?

Though greatly incapacitated by physical illness, Dr. Adams' mind is still keen and he still has much to offer the world through the field of invention. He has again brought to Washington from the Northwest an ingenious plan to make the new State of Alaska accessible to year around surface transportation. The plan invisions: a double-deck all-weather highway, with a monorail freight and passenger service inclosed with the lower deck, and an automatic water hauling train for resupplying our rapidly falling water table. Transportation and conservation of our national resources are of vital interest to him and with little hope of remuneration, he has brought his new ideas to Congress in the hope that they may be used in the future development of our country.

Dr. Adams has retained his sweetness of soul, his loyalty to God and country through the seemingly impossible odds. In terms of service—he has given 77 years and is willing to continue to give—but for what?

"The Communist Resolutions: What the House of Delegates Really Did," by Ross L. Malone, President of the American Bar Association, Delivered at the American Bar Association Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent granted me heretofore so to do, I am pleased to present the text of an important and timely article by Ross L. Malone, president of the American Bar Association. This text appeared in the American Bar Association Journal for April 1959 and was a speech given by Mr. Malone at the recent Bar Association Convention:

THE COMMUNIST RESOLUTIONS: WHAT THE HOUSE OF DELEGATES REALLY DID

(By Ross L. Malone, president of the American Bar Association)

(Few actions of the association have stirred up as much interest as the House of Delegates' approval in February of five resolutions offered by the association's Committee on Communist Tactics, Strategy and Objectives. The resolutions aroused considerable discussion, not only among lawyers, but also among the general public. In an address before the upper Ohio Valley regional meeting, delivered March 11 in Pittsburgh, President Malone seized the opportunity to give a straightforward, factual explanation of what the resolutions actually say and what their approval by the house of delegates means. The address is a timely account of an important policy decision by the house and should help to "set the record straight" in an area in which there seems to be a large degree of misunderstanding.)

The American Bar Association is privileged to convene its upper Ohio Valley regional meeting, the second and final regional meeting of this association year, in the city of Pittsburgh. The significance of the occasion is increased tremendously by the opportunity to participate in the celebration of the 200th anniversary of the founding of this city of dramatic achievement.

I can imagine no more inspiring atmosphere in which to conduct a regional meeting than in the Pittsburgh of today. The history of this great city and its triumph over seemingly impossible obstacles have captured the imagination of the entire country.

The Golden Triangle is known from the Atlantic to the Pacific. It stands as a symbol of the strength and vitality of free enterprise and as a tribute to the determination of its citizens. We join with the rest of the country in congratulating you upon a distinguished history and a future bright with promise.

When compared to the 200 years of the life of this great city, the octogenarian American Bar Association seems only a youngster. Yet the American Bar Association, like Pittsburgh, can view the past 25 years as a period of special growth and achievement.

Perhaps the greatest single event in the history of the association was the reorganization which occurred in 1936. At that time the representative body which is known as the house of delegates was created to replace the members who happened to be in attendance at an annual meeting, as the policy-making body of the association.

Today, in addition to representatives of the American Bar Association members throughout the country, it includes representatives of all the State bar associations of the United States and all local bar associations having a membership of 1,000 or more, 30 percent of whom are members of the American Bar Association. It counts in its numbers representatives of specialized national legal organizations such as the Association of Women Lawyers, the Association of Attorneys General, the American Judicature Society, the American Law Institute, and the other national organizations of the profession. In theory and in fact, when the house of delegates of the American Bar Association speaks today, it represents the organized legal profession of the United States.

Its ability to do so on a representative basis results from the fact that it is indeed a cross-section of the legal profession of the United States. A recent analysis of the membership of the house of delegates disclosed that its 249 members range in age from 3 members who are under 36 years of age to 3 who are octogenarians. The largest percentage of its membership in any age bracket, 23 percent to be exact, falls in the age bracket from 51 to 55 years of age. Approximately 50 percent of its membership is composed of lawyers 55 years of age or younger.

Seventy-six of the 125 approved law schools have alumni in the House of Delegates.

Approximately 10 percent of its members are individual practitioners. An analysis of the members of the house of delegates who practice laws as members of law firms discloses that the house is in no sense dominated by large law firms. Thirty-nine percent of the members of the house are in firms with five lawyers or less, and an additional 30 percent are in offices from 6 to 10 lawyers. It also includes law teachers, corporation counsel, bar officials and Government officials.

Populationwise, also, the house of delegates is representative. Whereas 38 percent of the lawyers in the United States practice in cities of over one-half million population, 34 percent of the house of delegates come from such cities. Turning to the other extreme, with 30 percent of the lawyers of the United States from cities under 50,000 we find 22 percent of the house of delegates coming from such cities. There was a time when the charge was made that the American Bar Association was dominated by big city lawyers from large firms. My analysis shows, however, that this group is actually under represented in the house of delegates, constituting only 6 percent of the membership of the house.

I have had this analysis of the composition of the house made because of the importance, both to the association and to the country, that it be understood in evaluating action of the house of delegates of the American Bar Association. The two meetings of the house of delegates which are held each year attract the attention of the press of the entire country. Action taken by the house of delegates upon issues of public importance receives widespread attention throughout the United States.

THE HOUSE OF DELEGATES—VOICE OF THE LEGAL PROFESSION

Persons who disagree with such action sometimes seek to discredit it with the statement that the views expressed by the house of delegates are not representative of the views of the legal profession of the United States. I suggest that there is no evidence to support such a statement. On the contrary, composed as it is, of delegates selected by the organizations of the legal profession of the United States, and typical as it also is, in terms of age, law schools, size of community and branches of the profession, it, in fact, expresses a representative opinion of the legal profession of the United States.

You and I, as members of the association and as members of the legal profession of the United States, are entitled to take pride in the attention given to action of the house of delegates by the people of this country and in the weight given to its action in the National Congress.

There is one further aspect of the house of delegates' action to which I should like to refer. The board of governors of the association, which is composed of one member from each judicial circuit of the United States, plus the officers of the association and the editor in chief of the Journal, is the executive committee of the house of delegates. Between sessions of the house, it exercises the and authority of the house. Only the house of delegates, and between its sessions, the board of governors, is authorized to speak for the association. The policy of the association on any issue is fixed either by the board or the house.

Action of the house of delegates is taken upon resolutions submitted to it by the reports of committees and sections of the association. The rules of the house require that any such report set out at the outset of the report the resolutions which it is proposed that the house of delegates shall adopt. There then follows the report of the committee which expresses the views of the committee, which are the bases on which the recommendations are made to the house.

The committee report expresses the views of the members of the committee who sign it, and only their views. When the house of delegates acts, it acts only upon the resolutions which are submitted—not on the body of the report. Following debate upon each resolution, it is either adopted, amended, and then adopted, or rejected by the house. Thus it is the resolutions voted on and adopted by the house that reflect the official position of the association.

The house of delegates takes no action upon a committee report which accompanies the resolution. Language in the committee report is in no sense the language of the American Bar Association or the house of delegates. It in no sense represents the policy of the association, which is limited to the language of resolutions adopted. The reason for this rule is obvious. A committee report which frequently may extend to 25, 50, or even sometimes 100 pages, obviously cannot be considered, rewritten, or adopted in a deliberative body of 249 members. The debate of the house and its action, for obvious reasons, is limited to the resolutions presented for action.

The distinction which I have mentioned between the resolutions adopted by the house of delegates and the text of a committee report which is submitted to the house with those resolutions is of importance. Of equal importance is the fact that committee reports filed with the house of delegates but which have no resolution accompanying them occasion no action by the house of delegates and hence do not represent the official position of the American Bar Association. They merely constitute an ex parte statement by the 5, 7, or 10 individual lawyers who sign the committee report which is filed. Reports filed by sections of the association are subject to exactly the same rules.

In an effort to avoid misunderstanding, the rules of the house of delegates require that the following statement appear on the face of all section and committee reports to the house of delegates:

"Reports of sections or committees of the American Bar Association, prepared for submission to the house of delegates, are not to be construed to represent the official pol-

icy of the association. Reports containing policy recommendations reflect association policy only as and when these recommendations are acted upon by the house of delegates. Reports containing no recommendations for specific action by the house of delegates are merely informative; they represent only the views of the section or committee recommending them."

I have mentioned in detail the internal functioning of the American Bar Association because it seems to me to be important that members of the legal profession, the public generally, and our representatives in Congress understand and be able to give appropriate weight to action of the American Bar Association and its subordinate bodies.

Unfortunately, statements and news reports resulting from the recent meeting of the house of delegates at Chicago have indicated considerable misunderstanding in this regard.

THE COMMUNIST RESOLUTIONS—WHAT DO THEY MEAN?

In the light of theforegoing background I should like to discuss the action of the house of delegates upon the report of the special committee on Communist tactics, strategy, and objectives, taken recently at Chicago. This committee was created in 1950 by action which originated in the assembly at the annual meeting in 1950 and was concurred in by the house of delegates.

Shortly before the February meeting the committee submitted a comprehensive report to the house of delegates. The board of governors of the association, acting as the executive committee of the house, reviews all reports before they reach the house of delegates and recommends to the House the action to be taken upon the resolutions submitted with each report. In this instance the board of governors transmitted the resolutions submitted by the committee with the following statement:

"The board recommends approval by the House of the several recommendations in the report and their transmittal to the Congress of the United States in order to correct legislative defects in the field of internal security revealed by particular decisions cited in the report.

"In making its recommendations for approval, the Board does not in any way intend to indicate censure of the Supreme Court nor an attack upon the independence of the judiciary. Indeed, the obligation of the Bar to defend the Supreme Court as an institution is emphasized in the first resolution proposed by the Committee's report.

"The recommendation for approval, in the case of this report as in the case of all other reports of association sections and committees, does not constitute endorsement of statements in the report itself, such statements being those of the individual members of the committee."

The house of delegates took up consideration of the report of the special committee on Communist tactics, strategy and objectives as a special order of business at 2 p.m. on Monday—the first day of its session. Upon motion made at that time, it was put over to 10 a.m. on Tuesday in order to afford the delegates an opportunity for further examination of the lengthy report of the committee. Final action was taken the following morning. Almost 2 hours were consumed in the debate on the resolutions.

The action of the house of delegates on these internal security resolutions has occasioned as widespread publicity and developed as much public interest as any action taken by the association in many years. As you would expect, the president's mail has increased tremendously since the Chicago action.

Reaction within the profession and from laymen has ranged from enthusiastic approval to extreme disapproval, with all intermediate shades of opinion well represented. There has been one letter of resignation in protest against the action. Other members who did not approve of the action of the house have expressed their disapproval and their resolve to remain in the association and seek to have their views reflected in future action. They are to be commended for so doing.

The American Bar Association includes in its membership lawyers of every school of thought—and there is a place in it for all of them. Its house of delegates must be, and I believe that it is representative of the legal profession of the United States.

Inevitably, when the house of delegates acts upon a question in an area of controversy, there is going to be strong disagreement on the part of those who opposed the action in the house of delegates and those who would have opposed it had they been in the house of delegates.

INTERNAL SECURITY—THREE CONTROVERSIAL AREAS

The internal security resolutions were certain to evoke disagreement on the part of some members of the organization whatever action was taken upon them. They involved not one but three areas of controversy. I believe that the existence of a Communist threat to our internal security is now generally recognized by lawyers of all schools of thought, but the magnitude of the threat, and hence the nature and extent of the action which should be taken to combat it, constitutes an area of controversy of long standing. It is one which relates closely to the emotions stirred by appeals to patriotism and hence it produces emotional and sometimes violent opinions.

The second area of controversy with which the resolutions dealt is that of civil rights. The rights guaranteed by the Bill of Rights are the distinguishing characteristic of our concept of government and our entire governmental structure was designed to insure their protection. Nonetheless, it must be recognized that the need for protection of our civil liberties occurs in areas of controversy, usually in cases of minorities or unpopular individuals. Accordingly, proposed legislation in this area frequently produces more heat than light.

Finally, it must be recognized that the Supreme Court of the United States today has become a center of controversy and sometimes even the subject of controversy. That this is so is to be regretted, but it is not without precedent. In fact, it is inevitable that the decision of the Court as the ultimate guardian of the rights of the individual and as the final arbiter of the validity of legislation will be the subject of controversy. This has been the Courts' entire history with only intervening periods of relative quiet.

It is not surprising then that the resolutions considered by the house of delegates were the subject of widespread interest or that the impact of association action was reflected in strong reactions of both approval and disapproval depending upon the interests and predilections of the individuals involved.

What is surprising is the fact that reaction in so many cases has been based upon misapprehension or misconstruction of the action actually taken by the association. This has been reflected in statements by men in public life in Washington, by newspaper editorials and in the voluminous mail that I have been receiving.

Any fair construction of the action of the association must be made on the basis of the resolutions which the house actually adopted. I submit that those resolutions, when read objectively are:

"1. An expression of concern as to the threat of communism to our internal security;

"2. A request for legislation in five specific areas which will strengthen our internal security by remedying defects in legislation which were pointed out in Supreme Court decisions;

"3. A recognition of the position of the Supreme Court of the United States as the final guardian of our individual liberties, and of the obligation of the Bar to defend the courts;

"4. Reaffirmance of the position of the American Bar Association in opposing the Jenner and Jenner-Butler bills of the last Congress and other legislation which would curtail the appellate jurisdiction of the Court;

"5. A request for improvements in the creation and procedure of congressional committees which would meet the standards set out by the Court in the Watkins decision, and, at the same time afford better protection to witnesses appearing before such committees;

"6. A request for continuation of the work of the committees of the Congress dealing with internal security matters."

I might add that resolutions similar to this have been adopted by the house heretofore.

Press reports, editorials and public statements which labeled the action of the house of delegates as an attack by the bar upon the Supreme Court of the United States were, in my opinion, and I believe in the opinion of the great majority of the members of the house of delegates, wholly unjustified and contrary to fact. Not only did they ignore all portions of the resolutions except those calling for legislation, the necessity for which has been diselosed by decisions of the Supreme Court, but, in addition, they attributed to the house of delegates approval of statements within the 50-page committee report which the house not only did not approve, but which, under the procedures of the house, it could not act upon in any respect.

In all fairness, I must confess that to an outsider the distinction between resolutions adopted by the house, which represent the position of the association, and the report of a committee which accompanies proposed resolutions to the house and which reflects only the views of the committee members who sign it, is quite finely drawn and likely to result in confusion. Nonetheless, to the members of the house in passing upon recommendations of literally dozens of committees and sections, it constitutes a very real distinction.

The board of governors made that fact quite plain in the statement by which it transmitted the resolutions proposed by the committee to the house. After recommending approval, in order to correct legislative defects in the field of internal security revealed by particular decisions, the board of governors said:

"The recommendation for approval, in the case of this report as in the case of all other reports of association sections and committees, does not constitute endorsement of statements in the report itself, such statements being those of the individual members of the committee."

The press of the United States has provided convincing evidence that construction of the house action as an attack upon the Supreme Court is unjustified. In spite of the fact that headlines such as "Bar Attacks Court" had resulted from some press reports, almost all editorial comment, written in the light of the actual resolutions adopted by the house, has found the action to be, as I believe that it was, a considered, constructive request for needed legislation. Certain editorial writers have recognized that the need for the legislation was disclosed by court decisions which revealed defects in existing laws. Equally they have recognized that the bar was evidencing its conviction that the legislation had desirable

objectives and that the requirements pointed out by the Court's opinions should be met through curative legislation. Only a small minority, however, have seen in the action anything even approaching an attack upon the Court or even disagreement with the correctness of the decisions themselves.

This has been true of newspapers of all shades of opinion. Thus, the Chicago Tribune did not find the resolutions to be an attack on the Court, but rather that they were "respectful of the Court."

The Boston Herald, after commenting on the known conservative mindedness of the association (which I think is equally applicable to the profession as a whole) said:

"Yet its report and recommendations with respect to recent Supreme Court decisions in the security field are surprisingly moderate.

"We cannot agree with all the ABA's proposals for remedial legislation. But the general approach the lawyers recommend is unexceptionable, and so is their language.

"The bar is performing a useful and appropriate function when it offers Congress recommendations in this area. Its main position is clearly in defense of the institution of the judiciary.

"This is a conservatism of which we can use more."

The San Francisco Chronicle observed:

"The action this week of the association's house of delegates at Chicago has been widely headlined as a slap at the Court. As a matter of fact, the house of delegates declined to go along with some of the Court's more intemperate critics and it usefully and wisely disapproved proposals to limit the Court's appellate jurisdiction."

After referring to the specific recommendations for legislative action, the Chronicle commented that "These recommendations are hard to quarrel with" and concluded "A careful reading of the actual ABA recommendations leads to the conclusion that the hotheads in the anti-Court faction of the ABA were repudiated."

These editorial writers, and others I could quote, clearly reached a conclusion as to the action of the house of delegates which was directly contrary to the impression gained in many parts of the country that the association had attacked the Court. I believe that their conclusions are sound. I believe that those conclusions represent the state of mind and intentions of the vast majority of the house of delegates when they voted upon these resolutions.

A SOUND DECISION—SUPPORTED BY A VAST MAJORITY

Because I believe that, and that an erroneous impression was created in many parts of the country as to the implications of the action of the house of delegates, I have been attempting to do what I can to get all interested persons to read and judge for themselves as to the action of the house and the position of the association. In so doing I want to make it clear that I am in no sense making apologies for the action of the house; neither am I seeking to pour oil on troubled waters. I have the utmost confidence in the lawyers of the United States and in their representatives who constitute the house of delegates. I think that their action was sound, and I believe that the vast majority of the United States will agree, if the action is judged on the resolutions which were adopted and not on erroneous conclusions drawn from them.

I recognize, however, that there is room for legitimate disagreement with the position actually taken by the association. To one who feels that the legislation recommended would constitute a peril to individual liberties in the United States, not justified by the threat of communism to our internal security, the action of the house is unsound—and he is certainly entitled to so view the situation. I cannot, however, find in the resolutions adopted by the house support for any statement that the American Bar Association has attacked the Supreme Court, has "maligned" the Court or in any sense has been unfaithful to the primary duty of the profession to "maintain the respect due to courts of justice and judicial officers" and to "maintain toward the courts a respectful attitude, not for the sake of the temporary incumbent of the judicial office, but for the maintenance of its supreme importance."

The vast majority of the lawyers of the United States, and the American Bar Association as the national voice of the profession, have demonstrated time and again their appreciation of their responsibility toward the courts and particularly toward the Supreme Court of the United States.

In 1937 the bar rallied to the defense of the Court against attacks from the Executive and from the left. In 1958, it rallied to the defense of the Court from attacks from the legislative branch and from the right. In both instances the decisions which had brought on the controversies were in highly controversial areas. There was no unanimity of opinion within the profession as to the correctness of these decisions. Be it said to the credit of the bar that it was not on that basis that the position of the bar was determined. Rather, it was on the basis of our knowledge of the delicate balance which must be maintained in the separation of powers of the three branches of our Government and upon our realization that only through the existence of an independent judiciary can individual freedom in this country be preserved and liberty under law be a reality. I have no hesitation in predicting that whenever that issue is presented the bar will be found as it is found today, in the foremost ranks of the supporters of the Supreme Court of the United States as a vital institution of our Government.

Mr. Speaker, also I call to your attention, and to the attention of my other colleagues, an editorial appearing in the same issue of the American Bar Association Journal on the same subject:

THE INTERNAL SECURITY RESOLUTIONS

The action of the house of delegates on the recommendations of the special committee on Communist tactics has drawn widespread national attention and a great deal of publicity, not all of it accurate, and some of it distorted, doubtless because issued without having the resolutions themselves available. Some of the distortion and confusion is doubtless due to lack of understanding that the action of the house did not include either adoption or approval of the report of the committee. This report represented only the views of the committee and not the views of the association; and it was so stated. The action of the house was specifically confined to the amendment and adoption of certain resolutions submitted by the committee. Therefore, a brief summary of the salient features of the resolutions approved by the house seems pertinent. The key features of these resolutions are:

1. It was resolved to "disapprove proposals to limit any jurisdiction vested in the U.S. Supreme Court."

2. It was resolved that the Congress should enact into law "a specific pronouncement of congressional intention that State statutes proscribing sedition against the United States shall have concurrent enforceability."

3. It was resolved to recommend that "the House of Representatives rewrite and adopt its basic resolution of authority for the Committee on Un-American Activities, under the same name or such name as such legislative body shall designate, setting forth that the purpose in creating said committee is to study the operation of existing laws and the requirements of further legislation, in addition to defining clearly and adequately the powers of such committee." Citing *Watkins v. U.S.*

4. It was resolved to recommend to the Congress "that whenever any of its committees subpenas a witness to appear and testify or to give evidence, such committee should furnish the witness at the time he is subpenaed with a copy in writing of the precise terms of the basic authority of the committee."

5. It was resolved that where "problems of safeguarding National and State security have been exposed or created" by Supreme Court decisions, Congress should undertake "the prompt and careful consideration and study of recent decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court, and the preparation and passage of separate amendments to the laws involved so as to remove any doubt as to the intent of the Congress, and to remedy any defect in the existing law revealed by the decisions."

6. It was resolved "that legislation be promptly enacted to eliminate obstacles to the preservation of our internal security in the following areas":

(a) "Amend the Smith Act to define the word 'organize'."

(b) "Amend the Smith Act to make it a crime intentionally to advocate the violent overthrow of the Government of the United States, or to teach the necessity, desirability or duty of seeking to bring about such overthrow (see *Yates v. U.S.*)."

(c) "Establish the right of each branch of Government to require as a condition of employment that each employee thereof shall not refuse to answer a query before a duly constituted committee of Congress or before duly authorized officers of either the executive or judicial branches of the Government with respect to Communist, Communist front or other subversive activities or any matter bearing upon his loyalty to the United States, as the Government has the right to know his record."

(d) "Invest the executive branch of the Government with the right to protect our internal security against the activities of aliens who were Communists at the time of their entry into the United States or became Communists at any time subsequent to their entry into the United States by providing for their deportation without any deprivation of due process."

(e) "Insure the effectiveness of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1948 by a requirement that political propaganda by agents of foreign principals be labeled for what it is where such agents are situated outside the limits of the United States, but nevertheless directly or indirectly disseminate such propaganda within the United States."

7. It was resolved that "the House of Representatives continue to maintain a committee to investigate matters relating to national security with particular emphasis on Communist activities, invested with adequate jurisdiction to accomplish its purpose, and that the Senate continue to maintain and support its Subcommittee on Internal Security."

8. It was further resolved that such congressional committees "maintain close liaison with the Intelligence and Security Agencies, as well as with the Attorney General of the United States, to the end that they may be kept advised as to legislative needs of the executive branch of the Government required to carry out its responsibilities for internal security."

In the best tradition of the bar, the house of delegates, just as in the Court-packing days of 1937, defended the Court as an indispensible arm of government to decide cases and controversies, reserving, however, to the members of the bench, the bar and the public, equally and at all times the right to criticize the Court's decisions and to suggest corrective legislation to solve problems "exposed or created thereby."

Except to refresh memories, it hardly needs recording that some of the most vigorous criticisms of certain of these decisions come from dissenting members of the Court itself, whose right to criticize the actions of the judicial department are no less and no greater than that of the humblest American citizen.

As said by Mr. Justice Black in 1941, in The Los Angeles Times case: "The assumption that respect for the judiciary can be won by shielding judges from public criticism wrongly appraises the character of American public opinion."

Mr. Justice Frankfurter, dissenting in the same case, nevertheless concurred on this phase, as follows: "Therefore, judges must be kept mindful of their limitations and of their ultimate public responsibility by a vigorous stream of criticism expressed with candor however blunt."

Taking cognizance of criticism of some of the Court's opinions, the house of delegates has asked Congress to evaluate the criticisms and the recommendations and to act accordingly.

Repeal the Wartime Tax on Communications

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. SLACK, JR.
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, during wartime, when special pressures dictate the actions of the Congress, measures are often enacted which are intended to serve a limited purpose and to be repealed with the end of hostilities. The present tax on communications is an excellent case in point. It was levied to raise funds for the war effort, but had the additional objective of discouraging the use of communication facilities for other than necessary purposes. This tax is a relic of the days of gasoline rationing and the little red and green commodity stamps, and should have passed away when they did.

In today's expanding economy, with all goods and services in amply supply, this tax is extremely discouraging to business incentive, because it keeps the public conception of the actual price of the product distorted and thereby undermines orderly future planning in a regulated industry. It is regressive in its application because it strikes hardest at those communication companies which have shared least in postwar prosperity by virtue of their location in areas clouded by depressed economic conditions.

I have joined the ranks of those who have introduced bills to repeal this tax, and as evidence of the strong desire for such repeal among our people I would like to call your attention to the following resolution passed at the recently concluded session of the West Virginia legislature:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION No. 43

Resolution urging repeal of excise taxes on communication services and transportation of persons

Whereas the Federal excise taxes on public utility and transportation services were initially levied or greatly increased during World War II to help defray war costs and to discourage unnecessary use of such services; and

Whereas Congress has acted to remove a substantial portion of this discriminatory tax burden on public utility and transportation services by elimination of excise taxes on the use of electrical energy and the shipment of goods and property; and

Whereas today, more than 13 years after cessation of hostilities, the excise taxes on communication services and the for-hire transportation of persons are still in effect and are continuing to discourage the public use of these services which are now the only services, regulated or unregulated, against which any Federal excise taxes are levied; and

Whereas a committee of the 85th Congress rejected a proposal for the enactment of legislation which would have repealed or reduced the Federal excise taxes on communication services and the transportation of persons even though the repeal of the discriminatory excise taxes would immediately release upwards of $86½ million annually to the West Virginia economy: Therefore be it

Resolved by the house of delegates (the senate concurring therein), That the Legislature of the State of West Virginia is of the opinion that the discriminatory excise taxes on communications and transportation services are not in the public interest, that such taxes should not continue to be levied by the Federal Government; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress is hereby petitioned to terminate the discriminatory excise taxes on all communications and transportation services at the earliest possible date; and be it further

Resolved, That the clerk of the house of delegates forward a copy of this resolution to Congressman WILBUR MILLS, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee of the 86th Congress, and to the U.S. Senators and Members of the House of Representatives from West Virginia.

Foreign Trade Requires Fairer Standards of Competition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, it has been a favorite charge of many of those favoring completely free trade abroad that those who seek regulation of imports by tariffs or quotas are motivated by fear and dislike of competition as such. This, of course, is not true. Americans more than the people of any other country have lived with competition, believe in competition, and are not afraid of it.

At the same time, since 1890, when Congress passed the Sherman Antitrust Act, we have made extensive efforts to see that domestic competition be fair. Subsequent legislation has included the Sherman Act, the Federal Trade Commission, and the Robinson-Patman Act. Fairness of competition was also a prime objective of the minimum wage and maximum hour law and the Walsh-Healy Public Contracts Act. Here the idea was that wages should not be used as a means of gaining a competitive advantage.

Clearly, American industry is not afraid of competition so long as it is fair. I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD a letter written by Mr. O. R. Strackbein in reply to one from a member of the British Parliament. The letter has to do with a charge from a member of the House of Commons much the same as that of our freer-trade advocates that we are afraid of competition. The letter, which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on March 30, 1959, follows:

UNWANTED COMPETITION

Your issue of March 23 carried a letter from the Honorable John Hall, British Conservative Member of Parliament, remonstrating against what he chooses to call our fear of competition from abroad, as distinguished from domestic competition. He shows himself particularly concerned about certain Government contracts that have been awarded to American firms, one of them relating to electrical turbines for the Greers Ferry Dam.

His exceptions are, by and large, temperate and well taken. He goes so far as to say that "we do not question your right to have buy American laws if you feel that you need them." No doubt Mr. Hall is aware that Britain itself has laws corresponding to our Buy American Act, such as the Safeguarding of Industries Act, and therefore has some appreciation of our position. Their law is quite restrictive on a number of items.

Mr. Hall says there is mounting irritation over our treatment of wool, lead and zinc. He refers to our tariff quota on woolen goods and our outright quota on lead and zinc.

The tariff quota on woolens resulted from a reservation made in our negotiation of a tariff reduction in Geneva under the auspices of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade in 1947. We cut our duty roughly in half but reserve the right to hold this reduction in bounds if imports should exceed 5 percent of our own production of similar woolen fabrics. All imports in excess of the 5 percent would then pay the old rate. Imports up to 5 percent of our production, however, would continue to pay the lower rate.

We invoked this reservation effective October 1, 1956, as we had every right to do under the agreement. Since then British exports of woolens to this country have declined materially even though our total imports have held up. Britain's trouble has been not with our tariff quota but with Japanese and Italian encroachment on her market in this country. Realistic as they are, the British would now like to see allocations so that Britain could not be driven out of our market.

Why are the British afraid of Japanese and Italian competition? Are her reasons about the same as our fear of competition from abroad? Somewhat; but there is a difference in degree. The differential in wages between England and the two other countries is not nearly as great as between our wages and those prevailing in other countries (Canada excepted).

Why then do we not fear domestic competition? The answer should now be obvious to Mr. Hall. We do not fear essentially fair competition, just as England does not. We do fear, as do the British, low-wage competition against which there is no defense, since we do not control such competition. Our cost-raising legislation, such as the wage and hour law, does not extend beyond our borders. With the rapid mechanization of the industry of other countries our own industries are as rapidly losing such competitive advantage as they may have had, and costwise they are falling behind.

Surely the British can understand this if they will look in the mirror.

O. R. STRACKBEIN,
Chairman, Nationwide Committee on Import-Export Policy.
WASHINGTON.

The Universal Message of Mohammed Iqbal, Poet-Philosopher of Pakistan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address given at the Islamic Center in Washington on the 21st anniversary of the death of Mohammed Iqbal, who combined in an inspiring way the mysticism of the East and the realism of the West. His roots were in the Muslim faith and culture but his message was to all mankind:

THE UNIVERSAL MESSAGE OF MOHAMMED IQBAL
POET-PHILOSOPHER OF PAKISTAN

(Address of WALTER H. JUDD, Member of Congress, at the Islamic Center, Washington, D.C., April 21, 1959)

Your Excellencies, ladies and gentlemen, we are living today in a world of unprecedented ferment and change. A large part of mankind has just begun to breathe the intoxicating air of human freedom. At the same moment another large section of human beings is being forced to don prison garb, regimented and driven like beasts of burden. Important segments of the world's population are being forced by events to decide whether they can best attain their hoped-for political and economic development by democratic or by authoritarian means.

In such times as these, it is a good thing for us to pause to contrast the eternal truths preached by the great spiritual leaders of mankind with the crass ideologies of those who would crush the human spirit and make man an instrument for the creation of a soulless state.

After all, what is man? That is the question asked by man himself, universally.

Some years ago I heard the eminent Lebanese philosopher, Dr. Charles Malik, now President of the United Nations General Assembly, say that when the Conference on Human Rights convened in Paris after World War II, the delegates spent several months trying, in vain, to agree on an answer to that ultimate question. For how could they declare what the rights are to which a human being is entitled until they decided what a human being is?

One of the great spirits of modern times to whom free men can go for renewal of their faith in God and in man, was the Muslim poet whose memory we revere tonight. Mohammed Iqbal, the man who dreamed a dream for the Muslims of the south Asian subcontinent and whose dream became reality in the creation of the nation of Pakistan, held no brief for those who would attain even the precious goals of political and economic independence by destroying the identity of the human being. Rather did he sing of the sanctity of human life, of the grandeur of the human self, and of the inviolability of the human personality.

Like all who profess the Jewish, the Christian, or the Muslim faith, Mohammed Iqbal conceived of man as being created in the image of God. In the core of his philosophy he held that the human personality, being created in the image of God, should be developed in a way to prove itself worthy of being in that image. Those things which fortified the human personality, said Iqbal, were good; those which weakened it were bad. Is there a better test?

His concept of the nature of man reminds those who have American heritage of the words of those who founded our Nation. "We hold these truths to be self-evident," they said, "that all men are created * * *." They based their whole venture on that great act of faith: that there is a Creator, that man is His child and therefore partakes of His nature. Man has from his Creator the capacity to make moral judgments and decisions. Man can become more and more like his Creator, if he will. To do so is the deepest joy and the richest fulfillment of life. And the more man becomes one with God, the more he becomes one with all mankind.

The faith regarding the nature of man, and of God, and of the universe that filled Iqbal in Asia and inspired the founders of the United States in the Western Hemisphere, is being everywhere coldly and cruelly challenged today. The conflict tearing the world apart is not an old-fashioned struggle for control of land; it is for control of man—the mind of man, the soul of man, the whole of man.

Another great son of Pakistan, Gen. Ayub Khan, now its president, said to a group of us in Lahore one night in 1953, "The time has come in this world struggle when all those who believe in one God, the God of justice and of righteousness—whether Muslims, Christians, or Jews—must stand together against those who believe in no God."

We need to sit at the feet of men like Iqbal whose profound insights and inspiring words help us see afresh not the minor things that separate us—whether race, nationality, language, or culture—but the deep things that unite us—our common faith in God and our common humanity.

Mohammed Iqbal was an extraordinary man in the breadth of his interests and the scope of his accomplishments. He was at once a great poet, a great philosopher, a great lawyer, and a great political thinker. But most of all, he was a great human being, a man who saw as the most significant of human rights the opportunity to serve humanity.

Born in Sialkot, West Pakistan, in 1873, Iqbal received his intermediate education in a Scottish mission school. Here he came under the influence of the prominent Muslim scholar, Mir Hasan—an inspiring personality who perceived the genius of the poet and moulded it.

Finishing his distinguished career at school he joined the Government College, Lahore, where he came in contact with another magnetic personality, Professor Sir Thomas Arnold, who was said to be an embodiment of all that was "the noblest and the best" in Western civilization.

Iqbal's love and appreciation of Eastern values and of Western disciplines, his desire to break down the barriers between East and West, his desire to see his country play its full part in the establishment of world peace, may be related largely to these early influences of his two great teachers.

Equipped with the idea of one humanity and one God as the basis of Muslim culture, which he learned at the feet of Mir Hasan, and the scientific approach of the West to the problems of life, which he gained from Professor Arnold, Iqbal went to Cambridge in 1905. For his further researches he went to Munich where he submitted his thesis, "The Development of Metaphysics in Persia," and obtained his doctorate in philosophy. That same year he was called to the bar, and the mind that had shown its grasp of philosophical ideas and its sensitivity to the things that are not seen, now revealed its ability to master practical legal issues.

Dr. Iqbal returned to India and started his practice at Lahore. He also was professor of oriental learning at the University of the Punjab. He entered political life in 1927 when he was elected to the Punjab Legislative Council, and remained a member for three years. He was elected president of the annual session of the Muslim League held at Allahabad in the year 1930. In his presidential address, he demanded "the formation of a consolidated Muslim State in the best interest of India."

Unfortunately, Iqbal did not live long enough to see the results of his efforts. From 1934 onwards his health deteriorated; he could not accept an invitation to Oxford as Rhodes lecturer in 1935. On the morning of April 21, 1938, his body breathed its last. But his words, like his spirit, will be immortal.

Iqbal's philosophy of life accepted the principles of freedom, equality, and love as the basis of world brotherhood. His concept for the new country of Pakistan, whose formation he did so much to inspire, was the establishment of a society deeply interested in the service of humanity, in the promotion of peace and in providing equal opportunities for all, irrespective of color, caste or creed. There was no conflict in him, as there need be none in you or me, between love of country and love of mankind. To work for the proper interests of one was to promote the well-being of the other.

Iqbal devoted the greater part of his life to giving people a faith in such an ideology of love and peace. His poems continue to speak that message to all men of all continents and cultures today.

Iqmal's faith in humanity was not misplaced. Along with the great cleavages that exist in the world today and occupy most of our attention, there is, nevertheless, a vast movement among the free peoples of the world to understand each other, to respect each other, and to inspire in each other mutual confidence and trust. It goes beyond mere tolerance of other cultures than one's own; there is increasing appreciation of other cultures—and the values in them. Understanding, appreciation, confidence, and trust are the spiritual foundations for any world order that is to withstand the ideological onslaughts of those who worship the material state and are determined to impose it on all mankind.

We Americans, as we take part in this tribute to the great poet-philosopher of Pakistan, are grateful that our own national leadership is alive to the need for the peoples of the world to know each other better. The President of the United States has advocated that people of all nations seek each other out and learn more of each other not by just one method, but by thousands of methods. This people-to-people diplomacy, which is certainly in the spirit of Iqbal's concept of the universality of mankind, can become a powerful force in determining the course of world events. Even tyrannies eventually have to pay some attention to changing attitudes and wishes among the peoples under them.

Our gathering tonight exemplifies the sort of relationship between persons of all sorts of backgrounds, races, and cultures which creates a genuine feeling of brotherhood. Americans and Europeans as well as Middle Easterners and South Asians; Muslims, Jews, and Christians we are gathered here to pay homage to a great Muslin spirit in a Muslin House of God. The memorial service in which we are taking part is sponsored by an American organization, the Council on Islamic Affairs, which is composed of Christians, Jews, and Muslims. We are gathered together because our desire to pay tribute to a great man is a bond which transcends differences of cultures, creeds and nationalities.

More and more people-to-people partnerships are being created as the human race gropes its way toward the spiritual perfection which Iqbal called "being worthy of having been created in the image of God."

Who can measure the constructive influence of an institution like the American University at Beirut, not only on the peoples of the Middle East from whom most of its students have come, but on the whole world, including the impact its many graduates have had at the United Nations and other international gatherings to which, because of their superior training and broadened outlook, they have been sent as delegates?

It was a desire to help relieve the suffering of people in need that sent me to China long ago, there to work for 10 years as a physician to men, women, and children of all walks of life as they came into my clinic. But I received more than I gave, and I learned more than I taught. That is what generally happens when men join hands to try to meet human needs.

Wherever some human beings have escaped the control of tyrants to become refugees on the face of the earth—from China, from Hungary, now from Tibet—other human beings from many countries have promptly volunteered to bring them relief, food, medical care, and, if possible, a new home somewhere and a new life of dignity and usefulness. Mohammed Iqbal would have been in the heart of all such efforts.

For he knew that some men are cruel and evil; but he believed that most men want to be kindly and good. In the universally understood language and symbolism of beautiful poetry, he called on all to stand together in common service to humanity—in realism opposing the evil of today in order that men may have opportunity freely to pursue, in idealism, their aspirations for tomorrow.

We gratefully honor here tonight the memory of this gifted man and noble spirit. He spoke to his own people, and he speaks also to us. May we refresh our spirits and renew our dedication by joining in his prayer.

"That my life, O God, should be like that of a candle
So that through my efforts
I may try to dispel the darkness of evil
And illumine the whole world."

Excise Taxes on Public Utility Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I submit to the RECORD a resolution of the Public Utilities Commission of the State of Maine, as related to excise taxes on public utility services.

Whereas during World War II the Congress of the United States levied or greatly increased the Federal excise taxes on communication services as a temporary, wartime emergency measure and several years ago the emergency ended and communication services are no longer considered a luxury; and

Whereas Congress has afforded substantial relief from discriminatory tax burdens on public utility services, and of the four essential utilities—heat, power, water, and communications—only communication services are subject to Federal excise taxation; and

Whereas the Federal excise taxes on communication services are discriminatory, have outlived their justification, and should be repealed; and

Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States certain bills which would effect the repeal of these taxes, which should no longer be continued in effect: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Maine Public Utilities Commission does respectfully urge and request the Congress of the United States to provide a measure of needed tax relief to the communication consumers of this country by repealing these "wartime" excise taxes; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution expressing the views of this commission, be sent to each U.S. Senator and Representative from the State of Maine and to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives and to the chairman of the Finance Committee of the U.S. Senate.

Dated at Augusta, Maine, this 14th day of April, A.D. 1959.

Cal-Sag Water Transportation Reaches Maturity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an address delivered by Maj. Gen. Louis J. Rumaggi, division engineer, U.S. Army Engineer Division, before the East Side Chamber of Commerce in Chicago, Ill., on March 30, 1959.

The address follows:

CAL-SAG WATER TRANSPORTATION REACHES MATURITY

(Remarks by Maj. Gen. Louis J. Rumaggi, Division Engineer, U.S. Army Engineer Division, North Central, before East Side Chamber of Commerce, Chicago, Ill., Mar. 30, 1959)

Gentlemen, thank you for having me here tonight. I appreciate the nice introduction and am indeed delighted to be with you. It is a great pleasure, since assembled here are many friends and associates with whom I've worked so intimately in the past 2 years. To them I wish to address my remarks. To those whose hearts and aspirations dwell on this fabulous region, it is a privilege to retell the story of this waterway's improvement, its present status, its future and the effects of these improvements on the welfare of the region.

Here is Judge Butler, the father of the port district, John Killian, Jim Haines and Donald O'Toole of the Calumet region congress, and of course you many, many others of the east side chamber, all strong boosters for this area of industry, who join with me as we are about to realize the culmination of long-sought goals. You have guided this endeavor for a long time and it is now proper that we look up ahead at the prospects of the immediate future.

Also here with me tonight are many who have been my coworkers in the corps. There is Col. John B. W. Corey, your district engineer at Chicago under whose immediate supervision your local projects are being constructed and who so ably pursued his responsibilities in connection with this program.

This is a significant year for the Great Lakes in general, and for this area in particular. With the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway, with the almost feverish activities of business, industry and Government in behalf of Great Lakes navigation, we are witnessing an unprecedented interest in the waterways serving the American heartland.

In developing this basic natural resource we depend on the initiative and leadership of organizations such as yours. Certainly this need for local leadership in providing for our country's progress is appropriate in a democracy. However, this reliance on farsightedness at the local community level carries with it great responsibilities. It requires an enlightened citizenry and an enlightened leadership with a long-range outlook on the future of their people, their lands, their cities and their industries.

It requires, at the local level, vision and devotion to a frequently thankless task of looking after interests of future generations and, incidentally, the future welfare of our Nation.

The local leadership and congressional support in furthering the growth of this region are certainly reflected in the great works which make this area a center of transportation, industry and business, second to none.

With large-scale St. Lawrence Seaway-Great Lakes navigation projects underway, let us first consider the Calumet-Sag region, South Chicago's vital industrial complex.

Accessible to the Great Lakes system via Lake Michigan and the Mississippi-Ohio Rivers systems via the Calumet-Sag Canal, this is an area situated on the crossroads of our Nation's finest transportation facilities.

Here converge waterways, railroads, highways, and air routes to make this truly a foremost transportation and industrial complex.

These great advantages have resulted in the almost fabulous growth of this area.

Now the area is reaching maturity.

The combined impact of the new St. Lawrence Seaway-Great Lakes navigation system and the widening of the Calumet-Sag Canal to accommodate modern inland barge transportation make it self-evident that you have outgrown the early years of pioneering and are now preparing for your most productive accomplishments.

The need for an improved Cal-Sag navigation project was long recognized by local leaders and Congress, and in July 1946 a congressional act finally authorized this important undertaking.

International crisis delayed initiation of construction until late in 1955, but since that time considerable progress has been made.

The first westerly 6 miles of channel widening are virtually complete to its authorized width of 225 feet and 9-foot depth in comparison with the old width of 60 feet provided when the channel was built in 1922. Another section about 4 miles long is approximately 80 percent complete at this time. An additional portion of the work will be placed under contract this year.

That will bring the project to the edge of the heavily congested metropolitan area of Blue Island—a situation which poses many additional problems.

Major among the problems, of course, is the complex of rail and highway bridges crossing the channel in the vicinity of Blue Island. These crossings must be altered to conform to the increased vertical and horizontal clearance requirements of the new improved channel.

I refer particularly in this connection to the Western Avenue Bridge, the Rock Island, Grand Trunk & Western, and the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad bridges, as well as the 139th Street overpass and the Vermont Street and Francisco Avenue underpass, all of which

present major engineering problems. The reconstruction of these inevitably will impose considerable inconvenience to residents and business firms of the area while the work is in progress. However, with the continued cooperation of local interests, the authorities of Cook County and the State of Illinois, I am hopeful that these problems will be worked out to the satisfaction of all concerned. Certainly, transportation into, and through, this area will be greatly facilitated, particularly at 139th Street, Vermont Street, and Francisco Avenue, once grade crossings are eliminated.

While we are on the subject of bridges, it can be reported that the Gulf, Mobile & Ohio Railroad bridge near Lemont is complete with the exception of approaches, work on which will start this spring. Also completed is the new Torrence Avenue overpass. The Michigan Central and Wabash Railroad bridges have been under construction for some time. The Michigan Central bridge is scheduled for completion during 1959, and the Wabash is scheduled to be completed in 1961.

I can also report that the Corps of Engineers is arranging with the bridge owners to start design work on 17 highway bridges which must be either replaced or altered between Sag Junction and 130th Street. If we can adhere to our present construction schedule, all of these bridges will be completed and in use within about 3 years.

Last June 13 we started an additional phase of the Calumet-Sag navigation project with the award of a contract for construction of the Thomas J. O'Brien lock and dam in the Calumet River. This work has been proceeding ahead of schedule and is well advanced at this date.

This structure is aptly named in honor of Congressman O'Brien, dean of the Illinois congressional delegation, who has so effectively supported the needs of this region.

The new lock, upon its completion in 1960, will replace the existing and inadequate Blue Island lock. Measuring 110 feet in width and 1,000 feet in length, it will be fully in keeping with the improved Cal-Sag Channel. Like the channel itself, it will permit the ready movement of modern-sized barge tows and towboat without the necessity of rearranging the barges before entering the lock chamber as at present.

It was also last June that the corps awarded a contract for the widening of Acme Bend, a horseshoe bend in the Little Calumet River. Unfortunately, it was impossible to eliminate the horseshoe entirely because of the heavy industrialization of the area. It was possible, however, to increase the channel width sufficiently to permit the ready movement of barge traffic.

This job will be accomplished before the year is over—a fact which will undoubtedly bring sighs of relief to harried towboat captains who have had the responsibility of negotiating Acme Bend's twists and turns in the past. Accomplishment of this objective alone will mean the excavation and removal of some 1,200,000 cubic yards of material from the channel.

In connection with this reach of the river there is also now in the planning stage the relocation of the Illinois Central Railroad bridge.

With the Cal-Sag Channel assuming the role as a major artery linking traffic of the Illinois Waterway with lake- and ocean-borne traffic at Chicago, it is interesting to recall that initially the channel was never intended for navigation at all. Rather, its original purpose was that of a sanitary canal designed to prevent pollution of Lake Michigan by reversing the flow of the Calumet River.

However, despite the limitation imposed by its narrow width and the maze of restrictive bridges overhead, its increasing use for commercial barge navigation has been little short of amazing. This traffic, during 1958 alone, amounted to approximately 6 million tons in receipts, shipments, and through traffic—a figure which is dwarfed by a predicted 12 million tons or more yearly after completion of the present project.

A large volume of the commerce through the Cal-Sag Channel will terminate, as it does now, along the channel and at the many terminals serving the huge industrial complex in the South Chicago, Indiana Harbor, and Gary regions. In addition, the channel will carry a large volume of traffic to and from the Great Lakes. Upon completion of the St. Lawrence Seaway this spring, the through traffic to and from the Great Lakes will be further extended through the St. Lawrence River and to foreign ports via the Atlantic Ocean.

Of prime importance in this regard has been the development of Lake Calumet Harbor by the Chicago Regional Port District. This facility already has assumed a significant role as a transshipment center serving not only waterway navigation and lake carriers but rail and truck transportation as well.

We are engaged at present only on part 1 of the Cal-Sag navigation project. From Sag Junction to Lake Calumet. There remains, as funds are made available, the widening and deepening of the Grand Calumet River, the replacement or alteration of numerous rail and highway bridges, and the widening to 225 feet of the Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal from Sag Junction to Lockport. Still another important milepost in the project will be achieved with the construction of a lock and controlling works in the Grand Calumet River just west of its junction with the Indiana Harbor Canal.

On the basis of 1958 price and wage levels, it is estimated that the Cal-Sag navigation project, in its entirety, will represent a total investment of $202 million. Of this amount, the Federal Government will assume an expenditure of $147 million.

The question as to whether or not this investment is worthwhile has been answered in the form of conservative estimates. These estimates indicate that, for every dollar expended on construction, operation and maintenance cost, the Cal-Sag navigation project will yield approximately $2.20 in savings and benefits.

Any discussion of the Cal-Sag navigation project must take into consideration the Illinois Waterway, of which it is a vital and integral part.

Stretching 327 miles from its junction with the Mississippi River at Grafton to Lake Michigan at Chicago, it provides a series of seven locks and dams which progressively elevate upbound traffic to the level of the lake or lower downbound navigation to that of the Mississippi. The seven locks are La Grange, Peoria, Starved Rock, Marseilles, Dresden Island, Brandon Road, and Lockport.

Together with necessary channel dredging, the seven locks and dams have been the instrument of canalizing the waterway and of creating a series of pools. The resultant benefits to commercial navigation have been significant. Since the improved Illinois Waterway was opened for use by the Corps of Engineers in 1935, commercial navigation carried over it has increased steadily and rapidly. It has increased from 1,700,000 tons in 1935—its first year of operation—to 23 million tons in 1958.

What commodities comprise this teeming water commerce? Where is its origin and destination? It includes many thousands of tons of coal, loaded on barges at Havana, Ill., and headed for Chicago, where much of it is transformed into electric power. It includes petroleum products from Mississippi River ports destined for Peoria, Chicago, and intermediate terminals. Grain and sand and gravel, iron and steel products and an increasingly wide range of manufactured products make up much of the balance. Increasingly in recent years, varied products from points as remote as South America, Puerto Rico, Florida, and Texas have moved along the waterway in transit to northern destinations.

I must emphasize here that all of the credit for the development of the Illinois Waterway as a major artery of commerce does not belong to the Corps of Engineers. Initially the State of Illinois had appropriated $20 million for the project and had accomplished much of the construction of locks at Starved Rock, Marseilles, Dresden Island, Brandon Road, and Lockport. The State met a further requirement in the construction or alteration of five railroad bridges spanning the waterway. In accordance with the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1930, the State later transferred to the Federal Government its partially completed project on the Illinois and Des Plaines Rivers between Utica and Lockport.

Lasting credit belongs to local leaders who had the foresight and provided lands, rights-of-way and other local cooperation required under the various river and harbor acts authorizing the project. Indeed, it took more than wishful thinking to get the job done.

As for future growth of the waterway, I need only cite from House document 677 of the 79th Congress. This report placed at 27 million tons the ultimate annual potential of traffic on the waterway between Brandon road and Sag junction within a period of 25 or 30 years following completion of the Cal-Sag navigation project. Likewise, prospective commerce on the waterway below Lockport is conservatively estimated at 32,700,000 tons by the year 1970 and—beyond that—at 55 million tons by the year 2000.

The facilities of the Illinois Waterway, the capacity of its seven locks and dams, are of course not commensurate with even a fraction of such an increase in commercial navigation.

The size of the present locks, 110 feet in width and 600 feet in length, is the principal factor which limits the size of tows on the waterway, particularly below Lockport. These restrictive dimensions result in congestion at the various locks as barge tows await their turn for passage. In order to get through at all, many tows must be rearranged and "jack-knifed" prior to entering the lock chambers, entailing time consuming delays.

To investigate this problem, Congress directed a study to be made by the corps of engineers, and as a result, a system of duplicate locks was recommended. Each additional lock would be 1,200 feet long and 110 feet wide. The system of duplicate locks would be constructed at each of the 7 locks, not immediately, but at such time as the traffic at each existing lock reaches its practical capacity.

This study is now subject to congressional action.

I now wish to describe briefly the present activities of the corps of engineers in the interest of deep-draft navigation on the Great Lakes.

There are 3 major items of work which must be accomplished to provide needed 27-foot controlling depth in the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence navigation system to accommodate modern shipping. There is the St. Lawrence Seaway which will provide 27-foot depth from Montreal to Lake Erie; the Great Lakes connecting channels which will provide 27-foot controlling depth from Lake Erie to the upper 3 lakes—Huron, Michigan, and Superior; and the deepening of Great Lakes Harbors required to accommodate the deep-draft vessel traffic anticipated to use the improved connecting channels and the St. Lawrence Seaway.

The St. Lawrence Seaway, the first of the three major items of work, will be open for deep-draft traffic by the beginning of the navigation season. In this historic undertaking, the Corps of Engineers served as design and construction agents for the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation. The seaway will provide a 27-foot channel from the ocean through the St. Lawrence River, Lake Ontario, and the Welland Canal into Lake Erie, replacing the old channel with a limiting depth of 14 feet in the St. Lawrence River above Montreal and of 25 feet in the Welland Canal between Lakes Erie and Ontario.

From Lake Erie to the upper three lakes, the controlling depths in the connecting channels are now 21 feet in upbound and 25 feet in downbound channels. These are being deepened to provide controlling depths of 27 feet for both upbound and downbound traffic. The present estimated cost of the connecting channels deepening is about $146 million, of which $45 million have been appropriated to date.

There are two upbound channels with controlling depths of 21 feet—one is the Amherstburg Channel in the Detroit River and the other is the Middle Neebish Channel in the St. Marys River. The first step in the construction program is to improve the westerly 300-foot width of these 21-foot upbound channels to provide a controlling depth of 27 feet. These channels will be used for deep-draft downbound traffic when the parallel downbound channels are being deepened since they must be closed to traffic while the work is underway. Deepening of the two upbound channels commenced in 1957 and is planned for completion in 1960.

Contracts have also been let for deepening the approach channel to the head of the St. Clair River at the foot of Lake Huron, for deepening the channel through Lake Nicolet and the Lake Nicolet anchorage area in the St. Marys River. Present schedules contemplate that 27-foot depths will be available in all of the connecting channels above Lake Erie by the middle of the summer of 1963. This will provide the second major item of work for the 27-foot Great Lakes system.

The third major item in providing a 27-foot depth navigation system on the Great Lakes is the deepening of harbors and probably some other improvements required to accommodate the increasing number of large deep-draft vessels.

In response to congressional directives, we are now engaged in a comprehensive study to determine the advisability of further improvements at harbors on the Great Lakes in the interest of present and prospective deep-draft commerce with due regard to the scheduled time of completion of the St. Lawrence Seaway and the deepening of the Great Lakes connecting channels. In these studies the improvements proposed at any individual locality must be justified on their respective merits. Our studies to determine improvements which can be justified at Great Lakes harbors involve three major elements—namely, traffic analysis, engineering studies, and an economic analysis.

The first step is to do the necessary research to form a basis for estimating the reasonably prospective waterborne commerce to and from a harbor. Next, an estimate must be made of the character of the vessel fleet which will carry this commerce. After preparation of these estimates of prospective commerce, engineering studies are undertaken to determine whether the considered improvements can be justified on the basis of savings in transportation costs resulting from such improvements. Each harbor situation is an individual problem and must be given special study to assure that the estimated savings will actually be realized because of the reduced cost of transportation as compared to the cost by any known present or prospective alternative means. Improvements are not recommended for authorization unless there is a clear showing that the annual benefits exceed the annual costs of the proposed improvements.

These Great Lakes harbors studies are being processed so as to accomplish the most productive work in the shortest possible time. In many cases interim survey reports are being submitted to consider improvements required to serve navigation involved in the transportation of bulk commodities of major importance, such as iron ore, stone, coal, and grain. This is being done since economic analysis for improvements serving the transportation of such bulk commodities can be completed in a much shorter time than traffic analysis for general cargo.

Interim reports have already been submitted on 15 harbors as part of our Great Lakes harbors study.

The importance of prospective general cargo or miscellaneous bulk cargo traffic through the St. Lawrence Seaway is also fully recognized. However, the comprehensive studies now underway to develop estimates of such commerce are complex and require more time to complete than those for the bulk commodities. These traffic studies have now advanced to the point that we will soon be able to consider general cargo overseas traffic in our reports. We hope, if sufficient funds are made available, to complete all of our Great Lakes harbors studies in the near future.

Gentlemen, as we review past accomplishments and current efforts in the interest of Cal-Sag and Great Lakes navigation, we must agree that waterborne transportation is not a thing of the past, indeed it is only now reaching maturity.

As we progress in the further development of our lakes and rivers in the service of man and his economy, we witness a new era for mid-America. In these accomplishments, the Federal Congress and the local interests have joined with the Army and the Corps of Engineers in the closest cooperation and mutual support.

As we pass the halfway mark of the 20th century, we face a future of unequaled opportunities limited only by our own imaginations and initiative. And as I complete my service, I wish you well in your efforts to build a greater Cal-Sag region and a greater Chicago.

The horizon of opportunity is broad, clear, and unclouded. There is room for grand endeavor here in Chicago. If I were a young man once again, I would equip myself to take a role in Chicago's bright future. I urge you to continue in your drive to keep Chicago in the forefront of American progress.

Golden Jubilee of the Greater Philadelphia Magazine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted in honor of the golden jubilee of the Greater Philadelphia magazine, 1831 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa.:

Whereas the stimulation of industry and commerce has and always shall be a privileged function in these United States; and

Whereas local efforts to stimulate industry and commerce have and always shall be an important part of the national effort; and

Whereas the contributions in the Philadelphia area toward prosperity and employment are, in fact, contributions toward prosperity and employment in all parts of the United States; and

Whereas over the past half century, the Greater Philadelphia magazine has made significant contribution to the growth and vigor of industry and commerce in Philadelphia and, indirectly, throughout the Nation as a whole: Now, therefore, on the occasion of the golden jubilee of the Greater Philadelphia magazine, it is

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States of America extend greetings and wishes for continued long and useful life to the Greater Philadelphia magazine.

Address of the Honorable Carmine G. De Sapio at the Annual Dinner of the New York County Democratic Committee on April 16, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, as the national committeewoman of the State of New York, I would like to bring to your attention the remarks of the Honorable Carmine G. De Sapio, the national committeeman of the Democratic Party of the State of New York. He made his address at the annual dinner of the New York County Democratic Committee, Thursday evening, April 16 ,1959, at the Hotel Commodore in New York. In this address he took issue with those who were critical of his leadership. In reading his address, I hope all will bear in mind that it was under the leadership of Mr. De Sapio that the Honorable W. Averell Harriman was elected Governor of the State of New York, and that the Honorable Robert F. Wagner was elected mayor of the city of New York.

The address follows:

My good friends, since the last time we met together, the people of our communities—as well as our Democratic Party here in New York—have undergone a series of very instructive, if not altogether fortunate, experiences.

To the younger people among us, some of these experiences have been rather bewildering. To those of us who are in our middle years, they have represented some striking parallels with the past.

These same experiences have demonstrated to many of the oldtimers to whom I have talked, that although history may not actually repeat itself, it does provide numerous examples of the people's ability to recognize that politics offers an astonishingly accurate means of predicting certain patterns of behavior.

To others, who are not here with us this evening, but who nevertheless have sought to leave certain impressions upon us, these experiences have proved to be too challenging. And the members of this latter group, to the regret of all of us who have had cause to admire and to respect them in the past, have taken refuge in bitterness, in acrimony, and in political secession.

And it is for us, for all of us who are present here tonight, not really to judge them, but to try to understand them, to examine the facts of their defection from our ranks, to evaluate their reasons for seeking to discrupt the Democratic Party, and to decide if it is possible—if it is desirable—for us to move forward without them or whether we must now seek refuge in conciliation, in compromise, or in capitulation.

This is the choice that they have insisted we must make. And, certainly, in deference to their past service and to their past achievements, we cannot—nor should we wish to—try to avoid making an honest, straightforward reply to their demands.

The issue upon which this controversy turns is liberalism. And in order to resolve it, we must first define liberalism. We must clarify in our minds and within the context of our philosophy whether liberalism is a useful and proper political phenomenon. And we must arrive at a thorough understanding of what is entailed by the espousal and practice of liberalism.

For only when we have arrived at a valid concept of what constitutes a liberal—only then, my friends, can we bring the wrangling and harshness to an end. Only then can we move ahead in unity and in strength. Only then can we give our full attention to the problems and tasks which face our Democratic Party in New York and throughout the Nation.

The time to resolve all of these questions is now.

The dictionaries define "liberal" as follows: "Free to give or bestow; munificent; bountiful; generous; not selfish, narrow, or bigoted; embracing interests other than one's own."

And a liberal individual is further characterized as someone who advocates "greater freedom of thought or action."

It should be obvious from all of this that to be a liberal—or, more accurately, to give the impression of being a liberal—is a very desirable and fashionable political goal.

And, indeed, in recent years, politicians and office seekers of all partisan denominations have made determined efforts to characterize themselves—accurately or otherwise—as liberals.

One of the few nonliberals who was sufficiently honest to admit that he was not a liberal—former Senator William Knowland, of California—learned very dramatically last year that his political theories are not very much in demand in the Unite States these days.

To his credit, if not to the advancement of his political career, Senator Knowland refused—unlike many of his colleagues in the Republican Party and unlike some who persist in identifying themselves as Democrats—he refused to compromise his principles by claiming to be what he knew he was not.

Now, of course, it is possible for anyone who possesses a certain amount of wit and intelligence to rationalize a claim to liberalism.

This was done, in 1952, and again in 1956, for President Eisenhower—by those who conducted his campaigns.

It was done again last year—in a strikingly evocative fashion—by Governor Rockefeller and his supporters.

It is being done today—now—by a splinter group within our own party.

In the case of Mr. Eisenhower, the presidential candidate was characterized by his friends, by his political mentors, and by himself, as a generous and outgoing individual.

Certainly, they declared, this was the hallmark of a liberal.

And it has taken the American people more than 6 long years—years of administrative inaction, retraction, and petrifaction—to reach the conclusion that Eisenhower practices a very special kind of liberalim—phony liberalism—and that his brand of liberalism is indeed based upon generosity, upon a lavish grant of power and privilege to vested industrial interests.

The people, in their observation of this new and callous concept of the Presidency, have learned a lesson that they will not soon forget. This lesson reduces itself to the inevitable logic that the Republican Party—with its false liberalism—has been and is consistently barren of ideas, void of ideals, and bereft of leadership.

In the case of Mr. Rockefeller, the gubernatorial candidate was characterized by his friends, by his political mentors, and by himself, as one who was munificent and bountiful, as one who would maintain at all costs his freedom to give and to bestow.

Certainly, they chanted, this was the hallmark of a liberal.

But the people of New York learned in 6 weeks—to their pain and deep chagrin—that Rockefeller practices precisely the same kind of liberalism as does Eisenhower—a phony liberalism—that his brand of liberalism is indeed based upon bounty and munificence, upon an extravagant subservience to the forces of industrial and financial bigness whose tenacity, voracity, and rapacity have proven to be his principal sources of political inspiration.

The people of our own city, certainly, have found that Rockefeller's freedom to give and bestow is entirely dependent upon the sufferance of upstate Republican legislators who abhor—who simultaneously fear and despise—the very thought of equal citizenship for the 8 million residents of our town.

And the capacity of the Republican legislators for bounty and munificence—much less for political morality—never has been more conspicuously nonexistent than during the first 4 months of 1959.

In the case of the vociferous handful of dissidents within our own party, its members are characterized by their friends, by their supporters, and by themselves as people who advocate greater freedom of thought and action—as people who are neither narrow, nor bigoted, nor selfish.

Surely, they proclaim, these are the hallmarks of liberalism.

But, my friends, it seems to have taken the vast majority of loyal Democrats no time at all to realize that these people, too, share with other self-ordained crusaders a peculiar kind of liberalism, that they, too, practice a phony liberalism, that when they speak of greater freedom of thought and action, they mean freedom to proclaim themselves leaders and candidates—as the case may be—without the mandate of voter support and freedom to act, not merely with a healthy degree of independence, but entirely apart from the great body of our Democratic Party.

Theirs is a concept of liberalism which is based principally upon friction, constriction, and dereliction.

My good friends, by all of these standards, political liberalism as you and I understand it, as our fellow partisans practice it, and as our Democratic Party is pledged to uphold its meaning and traditions, true liberalism has indeed fallen upon hard times.

For those who shout the loudest—those who clamor—about their own liberalism have abandoned the simple definition which provides the real key to the kind of liberalism to which we have dedicated our political creed and which the vast majority of our fellow citizens mean when they speak of liberalism.

The ability—coupled with the passionate determination—to embrace interests other than one's own.

My friends, let us ask the pseudo-liberals, the semi-liberals, the quasi-liberals—let us ask all of the part-time liberals—a few pertinent questions. And let the people judge their answers.

Let us ask Dwight Eisenhower, for example, if it is in keeping with a liberal political philosophy to pursue a national economic policy which enriches your friends in industry and impoverishes countless millions of working people through spiralling living costs, widespread unemployment and the repression of Federal aid in such vital areas of Government service as public health, housing and education.

Ladies and gentlemen—you who fill this room tonight—perhaps you would like to answer the question.

Is that your idea of liberalism?

Let us ask Nelson Rockefeller if it is in keeping with a liberal political philosophy to turn your back on the people who believed your promises, who applauded your pledge of interest in their welfare and who elected you on the basis of your apparent concern for their welfare.

Is it in keeping with political liberalism to break faith with 8 million of your fellow New Yorkers who trusted your declaration of political independence, to levy higher State taxes, to cripple our city's tax program and, at the same time, ruthlessly to slash State aid grants which you promised with such solemn and pious pronouncements only a few months ago?

Ladies and gentlemen—you who sustain and honor a great tradition of political realism—is that your idea of liberalism?

My friends, let us not attempt to hide the fact that there are some people within our own party whose concept of liberalism has suffered serious attrition in recent months.

Let us ask them if it is in keeping with a liberal political philosophy recklessly to condemn the will of the overwhelming majority for the sake of satisfying a sense of prejudice, pique, pride or power. Doesn't their personal ambition threaten the very structure of our party and aren't their actions really designed to tear down our political house?

Is it indicative of their self-ordained liberalism that they have failed to utter a single word in support of Mayor Wagner's and our party's fight for fiscal justice? Or is their silence on the most critical economic issue to face the people of our city in many decades * * * is this silence indicative of their personal approval of the Rockefeller tax and budget programs?

Ladies and gentlemen of the New York County Democratic Committee, perhaps you, again, would like to answer these questions. Is this the kind of behavior that you would interpret as liberalism?

My friends, many great liberal Democrats are present here with us this evening.

Our courageous mayor, Robert F. Wagner, who has carried the fight for public welfare to the people of New York and who has shown them just how shameful and deceitful is the fraud which the Republican-controlled State legislature and its captive Governor are trying to perpetrate in the name of liberalism.

Our brilliant State comptroller, Arthur Levitt, who proudly and vigorously bears the responsibility for preserving some semblance of sanity against the creeping financial crapulence of the Rockefeller administration.

And our very great Governor, Averell Harriman, who lost an election because he refused to betray the proud tradition of true liberalism which is his political heritage, because he refused to match the demagogy, the fakery, and the cynicism of his opponent.

In the past, I have talked often and earnestly—sometimes when it was politically unfashionable to do so—about the need for eliminating hypocrisy from politics and government.

And I submit to you now that never has that need been greater than it is today when anyone with ample lung power and

abundant campaign funds can proclaim himself to be a liberal and stand a fair chance of parlaying that claim into an election victory.

Let us pledge—here and now, tonight—in preparation for the momentous, rapidly approaching national elections, that we will work to restore this much-abused word "liberalism" to a place of honor in the lexicon of politics.

Let us place our concept of liberalism before the people. Let us—diligently and with all of the eloquence that we can summon—expose political fraud and hypocrisy wherever we may find it.

Let us not be afraid to repudiate—decisively and with determination—anyone in our own ranks who may be guilty of false liberalism. Let us use our own innovation of the direct election of district leaders by the people—an innovation which we have pioneered—let us use this technique of Democratic liberalism to accomplish our objectives.

For only by an honest and searching examination of our own political consciences can we achieve maximum unity and strength.

And only through our dedication to a political philosophy which accurately reflects the genuine liberalism of the people whom we represent can we claim, can we earn—and can we win—the exciting and challenging political battles which loom before us.

Thank you very much.

Where Protection Isn't

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Daily News of April 22, 1959, has performed a notable public service in presenting an editorial entitled "Where Protection Isn't."

In view of the decision in question, it clearly appears that if the public is to be protected against organized abuse the Congress must act.

It seems to be increasingly necessary to pass another law to enjoy simple justice.

The editorial follows:

WHERE PROTECTION ISN'T

In a San Diego case just decided, the Supreme Court has widened the gap in the law which leaves the public unprotected against organized abuse.

Several unions pressured an employer to sign a union-shop contract. The employer declined on the ground that his employees were not interested and there had been no election to delegate one of the unions as bargaining agent. The unions then threw a picket line around the employer's place and put the heat on his customers and suppliers to boycott him.

The California courts ordered the picketing stopped, until the employees had selected a bargaining agent, and awarded $1,000 in damages.

This action the Supreme Court has reversed. The Court held the State had no power to act because the abuses of which the unions were accused are forbidden by the Taft-Hartley law. Only the Federal Government can enforce that law.

But the Government, through the National Labor Relations Board, had refused to take jurisdiction. This, said the Court, didn't make any difference.

Now, we'll just leave it to the Supreme Court to say what the law is. But, as a moral proposition, doesn't this leave a lot of people in a devil of a fix? Regardless of the fine words in oodles of laws, Taft-Hartley included, a man can be harassed, pushed around, badgered, and menaced out of his business. And nobody to come to his rescue.

The victim will be the small businessman. Because the Labor Board measures its jurisdiction by the size of the business and the degree it is involved in interstate commerce. The little fellow the politicians always are bleating about is left out in the cold—he's too little to command the august attention of the Labor Board and the Court says his own State government must keep hands off.

Sometimes we think there is too much law and too little justice.

National Coal Policy Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, on this coming Monday evening, April 27, the newly formed and extremely important National Coal Policy Conference will have a dinner at the Statler-Hilton Hotel and all Members of the House of Representatives have been invited to attend. The theme of the meeting will be "Coal Powers America's Future" and one of its aims will be the adoption by the Federal Government of a national fuels policy based on a realistic approach to the use of basic fuels in America.

The National Coal Policy Conference represents coal operators, coal miners, coal carrying railroads, coal burning electric utilities and manufacturers of coal mining equipment. Thus, it is clear that the conference is well qualified to speak for a united coal industry.

Mr. Speaker, the reason I have requested permission to insert this plea in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD has been to respectively urge every Member of the House to make a special effort to attend this informative dinner. The speeches will be short and directly to the point. The Members who do not represent coal mining congressional districts and their constituents have a stake in the coal industry. It has been truly said, "The coal industry contributes—in an important way—to the daily living of every American ever day."

Coal is a basic American industry. It provides employment for hundreds of thousands of people. Coal is our basic fuel. Without coal, our Nation could not long remain free.

There exists a need for the Federal Government to take a look at the various basic fuels and establish a policy that will relate them to each other and to the national security. Our Nation has a gas policy, an oil policy and an atomic policy. Only coal of the basic fuels operates without a national policy as a guide.

It is my heartfelt hope that every Member of the House who can possibly do so will avail themselves of this opportunity to meet the men who head this great and vital industry. I can assure you with full confidence that you will enjoy an informative and rewarding experience.

New All-Time Record for Pacific Northwest Plywood Shipments Forecast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, last year the walls of this House echoed with debate as to whether or not the importation of Japanese hardwood plywood was ruining the Northwest's softwood plywood market. My position now, as then, is that this contention is incorrect.

To further substantiate the facts I should like at this time to place in the RECORD an article which appeared in the Portland (Oreg.) Journal, for March 14, 1959. It concerns the prediction by the Pacific Northwest advisory board that a new all-time record for Pacific Northwest plywood shipments will be reached in the months of April, May, and June.

The article follows:

RECORD PLYWOOD CARLOADINGS, BIG INCREASE FOR ALL FOREST PRODUCTS, FORECAST BY SHIPPERS

A new alltime record for Pacific Northwest plywood shipments in the next 3 months, along with a major increase of 10,580 carloads for all types of forest products, was forecast for this region here today by the Pacific Northwest (carloadings) Advisory Board.

The expected 18.3 percent boost over 1958 in plywood shipments would jump the second quarter of 1959 to 30,000 carloads, the first time plywood has reached that peak.

For all commodities, the board forecast 235,729 cars, up 4.2 percent from the second quarter a year ago with a gain of 9,560 carloads.

Only pessimistic factor generally is an expected freight car shortage that could cut into shipments of basic Northwest industries.

In analyzing the forecast, M. A. Kasen, of Portland, executive secretary of the advisory board, pointed out it is the fourth consecutive quarter of expected increases.

Forecasting by board members, who represent all basic industries, has been accurate within a fraction of 1 percent in the past.

With the pace of heavy construction continuing, gravel, sand, and stone shipments are expected to climb 11.2 percent and brick and clay products 12.7 percent.

Other major increases include sheep, hogs, and goats up 13 percent and scrap iron up 14.2 percent.

Some declines also are expected. Chief among them will be fresh fruits other than citrus and apples, off 14, potatoes off 11.4, coal and coke off 48.1, logs off 12, and cement off 19.5 percent.

The freight car shortage, current big worry of major Northwest industries, will be confined mainly to special types such as wide door cars needed by plywood and lumber.

"and they are short everywhere," admitted Ralph E. Clark, chairman of the Association of American Railroad's car service division, Washington, D.C.

However, bad order cars (in need of repair) have climbed from 6.5 percent of the total of all cars last year to a current 8.9 percent, he admitted.

Most of the increase in unrepaired cars has been on Eastern roads which had a larger drop in business volume last year, he explained, while bad order cars on Western roads are about normal.

Repair programs have been stepped up substantially to meet the situation, he told the group.

A big "if" in the car supply situation is the amount of transit lumber shipping this summer, he pointed out, declaring that warehousing in freight cars through such delayed shipments automatically cuts the number of available cars.

J. G. Manning, of West Coast Lumbermen's Association, Portland, was elected 1959 president, with M. A. Kasen, Centennial Mills, Portland, as new vice president, and Steve Kipper, Can-Go Shippers Association, Seattle, replacing Kasen as executive secretary.

Those elected from this area on the executive committee are:

Portland: K. C. Batchelder, WCLA; Ralph Benson, Georgia-Pacific (retired); W. C. Cole, Georgia-Pacific; Richard Crabtree, Kerr Grain; C. A. Nelson, Herbert Templeton Lumber; C. R. Tulley, NW Canners; J. G. Wilson, Simpson Logging, and R. M. Wirt, North Pacific Lumber.

Longview: A. M. Cloninger, Longiew Fiber, and B. H. Wills, International Paper.

Salem: N. H. Hickok, Western Paper Converting.

Vancouver: L. D. Jones, Washington Canners.

Eugene: N. E. Ottosen, Associated Ply, and R. B. Taylor, Timberland Lumber.

Hood River: R. G. Scearce, Apple Growers.

Must We Go Backward in Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, one of the early Governors of a neighboring State said in 1671:

I thank God there are no free schools or printing presses * * * for learning has brought disobedience and heresy.

We, today, might say: "We thank God that his biased and prejudiced views did not prevail, for without the blessings of education, it is doubtful if our civilization would have progressed much beyond the stage of savagery."

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the tendency of many individuals who have been fortunate enough to learn to read and write, although a lot of them never learn to think, is to say that because they have been this lucky, they owe nothing toward helping others to get an education. They are penny wise and pound foolish, for we know that if people are not educated, they cannot contribute as much to the society as they might otherwise contribute, and the whole country suffers.

It is hard to believe, but right today there are individuals—many of them—who are against the spread of new knowledge. They will not come right out and say it, but they vote against every practical method to cause new knowledge to spread. Therefore, at heart, they really are agaisnt having other people learn new facts and facets of what man has developed, although they might deny this in conversation.

I am heartened, Mr. Speaker, that editors in my own congressional district of Ohio are thinking on these things. Under leave granted me, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial by Don Beattie from the April 18, 1959, issue of the Ashland (Ohio) Times-Gazette, in my congressional district. This editorial is entitled "Well, We've Taken First Step Backward in Educating Our Children." This editorial also points up the growing needs of additional schoolroom facilities which characterize many areas of our expanding Nation. I commend it to my colleagues.

The editorial is as follows:

WELL, WE'VE TAKEN FIRST STEP BACKWARD IN EDUCATING OUR CHILDREN

Ashland moved a step or two backward this week.

Yes; that's exactly what it amounts to.

Since 1950 Ashland has been offering kindergarten education to its youngsters. Most communities in our State do and have done so for years and years.

Next year Ashland will no longer endeavor to train its youngest children.

The process of our educational progress will be slowed that much.

Next year, too, the program offered to Ashland's seventh and eighth grade pupils will be curtailed. Training in industrial arts, home economics, and crafts will be either eliminated or curtailed.

And three classes of eighth grade students, usually housed at the Osborn school, will be transported to and from Montgomery school—some 3½ miles away—throughout the school year so that ample classroom space can be found for them. That is expensive and time consuming.

The following year, when even more crowded conditions are certain, Ashland will take another—even more drastic—step backward in its educational processes.

In 1960–61 the high school and probably grades seven and eight may have to go on a half-day schedule.

This is a horrible situation, yet it is true here.

The city board of education took the first official steps in this direction Thursday evening.

It is a sad state of affairs in our community.

Yet it is with us and the situation promises to become far more severe before we can have it corrected.

We failed to approve a bond issue to get the correction underway last November. There probably are people who are proud of that achievement.

Yet those people still face the problem they refused to solve before. Now they are forced to suffer along with expensive temporary programs and still spend more to do the same they were offered for a cheaper price before.

This, antitaxers tell us, is wise.

It's another victory for the antispenders.

Yet they will argue with you that it's wise to spend more later to do the same thing that could be done when needed for less.

The kids are with us.

The space is needed.

This newspaper has been telling the public over and over since as far back as 1953 that this crisis was coming.

People simply don't seem to believe it until the youngsters are sticking out the windows, or roaming the streets during ordinary school hours.

They can express their belief on May 5. Sixty percent of those voting must say "Yes", or our situation will become more acute and more expensive.

The answer is as simple as that.

Lincoln's Attitude on Race

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

LINCOLN'S ATTITUDE ON RACE

Much has been printed about what Abraham Lincoln said on race relations.

His words have been twisted by the propagandists to produce a synthetic attitude the President of the United States held when the social conflict led to a war.

Lincoln had definite opinions about the amalgamation of the races and its dangers. He spoke out publicly and with force and conviction on these vital issues.

A reader has requested information on quotations from Lincoln on the subject. Research yields a few examples.

In an adress at Springfield, Ill., on June 26, 1857, Lincoln stated:

"A separation of the races is the only perfect preventive of amalgamation; but an immediate separation is impossible. The next best thing is to keep them apart where they are not already together.

"A few free colored persons may get into the free States in any event; but their number is too insignificant to amount to much in the way of mixing blood * * * Such separation, if it is ever to be effected at all, must be effected by colonization * * *. The enterprise is a difficult one, but 'where there is a will there is a way' and what colonization needs most is a hearty will."

In his famous debates with Judge Stephen Douglas, Lincoln at Ottawa, Ill., on August 21, 1859, said:

"I have no purpose to introduce political and social equality between the white and black races. There is a physical difference between the two, which in my judgment, will forever forbid their living together upon the footing of perfect equality; and inasmuch as it becomes a necessity that there must be a difference, I am in favor of the race to which I belong having the superior position."

On September 16, 1859, at Columbus, Ohio, Abraham Lincoln again spoke out on this subject when he said:

"There is no reason in the world why the Negro is not entitled to all the natural rights, enumerated in the Declaration of Independence, the right of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. * * *

"I agree with Judge Douglas, he (the Negro) is not my equal in many respects—certainly not in color, perhaps not in moral or intellectual endowments. But in the right to eat bread, without leave of anybody else, which his own hand earns, he is my equal, and the equal of Judge Douglas, and the equal of every living man.

"I am not, nor have I ever been in favor of bringing about in any way the social and political equality of the white and black races—I am not, nor ever have been, in

favor of making voters or jurors of the Negroes, nor of qualifying them to hold office, nor to intermarry with white people.

"I will add to this, that I have never seen to my knowledge a man, woman, or child who was in favor of producing a perfect equality, social and political, between Negroes and white men. * * *

"I give him (Judge Douglas) my most solemn pledge that I will, to the very last, stand by the law of the State which forbids the marrying of white people with Negroes."

After he became President, Abraham Lincoln, on August 14, 1862, recommended colonization to a "Deputation of Free Negroes," who called on him at the White House.

"You and we are different races. We have between us a broader difference than exists between almost any other two races. Whether it be right or wrong I need not discuss; but this physical difference is a great disadvantage to us both, as I think.

"Your race suffers very greatly, many of them by living among us, while ours suffers from your presence. In a word, we suffer on each side. If this is admitted, it affords us a reason, at least, why we should be separated. * * *

"Even when you cease to be slaves, you are yet far removed from being placed on an equality with white people. * * * On this broad continent not a single man of your race is made the equal of a single man of ours. Go where you are treated the best, and the ban is still upon you. * * * I cannot alter it if I would.

"I need not recount to you the effects upon white men, growing out of the institution of slavery * * * and its evil effects upon the white race.

"See our present condition—the country engaged in war—our white men cutting one another's throats * * * and then consider what we know to be the truth.

"But for your race among us there would be no war, although many men engaged on either side do not care for you one way or the other. * * * It is better for us both, therefore, to be separated."

When Lincoln signed the Emancipation Proclamation, he said:

"I have urged the colonization of the Negroes, and I shall continue.

"My Emancipation Proclamation was linked with this plan. There is no room for two distinct races of white men in America, much less for two distinct races of whites and blacks.

"I can conceive of no greater calamity than the assimilation of the Negro into our social and political life as our equal. * * *

"Within 20 years we can peacefully colonize the Negro and give him our language, literature, religion, and system of government under conditions in which he can rise to the full measure of manhood.

"This he can never do here. We can never attain the ideal union our fathers dreamed, with millions of an alien, inferior race among us, whose assimilation is neither possible nor desirable."

Thus spoke the founder of the Republican Party.

Oil-Import Restrictions Should Be Removed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting the text of a letter which I am this day addressing to the President concerning the restrictions recently imposed on the importation of oil products, its possible effects on our business community, and a request that the restrictions be withdrawn.

In the same connection, I am also inserting the text of a resolution adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of Greenpoint, which is a part of my congressional district in Brooklyn. The letter and the resolution read as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 23, 1969.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am writing you in connection with the recent mandatory quota placed by the U.S. Government on the importation of oil and oil products into this country.

The district which I have the honor to represent in the U.S. Congress is located in Brooklyn, N.Y., and is largely an industrial and commercial area. Many of the industries in the district are dependent on reasonable prices of oil products, which makes it possible for them to compete in the commercial markets and to stay in business.

The action taken in setting a quota on imports of oil products from foreign countries, while it is aimed to aid our domestic oil suppliers, actually means higher prices for oil and oil products for our refineries, for our industrial and commercial firms, and ultimately for the great masses of American consumers.

That is not all, however. It further means that many of the smaller firms, such as those located in my district, will no longer be able to compete in the open markets and will be forced to shut down operations. Needless to say that such a situation would be most calamitous, since it would throw out of work thousands of people and seriously impair our economy, at a time when we can least afford it.

Business people in my district are very much disturbed over the matter. Their employees are uneasy regarding their future economic security. This type of fear and uneasiness may result in irreparable damage to our economy if steps are not taken in time to improve it or to remove the causes of it.

In the light of the situation and the ensuing difficulties, Mr. President, I urge you to reconsider the acton taken by the Government and to withdraw the mandatory restrictions on oil imports in the interests of the Nation's economy and security.

Respectfully yours,

VICTOR L. ANFUSO,
Member of Congress.

RESOLUTION BY THE GREENPOINT CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Whereas the Government of the United States has placed a mandatory quota on the importation of crude and various oil products into the United States, we would submit the following for consideration:

Greenpoint is part of a large industrial and commercial area and contains many industries dependent on favorable fuel costs, one of the largest being a refinery operated by the Mobil Oil Co. which employs more than 500 individuals, and which is dependent on imported crude if it is to compete with other refineries which enjoy the advantage of lower processing fuel costs.

Many of these industrial enterprises are engaged in trade with many friendly nations of the world.

The difficulty and the cost of discovering and developing the oil resources of this country have been steadily increasing.

Trade with friendly nations and the industrial development which it stimulates abroad stands as our main bulwark against the Soviet trade offenses and must be regarded as one of the main pillars of this country's long term national security.

Many retail petroleum products consumers in Eastern States will be subjected to a spiral of increasing costs as eastern U.S. refineries are forced to seek crude supplies from domestic areas.

It is ridiculous to consider that oil from Canada is less essential to the national security than oil from U.S. fields across the border.

Federal regulation of a free enterprise industry destroys the main strength of the United States by adopting measures of compulsion paralleling those used by the very countries which are threatening our national security.

The provision in the mandatory imports control requiring surveillance of prices by Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization will lead to substitution of compulsion for the free market choice at competitive prices by consumers.

Be it resolved, That the Greenpoint Chamber of Commerce is opposed to the principle of mandatory quotas reducing to low levels the importation of oil and oil products, and requests immediate reconsideration and withdrawal of the mandatory provisions so that refiners may conform to the ideals of optimum economics and of the true national security in their use of domestic and foreign crudes.

Testimony Relating to the Community Facilities Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in the House Banking and Currency Committee on Tuesday, April 21, a distinguished leader and resident of my home district of Oakland County, Mich., gave some interesting and enlightening testimony in relation to H.R. 5944, the community facilities bill.

The comments which this gentleman, Mr. Harold K. Schone, director of the Oakland County Department of Public Works, made are of such importance to our Nation, its communities and its people that I would like to call them to the attention of all my colleagues.

In my opinion, he has pointed out some basic flaws in our present programs of Federal help to communities in providing the essentials in service. He has outlined a problem of the inability of a great number of growing communities to pay for the water and sewage treatment facilities which they must have to maintain acceptable standards of public health.

As you will note from his statement, Mr. Schone is not seeking a Federal giveaway program for a number of reasons. One of these reasons is that there simply is not enough money in our Federal coffers to do the job which is needed in providing adequate water supply and

pollution control facilities. Another reason is that in the vast majority of cases adequate funds would be available at local levels to provide these strictly local facilities if future growth is taken into account.

In addition to his present duties as county public works director in an urban area adjacent to Detroit, Mr. Schone has a distinguished record of public service. He has been manager of a number of cities, including Oak Park, Mich., which has won national acclaim for its orderly development during a period of tremendous population growth. He is an expert on community administration at both the city and county levels, and he has done a great deal of good in our own municipalities in Oakland County by working out cooperative programs which have permitted these local governmental units to provide essential services to their citizens at a minimum of cost and maximum efficiency.

Mr. Schone's testimony follows:

In presenting the views of Oakland County, Mich., which I represent, we do not presume to infer that our views are necessarily the views of every county throughout the country since certainly there must be situations where varied points of view will occur. However, we must assume that our views, while perhaps not identical, are representative of the combined thinking and would most certainly reflect the situation in all counties with a similar metropolitan complex.

We further feel that we represent the views of many cities, villages, and townships, since it has been proven to us that the best, and in most cases, the only solution to the problems relating to the major portion of community facilities must be approached either on an area or county basis since community facility needs generally transcend such jurisdictional boundaries.

While House bill 5944 is primarily a health and welfare measure and not an antirecession measure, it does refer to unemployment and stimulation of business activities and, therefore, we would like to comment on this aspect.

We are firmly convinced that the construction industry is a major portion of our Nation's economy and employment. Past history would tend to support this statement since it would appear that when construction industry declines, the result is a gradual decline in the Nation's economy with its resultant effect on unemployment following in a period of 12 to 18 months after the start of a decline and continuing in more pronounced degrees of severity until the construction industry starts on the upswing, at which time the effect is more immediate, insofar as its bearing on the national economy and employment, than the decline produced. In view of the high rate of unemployment existing in the Detroit metropolitan area, we have, therefore, a major interest in the effects of this legislation on unemployment in our area.

Of the various phases of the construction industry, we feel the housing industry is by far the most important because of the many fields involved in housing. The construction of housing calls upon almost every type of labor and production to satisfy its needs since even after the completion of the actual construction there is a resultant effect on industries and retail business to meet the needs for textiles, furniture, refrigerators, stoves, washing machines, nursery stock, etc. In addition, its effect on the moral fiber of our citizens is of vital importance, since the fulfillment of a person's needs and desires for adequate housing tends to create a new perspective of his citizenship.

The Nation's needs for housing have continuously outpaced the construction of homes and we must face up to the basic needs of our people before we attempt to supply the frills and luxuries.

It is apparent that the housing needs of our citizens are well recognized by Congress and the administration, since much has been done in the past to strengthen the housing program and from all appearances Congress is at this time giving serious consideration to methods of further strengthening the industry. However, in the past, not enough has been accomplished to provide community facilities which, in the main, are the foundation of the structure. This is somewhat like providing a farmer with tractors, plows and harvesters when he has no soil to till.

In February of 1958, we made several observations and recommendations to the Congress, regarding a program for Federal loan support in connection with public works which, in part, are as follows:

"A serious problem exists throughout the country, particularly in metropolitan areas, in abating pollution in our streams, rivers and lakes to protect the public health. In addition, a serious problem exists again, particularly in metropolitan areas, in providing safe, adequate and potable supplies of water.

"Those involved in the protection of public health and providing necessary facilities to the citizens of their areas recognize that the problems of sewage disposal and water supply cannot be divorced, one depends upon and complements the other.

"The problems are magnified by our rapidly expanding population into fringe areas that have heretofore depended entirely upon septic tanks, filter beds and inadequate subdivision treatment plants for sewage disposal and independent or community groundwater supplies, which are rapidly becoming inadequate for present populations with no provisions for the rapidly expanding populations. In addition, such ground-water supplies are, in many areas, endangered by the inadequate sewage disposal facilities existing today.

"While we do not presume to imply that we have full and complete knowledge of existing conditions regarding the inadequacies of sewage disposal facilities and water supply on a national level, all publications on these subjects, which have been reviewed, strongly support the theory that the conditions existing in the Detroit Metropolitan region and other metropolitan areas of Michigan are not unique but follow a well established pattern of "too little-too late" in regard to facility planning and construction.

"The practice is to build facilities according to financing ability rather than on needs with the result that as soon as such projects are completed, their capacities are already taxed close to their limits. This results in the waste of large sums of the taxpayers money since as soon as there is ability to finance further, the facilities have to be relieved and, in some cases, completely replaced.

"Oakland County, Mich., which is a part of the Detroit metropolitan region and the second largest county in Michigan, has and will continue to have tremendous increases in population, in relative proportion to national population growth.

"The 1950 census gave Oakland County a population of 396,001 and the best estimates of the regional plan commission indicates a present population of 700,000 with an expected population in 1980 of 1,158,400.

"In spite of the rapid increase in population, the county and local units of government have been extremely successful in providing for the needs of this increasing population with the exception of sewage disposal and water supply.

"Since these exceptions are those most necessary to protect the public health and welfare, serious problems are and will, in greater proportion, inthe future face the area. A solution to these problems must be found immediately.

"The Congress has on numerous occassions evidenced its awareness of the problems by enacting into law the provisions in the housing and home finance agency legislation which provides for public works planning advances. Special attention by Congress has been given to sewage treatment works needs under the Water Pollution Act grants as provided in section 6 of Public Law 660.

"The availability of public works planning advances through the housing and home finance agency has proven to be of much assistance in areas where the population is concentrated, the problem acute, and where assurance can be given that projects for which funds are advanced will be promptly carried out.

"This program, however, falls short of the needs in areas where population has not approached the ultimate and where financing of large adequate facilities to meet the known long-range—10 to 20 years—needs of a given area is impossible due to present population and tax base. Since under such conditions it is impossible to certify to the agency that the work planned for will be constructed in a reasonable period and without such assurance the planning advances will not be approved.

"A review of the accomplishments of section 6, the construction grant provision of Public Law 660, would appear to reveal that there has been a substantial increase in construction of sewage treatments works in 1956 and 1957 over 1955 which could be attributed to the provisions of the act. However, it can be assumed that a large portion of such work was probably anticipated and ready to go in 1955 or prior. Also, it seems reasonable to assume that of these obtaining grants-in-aid, a large percentage wolud have proceeded with their projects without the grant due to increased concentration of population and ability to finance.

"The degree of success of the program is a highly debatable one and strong arguments could be made on either side as to the degree but there is no question in our minds that in spite of any degree of success, it does not offer a total solution to the problems.

"In a report submitted to the Federation of Sewerage & Industrial Wastes Association's Annual Convention in Boston on October 8, 1957, prepared by D. A. Poole, Curtiss M. Evarts, and David B. Lee, State sanitary engineers of Indiana, Oregon, and Florida respectively, it was demonstrated that the distribtuion of the grants-in-aids to the States, in some cases, exceed the amount that could be used by four times, while in other States the amounts distributed amounted to only one-quarter of the amount that could be used, all based on present formula of 30 percent of construction or not to exceed $250,000 per project.

"The conclusions of the report bear out the reported needs and paragraph 'a' of conclusion 3 is a supporting conclusion to the requests made herein.

"We would urge Congress to take the following steps which we are firmly convinced will establish the background for a proper solution to facility construction and if they are adopted will start a strong public works program on a local level which will go far to solve the present problems of unemployment:

"1. Abandon the theory of Federal grants for sewage treatment works as established under Public Law 660.

"2. Increase the ability of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to make public

works planning advances for sewage treatment works and water supply systems.

"3. Establish an adequate Federal loan support program for sewage treatment works and water supply systems.

"GRANTS-IN-AID

"We do not feel that the grants necessarily are a strong encouragement to construction. It must be admitted that in some cases where the amount of the grant was the difference in the ability of the unit to sell bonds for the project that it does encourage construction. However, on the other hand, some units who could properly finance their own program might have a tendency to hold up the project in the hopes of obtaining a grant and if they did not receive one initially they might put the project off until the next year or a year thereafter in the hopes they eventually might obtain some free money.

"In some cases grants have been given after projects are already under construction. The philosophy of the Government giving people something they have the ability to pay for themselves does not seem to be compatible with our beliefs.

"PUBLIC WORKS PLANNING ADVANCES

"The Housing and Home Finance Agency should be provided with funds so that expansion of their advances for sewage treatment works and water supply systems could occur.

"The Agency should be encouraged to place the applications for advances to be used for these two purposes at the top of the priority lists and advances should be sufficient to provide complete construction plans. This might be placed on a formula of the advance being limited to 85 percent of the actual cost of the planning work with 15 percent being provided by the local unit so that only projects in which the unit has a sincere enough interest in the need for the work to raise funds of its own, in the amount necessary to meet the suggested 15 percent would be eligible for the advance."

The balance of the report dealt with the third phase of establishing a Federal loan support program and we would like to take this opportunity to draw to the attention of the House Banking and Currency Committee, House bill 2733 which was introduced by the Honorable WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD, of Oakland County, on January 19, 1959, for your serious consideration as a part of your deliberations on the bill now under study.

On March 26, 1958, we had the honor and the pleasure to appear before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee to testify in behalf of Senator FULBRIGHT's bill No. 3497, which was a community facility bill which failed to pass Congress.

We raised some objections to this community facility bill, as proposed by Senator FULBRIGHT, since it provided for loans for construction, repair and improvements of streets, sidewalks, highways, parkways, bridges, parking lots, airports, and other transportation facilities, public parks and other public recreation facilities public hospitals rehabilitation and health centers, public refuse and garbage disposal facilities, water, sewerage and other sanitation and public utility facilities, public police and fire protection facilities, public schools, libraries, offices and other public buildings and public land, water, and timber conservation facilities.

The bill proposed a $2 billion community facilities fund which, on the surface, appeared to be a tremendous figure, even to those of us who are involved in multi-million-dollar projects, yet in balancing this amount against the public works and public facilities which would be eligible under the act, we felt certain that either the amount must be considerably increased or some of the proposed eligible projects eliminated. Otherwise, the basic community facilities would be relegated to a minor position as they so often have in the past.

Certainly House bill No. 5944, as introduced by Congressman SPENCE, has taken care of this problem and lends credence to our belief that community facilities, as defined in the bill, are the basic needs of any community.

If the proposed legislation is enacted into law, it would go a long way in solving our present critical problems and could serve to properly solve problems which will be critical in a short time. As to known unsolved problems of financing where the proposed legislation would be the salvation we would like to point to a specific problem in our county.

The Clinton River Basin in Oakland County is an area encompassing approximately 250 square miles lying directly in the path of the approaching army of increased population and its resultant demands on the water supply system and sewage disposal facilities.

The units of government in the area are aware of the need for facilities and have petitioned the board of supervisors of the county to develop a master plan of sewers and sewage-treatment facilities for the Clinton River Basin. The board of supervisors recognize that the only economical and sound solution for the individual units is on an area basis and as a result of this have, by resolution, established the Clinton River Sewage Disposal System under the county department of public works.

The department is now preparing construction plans for this project with the aid of a planning advance through the Housing and Home Finance Agency. From a planning and engineering viewpoint, the answer to the problem is the construction of interceptor sewers to transport all of the sewage to a central treatment plant located on the lower portion of the Clinton River to abate pollution. The southerly or downriver portion of the area is now at the danger point and needs immediate relief and the interceptors need to be of such a size as to accommodate the present and ultimate populations of the upriver areas. The sewage-treatment plant site must be acquired in such a size as to adequately permit expansion at later periods to accommodate future populations. The initial treatment plant must be constructed with some built-in features for the ultimate population and others constructed in such a manner so as to be expanded.

While there is a strong desire to do the project right and to have the burden of the costs assumed by the area, it is apparent that a bond issue could not be sold at a rate of interest which would make the project financially sound.

There has been a known need in the area to supplement or replace the ground water supply with a potable and adequate water supply from Lake Huron for many years, and each year sees a serious lowering of the water table for ground water sources and inadequate supplies from other sources, and yet we are unable to guarantee that there will be the required supply before it is too late. Oakland and Macomb Counties have joined together and have spent $116,000 for an engineering report on the proposed project and it could be constructed in short order if financing problems were overcome.

The ultimate ability for the system to meet its obligations under a bond issue with realistic water rates is not a question. The only problem is in the first 5 years if a realistic interest rate is not obtained; and here is where the proposed community facilities bill, as introduced by Congressman SPENCE, and/or the loan support bill, as introduced by Congressman BROOMFIELD, would make it possible to provide for an adequate, safe, and potable supply of water for present and future population.

These examples could be repeated over and over again for specific projects in the region and we are sure throughout the Nation. Such a program, we feel, while not bringing us to a state of Utopia, will solve our major problems in relation to sewage disposal and water supply and in addition will spark an immediate construction program which will go far in relieving the present unemployment problem in metropolitan areas.

We suggest the adoption of such a program as being basic to the principles upon which our forefathers founded our form of government in which the Federal Government assists to perform those functions which the State and local governments are unable to perform by themselves.

It is further suggested that if such a program is adopted that adequate safeguards be provided so that only projects which clearly evidence eventual ability to pay any advancements under the program are certified. This does not mean that vision should not be used since this will be necessary. If such a program is handled through the Housing and Home Finance Agency, it will probably mean that their planning and financial division may have to be strengthened to properly review applications from areas where reliable regional planning commissions are not in existence and where units have not employed recognized financial consultants in connection with their applications.

We woud further suggest that consideration be given for providing that sewage, sewage treatment and sewer facilities be certified as eligible, under the act, by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare after review by the State agency charged with water pollution control.

In the proposed act under "Declaration of policy, section 201," it is stated that it has been the policy of Congress to assist lower levels of government in providing facilities essential to the health and welfare of its people where they are financially unable to provide same.

We believe sanitary sewers, drains, and water facilities are essential to the health and welfare of all our people, and certainly an immediate public works program would serve to provide these much needed facilities and at the same time relieve unemployment, not to mention the stimulus it would create in the many allied businesses, including the housing industry, which we have previously atempted to outline.

The opportunity to appear before this committee to present the views of the National Association of County Officials and Oakland County, Mich., is greatly appreciated. If the members of the committee have any questions I would be most happy to attempt to answer same. Thank you.

Pesach, 5719

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

Thursday, April 23, 1959

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, why is this night different from all other nights? Why is this time of Pesach, or Passover, different from all other seasons of the year?

We of the Jewish religion, inheritors of the rich and glorious tradition of Judaism, know well the story of the exodus from the land of Egypt, and our

children learn of the sufferings, the courage, and the deliverance, of their ancestors of thousands of years ago. It is as important today as it ever was, and it will be important as long as the world lasts, that we pass on to our children, unimpaired, the virtues inculcated by that story—the fortitude, the stubborn determination to resist oppression, the resolve to live by the spirtual truths and moral laws that are our precious inheritance, the humility to submit to the divine will in any misfortune, and the hope and energy to rise bravely to new life and new circumstances.

As we commemorate in our Seder, not only the sufferings and the deliverance of our Hebrew ancestors, but the sufferings endured by the Egyptian people before the Pharaoh would release the Hebrews from bondage, let our thoughts turn to the oppressed and enslaved peoples, the world over, in this day of peril and tyranny. A darkness of the spirit, black as the Egyptian night, lies over the Communist-dominated lands today. In other lands, differences of race or of religion give rise to mob violence or repression under the forms of law.

Let us keep ever before the eyes of the spirit, for our own guidance and the guidance of the world, as a pillar of fire by night and a pillar of cloud by day, the ideals of freedom, of justice, of equality, of goodwill toward all men.

Thus we may be able, in the fullness of time, to fulfill our high destiny, and lead all mankind, freed from violence and from wrong, and united in an eternal confidence of brotherhood, to celebrate the universal Passover in the name of our God of freedom.

Secretary of State Dulles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial, somewhat abbreviated, from the Los Angeles Times of April 16, 1959. For a man who has loved his country so much and so intelligently, putting its well-being and safety above every cruel attack on himself, it is, I hope, some small compensation to Secretary Dulles to have universal recognition now of the righteousness of his principles and policies, and grateful praise for his unswerving steadfastness and courage.

What an unpayable debt we all owe to John Foster Dulles.

The editorial is as follows:

SECRETARY OF STATE DULLES

The resignation of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles was announced by the wet-eyed President of the United States. The President is a military officer, conditioned from his youth to the loss of friends and heroes in war, and his weeping would more likely be for his country than for the dying man who has spent more time than he in serving the United States.

GREATEST MOMENT

Any stern republican American, republican in the sense of Cato, should understand the President's tears. The United States has lost John Foster Dulles at his greatest moment, at a crisis when three-quarters of the world confidently expected him to solve its key problem. And lost him without any possibility of recovery.

In writing this kind of an appreciation—almost a funeral oration—one is always tempted to seek a parallel, and there is one in another field of striving for the Republic. Robert A. Taft and Dulles were somewhat alike in this: that the people who had discussed them controversially for years became exquisitely aware of their positive virtues only when they were dying.

UNIQUELY QUALIFIED

Even Walter Lippmann, one of the most despondent of Mr. Dulles' critics, was candid enough to admit that he was appalled when it seemed certain that the Secretary would not be able to command the negotiations with Russia about the Germanys. Who else, after all the years-long racking and raging against Dulles, could handle this negotiation?

We have been guilty of criticizing Mr. Dulles, but, thank God, we have never denied him. This places us—a rare occasion—on the side of former President Truman: Mr. Dulles campaigned against him and all his works in 1948, but the reelected President, in one of his unusual insights, appointed him 14 months later to go to Japan as the Ambassador to make a Japanese peace treaty. Mr. Dulles went and produced the most magnanimous treaty of history. He gave Americans something to live by: Whenever Europeans or Asiatics, or some of the newly inflated Africans, declaim to a U.S. citizen that his country is dollar mad, obsessed with opulence, vindictive, prejudiced or race conscious, he has only to point to our accommodation with the Japanese. There is nothing quite so wonderful in history, and John Foster Dulles is its architect.

COMMUNISM CONTAINED

But there is a more recent and controversial association of notions with the memory of Mr. Dulles as Secretary of State. His enemies have complained that he would make no deal with the Communists. They have been right, and his intransigence has been our salvation. He has felt very strongly that there is no point in making agreements with the Communists unless the agreements are self-enforcing. He has been the symbol of Communist containment on every continent. His means have sometimes been called into question with reason (we think), but his ends cannot be challenged. We mentioned Cato. A civilized 20th century Presbyterian cannot insist that Russia be destroyed and its people enslaved or massacred, but he can, looking all moralists in the eye, say that the Russian thing shall not infect new ground so long as the United States can prevent it. He has conceived prevention to be his prime duty as Secretary of State, and he has carried it out.

His successor cannot possibly measure up to him.

You Should Be a Politician

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the April 22, 1959 issue of Human Events:

YOU SHOULD BE A POLITICIAN—THE PRECINCT KEY TO POLITICAL SUCCESS

(By Joseph J. Eley and F. Clifton White)

"Politics is the practical exercise of self-government, and somebody must attend to it if we are to have self-government. The principal ground of reproach against any American citizen should be that he is not a politician."—ELIHU ROOT.

Less than 25 percent of the electorate determine—through the processes of conventions, caucuses and primary elections—the alternatives which the electorate shall have. An even smaller percentage makes a majority of the fundamental decisions through work in the political party process.

In reality the American political process is dominated by an aristocracy of self-appointed people. The aristocracy is composed of those who work at politics, day in day out, year in year out. The public officeholders are an important and substantial bloc of the aristocracy, but the majority of the "self-appointed" are not officeholders in government but are instead the precinct, ward, district and county workers of the political parties.

Converging circumstances today demand that Americans begin to express themselves in political affairs if any semblance of the independent spirit remains. There can be no serious doubt in the student's mind that in the coming days we will be asked to choose between the capitalist economic system and socialism. The choice will be made within the structure of our political party system.

Some people avoid political participation because they think that political parties are closed organizations. The truth is that political parties are public bodies; their existence and general mode of operation are prescribed in State law. Most States publish or cause to be published those statutes which determine the legal base of the political parties, the manner in which party officers are selected and the methods of conducting elections.

In States in which the electoral statutes are codified and published separately from the general code, a copy may usually be obtained from the State attorney general or secretary of state. The individual who proposes to be an effective citizen should be conversant with the legalities of politics in his State by familiarizing himself with the code.

He should also be familiar with the bylaws of his party. Most State codes first stipulate the legal base for the political parties and then vest in the parties the right to formulate rules for their own operations. County committee bylaws are not always easy to obtain, but somewhere in the party structure there is an individual who has possession of the rules. In most cases, the rules are filed with the county clerk, giving them quasi-official status. There are some cases—Georgia, for example—in which the bylaws of the political party appear to be of more significance than the code, in that the bylaws are much more detailed.

Once the individual has familiarized himself with the code and bylaws, he should determine the structure and operations of his party at the county and subcounty levels. He should find out how party leadership in the precinct or election district (or whatever it is called in the particular State) is selected, how ward or town leaders are chosen.

The basic unit of the political parties' operations is the precinct or election district. The terms are synonymous. In either case, precinct or district, the focal point is a polling place surrounded by a geographical area containing a specific number of voters prescribed by State law and ranging from 300 to 1,200. The national average size pre-

cinct is 600 voters. The size of the precinct has been largely determined by practical circumstances; how many voters can conveniently vote in the prescribed time in the polling place.

Each political party attempts to have an individual in the precinct to act as the party leader in that neighborhood. The principal job of the precinct leader, who is known sometimes as a precinct captain, district captain, or committeeman, is to register the voters of his party and get his party's vote to the polls on election day.

He is, in almost all cases, the representative of his party's voters in his precinct on the county committee. In addition, in major cities, he is a member of the town committee. If he has organized his precinct properly and maintains communications with his constituency, he has a surprising degree of power. He can have considerable impact on the party councils, especially if he consistently carries his precinct for the party.

Precinct leaders are selected by different processes, determined by the election code or party bylaws. In New Jersey and many other States, the precinct leader is elected in a primary election for a prescribed term of office. In Texas, among other States, the precinct leader is elected in a precinct caucus. Still a third method, used in Virginia, for example, has the precinct leader appointed by the city or county chairman, who is elected in a mass meeting.

After the precinct—on the table of organization of the political party—each level upward is related to a unit of government, that is, officers of government are elected from each. The formalized party structure runs from the precinct through the ward, town or city to the county level, thence to the State and finally to the National level. At each of these levels, there is usually an individual or group of individuals working at the job of politics. To those levels of party organization noted above must be added others depending on the governmental structure of the particular State. There are usually congressional district organizations; sometimes State senatorial, legislative or judicial district organizations.

The organization of the parties is determined by practical circumstances; where there is someone to be elected to public office, there must be people to support the various candidates in circulating nominating petitions, transmitting to the voters the reasons for electing a ticket or a candidate, registering and getting the voters to the polls.

The county committee is the backbone of American politics. At the risk of generalizing, the county chairman, as an aggregate, represent the most potent political force in politics. The chairman has a voice in the selection of county judges, sheriffs, supervisors or commissioners, legislators, State senators and Congressmen. He is influential in the selection of delegates to conventions. He will be sought out by candidates for Governor, Senator and even President.

His primary function, though not completely official, is to find candidates for the various offices and coordinate the organization's efforts behind those candidates and his party generally.

The county chairman obtains his job in a variety of ways. He may be elected by the county committee, which represents the various precincts or districts of the county. He may be elected in a county convention or, as in a few cases, he may be elected in a primary election. State election codes generally spell out the procedure through which the county chairman and other officers of the party at the county level are selected. The method for the formulation of the State committee or committees and the selection of State chairman can be determined also by consulting the election code and the bylaws of the particular party in which the individual is interested.

With this basic structure in mind, you may be interested in some do's and don'ts that might prove of use to those going into politics:

Determine which party is most acceptable to you. Don't expect either party to reflect your philosophy perfectly, but choose the one in your locality which stands most for the things you feel are right.

Register and identify yourself as a member of the party.

Study the election code of your State, particularly those sections which apply to the formation and operations of the party.

Vote in primary elections, attend precinct caucuses and town, city, and county meetings of the party.

Speak up—when you know what you are talking about. When you speak, be guided by the facts and not by anger.

Don't talk too much. Remember, many people think the wisest man is the man who listens to their ideas.

If the leadership of your political party generally reflects your thinking and is honest and efficient, support it to keep it that way.

Don't buck the "organization" unless you have enough votes to defeat it. If the party leadership isn't what you think it should be, build up your faction's strength before you engage in a contest for leadership.

Don't be arbitrary or rigid in your thinking; this doesn't mean that you should compromise principles. There are many ways to climb a mountain. Find a way acceptable to the majority to achieve your objectives and implement your principles.

Don't forget the stake you have in politics. From such prosaic matters as garbage collection to weighty problems of foreign affairs the influence of politics is extremely important. Taxes, schools, zoning, traffic control, highways, the economic system, all are within the purview of the politician.

Decisions on these and many other matters are subject to your influence, first as a voter, second as an individual with the ability to influence others. You will either contribute to making these decisions or someone will do it for you. History indicates that free societies inevitably collapse when the people permit "others" to make their decisions, for the decisionmaking quickly realizes that his responsibility to make decisions gives him control.

Interposition: the Neglected Weapon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article distributed by the Federation for Constitutional Government, 801 American Bank Building, New Orleans, La.

The chairman of the Federation for Constitutional Government is a distinguished American, Mr. John U. Barr. The author of the article is Mr. Drew L. Smith, member of the Louisiana Bar. It follows:

INTERPOSITION: THE NEGLECTED WEAPON

(By Drew L. Smith, member of the Louisiana Bar, New Orleans)

As a result of the U.S. Supreme Court decision of May 17, 1954, invalidating segregation in the public schools of the Nation, the Southern States, with approximately three-fourths of the Negroes in this country, have been thrown into such turmoil as they have not known since the dark days of reconstruction.

Once again the power of the Federal Government is being employed to coerce the South into accepting racial integration in all public institutions.

Since the enunciation of the above decision the South has determinedly sought to find a legal solution to contain the race problem within the bounds of segregation, so arduously developed over the generations.

This is being done in order that the white and Negro people of this region may continue to live together on a peaceful basis, and in order that the racial integrity of the two races may be perpetuated for the general welfare of all concerned.

Indeed, it is also being done not just for these purposes alone, but to preserve the principles of States rights and constitutional government for all people everywhere in this Nation.

INTERPOSITION

In her search for a means to accomplish this there suddenly appeared on the horizon the word "interposition." Editors and publishers throughout the South, and some in the North, thoroughly explained in many editorials how individual States, among them some northern States, in many instances, had successfully interposed the State's power to protect the people of the State from an unconstitutional act of any branch of the Federal Government.

One of the best examples of interposition came from the North, and we may refer with profit to what happened in the State of Wisconsin concerning fugitive slaves.

Under the Federal Fugitive Slave Act of September 18, 1850, U.S. marshals were empowered to arrest fugitive slaves in any of the States of the Union and return them to their former masters. Sherman Booth, a Wisconsin editor, was charged under this act with unlawfully aiding a fugitive slave from Missouri to escape from the lawful custody of a U.S. marshal. Booth applied for a writ of habeas corpus to the Supreme Court of Wisconsin,[1] alleging in his application that the Fugitive Slave Act under which he was arrested and imprisoned was unconstitutional and void.

The language of the Court in declaring the act unconstitutional, and the freeing of Booth from custody, is such a forceful presentation of States rights and so appropriate and timely to the segregation problem in the South today, that it is quoted from extensively, as follows:

"Justice SMITH. I would gladly escape from deciding upon a question so grave as to whether the act of Congress is unconstitutional and void, but I believe the last hope of free, representative and responsible government rests upon the State sovereignties, and fidelity of State officers to their double allegiance to the State and Federal Government. To yield acquiescence in, and support to, every power constitutionally exercised by the Federal Government, is the sworn duty of every State officer, but it is equally his duty to interpose a resistance to the extent of his power, to every assumption of power on the part of the Federal Government, which is not expressly granted or necessarily implied in the Federal Constitution.

"Nor can I yield to the doctrine early broached, but as early repudiated, that any one department of the Government is constituted the final and exclusive judge of its own delegated powers. No such tribunal has been created by the fundamental law.

"The judicial department of the Federal Government is the creature by compact of the States, as sovereignties, and their respective

[1] In re Booth, 3 Wis. 1.

people. That department can exercise no power not delegated to it. All power not delegated, and not prohibited to the States, the States have expressly reserved to themselves and to the people. To admit that the Federal judiciary is the sole and exclusive judge of its own powers and the extent of the authority delegated, is virtually to admit that the same unlimited power may be exercised by every other department of the General Government, both legislative and executive, because each is independent of, and coordinate with the other. Neither has any power but such as the States and their respective people have delegated and all power not delegated remains with the States and the people thereof. The power of the Federal Government depends solely upon what the States have granted.

"I solemnly believe that the last hope of free representative and Federal Government rests with the States. Increase of influence and patronage on the part of the Federal Government, naturally leads to consolidation, consolidation to despotism and ultimate anarchy, dissolution and all its attendant evils. Without the States there can be no Union, the abrogation of State sovereignty is not a dissolution of the Union but an abrogation of its elements.

"The Constitution not only confers powers upon the Federal Government but it guarantees rights to the States and to the citizens. The States derive not one single attribute of power or sovereignty from the Constitution of the United States. They were preexisting sovereignties. The Federal Government is one of the delegated powers, the State government is one of inherent or reserved powers; the former competent to act only within the sphere prescribed by the Constitution, the latter exercising all the functions of sovereignty not delegated or relinquished by that instrument. A judicial determination without the constitutional sphere would be no judgment or decree."

Following the above decision Booth was again charged and convicted in the U.S. District Court in 1855, and once again was freed by the Wisconsin Supreme Court. Later in the year the U.S. Supreme Court issued a writ of error which the Wisconsin Supreme Court ignored, even refusing to send up a copy of its record. This record was finally obtained by the Supreme Court in 1857. In 1858 the Supreme Court[2] reversed the judgment of the Wisconsin Supreme Court. When the State courts refused to enforce the judgment of the U.S. Supreme Court, Booth was rearrested in 1860 by a U.S. marshal, only to obtain a pardon in that same year from President Buchanan.

As a result of the decision in *Ableman* v. *Booth*, the Wisconsin Legislature[3] enacted a resolution of interposition in 1859 which is briefly quoted from as follows:

"*Resolved*, That the Government formed by the Constitution of the United States was not made the exclusive or final judge of the extent of the powers delegated to itself; but as in all other cases of compact among parties having no common judge, each party has an equal right to judge for itself as well of infractions as of the mode and measure of redress * * * that the several States which formed that instrument, being sovereign and independent, have the unquestionable right to judge its infraction, and that a positive defiance by these sovereignties of all unauthorized acts done or attempted to be done under color of that instrument is the right remedy."

Most of the other Northern States enthusiastically supported the action taken by Wisconsin in interposing the power of the State, to check unconstitutional and unlawful acts of the Federal Government.

SOUTHERN STATES PROVIDING FOR INTERPOSITION

Observing what had been so effectively done by the Northern States on the issue of slavery convinced the South that this was the answer to her segregation problem, and one after another the Southern States passed resolutions and acts of interposition.

By Act No. 42, special session, 1956, the Alabama Legislature, enacted a resolution of interposition declaring therein.

"That until the issue between the State of Alabama and the General Government is decided * * * by a suitable constitutional amendment that the Legislature of Alabama declares the decisions and orders of the Supreme Court of the United States relating to separation of races in the public schools are, as a matter of right, null, void, and of no effect; and the Legislature of Alabama declares to all men as a matter of right, this State is not bound to abide thereby."

Georgia, in House Resolution 185 of the 1956 session of the general assembly, the senate concurring, provided for interposition in the following language:

"That the decisions and orders of the Supreme Court of the United States relating to the separation of the races in the public institutions of a State are null, void, and of no force or effect."

Mississippi, in Resolution 125 of the 1956 regular session of the legislature, set forth her position on interposition in the following words:

"We do hereby declare the decisions and order of the Supreme Court of the United States of May 17, 1954, and May 31, 1955, to be a usurpation of power reserved to the several States and do declare as a matter of right, that said decisions are in violation of the Constitution of the United States and the State of Mississippi, and therefore, are considered unconstitutional, invalid, and of no lawful effect within the confines of the State of Mississippi."

South Carolina enacted a resolution of interposition by act of the general assembly dated February 14, 1956, stating that:

"The State of South Carolina as a loyal and soverign State of the Union will exercise the powers reserved to it under the Constitution to judge for itself of the infractions and to take such other legal measures as it may deem appropriate to protect its sovereignty and the rights of its people."

Virginia provided for interposition in Senate Joint Resolution 3 of the general assembly on February 1, 1956. The resolution states:

"That by its decision of May 17, 1954, in the school cases, the Supreme Court of the United States placed upon the Constitution an interpretation, having the effect of an amendment thereto, which interpretation Virginia emphatically disapproves; that until the question here asserted by the State of Virginia be settled by clear constitutional amendment, we pledge our firm intention to take all appropriate measures honorably, legally, and constitutionally available to us to resist this illegal encroachment upon our sovereign powers."

Louisiana, by House Concurrent Resolution 10 of the 1956 session of the legislature, provided for interposition in these terms:

"The Legislature of Louisiana does hereby solemnly declare the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States of May 17, 1954, to be in violation of the Constitution of the United States, and of the State of Louisiana, and we declare, further, our firm intention to take all appropriate measures honorably and constitutionally available to us to void this illegal encroachment upon the rights of the several States."

In House Concurrent Resolution 174 adopted by the Legislature of Florida on May 2, 1957, interposition was provided for in the following terms:

"That the Legislature of Florida denies that the Supreme Court of the United States had the right which it asserted in the school cases decided by it on May 17, 1954, to enlarge the language and meaning of the compact by the States in an effort to withdraw from the States powers reserved to them and as daily exercised by them for almost a century. It is the duty of the State in flagrant cases such as this to interpose its powers between its people and the effort of said Court to assert an unlawful dominion over them: Therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That said decisions and orders of the Supreme Court of the United States denying the individual sovereign States the power to enact laws relating to the separation of the races in the public institutions of a State are null, void, and of no force or effect."

Tennessee in House Resolution 1 enacted January 17, 1957, by the general assembly denounces the decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court in the school segregation cases and resolves therein,

"That the House of Representatives, in cooperation with the Senate, pledges its firm intention to take all appropriate measures, honorably and legally available, to resist any and all illegal encroachments upon the powers reserved to the State of Tennessee in order to control its own domestic institutions according to its own exclusive judgment."

The State of Arkansas provided for interposition by means of initiative petitions which were approved by the people at a general election providing for constitutional amendment No. 47 which reads in part as follows:

"The General Assembly of the State of Arkansas shall take appropriate action and pass laws opposing in every constitutional manner the unconstitutional desegregation decisions of May 17, 1954, and May 31, 1955, of the U.S. Supreme Court including interposing the sovereignty of the State of Arkansas to the end of nullification of these and all deliberate, palpable and dangerous invasions of or encroachments upon rights and powers not delegated to the United States nor prohibited to the States by the Constitution of the United States and amendments thereto."

Texas, by House Concurrent Resolution 33 at the 1957 regular session of her legislature, provided for interposition thusly:

"The Legislature of the State of Texas is the appropriate body under mandate from the people of Texas to intervene between Federal encroachment and State sovereignty:

"*Resolved*, That the sovereign State of Texas intervenes and registers officially its objection on behalf of its people to the effort of the Federal Government to assert an unlawful dominion over her citizens and * * * Texas declares her firm intention to take all appropriate measures honorably, legally and constitutionally available to the State to resist illegal encroachment upon her sovereign power."

The Legislature of North Carolina did not provide for interposition, being the only State in the South failing to do so.

HAS THE SOUTH USED INTERPOSITION?

Now, what have the Southern States done to utilize the resolutions and acts of interposition so hopefully adopted by their legislatures?

A search of the records shows that it has been employed only three times, but in each instance was successfully used.

(1) In the first instance, interposition was used by Gov. Allan Shivers, of Texas.

The action of Governor Shivers grew out of the decision in the case of *Jackson* v. *Raw-*

[2] *Ableman* v. *Booth*, 62 U.S. 506.

[3] General Laws of Wisconsin, 1859.

don (235 F. 2d 93), pursuant to which the U.S. district court, northern district of Texas entered a decree on August 27, 1956, ordering the admission of Negro children to the Mansfield High School at Mansfield, Tex., and forever restraining the Mansfield school district officials, and all other persons acting in concert with them, from refusing admission of the Negro plaintiffs to the Mansfield High School.

As a result of this decree, disorders developed at the school and then Governor Shivers issued the following statement on August 31, 1956, which effectively interposed the sovereignty of the State of Texas to prevent the admission of the Negro students to the Mansfield High School:

"Under the general powers of the Governor to enforce the laws and see that order is kept in Texas, I have instructed Colonel Garrison to send Texas Rangers to Mansfield to cooperate with local authorities in preserving the peace. I talked by telephone with B. L. Huffman, superintendent of the Mansfield schools, and have wired O. C. Rawdon, president of the Mansfield school board, urging that the board go ahead and transfer out of the district any scholastics, white or colored, whose attendance or attempts to attend Mansfield High School would reasonably be calculated to incite violence. Should the resulting actions on part of the Mansfield school authorities be construed as contempt of the Federal courts, I respectfully suggest that the charge should be laid against the Governor and not the local people."

To this date, as a result of the Governor's act of interposition, no Negro children have entered the Mansfield High School.

(2) In the second instance, interposition was asserted by the Virginia Supreme Court in the case of *Naim* v. *Naim* (87 S.E. 2d 749).

That court held a marriage void that was in violation of a Virginia miscegenation statute. The U.S. Supreme Court held on appeal that the constitutionality of the Virginia statute was not squarely before it, and remanded the case to the Virginia court for clarification of the issues. Whereupon the Virginia Supreme Court held there was no provision in Virginia practice whereby the case could be reopened in the trial court and thus must adhere to its original opinion (90 S.E. 2d 849). In a per curiam opinion[4] the U.S. Supreme Court denied a motion to set the case down for oral argument, holding that the case was devoid of a properly presented Federal question.

The decision of the Virginia Supreme Court remains unchanged up to the present time.

(3) In the third instance, interposition was invoked by the Florida Supreme Court in the case of the *State of Florida, ex rel. Virgil D. Hawkins* v. *The Board of Control, et al.*[5]

This action was commenced by a Negro who sought admission to the Law School of the University of Florida in 1949. On appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court, that court held after the decisions in the school segregation cases that the Negro must be admitted. The Florida Supreme Court held that he could not be admitted to the school because it would lead to violence in the university communities, and that it would bring about a serious disruption of the university system. Following this action the U.S. Supreme Court denied a writ of certiorari to the plaintiff bringing about the withdrawal of his application for admission to the school.

From its early history to this date, interposition has always succeeded in the hands of a Governor or a State court that has had the desire and the courage to use it with determination.

Stripped to its simple definition, interposition is the right of a State to interpose its sovereign authority against a violation of the Constitution by the Federal Government.

Interposition has never failed. Interposition will succeed now, if our southern Governors and State courts will stand firmly upon the rights of the State.

[4] 76 S. Ct. 472.
[5] 76 S. Ct. 464.

Address by Dr. Samuel D. Proctor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOSEPH W. BARR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, April 12, the national convocation of the United Negro College Fund met in Indianapolis, Ind., in my congressional district. This organization has always been very close to my heart because I ran its campaign in the State of Indiana for 2 years.

Dr. Samuel D. Proctor, president of Virginia Union University, made the opening remarks of this convocation. It seems to me that in these remarks he stated explicitly the problems of these Negro colleges and the contribution they can make to the United States of America. It is my opinion that this statement is of such importance to our educational and cultural development that it should be a part of the record of this Congress:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY SAMUEL D. PROCTOR BEFORE UNITED NEGRO COLLEGE CONVOCATION, INDIANAPOLIS, IND., APRIL 12, 1959

Mr. Chairman, members of the Indianapolis host committee, the Honorable Mr. KENNEDY, Senator from Massachusetts, my distinguished colleagues, ladies, and gentlemen, in these days of contention for full integration in educational opportunity, it may seem paradoxical that we should be here in the interest of Negro colleges. It may appear to some that we should be seeking to abandon all institutions that imply racial distinction, close the doors of Fisk and Tuskegee forever and send our students to Emory, Vanderbilt, Duke, and Tulane.

Well-meaning persons, in the north especially, who are unfamiliar with the tedious process of social change and who are poorly informed on the extent of the impediments that lie between what is and what ought to be, have refused to support the United Negro College Fund on the grounds that this effort resuscitates the dying anatomy of segregation when rigor mortis should be setting in.

Others have suggested that every effort should be spent on compelling full implementation of the 14th amendment, as recently interpreted by the Supreme Court, and waste no further time and effort on predominantly Negro institutions.

There is a rather naive optimism abroad that the lion of race hate and the lamb of brotherhood may lie down together much sooner than the facts tend to indicate.

But the facts with which we must reckon courageously, imaginatively and immediately promise a long and arduous struggle against deeply entrenched prejudices, hallowed by time-honored practice. We are struggling against emotional sanction and accommodation to habitual practices which enjoy community and political approval and encouragement.

We operate in a climate of stagnant racial attitudes and a resistance to change fortified by community housing patterns, complete separateness in recreational and social life and legislative circumvention of lawful and duly constituted authorities. We are frustrated by intimidation, threats, economic reprisals, editorial castigation and the timidity of our friends who know the dangers of being overtly committed to our cause.

Every sound strategy for lifting the Negro people out of the morass of second-class citizenship, and establishing them as a fully productive, fully responsible, fully integrated and fully accepted segment of the American populace should receive our prayers and our generous support. And there are many such strategies. I am aware of the tremendous change in attitudes which may result from church agencies operating with an inclusive policy. The enlargement of the franchise of the Negro and the increase of political articulation throughout the country will certainly prove efficacious in changing the status of this crucial and growing minority.

It has already been demonstrated, however, that all other things being equal, the more education a people possesses the more the people can help themselves to approach the whole gamut of their problems with creativity and effectiveness.

The last thing that we would want to see would be the diminution of the influence of these 33 colleges, located in the South where more than 12 million Negroes must work out their destiny. We must not let these faculties become second rate, these buildings dilapidate, the laboratories become empty, these libraries become dust-laden curiosity items, the tradition of excellence evaporate and the history of sacrificial devotion to the upgrading of our people be forgotten.

Because of the record that these schools have already made in producing leadership of highest caliber, we must see them retained and strengthened, not as a matter of charity, but out of a moral, civic and patriotic compulsion. This compulsion is generated on the one hand by our loyalty to basic American ideals. We are passionately dedicated to the principle that every person shall have the right to realize his maximum capacity in a society which provides the same opportunity for everyone else. It is therefore cause for national shame that so many Negroes have been dwarfed by the impositions of racism throughout our country.

These colleges offer one of the best instruments by which the lags may be corrected and the evil consequences of racial inequality may be checked.

Ten of these colleges are located in the hard-core States of South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi—States where no modicum of integration in public schools and in tax-supported colleges and universities has yet taken place and where the reaction is so intense that no one dares to predict what forced compliance will bring forth.

But these 10 colleges, with integrated boards of trustees, integrated faculties, on whose campuses may be held meetings and conferences that bring all people together—these colleges are bound to be the key to the future in these States. Their alumni are serving constructively in every corner of these States, winning the admiration and respect of the people.

When democracy becomes a fact throughout the country we will owe much to the leaders prepared in United Negro College fund schools.

Not only are we compelled by virtue of our concern for democratic practices and processes but we are under a compulsion to see education—just education—available to everyone who desires it.

Thirty-two of the thirty-three are located in the area where two-thirds of the Negroes live. There are 25,000 boys and girls enrolled now in these colleges. This says nothing

of the prediction that the American college population will be doubled within 10 years.

Where will they go? The families from which they come earn one-half what the white families earn. They have to attend colleges whose fees are tailored to meet low-income family needs. How can Negroes pay $1,500 to $2,000 a year for college when this strains white families earning twice what Negroes earn? This is not just a southern problem. Our large numbers of northern students suggest that the relatively lower income of Negroes the Nation over require college education to be made available at $900 a year more or less.

This is of vital importance to the northern industrial centers. The Negro population has increased one to every four during the last 5 years in New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, and other points in between. You cannot escape the flood tide of untrained, frightened, apprehensive migrants looking for a better break in life. But if the condition is changed at the source, if wider opportunities are extended in the South, instead of the next 10 years bringing problems to the large urban centers, we will see an increasing number of technicians, accountants, nurses, teachers, and managers available for American business industry and humanitarian agencies.

A democracy is not a static thing. We do not look at problems with hand-wringing, teeth-grinding disgust. We approach our problems dynamically and positively. We see changes taking place all over. Negroes have sloughed off paternalism for equality. This is an ideal. In order for this to become a fact educational opportunities must be maintained and enhanced, especially in the South.

In order for us to destroy the correlation between color and delinquency, the new order now emerging must be nurtured to its full flower by wise and productive Negro leadership, eliciting respect and mutual friendship from those who will find it difficult to change their pattern of relationships.

When we succeed—for we will succeed—it will be as natural for a firm to engage a Negro—as natural for a real estate broker to sell a Negro a home in the nicest neighborhood—as natural for a club to receive a Negro member—it will be as natural as the seasons trailing each other and the planets coursing the sky in their orbits, for color will be neutralized.

And, then, there is the moral and spiritual compulsion which moves us to see this cause, thus far so nobly advanced, continue with vigor and strength.

One of the most moving chapters of American history is perhaps the least known. Ninety-four years ago, when 4 million slaves were set free in the midst of their former masters, in a climate of resentment and hostility, with no heritage of blood, gold, or self-determination, freed from the bondage of slavery, but shackled and fettered by the bondage of ignorance and fear, before the dust had settled at Appomattox and while the shells still smoldered on the ground at Gettysburg and Chancellorsville, and while the echoes of the gunfire from the Merrimac and the Monitor could still be heard on Virginia's fair and fertile peninsula, New England trained teachers, fair skinned and blue eyed, were leaving their ivy clad campuses, moving to South Carolina, Texas, and Tennessee, and Georgia to establish Shaw University, Atlanta University, Spelman College, and Hampton Institute. They used church basements, rented halls, abandoned buildings, boxcars, and parsonages.

In Richmond, they purchased Lumpkin's jail where incorrigible slaves had been held and beaten to submission. The jailkeeper's house became a chapel for the preaching of the gospel, the cellblocks became a dormitory, the whipping post became a lectern. The devil's half-acre became holy ground.

The rich tradition of the Judaeo-Christian faith had encountered another staggering human need and these angels of mercy came not to be ministered unto, but to minister.

My own grandmother, a contemporary of Booker Washington during his student days at Hampton, brought into my youth the discipline and the love of learning and the self-respect that she received at the hands of these dedicated servants of God.

Practically every one of these 33 colleges had such a beginning; they were the creation of sensitive spirits who braved ostracism and abuse to bring enlightenment to a benighted people.

Great progress has been made in these 90-odd years, but the Negroes of America are still wrestling with the consequences of slavery and segregation. An unfortunate image of our people has been etched indelibly on the minds of our neighbors, the delinquencies, social, and economic, caused and permitted by ghetto living and racial restrictions have perpetuated a stereotype among us for far too long a time.

The vicious cycle goes on and on. Denial on account of inferiority. More inferiority because of denials.

Any person whose soul is tuned to the moral imperatives of the God of our fathers can see the evils inherrent in this cycle.

A court edict will go far to correct it. Good will and fellowship will help to change the atmosphere and encourage amelioration.

But nothing—nothing will cause the tide of prejudice and hate to recede like the steady flow of well-educated, courageous, mature, and God-fearing young Negroes, standing in their full height as strong, young Americans, ready to become answers—not further problems—to the critical needs of our time.

When Henry L. Morehouse, the man for whom Morehouse College is named, was raising funds for the Baptist colleges of the South 50 years ago, he was asked why he felt that Negroes should be trained in the arts and sciences. His reply is a classic:

"I believe in the thorough humanity of the black man capable of culture, capable of high attainment under proper circumstances and with sufficient time—not a being foreordained to be a hewer of wood and drawer of water for the white race—predestined to irrevocable inferiority, but a being whose mind and soul can expand indefinitely, to comprehend the great things of God, and to take a place of usefulness and honor in the world's activities."

These colleges are the fulcrum, your support is the lever by which America may break the inertia in solving one of her most difficult problems and move forward without spot and blemish in her rightful role as the leader among the nations of the earth.

More Propaganda From the U.S. Department of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, on March 18 I introduced H.R. 5813 to provide for the expansion of presently authorized research into the effects of pesticides on fish and wildlife.

In a statement, on page A2375 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date, I documented the need for such an expanded program and the ways in which the increased authorization could be well spent.

In this connection, my attention has been called to an article by Jerry Hornsby in the March 20, 1959, issue of the Alabama Journal on the premiere of a new film on the fire ant control program. The article follows:

MORE PROPAGANDA FROM USDA

(By Jerry Hornsby)

Yesterday's Montgomery premiere of a new film entitled "Fire Ants on Trial" has left its first audience puzzled.

Is the film an attempt at dramatic preeminence, or is it supposed to be the comedy hit of the year?

Produced by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the film supposedly depicts the life of the imported fire ant which the USDA would have us believe constitutes the biggest single insect menace now facing the American public.

Among the film's featured stars are an anonymous little fire ant who starts out narrating the film, then suddenly disappears; a couple of local television personalities, and various Autauga County farmers and their families.

The film opens with a frightening closeup of a rather formidable-looking fire ant thrashing about to the accompaniment of pulsating music, and closes with this choice bit of dramatic monologue: "It is written that man inherits the earth—but for how long?"

SAFER WITH ANTS THAN POISONS

How long indeed? We're a lot safer with the fire ant than with the insecticides being used to poison them, and we'd be a little better off financially if we didn't have to kick in the tax money to support the USDA's "eradication" program in Alabama and other Southeastern States.

Eradication? Hardly, if the USDA's own figures and calculations are correct.

According to them, 11 million acres in Alabama are infested by the fire ant. Also according to the USDA, not more than 200,000 acres will be treated in Alabama during any one year.

As was pointed out recently at the 23d annual convention of the National Wildlife Federation, this means it will take 55 years to treat all infested areas in Alabama.

Figuring the residual effects of these insecticides to be 5 years, the areas now being treated will be vulnerable to reinfestation for 50 years before all areas are covered.

Meanwhile, what type of animal life besides fire ants is being killed? The USDA film neglects to touch upon this minor aspect of its program.

The poisons' disastrous effects upon wildlife (which is why a fire ant discussion creeps into this column) are generally known to sportsmen and conservation workers throughout the South. Appalling kills have been verified in Alabama and other Southern States.

The effect upon domestic animals was confirmed by the journal's own investigation into the Monroeville program. There, 36 affidavits showed the poison deaths of almost 700 chickens and other domestic animals.

POSSIBLE EFFECTS ON HUMAN BEINGS

Professional men are warning of the possible long-range effects upon human beings. A prominent medical doctor says the increasing use of pesticides is connected directly with the "alarming rise in the incidence of deaths from heart attacks and other forms of vascular disease." They also are thought to be contributing to an increasing number of mental and leukemia victims, among others.

Does the fire ant itself pose a menace to our very survival, as the USDA film intimates?

The USDA says the ant is a threat to human life; the National Audubon Society says one death has been attributed to the fire ant since its invasion of American soil 30 years ago.

The USDA says the fire ant is a menace to animal life; Auburn researchers, who are probably better informed about the fire ant than any other group or individual in the South, have observed no animal kills.

The USDA says the ant is a menace to crops; Auburn found it impossible to encourage ants to eat plants growing on their own mounds.

The USDA says the ant poses a threat to wildlife; Auburn researchers and the conservation department find nothing to substantiate this claim, and even say that wildlife is more plentiful in certain areas heavily infested by fire ants.

DEPARTMENT SEEKS ANOTHER $250,000

The battle rages, the public takes sides, and in the Alabama Legislature the agriculture department requests another $250,000 for its treatment program this year.

If only Noah had stepped on one of the little tikes as it boarded the Ark.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture has committed $4.8 million for eradication of the fire ant in the last 2 years, and the budget request for fiscal 1960 includes another $2.4 million for this purpose—despite disastrous kills of fish, small game, and other animal life, including livestock and poultry in the sprayed areas.

It seems to me that at least part of this amount could better be spent on research to find out what these deadly poisons are doing not only to fish and wildlife, but also to man.

In Remembrance of Him

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most solemn observances of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite of Freemasonry is the commemoration of the Last Supper that Jesus shared with His disciples; and the tragic events that followed that repast are foreshadowed in the ancient ceremony of extinguishing the lights.

On March 26 of this year, at the beginning of this annual commemoration, the Imperial Potentate of North America, A.A.O.N.M.S., George E. Stringfellow, of New Jersey, delivered the following address which was given at the Scottish Rite Maundy Thursday dinner, held at the Scottish Rite Temple, Balboa, C.Z. Mr. Stringfellow applies ancient religious teachings to the problems of today in a most constructive approach. Under unanimous consent, I include this address in full in the Appendix of the RECORD where his thoughts will be available to all of the Members:

IN REMEMBRANCE OF HIM

(An address by George E. Stringfellow)

Maundy Thursday is a day of deep significance to Christians and Jews alike.

It was on this Thursday of Holy Week that Jesus gathered his disciples for the observance of the ancient Feast of the Passover.

It was on this night before he was crucified that our Lord instituted the holy supper and mandated his disciples to do this in remembrance of him.

From these two historical events, which we traditionally commemorate on Maundy Thursday, have come an enduring emphasis upon the essentiality for mankind of such qualities as sacrifice, humility, service, and love.

With the passing of the centuries some of the external forms of the observance of Maundy Thursday have been modified.

The ceremony of washing the feet of the poor by noblemen, prelates, and kings is obsolete. The tradition of giving special alms and "Maundy money" is now seldom observed. Other special ceremonies and rituals have long since passed into the limbo of things forgotten.

The spiritual, moral, and ethical significance, however, of Maundy Thursday has not been diminished by the passing of time.

Certainly the opportunities to apply these values in a practical way have increased with each succeeding generation and, in our time, have multiplied almost unbelievably as our daily lives have become more complicated and our society has become more complex.

How easy it is for all of us to become involved and burdened with trivia of daily living. How easily we forget the really important things in life.

Our thoughts and our energy are too often devoted to the ephemeral rather than the eternal. We give ourselves unthinkingly to passing fancies rather than to enduring values.

We forget to commune with our God except when we are in trouble. We fail to think very much about the problems of other people. Seldom do we share another's burdens, his sorrows, or his cross.

But Jesus said at the Last Supper, "This do in remembrance of Me."

His command is neither selfish nor personal. Our Lord wanted us to remember all that is good in life, to cherish truth and beauty and goodness. He wanted us to conduct our daily lives in remembrance of Him.

We must ever remember that ours is a country founded upon the ideals of the Old anw New Testaments, by people who took their Bible seriously. We must remember that the men and women who came to our shores in search of religious and economic freedom were bound together by a spiritual thread that no hardship could sever. That thread has been the warp on which the whole pattern of our Nation was built. It is no accident that on our Liberty Bell the words "proclaim liberty throughout the land to all the inhabitants thereof" are to be found in the Old Testament Book of Leviticus.

It was that faith in God, as emphasized in our Bible, that gave our forefathers the courage to fight for independence and to win in spite of overwhelming odds.

From that faith came the almost divine wisdom that gave us our Constitution which for 170 years has assured us the right of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

That faith was the light which guided our leaders during the dark days of the Civil War. That same faith today will help us overcome the danger of communism, which is threatening the world. The Communists fear the power of belief in God and assert that it must be exterminated before communism can be safe. By their own admissions we have in our possession a spiritual weapon which can be used against this ideology which denies God, enslaves man, creates hate, and devastates the human soul.

As Christians and Jews and as Masons we believe in the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. This is a phrase we hear often in the rituals of our order. Its simplest interpretation can be made in the words of Jesus when he said "A new commandment I give unto you, that you love one another."

This is what gives significance to Maundy Thursday. This is why we are here tonight—to remember and to heed with renewed spirit the commandment to "love one another."

If we should practice that admonition, it might well be the solution to the ills and problems of the modern world. That may sound visionary, but it isn't impossible if we follow Jesus' teachings and his example.

His love inspired love in those around Him. There was little reason for a strict orthodox Jew like James to associate with a despised tax collector like Matthew. Yet, when they became friends of Jesus, they inevitably became friends of each other. A rough fisherman like Peter had little in common with a refined scholar like Nathaniel but they were drawn together by their mutual friendship with Jesus. And so it was that the love one showed for another, touched someone else, and like the ripples on the water reached unseen shores as a result of one point of contact.

To love one another is the motivating spirit of our brotherhood. Our example could be the pebble that could start the ripple of friendship spreading among ourselves, our neighbors, our business associates, our Government officials, and finally, through the leaders of other nations, touch foreign shores.

If the spirit of brotherhood were practiced in the affairs of individuals and of nations, the unrest which now disturbs the world would disappear.

It would create a better understanding. It would protect the weak from the strong. It would eliminate selfishness and greed. We would have peace and good will in national and international affairs. The world would thus be a better place in which to live.

And so in the name of Jesus Christ, our Savior, I say unto you, "Love one another."

Hunger Breeds Discontent and Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 23, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, when Fidel Castro was in Washington, he made the statement that Cuba will not turn to communism as long as the Cubans have enough to eat. Of course, this is an oversimplification of the situation, but it contains a basic truth. So long as people are hungry, uneducated and unemployed, they are easy prey for the first ism that comes along.

On April 20, I introduced in the House a companion bill to the food for peace bill introduced in the Senate by Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY. Under the provisions of this bill, our abundant food production would be used to implement our foreign policy by helping underdeveloped countries help themselves.

The importance of economic foreign aid is pointed out in an editorial which appeared in the current issue of my State's farm magazine, Wisconsin Agriculturist and Farmer. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include that editorial in the RECORD:

FOREIGN AID: HOW MUCH?

Both Houses of Congress seem bound and determined to slash $1 billion off the Government's request of $3.9 billion for foreign aid.

Almost any proposed slash in Government spending brings out a brigade of lobbyists to stop the cut. But foreign aid does not have a lobby.

Members of the House would like to take the full cut from economic aid, leaving the military intact. Leading Senators vow to fight for full economic aid, would cut military aid to underdeveloped lands.

The present Government request leans heavily to the military. Two-thirds of the request was earmarked for military assistance.

Economic foreign aid seems to lack all glamour. And yet it is one way to build stability in many troubled countries.

We can pour millions in tanks and guns into a country. One revolution can topple the government, turning all the equipment over to a totalitarian leader. Unless we are willing to risk an all-out war, we can only watch helplessly from the sidelines.

Only when people have productive jobs, schools to educate the people and some measure of security in life, will they have stable governments. So long as they are uneducated, unemployed—have seemly nothing to lose—that long will they follow whatever rabble rouser promises the most.

Economic aid, used wisely, brings jobs, education and stability to the peoples of underdeveloped lands. The amount of money needed may look great. But it is small compared to even a Korean war.

If we fail to help meet the economic needs of our friends overseas, the Russians are only too happy to rush to their rescue.

If we fail we can expect to continue to spend far more than economic aid would cost us. We'll spend it—as we have been doing for sometime—rushing from trouble spot to trouble spot trying to put out the fires. And we'll often be too late. We can expect to see more and more countries drop from the roster of the free world.

The truth is, that in these troubled times we need to spend more money on economic development overseas, not less.

The Farm Scandal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the current issue of Life magazine contains a timely editorial concerning the farm subsidies and surpluses in this country and how they are costing the American people nearly 20 cents out of every tax dollar spent for nondefense Government needs this year.

SUBSIDIES RAISE THE PRICE OF FOOD AND CLOTHING

I agree with the editorial that these unrealistic subsidies and surpluses are just raising the prices of food and clothing that must be purchased by my constituents in the Second Congressional District of Massachusetts, and by all Americans throughout the country.

SUPPORTS WILL COST $5.4 BILLION THIS YEAR

This Government is going to spend another $5.4 billion on supports this fiscal year. Storage alone is costing $1 billion a year for the surpluses. The overall farm program has grown to ridiculous proportions.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this editorial to my colleagues to read, and, under unanimous consent, insert it in the RECORD:

A TAX CUT YOU CAN AID

Fellow taxpayer, on this annual occasion of wailing and gnashing of teeth, we have a question to ask you: "If a man came up to you and asked you for a lot of money so he could raise the price of your food and of the shirt on your back, would you hand it over—or sock him?"

The answer is, you are handing it over, billions upon billions, and it is being used to raise the price of your food and clothing. We're talking about the subsidies being paid to farmers for crops that aren't needed, to raise new surpluses to pile on top of staggering existent surpluses.

This economic madness has now reached its ultimate absurdity with the multimillion dollar soil-bank program which is enabling quite a few farmers to retire: by agreeing to take their entire farm out of production for many years, they can get enough Government money to sit back and do nothing at all. Does that make you feel good at income tax time? Well, listen to this:

Out of every tax dollar you pay this year for nondefense Government needs, nearly 20 cents of it will be spent on these needless handouts to farmers.

At this very moment you have nine billions of your money tied up in these surpluses. They are now so huge that it will cost you more than $1 billion this year just to pay storage and other charges.

You've got as much money sunk in this unwanted surplus as you will spend this year on the whole U.S. Army.

You're going to spend another $5.4 billion on supports this fiscal year. And it isn't all going, as originally intended, to help the struggling small farmer stay on his feet. The great bulk of it is going to corporations or other farm outfits with operations so huge that two of them got more than $1 million each in loans, while 15 others got more than $250,000. Such loans frequently wind up as subsidies.

The Government has now so much wheat stacked up that if not another bushel were grown this year we would still have enough for all our domestic and foreign needs. In spite of this you, the American taxpayer, paid $330,267.51 in the form of a loan to the corporation of Tom Campbell, the millionaire wheat king of Montana (Life, March 23), who is perfectly capable of looking after himself.

Do you know how much of your tax money is going to support this wasteful and self-defeating program? Every single penny you pay above the basic 20% rate goes into the farm supports. The $5.4 billion now going into this is $2.2 billion more than the entire Federal budget in 1929.

Farmers, once free and independent, can now be arrested and prosecuted for growing "too much" grain even if they do nothing with it but feed it to hogs on their farms.

The Government has so much surplus cotton that it has been dumped overseas at less than the price paid. But U.S. shirtmakers have to pay an artificially high price for cotton, thus making your clothes cost more than they should. Make you happy? Well, reflect on the further fact that you paid $781,274 for a loan to Mississippi's Delta and Pine Land Co., a big corporation. The loan, unrepaid, became an actual subsidy.

Corn growers, who recently voted to accept a lower support price ($1.12 a bushel) in return for freedom to plant as many acres as they please, are getting ready to plant what is expected to be the biggest crop in U.S. history. The prospect of even trying to cope with this surplus has struck Eisenhower's economizers with fear and trembling. To buy it up would send the already fantastic cost of subsidies right through the ceiling.

In short, the whole farm support program, which has cost you $18 billion in a quarter-century, is a colossal failure.

The only sensible thing to do about it is to get rid of it, stop it. Why go on pouring good money after bad?

The subsidies were enacted in the depression, when farmers were in desperate need. Today, farming is a big business, highly mechanized, performed mainly by large operators, and enormously efficient. Thanks to chemical fertilizers and automation, each year it gets more out of every acre. There is no more reason why you should give a subsidy to this successful big business than to General Motors or any private operation. It can stand on its own feet. When it is left to find its own way in a free market you'll get cheaper meat, bread, and clothing. And the farm business will shake down to those efficient enough to survive.

Of course, that kind of a jolt will create distress for some of the smaller, marginal farmers who are on land that should not be in cultivation. But the taxpayers should be perfectly willing to spend whatever is necessary to relocate them. Such aid would only be a drop in the bucket compared to the billions now going to the big fellows who don't need relief.

Cynics in Washington say that no farm bill of any kind—for better or for worse—can be got through Congress in this political year when every other Senator is a would-be President. The cynics assume that you taxpayers will go on as before, meekly shelling out this money for what is, in reality, a double tax on you—the cost of the subsidy plus higher prices for your food.

Well, you can prove the cynics wrong. In this country, the voter is king. When he squawks loud enough, Congress listens—even more so in a political year. So start squawking loud and long enough to put an end, for good and all, to this incredible farm scandal that is getting worse every year.

The New York Naval Shipyard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, the New York Naval Shipyard, which to us of Brooklyn will always be affectionately known as Brooklyn Navy Yard, recently celebrated its 158th year of continued service to the Nation. It was originally established in February 1801 on a 42-acre tract of land and was subsequently expanded over the years, until it now occupies some 288 acres of factories, shops, drydocks, streets, ways, and buildings. It is a tremendous center of production and skill serving the needs of our country's defenses.

I am particularly proud of this shipyard because it is located in my district. I am proud of its wonderful record of achievements throughout its long history; the skilled and loyal personnel employed there; and the very able men

who are at the helm of this shipyard. It is no wonder that the New York Naval Shipyard has become popularly known as the Can Do shipyard, because of the great ships that have been built there and the men who built them. No job is too difficult for them and none is impossible.

The present commander of the New York Naval Shipyard is Rear Adm. S. N. Pyne, whom I have had the pleasure of meeting on a number of occasions. In the 2 years since he has been in charge of the shipyard he has done a magnificent job under difficult circumstances. Under his splendid leadership two special jobs were completed of which all the employees at the shipyard, in fact all of Brooklyn, were especially proud. I refer to the repair work done on the U.S.S. *Saratoga* and the construction of the U.S.S. *Independence*. For these jobs well done, I wish to extend my congratulations to Admiral Pyne and his very able crew at the New York Naval Shipyard.

While I extol the virtues of both the people and the facilities available at the New York Naval Shipyard, which I regard as the greatest in the world, I desire to call the attention of my colleagues in Congress and our leaders of the Defense Department, especially in the Department of the Navy, to the fact that this shipyard could and should get more work. I should like to suggest that the next aircraft carrier be assigned for construction there, as well as some of the new fleet of atomic-powered submarines, and other naval vessels being contemplated in the near future.

In connection with the job done on the U.S.S. *Saratoga* and the U.S.S. *Independence*, Admiral Pyne has received many congratulatory messages. Just a few of these have been selected and I am now inserting them into the RECORD. These messages are a well-deserved tribute to Admiral Pyne and the entire personnel at the New York Naval Shipyard. The messages are as follows:

"SARATOGA"

(a) From the Chief of Naval Operations: "Successful sea trials of *Saratoga* noted with pleasure. Congratulations and a special well done to all hands for expeditious completion of *Saratoga's* main reduction gear repairs.

"ARLEIGH BURKE."

(b) From commander in chief, Atlantic Fleet: "Early completion date on *Saratoga* most impressive. Consider this excellent example of the continued cooperation and effort which helps keep us in business."

(c) From the Chief of the Bureau of Ships: "Successful completion *Saratoga* considered outstanding accomplishment in view very great magnitude of task and very brief time elapsed start to finish. Convey my sincere appreciation to all responsible personnel.

"A. G. MUMMA."

(d) From the commander, Naval Air Force, Atlantic: "*Saratoga* sea trials successful. In accomplishing the replacement No. 3 main reduction gear in 2 weeks to the hour, you surpassed our most optimistic estimates. Magnificient job.

"Thank you."

(e) From commander, Carrier Division Six: "I hope that you may have a suitable opportunity to convey to all involved in the repairs to *Saratoga* my deep admiration of the superb job that was done. The professional competence shown together with the enthusiasm and interest around the clock for 2 weeks by all hands is an inspiration to all of us aboard.

"Many thanks and good luck.

"RADM ANDERSON."

(f) From the commanding officer, *Saratoga:* "Sea trial on No. 3 main engine reduction gear completely successful at all speeds including suitable period at full torque. Am proceeding Norfolk.

"Consider shipyard completing gear change in only 2 weeks in round the clock accident free effort is an impressive achievement and a tribute to all those who took part."

"INDEPENDENCE"

(a) From the Chief of the Bureau of Ships: "congratulations to you and all New York Naval Shipyard personnel on the fine shipbuilding job represented by U.S.S. *Independence*. This ship is a worthy addition to our fleet and another important contribution by your yard to national defense. An excellent performance.

"A. G. MUMMA."

(b) From the Commanding Officer, U.S.S. *Independence* (CVA62):

"For Rear Admiral Pyne:

"We leave New York with great appreciation for the fine ship built us by the great shipyard you command.

"MCELROY."

Increased Minimum Wage Would Benefit Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter from Mr. Joseph L. Hueter, manager of the Philadelphia Textile Workers joint board, Textile Workers Union of America, AFL–CIO.

He points out that the increase in the minimum wage to $1.25 an hour and the extension of coverage to workers now excluded would increase by an estimated $95 million a year the purchasing power of low-income workers in Pennsylvania, without imposing an undue hardship on Pennsylvania employers. The House should act promptly on the Kennedy-Clark-Morse-Roosevelt bill.

The letter follows:

PHILADELPHIA TEXTILE
WORKERS JOINT BOARD,
TEXTILE WORKERS UNION
OF AMERICA, AFL–CIO,
Philadelphia, Pa., April 3, 1959.

Hon. GEORGE M. RHODES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RHODES: Under date of March 10, 1959, Mr. Sol Stetin, the regional director of the Textile Workers Union of America for the States of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware, sent you a letter pointing out that within the State of Pennsylvania there are outstanding instances of low-wage employers competing unfairly with manufacturers who pay prevailing rates. Mr. Stetin pointed out that the enactment of a more realistic minimum wage could do much toward correcting the type of situation he described.

To supplement this relevant information sent you by Mr. Stetin and to follow up my earlier communication on this same issue, I wish to call your attention to an estimate just made by the research department of the AFL–CIO on the overall impact on the entire economy of Pennsylvania of the passage of legislation such as H.R. 4488 and S. 1046 which, as you know, organized labor is supporting. The data just released by the AFL–CIO are as follows:

In Pennsylvania, an increase in the minimum wage to $1.25 and extention of coverage to unprotected workers, as provided by the Kennedy-Clark-Morse-Roosevelt bill, would require raises for an estimated 349,000 low-paid workers.

The required increase in total wage and salary payrolls in Pennsylvania would be six-tenths of 1 percent.

Although small as a proportion of total payroll, the increase would be a considerable addition to the purchasing power of the State's lower-income families. In dollar terms, the increase in purchasing power for Pennsylvania's low-income workers would be an estimated $95 million a year.

We believe that these figures demonstrate beyond any question that passage of the broadened coverage and the $1.25 minimum wage would (a) stimulate purchasing power appreciably in our State; (b) offer no particular difficulties for employers in Pennsylvania; (c) aid in the most direct and desirable manner a large group of families who are now suffering severe economic depression.

Although we feel that the purely economic arguments for this legislation are clear and quite substantial, we wish to make it very plain that in the final analysis we support this measure on humane and moral grounds. To us it is quite indefensible and distressing to find that there are practically 350,000 wage earners in a State as productive as Pennsylvania who are today resceiving hourly earnings of less than $1.25 per hour. This figure, of course, does not take into account the larger number of persons who are employed in Pennsylvania at jobs that are classified as intrastate. Certainly we must act promptly to reach as quickly as possible those individuals who can be covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act and whose wages are now so glaringly substantard.

You will understand, I am sure, Mr. Congressman, that we are completely satisfied with your position on this legislation. Our purpose in writing to you once more is to transmit these recent figures relating to the impact of an improved Federal wage and hour bill on Pennsylvania. Also, to ask you to do whatever is possible to see to it that the hearings on the Roosevelt bill before the House Labor Committee are not postponed until passage at this session would be endangered.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH L. HUETER,
Manager.

Under What Circumstances Should a Passport Be Denied to an American Citizen?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mr. Arthur Krock from the New York Times. It will do much to clear up the misun-

derstandings that have developed on the question of compelling the Secretary of State to issue passports to persons who are reliably known to be enemies of our form of government and whose travel can be very injurious to the United States:

A LIBERAL FORMULA FOR THE ISSUING OF PASSPORTS

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, March 30.—The series of decisions by which the Federal courts strongly asserted the constitutional right to travel, and banned as illegal some of the discretionary practices of the Secretary of State in denying and revoking passports, has since been closely studied by Congress and the department for guidance toward a formula the courts will uphold as both constitutional and authorized by Federal statute. The results of the department's study were made public in detail for the first time by its security administrator, Assistant Secretary John W. Hanes, Jr., in a recent speech at Chicago.

The effect of the decision that invoked the new formula was stated by Hanes as follows:

"Since the Supreme Court's 5-to-4 ruling of June 1958 [that the Secretary cannot deny a passport to a known Communist Party member simply for that reason, or to a citizen he has specifically found is going abroad to 'willfully and knowingly engage in activities to advance the international Communist conspiracy'] there has been a flood of applications from such persons * * * some previously denied * * * some made for the first time. Many we know a great deal about. Others we would like to know more about.

But the Department is no longer in a position to inquire, much less to investigate, whether such applicant is a * * * party member or how dangerous he may be * * *. Passports have been and are being issued to all."

The Supreme Court based its ruling in part on the finding that Congress had not specified the right of the Secretary of State to deny passports to Communists just because they are that, and made clear that any new legislation by Congress must not infringe the constitutional right to travel. The consequent bill, approved by the House in the last Congress, died in the Senate. And thus far no action has been taken by the current Congress.

The Hanes speech was made in behalf of such legislation. As the administration's spokesman, he proposed this liberal formula for it:

1. Specific authority for the Secretary of State to deny passports to "hard-core supporters of the international Communist movement." This denial to occur under due process of law, including judicial review. The authority should not apply to citizens who merely hold Communist beliefs or have Communist associations, but should apply to them if they engage here in furtherance of international communism, or if the purpose of their errand abroad is to do this.

2. Due process means to the State Department that the Secretary must have sound, not arbitrary or capricious, reasons for passport denial; that he must give these reasons in detail to the individual concerned, and also give a full opportunity for refutation—in the Department's appellate structure as well as in the courts.

3. But new passport legislation would be meaningless and would not achieve any purpose if it prohibited the Government from utilizing confidential information. Almost without exception dangerous cases * * * involve confidential information and * * * investigative sources. But the Government should be required to provide the applicant a fair summary of the content of any such information.

4. Statutory authority is not wanted by the Department to stifle critics of the Government or the administration; or to restrict the travel of those who hold unorthodox political, social or economic opinions; or to end travel or activity abroad only because it might embarrass the American people or their Government.

5. And it is not wanted to penalize those who, before the nature of the Communist conspiracy became * * * crystal clear, may have had Communist sympathies, or even belonged to Communist organizations in this country.

Hanes probably surprised his Chicago audience with some statistics of passport denials that may also surprise readers of this report, particularly those who have seen in some denials infringements of the constitutional right to travel. He said that from 1952 until the Supreme Court's 1958 ruling the Secretary of State denied passports to only 15 after full hearings. He said also that in the calendar years 1956 and 1957 the Secretary (he must act personally in this matter) issued 1,145,000 passports and only 51 of the applicants were subjected to the process of inquiry.

A Salute to the New Federation in the Sun

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the brazen sun beat down through the sweltering humidity of Port-of-Spain. It was an historic day, April 22, 1958. The multiracial people of Trinidad—Africans, East Indians, whites, Chinese, and every possible combination—were packed tight around the Red House, seat of the Government. Finally the moment all had been waiting for arrived. Princess Margaret, cool and dainty, unruffled by the heat, entered the hall, greeted the officials, then read in her small, girlish voice, "I now declare the Federal Legislature of the West Indies to be inaugurated." With these eventful words, an important step was taken in the development of democratic institutions in the Western Hemisphere—the Federation of the West Indies was created.

This new nation is a crescent-shaped constellation of islands stretching over the Caribbean Sea from Jamaica in the northwest to Trinidad in the southeast. Though divided by Caribbean waters, these antilles share a common beauty—a kaleidoscopic purple and green and blue brilliance of sea around them, mountains climbing steeply from the water, and lush green valleys lying between stony peaks.

The total land area of these islands is only some 8,000 square miles, about the size of New Jersey, but they are scattered over 550,000 miles of water. The people of the West Indies are mostly descendants of slaves brought over from Africa hundreds of years ago to work on sugar plantations. After the abolition of slavery, contract workers were imported from the East Indies, and today the East Indians compose a substantial portion of the population, together with a number of Chinese merchants, some British plantation-owning families, and some descendents of early French planters.

The West Indies are as poor as they are beautiful, with too many people, too few jobs, and a very high birth rate. The islanders, outside of Trinidad and Jamaica, subsist chiefly from farming, particularly sugar and fruit. Some employment is provided in the oilfields and at the asphalt lake in Trinidad and in the bauxite mines in Jamaica. But poverty grinds the ever-increasing population, manifesting itself in wretched living conditions, malnutrition, and tuberculosis.

It was these conditions that engendered the movement for federation. The individual islands by themselves were too small and weak to maintain viable economies. The old form of government, with each island or small group of islands forming a separate colony ruled directly from Great Britain, was a barrier to economic progress.

Farsighted thinkers proposed to unite all of these colonies into one federation, with the unified group of islands to enjoy greater powers of self-government. After 10 years of patient study, negotiation, conference, debate, and action, a federal constitution was adopted.

Under it, the federation is headed by a governor-general appointed by the British Crown, who is vested with exclusive powers over defense and foreign affairs. The governor-general can veto the acts of the Federal Parliament, although he is normally expected to act on the advice of the Prime Minister and his Cabinet. Each colony is represented by two members of the Senate, which has the power to delay the passage of laws for as much as a year but not to defeat legislation. The power to legislate for the federation resides in the house of representatives, which is popularly elected. Its jurisdiction on most matters of policy is shared with the legislatures of the individual states.

Since the governor-general has the power to veto acts of the federal parliament, as well as to conduct foreign affairs, the new constitution does not grant full self-government to the West Indies. Rather, it establishes a more moderate form of colonial government under which the islands can progress toward autonomy. If political developments are satisfactory, in 5 years the West Indies will become completely self-governing and gain dominion status within the British Commonwealth.

From its very beginning, the United States has maintained trade relations with the West Indies. In recent times, many Americans have visited these islands, both as tourists and as traders. Since the early stages of World War II, there have been a number of important defense arrangements with the United States which reflect the interdependent nature of security among the countries of the Western Hemisphere.

The United States, which also emerged from a federation of separate British colonies, congratulates the Federation of the West Indies on the first

anniversary of its federal union and its initial step toward self-government and dominion status within the British Commonwealth of Nations. The economic and political problems confronting the new federation are strongly challenging.

The United States looks forward to being a good neighbor to the Federation of the West Indies.

Our Liberties Versus Responsibilities in a Free Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to include with my remarks an essay by John Kropf, a 10th grade student of Orrville, Ohio, which was the winner in the Ohio American Legion Essay Contest:

OUR LIBERTIES VERSUS RESPONSIBILITIES IN A FREE SOCIETY

(By John Kropf)

What do we mean by liberties? There are many different kinds—civil, political, individual, and personal. All these liberties denote a freedom from restraints by others. Civil liberties are those which we enjoy as citizens. Political are those that permit us to share in the formation and conduct of our Government. In individual liberty we find freedom of the person, while in personal liberty we enjoy equal rights in our courts and freedom of conscience and a security of our person and property.

Where do these liberties come from? We find them in our Constitution and in particular the Bill of Rights which were secured by our forefathers whose fundamental aim was to set up a government which would provide liberty for individual development and progress. Over the years it has been necessary for succeeding generations to put our free society to a test. Perhaps the greatest test was the great Civil War which, in the words of Lincoln, was a testing "whether that Nation, or any other nation so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure." In the exercise and enjoyment of our liberties and our freedoms we give the individual the permission to voice opinions and ideas which are often conflicting with those of others. Thus the "Anvil Chorus" might well be our theme as we hammer out on the anvil of public sentiment the differing voices which when brought together spell progress.

What do we mean by responsibilities? And how are they related, if at all, to our liberties? Someone has said that responsibility is the ability to pay, and I am wondering if it could mean that this relationship is one that requires us to pay for the liberties we enjoy. Since it takes money to run our Government, we have responsibilities toward the payment of taxes which support the Government. But in a larger sense our responsibilities require us to do what is right which will keep alive the liberties we cherish—liberties which were born out of conflict and continued in existence by the watchful eyes of our ancestors.

They also reocgnized their responsibilities as they took pride in their right to vote and to hold public office. They took an active interest in government and were free to say what they wished. This is the only way in which a democratic society can stay in existence.

We must realize that as members of a free society we face our greatest danger when the people fail to take an active interest in their government; fail to make their wishes known; when they feel they are helpless in making great decisions; fail to become informed about affairs of government; and when they become separated from their highest ideals. Each one of these failures represents a failure in the responsibility which we owe to our Government and society. To safeguard our liberties we must see to it that we are not guilty of these failures. We must see to it instead that we concern ourselves with affairs of government; that together we make our wishes known; that we get the necessary information to take part in the big decisions to be made; and that we constantly keep high our ideals. This provides the greatest security in keeping the liberties of our democratic society alive.

Integrity—Address by George Stringfellow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, I know that the membership will wish to read the inspiring address on integrity delivered by Imperial Sir George E. Stringfellow, of East Orange, N.J., imperial potentate, A.A.O.N.M.S., at a luncheon given by Phi Theta Kappa Fraternity, Tivoli Guest House, Balboa, Canal Zone, March 28, 1959.

The countless friends won by George E. Stringfellow in his manifold professional, fraternal, civic, and humanitarian activities associate him with the great traits of integrity and industry about which he spoke so eloquently to Phi Theta Kappa Fraternity. His fine qualities of mind and heart, coupled with his unusually broad experience, admirably qualify George E. Stringfellow for the challenging responsibilities of the office of imperial potentate, A.A.O.N.M.S.

The address reads as follows:

"INTEGRITY"—ADDRESS BY IMPERIAL SIR GEORGE E. STRINGFELLOW, OF EAST ORANGE, N.J., IMPERIAL POTENTATE, A.A.O.N.M.S., AT A LUNCHEON GIVEN BY PHI BETA KAPPA FRATERNITY, TIVOLI GUEST HOUSE, BALBOA, C.Z., MARCH 28, 1959

Thank you for having elected me to honorary membership in your fraternity. I appreciate the honor and I am complimented by your invitation to address you.

I have selected "Integrity" as my subject.

Let us at the outset define "integrity." "Integrity" is soundness of character. It is that quality of mind and spirit which we associate with honesty and good faith. It is the foundation upon which virtue and morality rest. It is the cornerstone of right relationships between individuals and groups. It is an indispesable ingredient of good business and the professions. Everything we are, everything we have, everything we hope for, rest upon the integrity of man.

A nation's greatest wealth is not found in the coffers of its financial institutions, nor is it found in the assets of its industries or its natural resources. A nation's greatest asset is the integrity of its citizens and the responsibility of its government.

There is a false notion abroad today that men of sterling worth, men of complete honesty and noble character, are not successful in a monetary sense. However, the history of human progress is a record of men of integrity, men who could be trusted and men who put righteousness, truth, justice, and freedom above personal gains, above power, yes, at times, above life itself.

Successful men in all walks of life have been men of integrity. The crooked businessman, the unscrupulous lawyer, the quack doctor, and the insincere clergyman are rare enough to make news.

In politics or statesmanship, Abraham Lincoln has been looked upon as a model of integrity. They called him "Honest Abe." The story of his walking 3 miles to return 6 cents to a woman he had overcharged is probably true.

Paralleling "Honest Abe" was the "Prince of Merchants," John Wanamaker, who was affectionately known as "Honest John." The story of his personal life, how he built his business on integrity and maintained it through giving honest value, has been a challenge and an inspiration to merchants everywhere.

In the realm of science and invention, Thomas Alva Edison, with whom I was privleged to be a daily business associate for a number of years, was a man of integrity. There is a story about Edison which I think is worth repeating since it represents a philospohy which he followed throughout his life.

Edison conducted more than 50,000 experiments on a certain product before placing it on the market. While he had taken great care to make sure that the product was right before he began to market it, defects showed up in the field which had not been revealed in laboratory tests. On learning of these defects, Edison closed his factory, requested his customers to return their purchases and to get their money back. Many of his customers were amazed at his request to "return the product and get your money back." Some protested that the product which Edison found defective was better than its competition and refused to respond to the inventor's request. In discussing this incident, I asked Mr. Edison why he had not charged the customers for the service they received and for which many of them were willing to pay. Mr. Edison replied by saying, "My integrity was involved and that is not for sale." Edison knew that integrity is a priceless ingredient and he measured his every decision by integrity. "Is it right?" he would doubtless say to himself. Edison was never interested in who is right. Edison was interested in what is right. And so were all great men of history. That is why their memory commands a devotion rooted deeply in human gratitude.

What is the future for those who are graduating from schools and college today and entering what is considered by some as a hard, cold world is a question many are asking. My answer to that question is that the future was never brighter for those who posses the priceless attributes of integrity and willingness to work. Such young people face the future with confidence and a feeling of security. Their contribution to civilization will be vasty enhanced and their rewards multiplied many times if they go forward with that matchless combination.

In closing, may I quote the last message of Thomas Alva Edison to the American people, and to the world, so far as that is concerned: "Be courageous. * * * History repeats itself again and again. Be as brave as your forefathers before you. Have faith. Go forward."

Integrity and the will to work produce great things. They produce a forward movement which cannot be stopped. Do you have them? If you do not have them, cultivate them.

Mr. Herter, Our New Secretary of State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CARLTON LOSER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including two very fine editorials from my hometown newspapers, the Nashville Tennessean and the Nashville Banner, with regard to the appointment of the Honorable Christian A. Herter as Secretary of State.

These two great newspapers are united on the selection of Mr. Herter. Such approval and support of our national leaders in these crucial times make our country great. Yes; Mr. Herter will be able to take over his new responsibilities with the full approval and support of a united people.

The editorials follow:

[From the Nashville Tennessean, Apr. 19, 1959]

CHOICE OF MR. HERTER WILL BOLSTER U.S. WORLD POSITION

Acting Secretary of State Christian A. Herter's choice to be the head man on foreign affairs after the resignation of Mr. Dulles is a deserved promotion which has the Nation's approval.

As a matter of fact it would have been difficult to overlook his fitness, by background and training, for the post he is now to assume. Senate confirmation can be taken for granted.

President Eisenhower seemed to lay particular emphasis on a clean bill of health for Mr. Herter before making up his mind. But he need not have done so in view of the 2 years of superior service that had marked the Bay Stater's record in the State Department.

Though dependent on hand crutches at times because of arthitis Mr. Herter has nevertheless been energetic and productive. In his 2 years as Under Secretary of State, he necessarily worked more behind the scenes as the operating head while Mr. Dulles was the front man and spokesman.

On those frequent occasions, however, when Dr. Dulles was traveling abroad or troubled by illness, he made the day-to-day decisions, held staff conferences, welcomed visiting diplomats, and directed the operations control board which carried out policy decisions.

Psychologically, it may have been preferable to see a younger and more mobile man as a conductor of foreign policy. But the physical troubles of Mr. Herter are not progressive or in any sense incapacitating, and more important than that, he does not have to be indoctrinated or briefed as to the intricacies relating to the many and complicating policies of the Government.

Though his diplomatic experience is not as great as that of the older Mr. Dulles, the new Secretary nevertheless has had much experience dating from the time he was a staff assistant to President Wilson at the Paris conference of 1919.

And with his background as Governor of Massachusetts and as a Member of Congress from that State, he may be rated as a better politician. He should be able to deal with the Congress more effectively than his predecessor.

In the main, his voting record on the Hill was fairly liberal, and his principal achievement was in seizing upon the Marshall plan idea and lining up support which put it through the Republican 80th Congress.

Of course it is too early for him to discuss any possible changes in policies as they apply to the Berlin or any other situation. But he will have his chance to demonstrate boldness and imagination that has been so often discussed when attending the foreign ministers' conferences and the summit meeting. That will be the climactic effort unless unexpected barriers arise.

In the course of time, Mr. Herter may become a controversial figure, as so many of his predecessors have. But as of now, in assuming tremendous responsibilities, he should be strengthened by the confidence of a sober citizenship, to say nothing of the national administration of which he is a part.

His mere presence as active head of the State Department will tend to increase his country's prestige and build for better morale and unity among the bickering allies.

[From the Nashville Banner, Apr. 20, 1959]

MR. HERTER EMBARKS ON TASK WITH FULL SUPPORT OF UNITED STATES

In just 9 days America's new Secretary of State, Christian A. Herter, will be in Paris meeting with other Western leaders to prepare proposals for negotiating with Russia over the Berlin crisis.

Next month Mr. Herter will be in Geneva for a Big Four foreign ministers conference with Russia to set the stage for a summit meeting.

Then in mid-June, unless all expectations fail, Mr. Herter and President Eisenhower will meet at the summit with Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev, British Foreign Minister Harold Macmillan and French President Charles de Gaulle.

These are the herculean tasks facing the man who has succeeded cancer-stricken John Foster Dulles.

It is generally conceded that as Under Secretary and Acting Secretary, Mr. Herter is the man who can replace Dulles with the least disturbance to State Department operations.

And probably no previous Eisenhower Cabinet appointment has drawn more support at home and abroad than the elevation of Mr. Herter to State Department's top post.

Senator LYNDON JOHNSON's outspoken endorsement of the Herter appointment is indicative of Democratic reaction.

The Senator observed: "Since he has been working closely with Secretary Dulles, his appointment assures continuity of policy." This statement, in itself, must be interpreted as tacit bipartisan endorsement of Dulles' program.

Associates who have worked closely with both Dulles and Herter emphasize that they foresee no change whatever in the basic policy line laid down by Dulles with Eisenhower's approval, and although the two men may differ in their methods of work, the goal will remain the same—and that is, continuing the policy of no appeasement, no surrender to Russian bluff and bluster.

And this is the primary task facing the new Secretary of State, growing from British pressure for a softer approach in dealing with the Russians—a softer approach than West Germany, France, and the United States are willing to take.

It will be Mr. Herter's immediate job to weld the Western Powers into a solid front before facing the Soviets on any vital issue.

To assure the "continuity of policy" Senator JOHNSON referred to, both Mr. Eisenhower and Mr. Herter will be able, during these crucial days ahead, to draw on the vast experience and wisdom of Mr. Dulles who is to be retained—and wisely so—as a consultant to the President.

As Mr. Herter embarks on the history-making job ahead, he does so with the comforting knowledge of the full support of American people.

Letter Opposing Proposed Amendments to Regulation T and Regulation U

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. DORN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter sent by Mr. George J. Scully of the firm of Eisele & King, Libaire, Stout & Co., of New York City, to the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, concerning regulation T and regulation U. I believe it deserves the attention of all of my colleagues:

EISELE & KING, LIBAIRE, STOUT & CO.,
New York, April 1, 1959.

FEDERAL RESERVE BANK OF NEW YORK,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR SIRS: With reference to your request for views on the proposed amendments to regulation T and regulation U, we are opposed to their adoption for the following reasons:

1. There appears to be no evidence of excessive use of credit for the purchase of securities. There is, however, considerable evidence of excessive use of credit in connection with installment buying and real estate.

2. If no excessive use of credit exists in the securities markets it can only be assumed that the proposed changes are aimed at controlling the price of securities, the volume of transactions, or both, neither of which functions appear to be authorized or provided for by the Securities and Exchange Act or the Federal Reserve System.

3. The continued rise in stock prices is considered by most economists as resulting from the fear of inflation by the people. Stock prices merely reflect the effect of the inflationary trends and are not the cause. The public's fear of inflation and their flight from fixed income obligations and cash to equities would be soon dispelled if the Government stopped deficit spending, maintained a balanced budget, and reduced the national debt.

4. The present privilege of switching from one stock to another does not in any way increase the amount of credit currently in use. If the proposed change is made effective it will probably result in creating a greater scarcity of stocks as holders will be unwilling to sell and lose their position or create greater activity in lower priced shares by switching the proceeds of higher priced stocks into an equivalent number of shares of lower priced ones.

5. The long-term result will probably be a lesser liquidity of the market which in turn could produce a drastic decline, and hamper new financing.

6. Any substantial reduction in volume will adversely affect the gross income and profits of member firms, cause a reduction of employment in the financial district, and in all probability make necessary the imposition of increased commission charges to compensate for lower volume.

7. Other lending institutions such as factors or finance companies that are not subject to the same requirements as broker-dealers and banks will be able to continue the extension of credit for the purchase of securities on more liberal terms.

8. Broker-dealers will be discriminated against by being prohibited from arranging loans with banks for their clients. Clients will not discontinue making such loans, they will merely be forced to arrange them directly with the bank or use the services of a money broker not subject to the regula-

tions. Both banks and brokers should be subject to the same regulations with respect to identical transactions, and if banks are to continue to be in a preferred position broker-dealers should be able to handle all of the details of a client's securities transactions.

Yours very truly,

GEORGE J. SCULLY,
Partner.

Drive for Higher Prices in the Name of Fair Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Kansas City Star on January 21, 1959.

That newspaper chronicles some of the evils of the fair trade bills, so-called, the danger to the consumers and to the free competitive American economy which we in America proclaim is the best in the world:

DRIVE FOR HIGHER PRICES IN THE NAME OF FAIR TRADE

You may be forced to pay much higher retail prices by action of this Congress. There is a serious drive for the so-called fair trade bill which is a price-fixing measure. By this device the manufacturers would be permitted to set the retail sale value of their merchandise and force compliance. According to fairly uniform estimates the price increases of controlled merchandise would be close to 30 percent.

It strikes us that the time has come for consumers to talk cold turkey with their Congressmen. Is your Representative in Congress prepared to slap a big price increase on you? Anyone is entitled to know.

The current movement is an effort to set up a substitute for the former State fair trade laws. Encouraged by an act of Congress, nearly all the States adopted official price fixing. Missouri was one of the few that refused to go along. Strong political support for such laws was assembled by associations of small merchants who were fearful of competition by chains and larger stores.

Now the State laws have collapsed before a series of adverse court decisions and competition by uncontrolled brands. State action was supported by a Federal law. But the price fixing principle encountered sharp criticism in the Justice Department. Normally the Federal Government is critical of agreements in restraint of trade.

This time the price-fixing groups propose much more drastic procedure that would enforce prices by Federal law. Missourians who were saved by their legislature from State price fixing would have to pay under the new proposal.

Such restraints of trade are directly opposed to American business principles. Free competition is the life stream of free enterprise. Obviously it is difficult for a small drugstore to compete on a price basis with a big chain. But many small independent merchants are succeeding. Generally the successes are good businessmen who know how to give personal service and make friends for their businesses.

Small business people represent the kind of initiative and courage that built America. Certainly we hope they will continue to be an impotrant part of the American economy. In many fields there are limits on the advantages of bigness.

But it would be ridiculous to ignore an inevitable trend toward big units in the American and world economy. Where it improves efficiency and cuts costs the trend is improving the American standard of living. But like it or not, it is here.

Fair trade laws don't stop the progress toward bigger business. They simply deny the public the benefits from large operations in the form of lower prices. If aroused, the American consumers can protect themselves in Congress.

Hints on Handling Witnesses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I pass along the following editorial by Larry Collins, Sr., of the Long Beach Independent of April 20, 1959, without comment other than to say reading it brought none of my colleagues to mind:

FEELING IMPORTANT

It is unfortunate that same people must express their feeling of importance by trying to make others feel unimportant. It is a weakness found in many executives in dealing with those they supervise. It is shown by some public officials who seek notoriety by browbeating division heads. It is sometimes shown by the way shoppers treat the clerks who wait on them.

Someone has said, "It's nice to be important—but it's more important to be nice." That slogan most of us could profit in our daily dealings with others. It is of particular importance in dealing with those over whom you exert authority. The person who feels secure in his position does not need to browbeat others. Those who feel unsure are more apt to show discourtesy to subordinates because it gives them a sense of power.

This is shown by city councilmen who arrogantly berate city officials or people who appear before them. Often it is shown by Congressmen or State legislators in hearings on budget or other public issues. It is apparent the politicians seeking publicity care nothing for their dignity or that of those whom they berate.

These elected officials are in effect boards of directors of the political units they represent. They make policy and pass laws. The career people who must administer these laws are the employees of the governing body. They may make mistakes and some may deserve to be removed from office. But there is no justification for the vitriolic condemnation they publicly take from politicians who never held an important administrative office.

Some of the public is responsible for the actions of such politicians. They seem to like to read of a tirade by some elected official. It gives the impression that here is a two-fisted individual who does not care what people think. But what they are really praising is an exhibitionist who is insensitive to the decency of dealing with other people. It encourages arrogance and a disregard for human dignity.

This situation is found among some employers in private industry. But very few such enterprises are ever successful. They do not have alert and loyal workers because they destroy these qualities. There are many foremen or supervisors over their fellow workers whose arrogance is destructive to morale. But such people soon find they are despised by workers and removed from such power.

The bigger the man, the more considerate he is of those over whom he has power. There is a humbleness about the successful individual that stands out. It is something he has learned during his climb to his position of authority. He realizes that more is to be gained by a courteous firmness than by an arrogant ranting.

Loud talking, table thumping, and belittling of others may make some people feel important. But actually they show themselves to be irresponsible and lacking in confidence in their own ability. When they deliberately embarrass those over whom they exert power they show an arrogant and cruel streak that labels them as persons who would harm others for their own personal gain. To such people we again quote: "It's nice to be important—but more important to be nice."

Opening the Doors of Soviet Russia for the Emigration of Jews to Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT R. BARRY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, on April 5, Dr. Joseph Schechtman, noted author and Zionist leader, delivered an address in Forest Hills, N.Y., on the problem of opening the doors of Soviet Russia for the emigration of Jews to Israel.

Dr. Schechtman forcefully and dramatically pointed out the paradoxes and pitfalls in Russian policy toward the Jews who tragically are forced to eke out an existence in the barren soil of Communist society with little hope of being permitted by the authorities to escape.

Forced to submit to unrelenting inequality of treatment, Jews in Russia are forbidden the teaching of their religion except by parents; the study of their culture is banned, and Hebrew theaters, cultural institutions, and printing houses have long been closed.

Despite exposure for 40 years to the unrelenting psychological and political pressure of the Russian colossus and despite being denied the opportunity for cultural self-expression, the Jews in the Soviet have not denied their lineage with the West. In the eyes of the Communist dictators this is unforgivable. They refuse to grant to the Jews rights of other minorities and they are obviously not prepared to grant them an extraterritorial national status.

The only alternative to this grim picture is to allow emigration to those who wish to leave.

Dr. Schechtman has explained the problem with clarity and compassion. I am happy to have his address brought to the attention of the Nation so that more of us will be made aware of the plight of these unhappy millions in that wretched land; and, that we remain alerted to their needs—conscious that we will not forget them as long as tyranny and fear darken the face of Communist Russia.

The address follows:

ADDRESS DR. JOSEPH SCHECHTMAN, NOTED AUTHOR AND ZIONIST LEADER, AT A MEETING OF THE UNITED ZIONIST-REVISIONIST ORGANIZATION OF AMERICA TO DEAL WITH THE PROBLEM OF JEWS IN SOVIET RUSSIA, HELD IN FOREST HILLS, N.Y., ON SUNDAY, APRIL 5, 1959

Organizations dealing with the welfare of Jewish communities in all parts of the world have been for years concerned over the status of the Jews of Soviet Russia who are being deprived of the opportunity of cultural self-expression. Every nationality in the U.S.S.R., big and small, possesses a school network of its own, its language is officially recognized, and its national culture fostered. Newspapers and books in dozens of languages are being published in millions of copies. Orthodox and Moslem religious institutions are free to expand. But no such facilities are granted to the Jews, although, technically, the Soviet constitution recognizes them as a national entity, at par with all other ethnic groups.

Study of Hebrew and Hebrew culture is forbidden. So is the teaching of Jewish religion up to the age of 18, except by parents. There are no schools with Hebrew or Yiddish as the language of tuition, nor bilingual schools such as are common in the Western World. With the exception of an occasional sheet in Biro-Bidjan, there is no Jewish periodical in the whole of the Soviet Union. Yiddish theaters and other cultural institutions have been closed and no books in Yiddish or Hebrew are being published.

Citing all these deviations from the general Soviet nationalities policy, Jewish organizations have been persistently appealing for equality of treatment for the Jews in Soviet Russia.

This appeal has remained unheeded. And it has no chance of ever being concurred with by the Soviet regime. It must be realized that, however just and well-founded by Western democratic standards, this plea stands in organic, irremediable contradiction to the very essence of the Communist concept of relationship between the state and its nationalities, to the entire pattern of the Soviet state structure.

This structure is based on ethno-territorial entities. All the nationalities of the Soviet Union live in compact territorial agglomerations. It was therefore possible to form them into territorial units with different degrees of self-government (constituent republics, autonomous republics, autonomous provinces, and autonomous districts), with all the attributes of cultural self-determination: national schools, cultural institutions, press, etc.

The Jews are different. They are scattered throughout the union and represent an extraterritorial entity. The overall Soviet pattern of settling the nationalities problem is not applicable to the Jewish minority. To claim for this minority "equality of treatment" is practically tantamount to demanding an exceptional status, which has no counterpart in the Soviet system.

It is futile to expect a Communist regime, based on uniformity, to grant such a unique status to the Jews, and thus to secure the further existence and development of a single extraterritorial minority endowed with all the cultural attributes of ethno-territorial entities.

The Jews simply don't fit into the general Soviet design. The classic Communist prescription for eliminating this anomaly was, and still is: Integral assimilation. As late as a few months ago the pamphlet, "The State of Israel, Its Position and Policies," issued in Moscow by State Publishers of Political Literature, reiterated and emphasized Lenin's, by far, not rhetorical question:

"Is it pure chance that precisely the reactionary forces of all Europe are uniting against the assimilation of Jewry and are trying to emphasize its isolation? * * * Hostility to heterogeneous sections of the population can be ended only then when they cease to be foreign and merge with the general mass of the population. This is the only possible solution of the Jewish problem and we must support all that serves to reject Jewish isolationism."

Any demand for Jewish national rights is viewed by Moscow as an attempt by "reactionary forces" at perpetuating exterritorial "Jewish isolationism" within the framework of the Soviet state—something wholly unimaginable, wholly unacceptable, and deeply suspect. The Soviet regime has always been very sensitive and apprehensive about the specific position of its Jewish minority. The Ukrainians, the Tartars, the Georgians, the White Russians, the Uzbeks, and other national groups in the Soviet Union live on the Soviet soil only. They have no co-national states, or sizable organized co-national communities abroad, and cannot be suspected of spiritual allegiance toward, let alone of nationalist "collusion" with, any foreign body. Their respective emigré associations in the Western world have as much—or as litle—influence and affiliation inside the Soviet Union as purely Russian emigré societies. All Soviet minorities can therefore be relatively easily controlled and therefore relied upon.

The case of the Jewish minority is divergent. Jews living in the Soviet Union and in the satellite countries constitute only a fraction of the Jewish people. The overwhelming majority of world Jewry are dispersed over many countries, for the greater part in the Western democracies and in Israel. The Soviet Government, of course, is fully aware of the bonds of sympathy and spiritual solidarity that bind the Jews the world over. It has for years been striving to sever these ties by hermetically sealing off "its" Jews from any contact with other Jewries. For a time the Kremlin was confident that decades of forcible isolation and indoctrination had irreparably destroyed the national consciousness of the Soviet Jews; that they were securely immunized against the call of Jewish solidarity and the magnetism of Jewish statehood.

This confidence has been rudely shattered. The Soviet rulers have reluctantly come to the conclusion that 40 years of brainwashing had somehow failed to permeate Soviet Jewry with fear of and hatred toward the entire non-Soviet world. Large sections of the Jewish population still have relatives and friends in the United States and a deep emotional attachment to Israel. This makes them suspect in the eyes of the regime. A Russian, an Ukrainian, a Georgian, a Tartar is implicitly supposed to have deep, ineradicable roots in his native Soviet soil. One or another of them may be convicted individually of treachery, "deviationism," reactionism, but not of "rootlessness." Yet the Jew is per se suspect of this greatest of all crimes and as such is being looked upon as a bad security risk.

There is little sense in arguing whether this appraisal is justified. What really matters is the fact that this seems to be the position of the Soviet rulers. It is therefore sheer wishful thinking to believe that they would ever consent to bestow on this section of their population any collective national rights which are being enjoyed by regular national entities centered in territorially defined areas.

It is, of course, possible to continue indefinitely repeating over and over again demands to this effect. But no useful purpose can be served by indulging in self-righteous protestations of this kind. There is little, if any, sense in reiterating the traditional, worn out roster of grievances and demands: some of them major and essential, others less so. It is permissible, for instance, to inquire whether it is that worthwhile to clamor for the resurrection of the Yiddish press in the Soivet Union. Is somebody really longing for the reappearance of the infamous Emes of Moscow or Shtern of Kharkov, organs of the notorious Yevsektzia, which had been for so long a time pouring venom and scorn on everything that is dear to the Jewish heart and mind? And where is the national Jewish value of one more replica of a Communist sheet? Two correspondents of a leading Warsaw weekly Swiat (The World), who have recently visited Birobidjan, candidly reported that the solitary Yiddish weekly, the Birobidjan Shtern, is "a mere Yiddish copy of the local Russian Communist paper, the Birobidjan Star."

Instead of a long litany of complaints and desiderata, which are in their majority either obsolete or manifestly impossible of achieving, Jewish national bodies must concentrate on a single powerful idea: that the Soviet Union allow those among its Jewish citizens who wish to leave the country, to do so freely.

The Jewish minority proved to be utterly unmanageable. It cannot be dealt with in the same manner as territorially centered national groups, and the Soviet Government is obviously not prepared to grant it an exterritorial national status.

The alternative to the status quo is twofold—and twofold only. The Soviet Government can either solve the problem of the Jewish minority by mass deportation to Siberia, or it can allow emigration to those who wish to leave. The first method was widely and ruthlessly applied during the Second World War to the 400,000 Volga Germans, to the 600,000 Chechen, Ingushes, Balkans, and Karachais of the Caucasus, as well as some 200,000 of Crimean Tartars. If they could see no other way out, the Soviets would hardly hesitate to apply this device to the Jews.

An alternative solution appears, however, more probable. Should the Soviet Government decide that a Jewish exodus offers a convenient way fo getting rid of a troublesome minority, it will not hesitate to have recourse to such a move. Those who shape Soviet policy are no doctrinaires. They have manifested time and again amazing capability for abrupt and radical turnabouts on many matters of both major and minor importance. Nobody could have foreseen either the Soviet vote in favor of partition of Palestine in November 1947, or the severing of diplomatic relations with Israel in February 1953, or for that matter the resumption of these relations in July 1953. Likewise, unexpectedly came the recent resumption of emigration from Rumania, which, of course, could not take place against the Kremlin's wishes. Totalitarian regimes are prone to such spectacular reversals. The Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev himself told, in the summer of 1957, a group of American visitors: "I am sure the time will come when all Jews, or Russians, for that matter, who want to go to Israel will be able to do so." One may doubt the sincerity of such a statement, but it offers evidence that such contingency is not completely ruled out in the mind of the Kremlin.

It is true that a few weeks ago the official Soviet Izvestiya blasted as provocative fabrications and badly smelling concoctions all Western reports that Moscow might permit some of its Jews to leave for Israel. It is, however, significant that the only reason for this attitude invoked by the paper was the Kremlin's determination not to shake Arab confidence in the friendship of the Soviet Union by increasing the military and manpower potential of Israel. No mention was made of the traditional argument that immigration to Israel was contrary to the general principles of the Communist regime. The motivation is distinctly tactical, not funda-

mental, and Soviet tactics and friendships are known to be elastic and reversible.

Should Moscow, for compelling domestic reasons, decide that Jewish emigration suits its interests, it could easily counter any Arab recriminations by reminding them of the Arab States' own record in this field. Did not Yemen, violently anti-Israel, in 1949 officially authorize wholesale Jewish exodus and thus contribute 48,000 Jews to Israel's military and manpower potential? Did not the Iraq Parliament on March 5–7, 1950, pass a law on the strength of which 123,000 Jews were flown to Israel? Did not Egypt in 1948–52 tolerate the emigration of 17,759 Jews to Israel, and did not Nasser himself, already after the Sinai operation, permit (from November 1956 up to the end of 1957) the departure of 24,000 Jews, of whom 13,000 went to Israel? Arab protests sound hollow in the face of these telling facts and figures. They can be smashingly refuted should Moscow deem it necessary.

What is needed now and is long overdue is not an intricate set of piled-up grievances and claims, but one single, clear and simple, even primitive, all-embracing postulate, which would offer a radical and uniform solution to the Jewish problem in the Soviet Union, "Let my people go."

It Really Is Price Fixing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the Christian Science Monitor on Thursday, April 2, 1959.

Among the more dangerous legislation introduced in this Congress during this Session has been the so-called fair trade bill, H.R. 1253.

The idea behind fair trade is supposedly to permit small business to compete.

Unfortunately, the effect of the bill will be to repeal pro tanto the existing anti-trust laws, and, in that way and in many others, make it less possible for the small retailer to get a fair share of the market.

The bill is nothing more or less than price fixing and will gouge the consumer for the big manufacturer and the big retailer. It will deny the small merchant an opportunity to conduct his own business in his own way, will not outlaw dumping of distress goods and will cost consumers billions of dollars a year.

The editor of the Christian Science Monitor has hit the nail right on the head in describing the so-called fair trade bill as "price fixing." The article is as follows:

IT REALLY IS PRICE FIXING

The United States has grown strong on the axiom that competition is the life of trade. Americans want to keep the freedom of a competitive economy. Yet they are not always awake to the ways in which that freedom is eroded through controls set up to restrain competition. So-called fair trade laws are among the most respectable-looking enemies of competition. And now, after suffering severe setbacks in State legislatures and in the courts, the advocates of this kind of price fixing are driving for Federal legislation.

In essence this legislation (notably the Harris bill) would put the National Government behind an arrangement denying retailers freedom to sell a product below a price fixed by the manufacturer. We can understand the feelings of the small retailer who finds a competitor resorting to loss leaders and even temporary price wars. In some cases this kind of competition can put an honest merchant out of business. But we do not understand why resort should be had to anything so drastic as Federal fair trade legislation.

Most unfair competition could be halted by Federal Trade Commission regulations or State laws barring sales below cost. Instead fair trade legislation would allow prices to be fixed to guarantee a profit to both manufacturer and retailer. No wonder powerful lobbyers are plugging for it. No wonder consumers must view it as a device for lifting or holding up prices.

But the threat in this proposed legislation is not merely to citizens as consumers. It threatens the basic American concept of free competition in one vast area of business. On this, let's note what the Federal Trade Commission has to say:

"The fixing of resale prices is inconsistent with the American system of free competitive enterprise and contrary to the public policy expressed by Congress in the antitrust laws since 1890."

It is one thing to protect honest retailers. It is quite another to erect barriers against the enterprising merchant trying to build a business, attracting customers by lower prices—made possible by his own efforts in lowering his operating costs. The retailer is already under enough pressures which would make him merely the agent of the manufacturer or supplier. Why add the force of Federal law to restrictions on his freedom and initiative? Slice fair trade any way you like, it still amounts to price fixing.

Are Congressmen prepared to put the special interests of certain groups ahead of the general interest of the public? Are they ready to override the wishes of 20 States which either have refused to adopt fair trade laws or have thrown them out after experience? Do they wish to substitute price fixing for free competition in one great section of the American economy? Do they favor higher prices and guaranteed profits at the expense of consumers?

These are questions Americans should be asking their Congressmen.

The New Elite in Public Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the folowing provocative account of public housing tenants in Boston as recounted in an editorial of the Boston Herald of Monday, April 13, 1959:

THE NEW ELITE

Last fall, in a referendum subverting Mayor Hynes' right to determine appropriate municipal pay scales, Boston firemen won pay raises ranging from $790 to $1,050. Identical increases were subsequently extended to the police in order to reestablish the traditional equality of pay scales as between the two protective departments.

Now, the Boston Housing Authority is seeking to raise the income ceilings for continued occupancy in State-aided housing projects so that 353 families of Boston police and firemen will not be evicted because of the increased income gained through the referendum.

A better instance of having one's cake and eating it, too, could hardly be imagined.

Public housing, designed for persons of law income, must be converted to middle-income, or near-middle-income status, because the firemen and policemen have advanced to that status.

The Boston Housing Authority says rents will be increased for these 353 families, although it hasn't said how much. But even if these increases are commensurate with the fire and police pay raise, the continued occupancy of public housing by these families automatically bars as many low-income families from entry into the projects.

Will the Boston Housing Authority state how many low-income families must stay in shabby tenements so that the fire and police families may remain in public housing?

May we not legitimately ask whether we are on the way, here in Boston, to the establishment of a new elite—a special class of drones for whom those without influence labor unremittingly?

World War I Veterans Pension—Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, the Senate of the State of California adopted, on April 7, 1959, its Senate Resolution 39, by Senator Teale, relative to World War I veterans' pension.

The Senate of the State of California shows an awareness of the desperate plight in which, unfortunately, many World War I veterans find themselves.

I hope that this legislation will encourage the Congress to take positive and favorable action in this important matter:

SENATE RESOLUTION 39

Whereas many thousands of veterans of World War I are in dire circumstances and subjected to the indignity of public charity: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of California, That the Congress of the United States is respectfully memorialized to provide for a World War I pension, and that the senate recommends to the Congress the program approved by the legislative committee of the Veterans of World War I of the United States of America; namely, that such a pension be in the amount of $100 a month to those veterans of World War I who have attained the age of 62 years and whose annual income is not greater than $2,400 without dependents, or $3,800 with dependents, excluding social security or other pensions to which the veteran has contributed; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is hereby directed to prepare and transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States.

I hereby certify that the above resolution was unanimously adopted by the Senate of the State of California on April 7, 1959.

J. A. BEEK,
Secretary of the Senate.

Anatomy of an Aid Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a recent issue of the Wall Street Journal published the following discerning article on foreign aid in Thailand:

A LOOK AT THAILAND SHOWS THE U.S. PROBLEM ALL OVER THE WORLD

(By Vermont Royster)

BANGKOK.—An inquiring American who wants a clear look at what the U.S. foreign aid program is trying to do all over the world can hardly do better than to come here to serene and peaceful Thailand.

The aid program here is small, as those things go; its $20 million a year sinks almost unnoticed in a total foreign aid budget of $4 billion. It seems to be handled with reasonable care; at least it has not been plagued by public scandals.

Moreover, it is an aid program that does not have to wrestle with the special problems that, in so many countries, are used either to justify or excuse the results. The Thai government is solvent. It has been spared extreme political chaos. The Siamese people lack neither rice nor roofs. They are easy going and happily unconscious of any great problems.

Perhaps all this robs the American aid program here of a certain amount of color. But it does permit the ICA to plan its program under almost ideal circumstances and its more than one hundred officials to apply them with a minimum of hindrance. And so if the present U.S. program can look good anywhere, it should look good here.

It certainly looks ambitious. The American foreign aid help for the Siamese reaches into the financial structure of the country, the homes, the schools, down Bangkok streets, across rice paddies and into the almost impenetrable jungle.

ADMINISTRATIVE MACHINERY

To see how, perhaps the best way to begin is with a glance at the size of the administrative machinery the International Cooperation Administration has found necessary to erect to spend this $20 million a year.

At the top of the U.S. Operations Mission ("Usom" is an ubiquitous word in Southeast Asia) is the office of the director, together with an office of the deputy director. Spread out below them is a rather intricate array of division offices, reporting not only to the director but in some cases to each other.

These are, separately, an Office of Technical Services, a Division of Agriculture, a Division of Education, a Division of Public Health, the Public Administration Division (this is to help the Siamese run the thousand-year-old city of Bangkok), a Division of Public Safety (to make the Siamese better policemen), an Audiovisual Division (teaching with pictures), a Training Division (to teach the Thai Government how to govern Thailand), a Division of Public Works and a Division of Industrial Development.

These, of course, are only the divisions dealing directly with aid to Thailand. To do the housekeeping and general management of these divisions there must be other administrative divisions. There is, for example, an Office of Management to keep track of the other divisions, an Office of Finance to keep track of the money, and an Office of Programing to coordinate the programing of the programs of the separate parts.

Even so, categorizing these on an organization chart does not give the full sweep of the U.S. aid program to this small country, because under nearly every division there are branches or sections for specific projects.

A sampling of these shows that even in an underdeveloped country atomic energy is not neglected; there's a program for training a cadre of nuclear scientists. There's a skilled labor training program, a regional telecommunications program, an English language teaching program (few Usom personnel speak Siamese), and a project for stimulating villagers to take more active interest in community affairs.

Nor are these merely paper programs. For example, a visitor finds that though the Siamese, being blessed with rich land and adequate rainfall, are a people who have never known famine and who are heavy rice exporters, they are nonetheless getting the benefit of a very active and extensive agricultural program.

The U.S. is bringing to Thailand the American system of farm extension services, and even the 4-H clubs. More than 100,000 farmers have been instructed to date, more than 250 extension agents have been trained in American methods, and something like 4,000 farm boys have been signed up for 4-H. Not content with this, the agriculture program envisions for the future creating a "unified extension service with clear line of administration, staffed with best available personnel; trained extension workers at national and regional levels and establishment of plans for continuous trainig of future extension workers."

But this is only a part of what we plan for Siamese farmers. Some time this year the Usom agency plans to demonstrate contour cultivation on some 200 farms and to organize some 30,000 village seed associations. About 50 breeding bulls are being brought in and will be distributed to selected villages. The American cooperative marketing system is being encouraged, and this year a cooperative management program will be organized for more than a thousand families.

Meanwhile, industrial development is not being neglected. Technical surveys are underway of the country's mining and water resources, including an airborne geophysical survey. The highway program involves not only actual roadbuilding but the reorganization of the Thai highway maintenance and equipment division and the replanning of the streets of Bangkok.

There's also an airport construction program, an air communications program, a meteorological program, and, in fact, a comprehensive program for the reorganization of the whole Thai transportation system.

Nor is U.S. aid limited to agriculture and industry. There's a health program which includes teaching 7 million Thai householders to spray for mosquitoes (this would be followed up with a surveillance program), training doctors, organization of district health units.

And so it goes on. The educational program embraces projects on the elementary, secondary, and university levels of the Thai school system. "Usom's" arm also reaches out, through the public administration division, into local city planning, the national government's taxing and budget offices. The United States also plans to improve the Thai Government economic policy and planning procedures, to revamp its statistical services, and in general guide its officials in doing their jobs.

In short, ambition is a small word for the U.S. aid program in Thailand. Indeed it looks less like a program to give an economic boost to these hard-working and self-reliant people than an effort to redesign, if not to remake, their country. The visitor must constantly remind himself that this is a very small program, less costly, less complicated, and less comprehensive, compared to others.

A visitor, touring the country, can see that some of these projects have in fact helped the Siamese people. You can't put $20 million a year into so small a country, build highways through the jungle, or fight malaria, without leaving some benefit behind.

But passing over entirely the question whether the program has a point other than generosity, you can't look at this program—a plain, rather ordinary, standard U.S. aid program—and its effect on the Siamese people and fail to see that by its very nature it has some built-in problems that the system itself makes insuperable.

For example, one of the chief complaints of foreign aid officials—and one of their excuses (when things go wrong) is that they can't get enough good people to fill all the billets in these far-away places.

ONE OF 70

Yet Thailand is only one of 70 countries in which we have aid programs. And the scope of this comparatively small program would require, to be carried out properly, more than a hundred first-class officials, not only technically knowledgeable in their fields but in their manners, vision, and understanding.

So it is hardly surprising that the director here, who strikes the visitor as an able man, has his personnel problems. To run a program of such magnitude he needs superior accountants, horticulturists, entomologists, soil chemists, veterinarians, livestock biologists, parasitologists, sanitation engineers, highway engineers, electrical engineers, civil engineers, machinists, geologists, doctors and nurses, electronics technicians, air operations specialists, police administrators, and meteorologists, just to name a few.

Look, for instance, at what the aid director's "TO"—or technical organization chart—calls for in just the single category of police administrators: He needs a chief police adviser, a deputy police adviser, a police program officer, two police program assistants, four police adviser investigators, and a police adviser who's a training specialist. That's only the beginning. He also needs police advisers who are specialists in border control, traffic control, logistics, identification and laboratory investigation, not to mention a police adviser (administrative) to run it all.

In addition to all of this there are, of course, the secretaries, clerks, auto drivers and miscellaneous personnel necessary to keep all this administrative machinery functioning. And these people, too, are unofficial U.S. ambassadors abroad.

Now since it is difficult to find enough competent people to fill all these billets in little Thailand, it is plainly impossible to find them in sufficient numbers for all the other countries too, in many of which the program is mammoth compared to here.

Thus the inquiring visitor is brought relentlessly to the conclusion that the sheer size of the U.S. aid program, and the scope of what it is trying to do, makes the personnel problem an almost impossible one.

Unfortunately this is not the only problem built in by the size and concept of the foreign aid program. More important, for our own self-interest, are the irritations it

creates among those blessed with our giving.

Consider that here is a country which, for all that it may be backward by American standards, has managed to get along for a thousand years without U.S. dollar aid or U.S. aid advisers. Its people are proud of their independence, their tradition, their own way of life and are probably as successful in the pusuit of happiness as any people can be.

Yet here come the Americans with a program which, when you look at it, would remake the country from one end to the other, from top to bottom. There is no area of Siamese life—schools, farms, business, language, homes, government, customs—left untouched in some fashion by the U.S. aid program.

No one, be he a visitor here among the ancient temples and palaces or a stay-at-home reading about it, need be surpised that a program so conceived rubs many Siamese the wrong way. Certainly the evidence of it is not hard to find.

It crops up even in the official ICA documents when officials plaintively report that all is not going well because the Siamese are reluctant to accept all their advice. "Only limited progress has been made to date due to the reluctance of the Thai highway department to accept the advice . . ." Or when they note that part of the job is to sell a program to the Siamese; one operational goal for the 1959 health program, which we designed, is "to secure official backing of the Thai goverment."

REFUSE ADVICE

It crops up in conversation, polite and courteous though the Siamese be. By any abstract standards it may be progress to fill in the dirty, old klongs (or canals) that once made Bangkok the Venice of the East. But it's bound to seem a mixed blessing to poor people who once could move readily by boat and now have to forage for some kind of motor transport for the modern boulevards.

The government officials with whom the visitors talks are not unmindful of the value of dollar bills but nonetheless they can be a little rueful of all that comes with them. Some of what comes with the dollars is the feling that the Americans are meddling in everything. And sometimes what comes are real practical problems.

One such practical problem is inflation. Since every country nowadays (including the U.S.) has an inflation problem, Thailand might have one without our help. But our help does intensify it. The U.S. aid also intensifies the management problems of the Thai government by increasing the number and the scope of tasks undertaken by the government. Furthermore, the Thais could not possibly keep such a program without the United States, some of them are beginning to wonder if the Americans will not have to stay forever.

This last feeling is met quite frequently once the visitors gets outside the government offices. Among the people, who may not see how helpful the Americans are being, it is even easier to find a kind of weary wishing that they would just all go home.

One friendly Siamese, with a twinkle in his eye, put it to his American visitor this way: "I suppose we ought to be glad that you are helping us, but we do wish you wouldn't help us so hard."

So here is the U.S. aid program to Thailand, a clasic minature of our economic aid programs. It's small in dollars, perhaps, but it's plainly big in ideas. And as this visitor says farewell to Bangkok it is with a growing sense of wonder at what we think we are trying to do all over the world.

Conference on India and the United States—1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I call attention to the conference to be held on May 4 and 5 in Washington on India and the United States—1959. The conference is sponsored by the Committee for International Economic Growth.

No one can observe the march of recent events in Asia without realizing the pivotal importance of India to the future of freedom in that most populous region of the world.

Red China's massive economic push, achieved through the brutal regimentation of the Chinese people—and now Red China's ruthless subjugation of Tibet—have made it clear that Communist imperialism is on the move in Asia.

It seems to me vital for all of us to understand this, and to understand also the crucial role which the great parliamentary democracy of India can play in counteracting Communist influence throughout the whole subcontinent of southeast Asia.

In this connection I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to the letter of invitation recently received by all Members of the Congress from Mr. Eric Johnston, chairman of the Committee for International Economic Growth, inviting our attendance at a national conference on Indo-American cooperation in Washington on the 4th and 5th of May.

This Conference is sponsored not only by the private organization of which Mr. Johnston is chairman, but by such eminent institutions as the National Planning Association, the Stanford Research Institute, the Asia Foundation, and the Center for International Studies of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

The Conference will bring together some of the most eminent and distinguished authorities on India and Indo-American relations available in industry, the universities, labor, education, and other walks of life, both here and in India.

Their discussions will offer a unique opportunity to obtain authoritative information about the urgent problems of economic development confronting India today and may suggest new avenues of cooperation between that country and our own.

Certainly at this particular time, when events leave no doubt as to the importance of India in the community of free world nations, the calling of this conference is most fortunate. I can think of no more effective way of producing the facts on which sound judgment about Indo-American relations can be based.

Since we may all be called upon to make such a judgment in the months ahead, I hope as many Members of this body as possible will take advantage of the opportunity offered by the initiative of the distinguished citizens associated with Mr. Johnston in the Committee for International Economic Growth.

Statement of Chief Postal Inspector David H. Stephens Before the House Post Office and Civil Service Subcommittee Investigating the Mailing of Obscene and Pornographic Material

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent approved by the House, I am including an interesting and forceful statement by the Honorable David H. Stephens before the House Post Office and Civil Service Subcommittee investigating the mailing of obscene and pornographic material. I am sure Members of the House, as well as the general public, will be interested in Mr. Stephens' statement. He is one of our outstanding public officials. His views are entitled to careful consideration.

The statement follows:

The responsibility for the investigation of all instances of the use of the mails for the sale and distribution of obscene matter is charged by law to the postal inspection service. Included in this responsibility is the identification and apprehension of offenders, and the presentation of evidence to United States attorneys and, through them, to the courts.

Investigations of this nature have always been regarded as among the most important and serious of the various crimes which are committed against the postal establishment, even though it appears that over a long period of time there was limited public knowledge of these offenses, outside of the homes which were directly affected.

The rapid increase in the sale of filth through the mails, and otherwise, seems to have developed far ahead of general public awareness of its scope. The volume today can be measured in tons.

That juvenile delinquency stems in large part from the demoralizing influence of exposure to obscenity and pornography is well known to all law enforcement groups. Time after time in our investigations of armed robbery, extortion, embezzlement and forgery it is learned that those responsible for such crimes were early collectors of obscene pictures and films. Also in the many vicious murder and other sex crimes, with which all law enforcement agencies come into contact, it is often disclosed that criminals responsible were addicts to pornographic and sadist material.

There is no particular mystery to the fact that many of the mailings of trashy circulars

soliciting the sale of even worse material is sent unordered, or delivered into the hands of schoolchildren by salesmen who lurk in school areas. It is well established that mailing lists have been compiled from the responses of children to apparently innocent ads offering a model airplane or auto for a dime or quarter. Promptly after the receipt of such remittances children have received from the same business address circulars of the most objectionable nature soliciting the sale of nude pictures, slides, and related material.

Mounting profits, which today can be measured in terms of really big business, enable dealers in obscenity to retain high-priced and clever legal talent, which has successfully defended, on repeated occasions, some of the largest dealers in obscenity. Small fines—even short jail sentences, mean little to the big promoters, some of whom to our knowledge have continued to operate during rare occasions of short prison confinement through associates and members of their own family, using assumed names.

All of these continuing successes and huge profits have served to build an increasing smugness and defiance on the part of dealers in obscenity, who are quick to declare their privileges and recite court decisions favoring them incident to each and every investigative inquiry into their operations.

However, the increasing pressure in the Departments' program to identify and bring to attention these same and other promoters, plus the legislation enacted by the last Congress by which dealers can now be brought into the communities to which they mail their merchandise for trial, are having an important and beneficial effect.

We note an increasing interest on the part of the public to bring to the attention of the Post Office Department evidence that obscene matter is reaching their communities. These same groups are also insisting upon a clean up of newsstands in their areas. However, the success of the program to completely rid the mails of filth requires greatly expanded public response.

It is considered to be significant that few public complaints are received from some cities, even though evidence obtained during raids elsewhere reveal that wholesale mailings have been made to those same communities.

Dealers in obscenity are well aware of the sanctity of sealed mail and, therefore, know they can rely upon this security, intended for lawful mailings, and are safe unless complaint is made by the receiver of their mailings. They know, too, that a percentage of addressees will refrain from making complaint due to personal embarrassment which they think may result.

We regard it as absolutely essential that the public be continuously alert to the type of matter which is being delivered into their mailboxes and that they turn over to the Post Office all matter which they consider to be objectionable. Not only will this action prevent obscene matter from reaching the hands of children—as we know it does in many instances, without the knowledge of parents, but it will enable prompt action against mailers of such trash.

It is well established that the nature and number of public complaints have had an important bearing upon the decisions of prosecutors and courts.

As we see this problem, continuing and accelerated public cooperation on this program, plus public demands for prompt and positive prosecution and court actions, will enable the Post Office Department to rid the mails, and keep them clear, of indecent and filthy matter, which the postal establishment does not desire to handle, and the public does not desire to receive.

John Foster Dulles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 23, 1959

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, there is little I can add to the many tributes which have been paid, both within and without these halls, to John Foster Dulles, a great Secretary of State whose true greatness is only beginning to be fully appreciated. In the current issue of U.S. News & World Report, David Lawrence expertly analyzes wherein this greatness lies.

The sorrow which freedom-loving peoples everywhere feel at Secretary Dulles' resignation is reflected typically in another editorial, entitled "A Free World Loss," in the State Journal of Lansing, Mich. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include both editorials, as follows:

[From U.S. News & World Report, Apr. 27, 1959]

THE MAN WHO HAS KEPT US OUT OF WAR

(By David Lawrence)

John Foster Dulles will be known in history as the man whose bravery kept his country out of war.

For it takes no courage to appease, to retreat, to accept the promises of an unscrupulous enemy at a time when it is being urged that "concessions" and "compromises" are the way to avoid bloodshed.

It takes no courage to argue that because the Communists are strong militarily and have already achieved a sort of "right of conquest" in Eastern Europe we must, therefore, "accept the status quo."

It takes no courage to become so "flexible" as to desert moral principles in international life.

It takes no courage to yield to the temptations of domestic politics and to seek political advantage by claiming to be a crusader for "peace"—even if it's peace at any price.

But it does take courage to fight the insidious doctrines of those, inside and outside of our Congress and the Parliaments of the West, who think that the easiest way to deal with your adversary is to appease him.

One reason why John Foster Dulles has been able to see through the deceptive tactics of the Communists is that he has had a long experience in diplomacy—covering perhaps the longest span of any living American.

The critics of the outgoing Secretary have been so preoccupied with one objective in the last 3 years—to force the resignation of Mr. Dulles—that they have discounted his consummate skill in dealing with the ever-changing wiles of the Communists.

Thus, there has been no lack of conferences at high level with the Communists on almost every subject—from the question of suspending nuclear tests to the matter of "cultural" exchanges. Even the artificially stimulated campaign to secure the admission of American press correspondents to Red China resulted in Mr. Dulles making a concession, only to find, as he had suspected, that the Communists were not sincere. For they immediately insisted on a diplomatic package involving, in effect, the right to send a host of espionage agents into the United States as the price of admitting American newsmen to the Chinese mainland.

The critics have made much of the liberation policy advocated by Secretary Dulles. He never implied that America would use force to liberate Eastern Europe, but his opponents mischievously distorted his words in trying to impute such a purpose to him. By upholding the cause of peaceful liberation as a goal, he has kept the fires of freedom burning in the hearts of the peoples of the captive states.

Among those who so often have assailed Mr. Dulles for the phrase "massive retaliation" are many of the unwitting appeasers. They shortsightedly took his words to be an empty threat. They shuddered at a policy of resoluteness. Yet this is the only way to warn a potential enemy not to miscalculate our strength or our purpose.

Today massive retaliation is the embodiment of the military power of the West, though there has lately been more frequent use of the phrase "deterrent power." Actually, peace rests today on the knowledge in Moscow that an atomic attack on any country now a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization will result in a massive blow from our bombers based both overseas and in this country.

To John Foster Dulles belongs the accolade for having effectively warned the men in the Kremlin of what America would do if they started any general attack. President Eisenhower deserves the greatest credit for his unswerving support of these policies.

The strength of our determination has been tested at Quemoy and in Lebanon and in Indochina and lately in the West Berlin crisis. At no time has there been any doubt that Mr. Dulles would recommend military action in our defense if he thought it necessary. He was chastised in the press for using the phrase "brink of war." This has often been sarcastically referred to as "brinkmanship." Yet it is this basic readiness to fight if necessary—to let your enemy know you are willing to risk war to avoid war—which is the essence of brinkmanship.

It is to be regretted that in the 1930's we didn't let Hitler know that Britain and France and America would join in fighting him if he started a war. He was convinced that, with the Soviet Union as an ally on his eastern flank, he could quickly finish off the western countries. It took a tremendous sacrifice of human beings to show the Nazis the error of their way. May no such demonstration of error ever be necessary again.

If a world war is averted in the next decade, it will be because in the United States, irrespective of whether a Republican or a Democratic administration is in power, the principles that have been applied by John Foster Dulles in shaping America's policies in world affairs have been faithfully followed by his successors.

[From the State Journal, Lansing, Mich.]

A FREE WORLD LOSS

Announcement that ill health has forced John Foster Dulles to resign as Secretary of State has saddened America and its free world allies.

The millions of people Mr. Dulles had served tirelessly and courageously during the six years he has headed this country's State Department had clung to a hope that recovery from cancer would make it possible for him to represent the United States at forthcoming crucial Big Four meetings.

That hope was dashed Tuesday when President Eisenhower sadly announced that the man who had stood faithfully by his side during years of global tension and crisis had resigned because illness had made it impossible for him to continue to carry the administrative burden of office and assist in making policy as well.

While some free world diplomats had disagreed with Mr. Dulles on some points of his approach to east-west problems, he was widely admired for his firm support of the basic principles on which all who cherish freedom and desire an honorable and enduring peace are agreed.

Disagreement on details of policy were put aside as western leaders expressed both regret at the loss of Mr. Dulles' services in a crucial period of the cold war and sympathy because of the personal tragedy which has forced him to put aside duties to which he was so deeply devoted.

Many jokes had been made about Mr. Dulles' farflung travels but many of those who spoke of them humorously recognized that his travels were in the interest of freedom and in quest of peace and therefore a part of the measure of his staunch support of these causes.

Mr. Eisenhower, in announcing his Secretary of State's resignation, said Mr. Dulles will continue to serve him as a foreign policy consultant.

While the President will be able to find another to take over direction of the State Department and carry out the basic policies which he and Mr. Dulles have shaped, he will be able to find no one more devoted to America and the principles for which it stands, nor better able to speak for his country in world councils, than John Foster Dulles has been through his years of untiring and devoted service.

There Is Nothing Fair About "Fair Trade" Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Atlanta (Ga.), Constitution on Thursday, January 15, 1959. That editorial describes the so-called fair trade bill pending before the Congress at this time.

I hope all will read the views of the Atlanta Constitution in opposition to fair trade:

THERE IS NOTHING FAIR ABOUT FAIR TRADE LAWS

That old bugaboo of the consumer, resale price maintenance, better known as "fair trade," is back in the news again. Before Congress had time to warm up, Representative OREN HARRIS, of Arkansas, introduced a bill for a national fair-trade law.

"Fair trade" has had a sordid history as far as legislation on the national level is concerned. The Miller-Tydings Act which slipped through the back door of Congress in 1937 as a rider on an appropriations bill, opened a Pandora's box for the consumer which has never been completely shut since. The act specifically exempted fair trade laws passed by the States from the antitrust laws.

However, the fair traders made one mistake. Most State laws included a so-called nonsigner clause.

In 1951 the Supreme Court ruled nonsigner clauses were price-fixing by compulsion, a violation of antitrust laws in regard to interstate commerce. This decision knocked the props from under the fair traders, but only temporarily. In 1952, when Congress convened, one of the most powerful lobbies in Washington was back at its old stand. It paid off in the passage of the McGuire bill, which amended the Federal Trade Commission Act of 1914 to permit minimum resale price agreements between manufacturers and retailers and to extend the agreements to nonsigners.

There are a number of legitimate objections to fair trade laws. They are discriminatory. They unfairly gouge the consumer. They do not prevent unfair competition; rather they eliminate competition on the retail level. They legalize price-fixing, a procedure abhorrent to the American public.

Rather than pass another fair trade law, Congress had better busy itself in repealing such discriminatory legislation.

Our Position in Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to call to your attention the following editorial appearing in a recent issue of the Evening Star. This is a report on the able speech made by Dr. T. Keith Glennan, Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, to the National Petroleum Association meeting in Cleveland:

OUR POSITION IN SPACE

The great problems and promises involved in our country's effort to achieve leadership in space have been effectively outlined by Dr. T. Keith Glennan in the address he has just delivered to the National Petroleum Association meeting in Cleveland. Taken as a whole, the picture he has drawn is encouraging, but he has been at pains to emphasize that our position in the field is still second to that of the Soviet Union in at least one important respect.

Thus, speaking as head of our National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Dr. Glennan has made clear that the Russians are substantially ahead of us at present in terms of being able to place heavy payloads in orbit—a superiority explained by "the fact that they began serious work in the ballistic missile field 6 or 8 years earlier than we did." As a result, we have quite a lot of developmental labor cut out for us in trying to catch up with them in the power of our rocket propulsion, and they may therefore be the first to send a man on a successful round-trip orbital flight.

But this does not mean that the United States has lost the race. Far from it. Actually, as Dr. Glennan has pointed out, our position in spatial fields other than rocket power is a good one. For example, "with respect to the acquisition of data obtained from sensors in our small but highly instrumented payload packages, and the analysis and interpretation of that data, it seems clear that we have done as well as the Soviet scientists—indeed, in some areas, somewhat better." Accordingly, in terms of technological know-how, there is every reason for confidence that we can come abreast of the Russians, and eventually surpass them in the exploration of the universe around us.

In any event, to that end, the NASA, wholly apart from the Pentagon's Advanced Research Projects Agency, has prepared short-range and long-range programs designed to make the United States second to none in space. These programs, besides being aimed at such objectives as placing an American in orbit some time in 1961, include the establishment of spatial laboratories, orbital systems of weather forecasting and global communications, and unmanned and manned landings on the moon. Above all, they envision the production—for use within the next 4 years—of a single-chamber rocket booster engine that will provide between 1 and 1.5 milion pounds of thrust.

Given such an engine (a comparable but makeshift intermediate version is expected to be developed much earlier by the Army Ballistic Missile Agency), our country will be equipped to do many spectacular things. In Dr. Glennan's words, we will be able, for instance, "to propel a payload weighing more than 18 tons into a satellite orbit. Or we can land as much as two tons on the moon intact. Furthermore, by arranging four of these engines in a cluster, we can raise our orbital payload to 75 tons, or place up to 8 tons in a soft landing on the moon." And the exploration of places like Mars and Venus will then become anything but fantastic.

This is a prospect that speaks pretty much for itself. Within a matter of just a few years, the United States will be moving out into space in ways and to distances which only recently were regarded as inconceivable. Russia will be doing the same thing, of course, and probably one or two other countries as well. But we need not fear losing the race if we act with vigor and dispatch in meeting the challenges it poses.

Foreign Military Aid—Doubts of Its Combat Effectiveness Reflected in Congressional Debate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to include in the RECORD an article by Hanson W. Baldwin, which appeared in the New York Times recently.

The article deals with the question of foreign military aid, and I urge all my colleagues to read it carefully:

FOREIGN MILITARY AID—DOUBTS OF ITS COMBAT EFFECTIVENESS REFLECTED IN CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

The continuing debate on foreign military aid, now resumed after the congressional recess, has become a recurring phenomenon of each legislative session.

The debate reflects far more than a thwarted longing for the dear dead days beyond recall when isolationism and a "Fortress America" strategy were viable political-economic-military concepts. Nostalgia and a human desire to get away from the world's problems are inherent in the perennial foreign aid debate, but there are other more important factors.

One is a feeling, fostered by the origin of the foreign aid programs, that there should be some finite end in sight to a program of overseas aid. When foreign aid was started Congress and public opinion believed that the aid was temporary, to help fill the vacuums of power left by World War II. But it has assumed a permanent character over the years and the pressure of high taxation prompts an annual reexamination of the program.

Another factor that has provoked increasingly intensive analysis of foreign military aid by Congress is the lack of adequate mechanisms in the executive branch of Government for continuous critical review of the program's combat effectiveness.

An ad hoc committee to study foreign military aid, headed by William H. Draper, Jr., is now undertaking such a review in behalf of the President, but such judgments should be continuously available, in the opinion of Congress.

There are, also, some serious military reservations in the Pentagon. These apply not to the principle of collective security, of overseas allies, nor of foreign aid, but to some of the methods and practices that have characterized the program.

The old shibboleth, so often used to sell the program, that a dollar spent overseas to train and equip allies buys much more combat effectiveness than a dollar spent on U.S. forces is particularly resented by some officers in the Pentagon. It is certainly open to serious challenge.

The basis for this easy generalism is, of course, that foreign soldiers and equipment are cheaper, that the Nation can get more divisions, more bang for a buck. But omitted from this inaccurate formula is the factor of comparative quality. Too often no detailed analysis, country by country, is applied as a qualifying factor.

There are other factors in certain countries that, in the opinion of some qualified military men, have seriously reduced, in those countries, the value of the foreign military-aid program. Too often military aid has been used as a political prop, or for nationalistic prestige purposes, as in Iraq. It would be hard to prove that the money spent for military aid to Iraq has served any really useful purpose.

Too often the United States attempts to build in small, undeveloped countries armies after its own image, with all the informal trappings that go with a major industrialized state. And too often, when dealing with its largest allies, the Nation has been reluctant, or slow, to furnish them the arms that have for them major political and military significance today—nuclear weapons and missiles.

CHANGES ADVOCATED

Many military observers believe that there should be some important changes in the Nation's objectives and methods in some countries. In many of the smaller countries the original objective of military aid has been completely altered with the years. In small countries, like Thailand, there are really only two valid goals for any military-aid program: an internal security force powerful enough to prevent any Communist coup or conquest by subversion and a small trigger force, ready to fire the first shots against external aggression.

Both of these forces should also have the capability of organizing, leading and developing, with this country's help, a major indigenous guerrilla effort in case of invasion. The kind of armed force needed and the type of warfare to be waged would obviously vary with the terrain, climate, people, and other conditions.

But the sort of defense that the Tibetans have employed against the Chinese Communists offers far more hope in terms of combat effectiveness for each dollar spent than a show army of tanks and jet planes that would always be outnumbered and that the smaller nations could never properly employ.

In the case of our larger allies—France, the United Kingdom, Italy, West Germany, and so on—the problem differs materially. Despite the political and military dangers of a greater dispersal of nuclear arms, it is clear that such a dispersion will take place, no matter what the United States does.

These nations have acquired or will acquire nuclear weapons and missiles, but with this country's help they can become nuclear-missile powers of importance far more rapidly and at less cost than if they must depend upon their own resources. This affirmative policy, fortunately, has been endorsed, but practically it has been implemented far too slowly.

These factors, plus individual mistakes and inefficiencies, are some of the problems that underlie the congressional debate on foreign aid. They deserve continuing critical examination, not only by Congress, but also by the executive branch of Government.

Fair Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Arkansas Gazette on Monday, January 12, 1959. That excellent newspaper carefully recognizes and chronicles the danger inherent in the so-called fair-trade bill, H.R. 1253, now pending in the House of Representatives.

I hope all will read this excellent editorial and will be aware of the dangers not only to the consuming public but to the small businessman inherent in H.R. 1253:

FAIR TRADE

One of the first legislative presents offered to voters who thought they were electing a more liberalized Democratic Congress is a Federal fair trade proposal.

This measure was introduced on the first day of the new Congress by Representative OREN HARRIS of Arkansas. Because Mr. HARRIS has been elevated to the chairmanship of the governing House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee through the workings of the seniority system, the apprehensive consumer can be assured that this piece of arbitrary price-fixing legislation will get favorable treatment in committee.

The Harris bill is an attempt to write around court decisions invalidating similar State laws, the most extreme of which sought to bind every tradesman in a State to a price-fixing agreement which might have been signed by only a single retailer.

One of the recurrent mysteries of American economic life is the fact that where price (and wage) ceilings are widely regarded as unthinkable even in times of near-war, there is no comparable outcry against the imposing of price floors, except, as we have seen, in the courts.

This is in part because there is no consumers' lobby in Washington. There are manufacturers' lobbies and retailers' lobbies but no consumers' lobby, unless one is naive enough to believe that Congress itself is supposed to act in that capacity at least part of the time.

The consumer's only chance lies in his ability to cut through the fog of extraneous issues every 2 years to get at some of the men in Congress who have done him wrong.

If the majority in the House is wise it will reflect that the protest vote heard last November 4 was in large measure a rebellion against the cost-of-living squeeze.

The 86th Congress was not elected, we are certain, in order to settle a burden of high fixed prices around the shoulders of the presumed end beneficiary of the American economic system. Not, that is, if the purpose of the American enterprise system is the free and full movement of goods.

Desegregation and the Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important of the recently published books in the United States dealing with a problem vital to the Nation is "Desegregation and the Law," by Albert P. Blaustein and Clarence C. Ferguson, Jr. It was published late last year by the Rutgers University Press.

As Adlai Stevenson wrote to the authors, "You have made an important contribution to this field which is so important and so urgent."

The most comprehensive review of this book, setting forth its scope and importance, is the review by the outstanding lawyer, Nathaniel Phillips. A portion of this review, which appeared in the January-March issue of the New York County Lawyers' Bar Bulletin, follows:

AVOIDANCE, EVASION, AND DELAY

(Review of "Desegregation and the Law," by Albert P. Blaustein and Clarence Clyde Ferguson, Jr. The Rutgers University Press, 1957. $3.50.)

The drama of the struggle for integration and the dread accompaniments of the efforts toward desegregation are brilliantly and frighteningly set forth in a notable work, "Desegregation and the Law; the Meaning and Effect of the School Segregation Cases." The authors, Albert P. Blaustein and Clarence Clyde Ferguson, Jr., are members of the faculty of Rutgers University Law School.

In the first sentence of the book, and with fine simplicity, they have expressed the aim of their work. "Here is the story of a case decided by the Supreme Court of the United States. And the purpose of this book is to explain the background, significance, and future of that case." They have told the story admirably.

They refer to *Brown* v. *Board of Education* as the most important legal decision of the 20th century. They go on to say it may well have been the most important legal decision ever rendered by an American court. This reviewer agrees, while remaining fully mindful of *Marbury* v. *Madison*, *McCulloch* v. *Maryland*, *Gibbons* v. *Ogden*, and Dred Scott.

The authors have presented a balanced work, authoritative, capably indexed, and fully but not overwhelmingly annotated. The book is more than a mere study of legal phases of desegregation. It is a lucid and very readable approach to a survey of a most complex admixture of legal, economic, and sociological factors. It is a fine recital of the legal history that preceded *Brown* v. *Board of Education*. In fact, the authors admit that in considering the Brown case, the Supreme Court might have agreed with John W. Davis as principal advocate for the South that after 50 years of failure to declare separate but equal invalid, it was too late to raise the argument anew in 1954. But the authors show that in no case since Plessy did the Supreme Court reach the specific determination

of whether a racial classification was unconstitutional per se. The nine men in 1954 met the specific question head on.

Said the Court in the Brown case, "Did separation itself result in an inequality which deprived Negroes of their personal and present rights as guaranteed by the equal protection clause?"

* * * * *

Blaustein and Ferguson have done so well that it is difficult to single out any chapter for special mention. But the section entitled "Avoidance, Evasion and Delay" that deals with the obstructive measures against the implementation and enforcement of *Brown* v. *Board of Education* is of timeliest interest and gives an admirable picture of the general merit of the book. Though written before the discouraging happenings in Little Rock, the authors in this chapter showed their full awareness of the obstacles that would be put forth to block integration. Those measures fall into four categories: (1) "Interposition and Nullification" (the theoretical basis of the States rights philosophy), (2) "Disqualifying Potential Litigants." (The lower Federal courts, charged by the Supreme Court with the responsibility for implementation, are powerless to act unless a segregation suit is in litigation before them. Litigation is expensive, and so the task of instituting litigation fell by default to the NAACP. Therefore, a considerable part of the southern legal strategy has been to prevent the NAACP from operating in the Deep South. States attorneys have sought to enjoin the association from any activities within the State until it registers as a foreign corporation. The association has refused to register and it has been enjoined in several States. Some States have enacted legislation prohibiting the employment of any NAACP member by a State agency. Mississippi has a third approach, making it a crime for an organization to institute desegregation proceeding in the State courts.)

A third category is "Separation, But Not by Race," an attempt to find some method of classifying the grounds for admission to school, ostensibly devoid of racial overtones, which will nevertheless result in the continued separation of the races in the southern school systems. Some States set up a factor based upon scholastic achievement, others "health and moral factors," "aptitude" of the child and "availability of transportation." The authors do not deny that these plans are constitutionally valid—if they are enforced without regard to race or color. A Federal district judge in Virginia, however, saw through the program and declared a plan unconstitutional because in actuality the pupil assignments had been made on a racial basis. A fourth device is the "private-public schools." Virginia would abolish all public schools threatened with integreation and provide tuition grants in private schools. Georgia would close all public schools and lease the public school facilities to private persons who would be expected to carry on segregated education. It is the belief of the authors that these and similar schemes that would maintain racial segregation will ultimately be found to be unconstitutional.

The authors have made no prophecies as to what would occur if Negro pupils should be kept out of school by force, because apparently they could not have conjured up a Faubus.

"Desegregation and the Law" does give one the feeling that resort to armed action will not be the instrumentality for the enforcement of *Brown* v. *The Board of Education*. The orderly processes of the courts will win increasing acceptance by the public, the hotheads and forces of lawlessness will be increasingly discouraged, and desegregation will be accomplished "with all deliberate speed".

NATHANIEL PHILLIPS.

Mr. Speaker, other legal scholars writing in leading professional journals have also praised this important contribution to the solution of the desegregation problem. Typical is this review excerpt from the University of Maryland Law Review:

With candor, confidence and restraint the authors, both of whom are law teachers and one of whom is a Negro, have combined simple constitutional history with shrewd legal analysis to produce what surely must be at once the most readable and the most thorough book on the subject. But first of all, this is a careful book: carefully thought out, carefully written, carefully balanced, carefully complete. That is reflected in the development of the authors' principal argumentative thesis: that the Brown decision was not a brazen piece of judicial legislation utterly defiant of 60 years of established legal precedent, but rather "was a logical extension of the standards which had been created" (p. 127) by the Supreme Court in striking down racial discrimination in the graduate school cases [*Sweatt* v. *Painter*, 339 U.S. 629 (1950) and *McLaurin* v. *Board of Regents*, 339 U.S. 637 (1950)]. It is their position that the tests adopted in those cases left little room for any continued vigor of the "separate but equal" doctrine of *Plessy* v. *Ferguson*, 163 U.S. 537 (1896). Did the Supreme Court go that far? The authors think so. With admirable precision they determine that the words of the Chief Justice— ". . . in the field of public education the doctrine of 'separate but equal' has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal."—mean "that all classification by race is unconstitutional per se, and that segregation in public education is thus merely an example of such invalidity" (p. 140).

For anyone who seriously wants to understand the legal complex surrounding what have come to be known as the segregation cases, this book is required reading. For anyone who simply likes to read an interesting book with a legal topic, this item is a real find.

ROGER D. REDDEN.

Mr. Speaker, other law reviews have been complimentary. The Northwestern Law Review praised the book as having "ably recounted" the law involved in the desegregation problem. The review states that the complete story is told "in a useful way" and that it "clearly identifies the three central puzzles which underlie the school segregation cases."

The Boston University Law Review writes as follows:

The reviewer thoroughly enjoyed reading Desegregation and the Law. He could not help but recall the words of Chambers regarding books: "A good book, in the language of the book-sellers, is a saleable one; in that of the curious, a scarce one; in that of men of sense, a useful and instructive one." Professors Blaustein and Ferguson have afforded us a useful and instructive book.

And former Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr., writing in the Harvard Law Review, had this to say:

While the authors do not attempt to predict the ultimate answers to the questions raised by these quoted phrases, they make the valid point that an analysis of the *Brown* case is the starting point for a search for the answers. And their analysis of the *Brown* case is a competent one.

The book rightly points out that, for the future, equal to or greater in importance than the broad sweep of the Supreme Court decisions declaring unconstitutional all State-imposed racial discrimination is the method of implementing the Court's decision concerning the public schools.

Legal scholars are not the only ones who have praised this book. The following is taken from the Wisconsin Magazine of History:

This book seeks to describe, with a minimum of technical jargon, how the five segregation cases came up, the strategy of counsel on both sides, the principal precedents that related to the problem at hand, and the line of reasoning followed by the Court in reaching its ultimate conclusion. In a sense, this book may be read as an exhaustive analysis of every important aspect of one important piece of litigation. Wholly apart from the intrinsic importance of the problem which is the main subject of this book, it is worth remarking that we need more such studies of important decisions of the Court. That is to say, we must get beyond the familiar patterns of analysis of appellate court opinions to examine a case in the context of all the factors that determined its contours.

The statement on this book which appeared in the Phi Beta Kappa magazine, the Key, says:

This careful, accurate study traces the steps leading to the recent desegregation rulings of the Supreme Court and discusses the subsequent impact of the rulings. The clarity of the analysis and the straightforward style makes the volume particularly useful to nonspecialists.

In the more popular publications, the Saturday Review had this to say about the volume:

Now, in "Desegregation and the law," the two Rutgers University Law School professors who are that book's authors have traced with meticulous care the reasoning and the steps leading up to the momentous decisions of 1954 and 1955. By this means they have brought one of the most controversial issues of the decade into clearer perspective and they have thrown light upon the character, the operation, and the importance of our Federal court system.

This is supplemented by the observations in such newspapers as the Washington Post, which called the book "a sensible primer clearly written."

Nor have the publications of the South—though they disagree with the decisions—failed to praise the book.

The Pulitzer Prize-winning Arkansas Gazette, Little Rock, Ark., made these comments:

The excellent study is a must for any practicing attorney. It is within the comprehension of the average high school graduate.

The authors urge the point that "with all deliberate speed," as suggested by the Court, has a specific meaning, as indicated by its use in an earlier case involving money to be paid by a State. In that instance, 'with all deliberate speed' meant as soon as, in the regular course of affairs, the State's legislature could take the action necessary to appropriate the sum. In the school case, the authors say, "with all deliberate speed" does not rest on the majority sympathies of a local community; it has regard only to such questions as facilities, faculties, school districts.

Another southern newspaper, the Chronicle, in Houston, Tex., uses these words in writing about the book:

The burning issue of our day is segregation and most people regard the subject either with conscience or custom directing their opinions. This book, written by two lawyers, breaks away from the individual problems which set conscience and from the social order which directs custom.

Taking for granted that heated controversy, journalistic writing and even objective analysis merely publicize the issue, the authors delve into the judicial aspects of segregation and its solution.

Feelings and emotions are beside the case; cold facts and a special study of the Constitution and its final interpretation here determine the righteousness of the outcome.

One chapter, "The Color-Blind Constitution," makes clear to the layman the legal foundation upon which our social order must rest. Facts are presented without argumentation, in easy style, unencumbered with legal terminology.

This book should prove enlightening to the serious reader who desires to act without fear of selfish motivation.

The competency of the authors is beyond question. Both are professors of law at Rutgers University. Both have had legal assignments for our Government.

And the Mississippi Law Journal characterizes the volume "as both welcome and valuable as a dispassionate and unemotional study of the Supreme Court decisions."

Poison in Your Water—No. 62

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Newark (N.J.) Star-Ledger on July 31, 1958, entitled "Polluted River Diverts Five Towns to Wanaque."

The article follows:

POLLUTED RIVER DIVERTS FIVE TOWNS TO WANAQUE

(By Peter Kurzman)

The Passaic River of Paterson was so polluted yesterday that the Passaic Valley Water Commission switched to Wanaque Reservoir to provide water for its 400,000 customers.

The commission reported river water reaching its Little Falls filtering plant was devoid of oxygen, causing the death of hundreds of fish and, in turn, causing a stench which spread over parts of Passaic, Essex, and Morris Counties.

The pollution was traced to waste from three mills of the Whippany Paper Board Co. of Whippany.

The commission ordered the largest mill shut down immediately and scheduled a conference last night with company officials.

Richard Bonyun, commission general superintendent, said pollution had been getting worse for several weeks, causing hourly checks to be made at the filtering units of intake from the river.

Finally it became necessary to draw the entire 70 million gallons from the Wanaque Reservoir for consumers in Paterson, Passaic, Clifton, Nutley, and Harrison.

Bonyun said no customers received impure water at any time. The strong odor of hydrogen sulfide alarmed many residents and led to a flood of inquiries to authorities.

Garret Westervelt, Passaic County conservation officer, said the river has been low during the past weeks and waste from the mills filled bordering swamps and eddies in Essex and Morris Counties.

High humidity and Monday night's heavy rain flushed the pollution into the main river stream, he said.

Reports of the number of dead fish ran into the thousands and many were seen coming to the surface gasping for air.

Earlier this year the commission obtained an injunction against the paper company which orders the erection of more waste treatment facilities by June 1959.

The company reportedly has begun meeting these terms and has allocated $500,000 for the projects.

Why Our China Policy Is Realistic, Necessary, and Sound

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, there are few subjects, if any, about which there has been longer and greater disagreement in our country than our China policy. The impression has been created that the issue of what to do and what not to do about Red China is hopelessly complicated, beclouded with emotion, and stubbornly unrealistic. Actually the facts are very clear. The question while exceedingly difficult is not complicated in terms of the principles involved. And the policy this administraton has followed of not granting official recognition to the Peiping regime as the bona fide representative of the Chinese people, and nonadmission of it to the United Nations, is completely hardheaded and realistic.

The American who knows most about the Chinese Communist from firsthand experience is Hon. Walter S. Robertson, Assistant Secretary of State for the Far East for the last 6 years. Mr. Robertson was General Marshall's right-hand man in China in 1945 and 1946, in the futile effort to get a workable truce between the government of China and the insurgent Communist regime. As often as each of four cease-fires had served its purpose for the Communists they broke it. They were then, as they have been in our own long negotiations with them the last 3 years at Geneva and Warsaw, "irreconcilable"—to use General Marshall's word.

Mr. Robertson has spent more hours in personal discussion with Mao Tse-tung, Chou En-lai, and their associates than any other non-Russian white man, unless it be a Russian. He knows them and the facts about them, not rumors, guesses, and propaganda. Recently he gave an address in Canada which sets forth clearly what our China policy has been and is now—and why prudence, honor, and intelligent concern for our own future require that the policy be continued resolutely.

It gives me great pleasure to include this splendid address. It will dispel much of the fog for all who will read it.

U.S. CHINA POLICY

(Text of address by Assistant Secretary of State Walter S. Robertson before Canadian Club, Ottawa, Canada, March 13, 1959)

I deeply appreciate the honor of being your guest today and of having the opportunity of discussing with this representative group of Canadians a problem of grave concern of to the future of our two countries.

It has become a commonplace in making speeches to each other to say that Canadians and Americans share a common heritage. It is a commonplace because it expresses an obvious truth. We do indeed share a common heritage which, in the final analysis, we would both agree far transcends in importance any of the problems which arise from time to time to vex our neighborly relations. We are indeed the inheritors of personal liberties, without which all of our material blessings would count for naught—liberties which we take for granted as we do the stars, but which are now denied, and always have been denied, to the overwhelming majority of the peoples of the world.

In the seeming security of our daily routine lives it is difficult to realize that our world is in a state of crisis, that we are inded engaged in a global struggle for the survival of a free civilization. The Far East is a strategic and critical area in this struggle. It is a vast area: 13 countries, 900 millions of people, approximately one-third of the world's population. It includes: Japan, Korea, China, the Philippines, Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, Burma, Thailand, Indonesia, Malaya, Australia, and New Zealand; 11 Asian countries and two Anglo-Saxon countries in an Asian setting.

The 11 Asian countries comprise a region of great diversity, divided by sharp differences in tradition, religion culture, and circimustances. The economies range from the great industrial, mercantile complex of Japan to the primitive economies of Southeast Asia. Eight out of the 11 of these countries have achieved their independence since 1945.

Taken as a whole, the area is one of great potential wealth in both human and natural resources, but, with few exceptions, suffering from mass poverty and ignorance, economic and political instability, shortage of investment capital, shortage of technicians of all kinds, shortage of educational facilities, deep resentments of western colonialism, deep suspicions of the white man and fears of a new explotation. It is an area seething with a new spirit of nationalism, social unrest and rising aspirations for a place in the sun and a better life for its poverty-stricken millions. And interrelated with and overriding all of its problems are the aggressions, infiltrations, and subversions of the international Communists.

Now it is the policy of the United States to meet this pervasive threat by helping to build up the military, political, and economic strength of our Far Eastern allies and friends as rapidly as possible. This is the sole purpose of our mutual security programs in these countries.

Yet the governments of all of these free countries without exception have a gnawing fear of the growing power and threat of Red China. And because Red China is a major threat to their new found independence, and therefore a major threat to the security of the free world, it is essential that China policy be coldly realistic and one that best serves free world security interests and objectives.

I need not remind you that U.S. China policy has been a subject of bitter controversy. It has disrupted friendships, has lent itself to name-calling, to the questioning of motives, and in some tragic instances to the

questioning of loyalty itself. But strange as it may seem, U.S. China policy has probably enjoyed a larger measure of bipartisan support in the United States than any other major policy of our Government.

Since 1950, the difference in basic China policy between former President Truman and President Eisenhower is the difference between tweedle-dum and tweedle-dee.

In early 1950, following the Communist takeover of the mainland in December 1949 and about the time of British recognition, President Truman vetoed the recommendation made to him that we recognize Red China. The Republican attack on the Democrats in the 1952 election campaign was not on basic China policy as it then was, but rather on what was alleged to have been the vacillations and blunders which had helped to create the Frankenstein monster of Red China and enhance its menace to the free world. In 1956, an election year, a Democratic-sponsored resolution, reaffirming support of the Republic of China and opposing the seating of Red China in the United Nations, passed the House by a vote of 391 to 0, and of 86 to 0 in the Senate. Not a single Congressman or Senator of either party was willing to vote against this resolution. This is a phenomenon unprecedented in American political history. When the parties later assembled for their national conventions they adopted almost identical planks in support of this policy. In the recent Taiwan crisis, Mr. Truman was among the first to come out in strong support of President Eisenhower's position. To repeat, the differences of opinion about China policy do not represent differences between political parties but rather differences between individuals, irrespective of party lines.

Herbert Feis called his book on the subject "The China Tangle." It is a good name. The controversy is indeed a tangle, a tangle of truths, untruths, and half-truths. It is entangled by Communist propaganda and distortions. The Communists will always see to it that this is so. It is entangled by the unwitting acceptance by many highly respected and intelligent Americans of the subtle propaganda and misinformation to which they are subjected. It is entangled by our early failures to recognize the origin, nature, direction, and control of the Communist revolution in China. It is entangled by the corruption and ineptness which existed in certain elements of the Kuomingtang, but which was exploited so as to make it appear that all Chinese Government leaders were corrupt and inept. And finally, it is entangled by honest differences of opinion among the objective and well-informed; differences of opinion which, thank God, have always existed and always will exist concerning public questions in the kind of free society we are struggling to preserve in the world today.

But despite the tangle, and however, complex it might be in implementation, our policy is simple to state. On the one hand, our policy is to face up to the realities of Chinese Communist objectives, opposing the further spread of Chinese Communist influence and power. On the other hand, as a principal means to this end, our policy is to keep alive, support, and strengthen, a non-Communist Chinese Government, firmly oriented to the free world, as a foil and a challenge to the fanatical, aggressive, hostile, and threatening international Communist regime of Peiping, an implacable enemy dedicated to the destruction of all the foundations upon which a free society rests.

It is often charged that our policy is tied to the political fortunes of one man: Chiang Kai-shek. This is a reductio ad absurdum. Chiang is in fact a time-tested friend and ally. He has never broken his word to us or an agreement with us. Following Pearl Harbor in 1941, all of the Western Powers were soon swept from the western Pacific. We were swept about as far as we could be swept this side of the South Pole—Melbourne, Australia. When the Japanese had Chiang bottled up in Chungking, having occupied all of his ports of entry and large sections of his country, and with no ally within thousands of miles, they made him a princely offer to sell out to them. He refused, fighting on against overwhelming odds. This refusal saved thousands of Allied lives. Had he sold out, there would have been released from 1½ to 2 million additional Japanese troops to oppose our advance from the south.

He refused to sell out to the Russians. After the Russians had occupied Manchuria—that great prize which they received for 5 days of nominal participation in the Pacific war, and, incidentally, the most strategic base in all of Asia for carrying out their objectives of communizing Asia—they invited Chiang to come into their economic orbit, saying that they would settle his Communist problem for him. He rejected this offer, and they retaliated by refusing to allow the United States to transport troops of the Nationalist Government into Manchuria to take over territory in accordance with solemn agreements to which the Soviets were a party. Instead, the Soviets turned over vast areas and Japanese arms and equipment to the Chinese Communists. This despite the fact that on August 14, 1945, the day the Japanese surrendered, the Soviets had signed a treaty with the Republic of China acknowledging its sovereignty over Manchuria and pledging all moral, material, and military support to that Government. And finally, Chiang has repeatedly refused to sell out to Peiping, which constantly plies him with lavish offers.

Be all this as it may, if Chiang should die tonight, the validity of our policy would in no way be affected. Today, as in the past, there are only two choices available to us: the anti-Communist Republic of China, our friend, or the international Communist regime of Peiping, a deadly enemy dedicated to our destruction.

In Chungking back in 1945, some of my friends and associates thought that the Democratic League offered a third force which we should cultivate and support. It was later recognized as a Communist front organization designed to ensnare the middle-of-the-road intellectuals.

Our opposition to the Red regime is not, as you are often told, based upon the disapproval of an ideology or an economic system, much as we abhor both. We recognize many totalitarian regimes with varying economic systems and we have not refused to sit down with them in the world forum of the United Nations. Nor is our policy, as sometimes charged, based upon an emotional reaction to the Korean war. Our policy is a coldly realistic one, based upon three major considerations, all directly related to the overall collective security of the free world.

The first of these considerations is the security interest of the United States. It is often forgotten or ignored that the recognition of Red China would, as a practical matter, mean the liquidation of the Republic of China with all that would mean to our strategic, psychological, and moral position in our opposition to Communist expansion in the Far East. Taiwan is a vital link in our island chain of defenses in the Pacific all now covered by bilateral defense treaties. The Chinese military forces on Taiwan of some 600,000 are an important factor in the military balance of power in the Pacific, and a continuing deterrent to the renewal of Communist aggression in Korea or elsewhere in Asia. If Taiwan should be given over to the Communists, Japan, the Philippines, and all of southeast Asia would be seriously threatened.

The second basic consideration is our interest in helping other Asian nations maintain their national independence. Our bilateral and multilateral defense treaties, as well as our mutual security programs, are designed to this end. If the United States were to abandon its commitments to the Republic of China in order to appease the threatening Red Chinese, no country in Asia could feel that it could longer rely upon the protection of the United States against the Communist threat. These comparatively weak nations would have no alternative but to come to terms—the best they could get—with the Peiping colossus. Not only could we then expect a rapid expansion of communism throughout Asia but the moral position of the United States upon which we must rely for much of our strength throughout the world would suffer irreparable damage.

The third major consideration is the long-range interests and future orientation of the Chinese people themselves. The anti-Communist government of the Republic of China is a symbol of Chinese opposition to communism—the only rallying point in the world for non-Communist Chinese—the only Chinese alternate focus of loyalty for millions of Chinese on the mainland, on Taiwan and throughout southeast Asia. If the Republic of China should be liquidated, it would extinguish a beacon of hope for millions of mainland Chinese. Taiwan's 10 million would be delivered to the slavery of the mainland, and the 12 million overseas Chinese would automatically become increasingly dangerous cells of infiltration and subversion in the countries where they reside.

Let no one say that representation is being denied to 600 million mainland Chinese. The fanatical Marxists of Peiping come no closer to representing the will and aspirations of the Chinese people than the puppet regime of Budapest comes to representing the will and aspirations of the Hungarian people or William Z. Foster comes to representing the will and aspirations of the American people. They have given indisputable evidence that they are part and parcel of the apparatus of the International Communist conspiracy to communize the world.

Back in the 1940's when the Chinese Communists were being reported by some observers as not being real Communists but rather the leaders of a democratic revolution for agrarian reform, Mao Tse-tung was writing of himself, "I am a Marxist dedicated to communizing China and the world under the leadership of Moscow." All of his subsequent actions have borne out his dedication to that goal. Peiping has demonstrated its unity with Moscow by faithfully following the labyrinthine twisting and turnings of Moscow's ideological line on bloc and world affairs. When there were rumblings of revolt in Eastern Europe, Mao sent Chou En-lai to rally the wavering satellites into unity "under the leadership of Moscow." In November 1957, when Mao visited Moscow he spoke to the students, including many Chinese, of Moscow University: "In the association of Socialist states," he said "there must be a leader and that leader is Moscow." Despite the price it had to pay in Asian opinion, Peiping proclaimed vigorous approval of Moscow's bloody suppression of the Hungarian revolt. It publicly applauded the execution of Nagy. Mao's bitter denunciation of Tito was not because Tito was not a Communist but rather because he dared to challenge the leadership of Moscow. Most recently, at the 21st Congress of the Soviet Union in Moscow, Chou En-lai addressed the Communists in these words: "The most sacred international duty of Communists in all countries at any time is to strengthen the unity of the countries in the socialist camp headed by the Soviet Union." Chou En-lai said to me one day in Chungking back in 1945, "Why do Americans come over here and go back and write that we are not Commu-

nists, that we are just agrarian reformers?" Then with a light in his eyes, he said, "We are not agrarian reformers; we are Communists, and we are proud of it."

The Peiping regime was imposed by force with the volition of only an infinitesimal fraction of the Chinese people. Today, after 9 years, less than 2 percent belong to the party. It has kept itself in power by bloody purges and the liquidation of some 18 million of mainland Chinese in 9 years. No regime representative of its people would have to resort to wholesale murder in order to keep itself in power.

In our view, the security interests of ourselves, of Asia and of the free world as a whole, demand that we take no action which would create international prestige for this regime, which would increase its capacity for advancing its objective of communizing all of Asia, or which would betray the hopes of those having the will and the courage to resist it.

Even if no security interests were involved, there is no basis either for the recognition of Peiping by the United States or for admission of that regime to the United Nations. By every standard of national and international conduct, it has proven itself to be an outlaw regime.

Take first the question of recognition by the United States. Since the days of Jefferson, diplomatic recognition of a government by the United States has involved two major tests. The first test is whether the act of recognition would be in the interests of the United States. In our view the diplomatic recognition of Red China would not be in our country's national interests for reasonss I have already mentioned. The other test for diplomatic recognition involves not only de facto control of territory but also the ability and willingness to live up to international obligations. What is the record of Peiping by this standard?

Gaining control of the mainland in December 1949, it promptly repudiated the international obligations of China. It confiscated without compensation properties of other nationals valued in the hundreds of millions of dollars, something over 1 billion for the United Kingdom alone. It demanded and received as blackmail money hundreds of thousands of dollars additional before it would issue exit visas for the personnel operating these properties. It threw foreign citizen into jail without trial, and subjected many of them to the most inhuman tortures. It has flagrantly violated the Korean and Indochina armistice agreements. It has failed to live up to its commitment to us, reached after long negotiation and publicly announced in Geneva on September 10, 1955, to release expeditiously all American citizens imprisoned in China. Five are still being held as political hostages.

If any of you are inclined to say that if we can tolerate the broken agreements of the Soviets, we should be able to overlook the long record of broken agreements by the Red Chinese, I would remind you that Soviet perfidy in breaking international agreements followed rather than preceded recognition by the United States.

The Bolsheviks seized power in 1917. Nevertheless we continued for 16 years to recognize the Kerensky government-in-exile. By 1933 it seemed that the Communist regime in Moscow might indeed be considered a peaceful member of society. It had committed no action of armed aggression for more than a decade. It had accepted the independence of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Poland (all later betrayed). It pledged itself to cease its subversive activities in the United States, to respect American rights in Russia, and to settle Russia's public and private debts to the United States.

We need not question that action of recognition under the circumstances which prevailed at the time. However, who can now doubt that recognition would not have been accorded even in 1933 had there been clear warning that Soviet promises given in that connection were totally unreliable and that aggressive war would soon become an instrumentality of Soviet policy. In the case of Communist China, we have been clearly and unmistakably forewarned.

Now how does Communist China qualify for membership in the United Nations?

You will remember when the U.N. was organized in 1945, it was exhaustively debated whether membership should be based upon universality or whether there should be qualifications for membership. It was decided that universality was not the test but rather that an applicant must fulfill certain qualifications. The Charter finally adopted provides that only peace-loving nations willing to assume and live up to the obligations of the Charter are eligible for membership. It further provides for the expulsion of members who violate the Charter.

Is Red China a peace-loving nation?

Let us again look at the record. In February 1950, approximately 2 months after establishing its regime on the mainland, it issued a call to all the peoples of southeast Asia to overthrow their governments, denouncing their leaders as puppets of the imperialists. Before the year was out, it invaded Tibet even though the Peiping regime had just promised the Government of India that it "would settle the Tibetan question by peaceful means." Nine years later it is still engaged in fighting the rebellious Tibetans. Also, before the year was out, it invaded Korea. For the Korean aggression, it was denounced by United Nations resolution as an aggressor against the peace of the world. That resolution is still outstanding and Red China is still defying the United Nations, charging that the United Nations are the aggressors in Korea and therefore without moral competence to supervise free elections for the unification of the country. Today Red China is still threatening war in the Taiwan Strait, stubbornly refusing throughout 87 meetings in Geneva and Warsaw to renounce war as an instrument of national policy. Its philosophy was recently expressed by the Peiping Defense Minister in this language: "Ours is a policy of fight-fight, stop-stop, half-fight, half-stop. This is no trick but a normal thing."

By no stretch of interpretation of the United Nations Charter could Red China qualify under that Charter as a peace-loving nation eligible for membership. Those advocating membership for Peiping are not demanding that Red China change its ways and conform its policies to United Nations standards, but rather are insisting that the United Nations modify its standards to accommodate the lawlessness of Peiping. Those who are opposed to such denigration of the United Nations Charter are charged with being unrealistic and denying the existence of 600 million Chinese.

You might think from much of what you read in the press that the United States occupies an isolated position in its refusal to recognize Red China. I would remind you that of the free countries of the world, 44 recognizes the Republic of China, 22 recognize Peiping. Many of the 22 recognized Peiping before it had demonstrated its lawlessness. Of the 13 countries of the Far East, only 3 recognize Red China. Instead of being isolated, we stand with the overwhelming majority of the countries of the free world in this position. It is essential that this majority continue to stand together. Other countries, particularly those most exposed to the immediate menace of Communist power, have been following the lead of such countries as yours and ours. Many of them are watching anxiously to see what we are going to do. If we should begin to break ranks and withdraw opposition to the reckless course of this aggressor these countries would have no alternative but to get on the bandwagon so as not to be left out on a limb of opposition, deserted by strong free world support.

I believe you will agree that the United States is the main military obstacle to Communist overt aggression in Asia. You might be interested in an evaluation of the Asian situation during the time of the Taiwan crisis by the Far East expert of the London Economist published October 11 last:

"America's underlying dilemma * * * might be summed up in the words: 'Little Brother is watching you.' Anxious little brothers are indeed watching the United States from all sides, and their anxieties are of excruciatingly contradictory kinds. When Mr. Dulles talks tough about Quemoy, European stomachs flutter; but when he seems to be giving even a mere inch of ground, far eastern hearts sink. The Quemoy drama is being played out with ringside seats occupied by uneasy Japanese, Koreans, Vietnamese, Filipinos, and other Asian peoples who must take into account the possibility that some day American power may withdraw altogether across the wide Pacific, leaving them alone with the newborn Chinese giant. * * * And they recall that for years Peiping and Moscow have canvassed twin projects for mutual security systems in Asia and in Europe, both of which would exclude the United States, so that China would be the dominant power in one sphere, Russia in the other. It is the complete disappearance of the American presence from the scene that the Communists are after. And whether anti-Western feeling and neutralism are weak or strong in these Asian countries and whatever their public postures, they know well enough that if the eagle once takes flight, the dragon—and perhaps the bear too—will have to be propitiated.

"If America really retires, China's immediate neighbors will inevitably again become China's vassals—not necessarily by military conquest, but by the impossibility of their resisting for long the pressure which their huge and dynamic neighbor can put upon them in many forms."

Our view of the China situation is the same as that we hold with respect to the other three divided countries of the world where the Communists now exercise de facto control over large areas of territory. We consider it to be in our national interest and in the interest of the free world as well to recognize the Republic of Korea, not the Communist regime of North Korea; to recognize the Republic of Vietnam, not the Communist Viet Minh regime of Ho Chi Minh; to recognize the Republic of Germany, not the Communist East German regime. In noneof these countries do we advocate the use of force to achieve unification, nor do we advocate the use of force for the unification of China. In fact, the contrary was recently proclaimed in the joint communique of President Chiang Kai-shek and Secretary Dulles in Taiwan in October of last year.

It is now being stated in certain quarters that we are drifting to a two-China policy. We do not have a two-China policy any more than we have a two-Korea policy, a two-Vietnam policy, or a two-Germany policy.

In closing I should like to mention an ancient Chinese proverb. It is in the form of question and answer. "What is the cure for muddy water?" the question goes; "Time" is the answer. In the long rollcall of history, nazism and fascism will be episodes only, dark incidents if you will. So, too, will communism be, although the most evil and pervasive of the three. Man will not permanently endure the cruel enslavement imposed by the ruthless regimes of international communism. But his libera-

tion will be immeasurably delayed by frustrated appeasement of the forces which enslave him. An awful responsibility rests upon us—upon our patience, upon our steadfastness, upon our courage, and above all, upon our strength. How we counter the menace now posed to our freedom will determine the climate of the world for as far into the future as we can see.

Indiana Students Write About Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Oregon Centennial Commission and the residents of my State, I want to thank my friend and colleague Ross ADAIR for making it possible for the student members of the Mary's Catholic Civics Club in Decatur, Ind., to become acquainted with the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The seventh graders read about the Oregon Centennial in my March 23, 1959, Appendix insertion. One of them, Dick Omlar, writing on behalf of his class, told me in his letter of April 17 that his teacher, Sister M. Joan of Arc, had read to the class the sampling of comments from my colleagues concerning the Douglas-fir tree distribution.

Because the class was studying "Careers in Farming" their teacher suggested they write some verse on trees in commemoration of the Oregon Centennial.

The Indiana students have done this. They sent to me six fine poems which point out the value of trees with several specific references to the West, Oregon, and the Douglas-fir.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Dick Omlar's letter and the poetry written by James McG., Patricia P., Jon Alberding, Steve Geimer, Ann Schurger, and Karen Andrews.

I hope each member of the class and the Mary's Catholic Civics Club in Decatur has the opportunity to come to Oregon and see the Douglas-firs, participate in our centennial and visit throughout the State. They will be most welcome:

MARY'S CATHOLIC CIVICS CLUB,
Decatur, Ind.

DEAR MR. PORTER: For the first time in our lives (seventh graders) we have seen and handled the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Our friend and Representative, E. ROSS ADAIR has been sending it to us through Sister M. Joan of Arc, our teacher. We are writing today because Sister read us your article, "I Think That I Shall Never See," regarding humor in Congress in the March 23 issue, page A2571, of the RECORD. We enjoyed it immensely. Because we are studying careers in farming this month, Sister suggested that we write some verse on trees in commemoration of your centennial. You will take notice that we use the Oregan Centennial stamp, too, for our correspondence.

We want to congratulate you on the unique way you advertised the Oregon centennial. Our club hopes the Oregon firs will thrive in all the 49 States. We want to share with you some of the verses composed on trees and several on the Oregon fir.

Three cheers for Oregon.

Sincerely yours,

DICK OMLAR,
(Seventh grade.)

P.S.—We belong to a national Catholic civics club, with our headquarters in Washington, D.C., at the Catholic University.

KNOWN TREES

A common tree we call the fir
Is known to all of you;
The trunk is straight, the leaves are flat
And green the whole year through.
They're found in North America,
But chiefly in the West.
The spruce and the pine, you will agree
Are known to us the best.
—*James McG.*

BIRDS' REFUGE

A tree stands majestic
Against the sky's dome;
To birds of the air
It's shelter and home.
It braves the wild storm
While within their mists;
The birds are quite warm,
Safe from the storm's crests.
—*Patricia P.*

OREGON FIR

An Oregon fir tree am I
Extending far into the sky
God made me great among His trees
That I should fill His creatures' needs
Won't you be great in your good deeds?
—*Jon Alberding.*

FOLK'S TREES

There are so many different trees,
But less than the number of bees
For instance, the Douglas-firs,
Which lives longer than any miss or sir
Another well known tree, the maple,
Which awaits patiently the showers of April.
Still another is the elm
That belongs in every king's realm.
The canine tree, the dogwood,
A long-living tree, the redwood
And there is the mighty oak,
Whose wood is used to make yokes
All these trees are known by all folks.
—*Steve Geimer.*

TREES

We are given trees for shade
And also some for fruit,
But when a tree has been cut down
Replace it with a fir tree from Oregon.
—*Ann Schurger.*

SMALL TREES

Some trees are big
Some trees are small;
But you haven't seen all.
The fir is handsome
The elm is small,
You have seen some
But you haven't seen all
The Douglas-fir from Oregon
To party of United States has gone,
For Oregon's 100th celebration
As a State in the Nation.
—*Karen Andrews.*

Tribute to the American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 14, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a resolution offered in the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts by Senator William X. Wall, of Lawrence, Mass., on April 15, 1959.

The resolution follows:

SENATE RESOLUTION 597

Resolutions paying tribute to the good works of the American Legion

Whereas the American Legion, dedicated to service for God and country, has become one of the great bulwarks of the American way of life through its leadership in all movements designed to preserve and perpetuate our free institutions and freedoms; and

Whereas the American Legion, with millions of members who have served in three wars, will in this year celebrate the fortieth anniversary of its establishment, marking the completion of four decades of patriotic labors which have had a great and beneficial impact on the welfare and security of America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts Senate calls upon all citizens and all organizations to join with it in paying tribute to the good works of this great veteran organization.

IRVING N. HAYDEN,
Clerk.

Poison in Your Water—No. 63

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Sunbury, Pa., Daily Item on April 18, 1958, entitled "Mine Pollution Blocks Industry."

The article:

MINE POLLUTION BLOCKS INDUSTRY—FIRMS SHUN COAL REGION BECAUSE OF ACIDS, CONFERENCE TOLD

HARRISBURG.—Mine acid stream pollution was cited today as a major factor keeping water-starved industries from locating in the economically distressed coal counties of Pennsylvania.

William Voigt, Jr., executive director of the State fish commission, stressed the need for more research to solve the problem of pollution created by acid water flowing from mines into streams.

"New industry will find it difficult to become established in the areas heavily polluted by mine acid, particularly if they require relatively clean process waters," he said.

"Our generally fine transportation system may make it possible for them to import raw or semifinished materials from other places, but the water must come from local sources."

Voigt made the statement in a speech prepared for delivery at the Sixth Annual Clean Streams Conference called by the Pennsylvania State Chamber of Commerce.

The law now requires all mine operators to take out a permit with the State sanitary water board under the Commonwealth's operations.

He described this problem as the State's "biggest headache," and added:

"It is about time some of us got interested in pushing for some kind of crash program to search out a feasible way to lick this tremendously complicated, but also tremendously important, acid problem."

Kenneth S. Watson, Schenectady, N.Y., president of the Federation of Sewage and

Industrial Wastes Associations, said municipal and industrial growth is dependent on clean streams.

He said industry would expect that it be allowed to treat industrial wastes with minimum acceptable treatment as a means to keeping down the cost of its own products.

Walter A. Lyon, acting director of the State division of sanitary engineering, commended Pennsylvania industry for what he said was "good work" in the water pollution control field.

Boosters for Better Television Reception

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMER H. BUDGE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks there follows a letter addressed to the Honorable J. W. FULBRIGHT by the Honorable C. C. Dill, under date of March 10, 1959, and which is self-explanatory:

SPOKANE, WASH.,
March 10, 1959.

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have just read an Associated Press report of your appeal to Members of Congress to let the FCC administer the Communications Act as it relates to boosters without undue interference. As the former Senator who wrote the radio law of 1927 and revised it into the Communications Act of 1934, I am writing to ask you to reconsider this matter. The use of boosters originated in the far Northwest in the canyons of the Columbia River and its tributaries. The communities these boosters serve are made up of what might be well termed "little people." Their homes are scattered. Often they are few in number. Because of these conditions, they are unable to pay for a translator. The cost, $5,000 to $7,000, is prohibitive. In addition, each television set would require a receiving gadget costing $35 to $40.

I wonder if you have ever seen one of these boosters. They are small contrivances placed on a high point overlooking areas where television reception is impossible. By the use of one or two amplifying tubes with an output of 1 watt or less of power, they reproduce the television signals and direct them to the scattered homes below. Thus, they provide perfect reception. Satisfactory equipment which will meet the requirements of the FCC can be secured for $500 to $600.

It should be remembered that the dominant purpose of Congress when it passed the radio law was to provide free radio service to all the people. These little boosters come as near doing that job as is possible in these lonely parts of the country where direct reception is impossible. It has taken several years for the members of the Commission to understand fully the situation. Now that 1,500 or more communities served by these low cost extremely small power boosters have been able through letters, petitions and the help of their Congressmen and Senators to induce the Commission to reconsider this problem, it seems most unfortunate that you, one of the leading and most powerful Senators today, should attempt to induce the Commission to take a backward step.

To insist upon the use of translators will mean then that most of these people living as they do in lonely unheard of places, many of whom are unable to leave their communities during the winter months because of the rough country and poor roads, will be deprived entirely of television service.

These people are not attempting undue interference. They have simply availed themselves of their right of petition. They have induced their Congressmen and Senators who understand the situation to propose amendments to the law that will require the Commission to permit them to receive television programs. By so doing, these Congressmen and Senators are simply representing the urgent needs of their constituents. All they attempt to do is enable their constituents to continue to have reception of this greatest mass communication the world has ever known.

This problem was not properly presented to the Commission members at first. The Commissioners should be commended now for showing a willingness to reconsider the situation. I urge you, therefore, at this late date in their struggle, not to interfere with the progress they have made.

The FCC officials are just like other public officials. They sometimes make mistakes. They are dealing with an art that is ever changing. Take the subject of "Cleared Channels," for example. For many years the Commissioners listening to the advice and theories of the engineers of the Commission, allowed but one radio station in the whole United States on each of 40 wave lengths. They called them clear channels. I fought that action fiercely when I was in the Senate. The Commission later reduced the cleared channels to 25 or 30, then to 12, and now indications are they will be abolished. The enlargement of the bands that can be used by radio and television in recent years has been so great that necessarily the Commission often reconsiders its decision. In fact, they would be failing to fulfill their duties, if they did not reconsider and revise a decision when they find that a change should be made.

In the case of boosters the Commission can protect all other service by requiring proper equipment and still permit good reception to the "little people" in these communities and towns where otherwise they will be without any television service at all.

In closing, let me add that I am not attorney for any community using boosters. Nor do I represent any pressure group. I have long urged members of the Commission to work out a solution to permit these simple contrivances using such an extremely small amount of power to serve the people who need television most of all. Now that they are on the way, may I urge you again to reconsider your attitude and not interfere with the forward step the Commission has already taken.

With highest personal regards, I am
Sincerely yours,

C. C. DILL.

The San Jacinto Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, 123 years ago—on April 21, 1836—a handful of Texans, under the leadership of Sam Houston, fought and won the Battle of San Jacinto.

As a direct result of this victory, the Republic of Texas was brought into being.

These men had courage. They fought a larger number of better trained, better equipped foes.

These men had vision. They literally "bet their lives" on the chance that their loved ones might have a future under freedom.

These men had strength of character. The hardships, the discouragement, they conquered were more forbidding than their human enemies.

Yet, they made their decision and went on to win.

Mr. Speaker, I have one question in my mind. This is the question: "How much Federal help did Sam Houston and his Texans have in winning and preserving their independence?"

Food for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN V. CARTER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced in the House a companion bill to the proposed Food for Peace Act which has been introduced in the Senate by the Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY. I might say in the outset that Senator HUMPHREY has put a tremendous amount of effort and study into this bill and deserves the wholehearted appreciation and support of everyone interested not only in a solution to the problems of the world's starving people, but also the problems of American farm surpluses.

The purpose of the Food for Peace Act is to so amend and revise Public Law 480 as to make it a more effective instrument for using the U.S. surplus of food and fiber to help build essential world conditions of peace and freedom and thereby strengthen and promote foreign policies of the United States. It is intended to enable the United States to promote more effectively the economic and social development of friendly nations and to lead the way in cooperation with other nations toward the abolition of human hunger.

Under this proposed legislation, a Peace Food Administration would be established in the Executive Office of the President, headed by a Peace Food Administrator to aid the President in carrying out the purposes of the act and also the purposes of section 402 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended. There would also be created an interdepartmental Peace Food Policy Committee to advise and consult with the Peace Food Administrator and also a Peace Food Advisory Committee consisting of representatives of private U.S. groups and organizations.

Mr. Speaker, all of us fully realize the burdens that our terrific surpluses of food and fiber place upon us. We must consider the burden to the producer of agricultural commodities, the burden to the taxpayer who has to share the cost of storage and maintenance of surplus

stock piles, our burden as a leader of nations in trying to promote the cause of freedom and democracy in areas where people are starving to death at the same time that we are sitting on top of $9 billion worth of edible or usable surpluses.

Before coming to Congress, I knew of the provisions of Public Law 480 and thought that they were adequate to properly distribute our surplus food to needy peoples all over the world. I thought that our failure to more adequately dispose of our surpluses was because of political considerations which made it inadvisable to distribute these things to needy people. Now I find that this is not true, that the failure to more effectively distribute our surplus agricultural commodities has apparently been due to the fact that there was no single authority charged with this responsibility. It is my opinion that the proposed Food for Peace Act will be a great stride in the direction of meeting our moral obligations as a leader of nations, as well as helping us to solve what has become a tremendous domestic economic problem. Surely, anyone from the most erudite academician to the most uninformed member of our populace must ask why it is that people are starving throughout the world while we, the United States, are blessed—or cursed, as the case may be—with our tremendous surpluses, and why these foods are not being made available for those starving people. It is a very simple, and yet, extremely valid question. This piece of legislation will go far in providing a solution to the problem.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer, plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Tullidge Clinic Dedication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 24, 1959

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address to be delivered by me at the Tullidge Clinic Dedication, at Ararat, Va., on April 25, 1959.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TULLIDGE CLINIC DEDICATION

(Address by Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON at Tullidge Clinic dedication at Ararat, Patrick County, Va., Apr. 25, 1959)

The happy privilege of joining with Patrick County friends in the dedication of a new clinic reminds me of the fact that my first visit to Patrick was with a young doctor from Franklin County who later located at Stuart for the practice of his profession—Dr. George T. Divers. The time was June 1912; the occasion was the marriage of Dr. Divers to Miss Evelyn Martin, the charming and talented daughter of Dr. R. S. Martin, one of the most beloved men who ever lived in this county.

The remarkable development during the intervening years of Franklin County, where I lived as a boy, and the adjoining mountain counties of Henry and Patrick, has been a source of pride and great satisfaction to me. As a State senator I was fully aware of how our mountain counties were handicapped by the lack of good roads and hence, in the State senate the establishment of a State highway system was my major goal. Four of those who served on the commission to lay out a highway system and who sponsored the legislation to adopt it, are still living—Col. Sinclair Brown, of Salem, Hon. C. O'Conor Goolrick, of Fredericksburg, the senior United States Senator from Virginia, Mr. BYRD, and myself.

During my service in the Congress I have supported the programs to bring electricity and telephones to our farmers, the promotion of scientific farming through Federal and State research and the preservation of fertile topsoil through modern conservation practices. The end result has been to greatly increase the production of the average farmer in Patrick, as well as elsewhere in the State, while good roads have not only facilitated the marketing of farm crops but also have contributed to the improvement of local schools and churches.

In giving credit to technological developments that have improved the economic status of the people of Patrick County let us not lose sight of the fact that today, as in the days of the birth of our Nation the most important product of any community is the quality of its men and women. It takes more than material prosperity to produce character and good citizenship, and Patrick County has met that test. I welcome this opportunity to pay tribute to the example of the ideal family physician set Virginia doctors by the late Dr. R. S. Martin of Stuart and to the political and civic leadership furnished by families like the Hookers, Georges, Joyces, Clarks, and Thompsons (to mention just a few of those I have been privileged to know) and to say nothing of the county's gift to North Carolina of the wizard of tobacco manufacturers, R. J. Reynolds, and his brother who was the grandfather of Richard S. Reynolds, who now heads the greater aluminum empire which has its headquarters in Richmond.

In both the State legislature and in the United States Congress I have appreciated and enjoyed my friendship with the fine and able men who have represented Patrick, including your present Representative in the House, the Honorable WILLIAM M. TUCK.

The high quality of citizenship which has characterized the people of Patrick is due in no small degree to the fact that many of the early settlers were Scotch-Irish who came to Virginia in search of religious and political freedom and who have handed down to succeeding generations a belief in the virtues of representative democracy and self-government so eloquently expressed by Patrick Henry.

You will, of course, recall that Patrick County was formed from a part of Henry County in 1791, only a year after the States had ratified the first 10 amendments to our Constitution which we know as the Bill of Rights.

Those amendments, which Virginia and several other States had insisted upon as a condition to their acceptance of the Federal Constitution, were designed to protect for all time such basic rights as freedom of religion, freedom of speech and freedom of the press, the 10th amendment clearly stating the theory which too many persons have ignored or forgotten today—that basic human rights can best be protected when the power of the central Government is limited.

In the Virginia convention, called to ratify the Federal Constitution, Patrick Henry was a leader of the faction which demanded assurance of protection from the possibility of despotic power. He said that Congress, having the power of taxation and the authority to raise an army and a navy, would have "the sword in one hand, and the purse in the other," and he asked: "Shall we be safe without either? * * * Where and when did freedom exist, when the sword and purse were given up from the people? Unless a miracle in human affairs shall interpose, no Nation ever did or ever can retain its liberty after the loss of the sword and the purse."

In the same convention Patrick Henry spoke with prophetic vision when he pointed out that Congress would have the power of involving the Southern States in all the horrors which would result from a total emancipation of their slaves, and predicted that the Northern States, uninterested in the consequences of such an act, and with a controlling majority of votes, probably would be inclined to do this.

Our fathers knew those horrors in the War of 1861–65 and the bitter reconstruction period which followed.

In the Virginia convention George Mason, the author of the Bill of Rights, also pointed out that the power to levy direct taxes given to the central Government was calculated to annihilate totally the State governments.

That has not yet happened but the administration of State governments has been made increasingly difficult by financial pressures resulting from an ever-increasing Federal tax burden required to service a mounting national debt and to carry on programs understaken by the Federal Government in areas never dreamed of by the Founding Fathers. New spending schemes are introduced with a pious reference to promoting the general welfare but nothing would better promote the general welfare than an economy program, accompanied by a reduction of Federal taxes.

Destruction of State governments may indeed be threatened in the future if the Congress continues to approve legislation authorizing Federal activities which displace those traditionally carried on by the States and localities and if the courts continue to assert, in effect, that there is no practical limit to the bounds of Federal authority.

Believing that the political wisdom of the Founding Fathers has never since been equaled I have been proud, throughout my political life, to call myself a Jeffersonian Democrat, interpreting as best I could, in terms of 20th century conditions, the political philosophy of men like Patrick Henry, James Madison and Thomas Jefferson.

The splendid and much appreciated support I have always received in Patrick indicates your approval of the firm stand I always have taken in behalf of States rights and efficiency and economy in Government. It should be needless, therefore, for me to assure you that as long as I have the privilege and honor of representing you in the U.S. Senate I shall stoutly resist the current trend to override the rights of the sovereign States and to engage in national projects of a socialistic character.

I am happy to say that the construction of a clinic with private funds at a time when many are advocating socialized medicine is in full keeping with Jeffersonian Democracy. I warmly commend the fine spirit of unselfish cooperation of the people of this community whose personal contributions have enabled Dr. Archer Tullidge to make a success of this undertaking.

The decision of Dr. Tullidge to dedicate this clinic to the memory of his deceased brother, George, is in keeping with his own decision to locate in a rural area where there was need for the services of a family physician rather than in a city where the financial rewards for his fine medical training would have been greater.

It has been my privilege to know the family of Dr. Tullidge for many years. It is a fine Christian family, of Scotch-Irish origin, long prominent in the church, civic, and business affairs of Staunton and Augusta County. Mr. and Mrs. George Tullidge, Jr., raised three fine sons, the oldest of whom was George Bowler Tullidge III. He was a sergeant of the 507th Parachute Infantry, 82d Airborne Division, who at the age of 20 years gave his life in the invasion of France, June 8, 1944. Scarcely more than a month before his death Sgt. George Tullidge wrote Tommy, the brother next in age to him, a letter from which I quote the following:

"Mother writes and tells me how big a boy you are getting to be. It seems like a mighty long time since I have seen you boys, and I guess it will be a while longer; probably I will have a hard time even recognizing you. I just know and pray that you will turn out to be the kind of boys that Mother and Dad are teaching you to be. Just take a word of advice from somebody who has had a small look around anyway. Maybe I am not so

old, but these 2 years in the Army have shown and taught me lots of things about life that I never dreamed of before. I won't go into a long discussion but just remember when you are out with boys and girls what is wrong and what is right. Please don't let them get you and Arch off on the wrong foot because they will if you are not careful. There are lots of things in life bigger and finer than some immediate pleasures; and some few seeming small things at present can break up the finer ones for you later. * * *

"Another thing that has helped me a lot is my firm belief in the Lord. Oftentimes when I feel depressed and blue it does me an awful lot of good to read my Bible and a little book that Mother sent me. A good belief in Christianity (very broad term) gives a fellow something to grasp when the going gets tough, and it does at times. * * * Best wishes and may God bless you always. Your best pal, George."

It should be a source of inspiration to the people of this community to have a local health center dedicated to the memory of a patriotic boy who gave his life for the p--petuity of our freedom and democratic institutions and to know that the new clinic will be operated by a physician who shares the faith of an older brother who, because of his implicit faith in God and the justness of his cause, could smile when he heard the rustle of angels' wings and say to the Grim Reaper, "O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?"

In the eighth chapter of Genesis it is recorded that after being tossed 40 days and 40 nights by the great flood, the ark of Noah came to rest upon the mountains of Ararat. By the same token may those buffeted by illness and disease find this a new Ararat of rest and solace; a tangible evidence of the fact that God still rules the world in a spirit of love.

The Name of Quarles Is Synonymous With Missile Gap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 24, 1959

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, repeatedly, in private discussions with people intimately familiar with the defense preparedness program, I have heard statements which indicate that deputy Secretary of Defense Donald Quarles is the biggest gnat in the defense ointment. The idea of Donald Quarles ever becoming Secretary of Defense sends a universal shudder through the Pentagon and the industries working in defense production. I have wondered when someone was going to say so in public print.

Mr. Joseph Alsop, in his column in the Washington Post this morning entitled "Mister Missile Gap," has put the case in cold print.

The Constitution of the United States requires appointment of Cabinet officers with the advice and consent of the Senate. I would suggest, in the line of giving advice ahead of time, that the President take a long look at Donald Quarles before submitting his name to succeed Secretary of Defense Neil McElroy. Quarles has been so consistently wrong that his appointment could be a major menace to the defense effort of this country. I suggest a careful reading of Mr. Alsop's column—and I am sure that he has only partially set forth the bill of particulars on Mr. Quarles' lack of qualifications to be Secretary of Defense when Mr. EcElroy carries out his announced plans to retire.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Alsop's article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Apr. 24, 1959]

"MISTER MISSILE GAP"

(By Joseph Alsop)

For the past 10 days Washington has been preoccupied with the succession at the State Department. The preoccupation was needless. Christian A. Herter was the obvious and almost necessary choice to succeed John Foster Dulles, and he is also a man of proven stature and courage, who ought to do a first-rate job.

No one, meanwhile, seems to be at all preoccupied with the succession at the Defense Department, although the early departure of Secretary of Defense Neil McElroy was foreseen some time ago. It is taken for granted that when McElroy goes his Deputy Secretary, Donald Quarles, will get the top job. Certainly the President will have the utmost difficulty in finding any other replacement for McElroy.

Yet the succession at the Defense Department really deserves more attention than the succession at the State Department, if only because the right name for Donald Quarles is "Mister Missile Gap."

Quarles has been a leading defense policymaker during the whole of the last 6 years, when the world balance of military power has tilted so dangerously against us. He has had much authority over our missile programs, and the missile gap is the worst of our problems. He currently opposes the measures that might bridge the gap. And if he had had his way in the past, there would be no mere gap, but a vast, unbridgeable, inescapable abyss.

These are rather serious things to say about the foreordained next Secretary of Defense, but they are easily documented. In brief, when Quarles first entered the Department as Assistant Secretary for Research and Development, the American long-range missiles program was in a condition that was appalling to contemplate.

The cause of this condition was bad specifications. The development of compact, relatively lightweight H-bomb warheads had not been foreseen or allowed for by the air staff. Missile designs were therefore required to carry warheads of impossible weight and size. Thus the missiles under development were then either doubtfully useful or actually impossible. In the first category were Snark and Navajo projects, both now terminated. In the impossible category was the Atlas as then conceived, as a vast, hopelessly unwieldy missile with a takeoff weight of 450,000 pounds.

On the initiative of the Air Force's assistant secretary for research, Trevor Gardner, a committee was named to review the long-range missile program under the leadership of that great scientist, the late John von Neumann. Without the Von Neumann Committee's report, we should probably have no serious long-range missile program to this day. But the changes the committee proposed were tepidly received by the air staff, and they were actively opposed by Donald Quarles. The dogged insistence of Gardner, the bold determination of his chief, Secretary of the Air Force Harold Talbott, were both needed to secure acceptance of the Von Neumann Committee report.

The principal initial change was the complete redesign of Atlas, as a workable missile built around the new, much lighter weight warheads the Atomic Energy Commission was perfecting. Somewhat later, the decision to add the Titan project also grew out of the Von Neumann report. Without Titan, this country would not even be in sight of having a long-range ballistic missile capable of being placed in a fully hard pad. But once again, Donald Quarles sharply opposed the inauguration of the Titan project; and Talbott and Gardner had to fight with tooth and claw to win the day.

Even the redesign of Atlas and the order for Titan would have been fruitless, however, without the establishment in Turkey of missile-watching radars. Nothing but the grim, indisputable intelligence derived from these radars could have driven the Eisenhower administration to spend the necessary sums for serious development of the big missiles. But once again, Donald Quarles fought the whole plan for the missile-watching radars. The project was smuggled through, without Quarles' concurrence, by the Talbott-Gardner team. In truth the country owes much to these two men, one of whom was later disgraced, while the other was briskly dismissed for his pains.

Such is the early Quarles record, in the formative period. The later record has been wholly consistent with the beginning. Indeed, the great tragedy of the hapless McElroy's service as Defense Secretary has been his choice of Quarles as his chief adviser. But with the missile gap growing more perilous with each passing month, "Mister Missile Gap" will no doubt became Defense Secretary when McElroy goes.

Free Hospitals: How Canada's New Plan Works

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 24, 1959

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Free Hospitals: How Canada's New Plan Works."

The article appeared in the April 27 issue of U.S. News & World Report.

I note that this magazine concludes that the hospital insurance plan has not disturbed the relations of doctors and patients.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREE HOSPITALS: HOW CANADA'S NEW PLAN WORKS

OTTAWA, CANADA.—People of Canada now are taking a long step along the road of socialized medical care. How well they make out is expected to have a big part in determining whether the United States takes a similar course.

Just a few days ago, on April 13, the U.S. Congress got a report on the cost of free hospital insurance for only one group of Americans—those on social security pensions.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare reported that such insurance would cost a billion dollars a year at the start, and lead to demands for broader aid to other

groups. Legislation for the insurance is strongly backed by U.S. labor unions.

In Canada, free, or nearly free, hospitalization has begun in 7 of 10 provinces. Two more provinces are expected to join this summer, leaving Quebec the only holdout. The high and rising cost of hospital care had led four provinces into earlier experiments with Government subsidies. A system that is nearly nationwide has followed.

Most Canadians who are ill today are assured of bed and board in a hospital ward with no limit on the length of stay. In two Provinces—Albert and British Columbia—a deterrent charge of $1 to $2 a day is made. In other provinces, the service is free.

Other free services include: all necessary nursing, X-rays, laboratory, and diagnostic services, use of operating rooms, anesthetics, routine surgical supplies, drugs, when administered in hospitals; blood transfusions; use of radiotherapy and physical therapy, when equipment is available.

If medical necessity requires it, a patient is entitled to a private room and special nursing care. The attending physician decides upon medical necessity. Otherwise, such extras as a special nurse or a private room must be paid for by the patient.

STATE MEDICINE?—NOT YET

Canada is undertaking to provide for everyone broader hospital care than that offered by privately financed hospital insurance in the United States. Canadians point out, though, that they are stopping short of state medicine.

The following services, provided free in Great Britain, are not available without charge to the people of Canada: payment of doctors' bills or surgeons' fees; private nurses, except for medical necessity; ambulance service; dental care; false teeth, eye examinations; eyeglasses; hearing aids; crutches, canes, and wheelchairs.

The Canadian plan also excludes, in most Provinces, the type of special care and treatment that patients get in tuberculosis sanitariums, cancer clinics, mental hospitals, old-age homes and rehabilitation centers. In most Provinces, there are other arrangements for these services.

The accompanying illustrations present in graphic form the kind of care now available under the insurance plan. The cost is shared roughly on a 50–50 basis between the Federal Government of Canada and the Provinces. The Federal share comes out of the Federal Treasury. The Provinces have adopted a variety of taxes to meet their share.

HOW COSTS RUN

In Ontario, a preminum of $4.20 a month in most cases is deducted from the paycheck of a family man; $2.10 from the pay of a single worker. Manitoba charges $2.05 for single persons, $4.10 for families. Alberta uses a special property tax. Nova Scotia levies a special hospital tax of 3 percent which, in effect, is a retail sales tax. British Columbia levies a straight sales tax of 5 percent. Saskatchewan uses a sales tax and an annual premium of $17.50 for single persons, $55 for families. Newfoundland expects to defray its costs out of general tax revenues.

Total cost of hospital insurance is estimated by Canadians to come high. The Federal Government is expected to provide $160 million as its share for the fiscal year that ends March 31, 1960. The Provinces are expected to provide at least that much or more.

Ontario, for example, estimates that the first year of the plan will cost the Province $233 million with $75 million coming from Federal funds, $71 million from the Provincial treasury, and $87 million raised from the premiums deducted from payrolls.

The plan is designed to provide hospital insurance for each one of the 17.3 million persons in the Canadian population. Basic hospital care is to be offered regardless of income, or financial resources. Most of the voluntary hospital insurance programs, such as Blue Cross, have been taken over by the Provincial governments. These private organizations, however, are continuing to operate on a reduced scale by offering superior accommodations not included in the Government program.

MORE HOSPITALS COMING?

Hospitals also are expected to be freed from annual deficits and financial worries. Each hospital accepted by Provincial authorities submits a budget and, after the budget is approved, its costs are reimbursed.

The program is expected to lead to more hospital construction on a nationwide basis. Agreements signed between the Provinces and the Government in Ottawa call for minimum standards which all hospitals are supposed to meet. And the Federal Government agrees to help the Provinces with special grants to meet hospital needs.

The Financial Post of Toronto estimates that the total cost of hospital insurance and new construction will be more than $3 billion in the next 5 years. This program is being adopted in a country where the annual budget has never exceeded $5.4 billion.

Private doctors are being relied on to keep hospital costs within bounds. The relations of doctors and patients are not disturbed by hospital insurance, but Government authorities expect that doctors will not be too lenient in recommending hospital treatment. If they are, officials say, costs will get out of bounds.

The Moscow Fair—U.S. Exhibit on the Role of Religion in American Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 24, 1959

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on April 10, I wrote to George V. Allen, Director of the U.S. Information Agency, and urged that an exhibit depicting the role of religion in American life be included in the forthcoming American exhibit at the Moscow Fair.

I have since received from Mr. Allen assurances that such an exhibit will be included.

I wrote further to Mr. Allen and suggested that the National Conference of Christians and Jews be assigned the task of planning the exhibit, in order that we may be assured that this religious exhibit will be truly representative of America's great religious groups.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD my correspondence with Mr. Allen; an editorial from the New Haven Register of April 19, 1959; and an editorial from the Bridgeport Post of April 20, 1959.

There being no objection, the correspondence and the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. GEORGE V. ALLEN,
Director, U.S. Information Agency,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ALLEN: It has been brought to my attention by visitors to the Brussels Fair that there was not a single display of a religious nature in the American exhibit.

It is incomprehensible to me that an American exhibit designed to portray the various aspects of American life should neglect one of its principal elements, the role of religion.

Millions of visitors from all over the world went through the American exhibit. We missed a wonderful opportunity to demonstrate to these people the importance of religion in the development of our history, and its great influence on contemporary American affairs.

Many of the early colonists of our continent came here in quest of religious freedom. Many of our first settlements were essentially religious settlements.

Throughout our history our great state documents, such as the Declaration of Independence, Washington's Farewell Address, and Lincoln's Second Inaugural, have been expressions of basic moral principles.

Therefore, I consider it inexcusable that any exhibit purporting to be representative of American life should fail to depict its most important aspect.

The next exposition of this kind will be at the Moscow Fair. Our mistakes at the Brussels Fair must not be repeated. The State Department should see to it that the American display at the Moscow Fair contains a religious exhibit indicative of the fundamental place of religion in American society.

With best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS J. DODD.

APRIL 20, 1959.

The Honorable GEORGE V. ALLEN,
Director, U.S. Information Agency,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ALLEN: On April 10, 1959, I wrote to you urging that an exhibit of a religious nature be included in the forthcoming American exposition in Moscow.

I suggested this because our religions have played such an important role in American history, and their influence on contemporary affairs is so great, that no exhibition which purports to be representative of American life would be complete without a religious demonstration.

I realize that many difficulties will be encountered in preparing an exhibit that seeks to do justice to America's many religious denominations, and their historical contribution to our Nation.

Therefore, I recommend that the National Conference of Christians and Jews be given jurisdiction over planning the contents of this proposed exhibit.

I think this would assure a devout tone, an historical accuracy, and a proper balance that would be agreeable to our Nation's various religious groups.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS J. DODD.

[From the New Haven Register, Apr. 19, 1959]

A RELIGIOUS NOTE IN OUR MOSCOW SHOW?

Connecticut's Senator DODD has urged the State Department to make plans for a religious exhibit at the Moscow Fair this year. Such a display, stressing the fundamental place of religion in American society, would—he feels—have an important role in defining the origins and the roots of the sort of freedom for which the United States stands.

This is a stimulating proposal.

Certainly one of the fundamental differences between our views and those of the Communist leaders springs from the Kremlin's denial of God, its denial of religion, and its attempted substitution of a totalitarian party ethic for the established beliefs of so many people in so many parts of the world that are now under its control.

"It is incomprehensible to me that an American exhibit designed to portray the various aspects of American life should neglect one of its principal elements, the role of religion," says Senator DODD. And he points out that such an element was neglected in the U.S. show at last year's Brussels World Fair.

"Many of the early colonists of our continent came here in quest of religious freedom. Many of our first settlements were essentially religious settlements. Throughout our history our great State documents, such as the Declaration of Independence, Washington's Farewell Address, and Lincoln's Second Inaugural, have been expressions of basic moral principles.

"Therefore I consider it inexcusable that any exhibit purporting to be representative of American life should fail to depict its most important aspect."

The Dodd proposal is one that the State Department and the American people should weigh most seriously. The religious freedoms which we enjoy and the individual rights which we uphold often promote a sort of bland avoidance of all religious statement in this country. Among peoples abroad, though, the religious diversity which we take for granted and the religious faith which we rarely trouble to defend may be far more impressive than any demonstration of technological progress or political objective. They are a priceless part of our heritage, a fundamental base for our liberty—and a part of our daily living which should not be ignored as we attempt to tell Russia's people of the values we cherish.

[From the Bridgeport Post, April 20, 1959]

AN IDEA, SHARP AND TIMELY

The State Department has received a suggestion from Senator THOMAS J. DODD which should obtain warm and immediate approval. When we take part in the big Moscow fair this summer, in an effort to show Soviet citizens how Americans really live, the Senator says we should include a religious exhibit, to indicate religion's fundamental place in U.S. society.

A picture of an American community would hardly be complete without showing its schools and its churches. Senator DODD in a letter to George V. Allen, U.S. Information Agency Director, recalled that there was not a single display of a religious nature in the U.S. exhibit at Brussels. Our mistakes there, he advised, should not be repeated.

Millions from all over the world went through the U.S. exhibit. Mr. DODD holds that "we missed a wonderful opportunity to demonstrate to these people the importance of religion in the development of our history, and its great influence on contemporary American affairs."

Many of the colonists of our continent came here to seek religious freedom and many of the early settlements were essentially religious. Throughout our history our great State documents have been expressions of basic moral principles.

How better to impress the Soviet citizens with the story of life as it really is in this country? Let us show them that among our freedoms, which they are denied, is the freedom of conscience, of the right to worship God as one pleases or believes is right.

An excellent suggestion and one that will give the Red propagandists something else to attack. And the Soviet people, knowing well that the Kremlin line is phony, will see and believe, and be encouraged.

School Lunch Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 24, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, one of the finest programs in operation in our schools today is the surplus food program which provides free lunches for some school children. This insures that these youngsters will have a good meal and a balanced diet, which they otherwise might not have.

Yet some school districts have chosen not to take advantage of this very worthwhile program, even though the current recession has increased the need for it.

Mr. President, one of the best discussions of this situation which I have seen was an editorial in the Houston (Tex.) Post, one of the State's outstanding daily newspapers. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the editorial printed in the Houston Post for Monday, April 13, 1959, under the heading, "School Lunches Paid for Twice."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCHOOL LUNCHES PAID FOR TWICE

We who live in the Houston Independent School District pay double to provide lunches for hungry school children.

We pay once in the tax money we have invested in the country's $9 billion worth of surplus farm products, in the tax money it takes to store that surplus, and the tax money it takes to keep the surplus from becoming even greater.

We pay a second time when our United Fund donations are spent for school lunches for needy children.

We pay twice simply because the Houston School Board is unwilling to participate in Government-sponsored programs which make the surplus foods available to school districts at no cost.

Persons who live in school districts which participate in the programs pay only once to feed their hungry schoolchildren. These districts do not ask for donations from the United Fund. They do not have to.

Why is the Houston School Board willing to see its constituents pay twice to provide free school lunches to hungry pupils?

Since 1946 a majority of members have offered two chief reasons:

1. That if the district participates in programs sponsored by the Federal Government, the Federal Government will take over control of the school district entirely.

2. That if the district participates in the program, the character of the schoolchildren will be weakened to the extent that they will expect more and more help from Federal Government sources.

In the first instance, the school board members appear to be governed more by fear than by facts. The Federal Government has not attempted to control 19 neighboring Harris County school districts which participate in the programs. And there is no evidence that it ever will.

The second reason is no reason at all. If a child would grow dependent upon the Federal Government simply because his school participated in the programs, wouldn't the same logic dictate that he would grow dependent upon charity simply because his school's free lunches were provided by United Fund donations?

Certainly a needy child and his parents are aware that they are accepting charity when the child is provided a free lunch purchased with United Fund money. This is an unpleasant thing to say, but it is true. The needy child under such circumstances stands apart.

Under the Government-sponsored programs, the needy child is fed but his paying fellow students also benefit. They receive more food for less money. Borderline cases—pupils who do not always have sufficient money for a school lunch—are able to obtain a nutritious lunch more often.

Presuming that the school board members' arguments have some merit, they would not appear to have enough merit to justify a line of action which forces taxpayers to pay twice for free lunches and deprives the greatest number of children of an opportunity to obtain a better lunch for less money.

It is shocking to know that our Government has more than $9 billion invested in surplus farm products.

It is shocking to know that it costs us more than $1 million a day simply to store the gigantic surplus.

It is still more shocking to know that the surplus grows with every passing harvest, that more tax dollars are involved with every passing year.

Every thinking American hopes and prays that some formula will be found to decrease the surplus without further upsetting our economy. But no Congress or no administration since depression days has found it.

And in the meantime we must accept as hard and simple truth that the surplus is there, that it will be with us for years to come.

And we must call on such wisdom and compassion as we possess to see that it is used for the greatest good.

Senator Gore's Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 24, 1959

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, in the April 23 issue of the Commercial Appeal, published in Memphis, Tenn., there appears an excellent editorial, well deserved by my good friend, Senator ALBERT GORE, of Tennessee. It should be called to the attention of the Congress and the public at large.

I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR GORE'S WEEK

Although modesty might prevent him from seeing it in that light, last week was definitely Senator ALBERT GORE's in some vital areas related to the national well-being.

When Senator GORE returned from the Geneva Nuclear Conference last November, he recommended that the United States take the lead in proposing a stoppage of nuclear tests within the earth's atmosphere.

Last week the administration did that very thing at Geneva. The Gore recommendation, now this country's formal position, would leave the United States free to continue underground and outer space tests where developments can be assured without consequential radioactive fallout.

Since 1954 Senator GORE has been a consistent and persistent advocate of governmental development of nuclear power. In his fight to that end the Tennessean encountered formidable opposition in and out of Government.

Last week a decision to construct a Government-owned and operated nuclear power reactor in Oak Ridge was made and announced by the administration, thus com-

pletely vindicating Senator GORE's long-maintained position.

Discussing this development a few days ago, he pointed out that "the gas-cooled concept which the Government will now develop at Oak Ridge has been ready for development in our country for nearly 10 years."

"The private power industry has had not only ample opportunity to develop this concept upon its own, but has had repeated offers of governmental subsidies if it would do so. It has not, and I do not wish to be critical of the private power industry for not having developed this and other reactor concepts.

"The expense of developing a reactor concept is too great and too risky for one company to afford, but the public interest requires such an effort on the part of the Government in order to maintain U.S. leadership in the vital field of nuclear energy.

"Once a reactor concept has been successfully demonstrated by the Government through research and development, private industry can utilize it to its own profit and to the profit of the Nation. The British, incidentally, have made great headway with the gas-cooled concept. Indeed, both the British and the Russians have pulled ahead of the United States in the actual construction and operation of large-scale powerplants."

Had the administration in 1954 recognized the soundness as well as the vision in Senator GORE's pleading this would not now be the case.

One of the most memorable fights made last year on the Senate floor by the Tennesseean was that for adoption of a tax law which would require the vastly profitable insurance industry to pay a fair share of the cost of Government and national defense. His efforts were opposed by the Treasury Department and by tremendously influential Senator BYRD.

Last week the Senate Finance Committee began considering a bill recommended by the Treasury Department and supported by Senator BYRD. If enacted its general effect would be what Senator GORE was seeking a year ago.

Acceptance and support of the Tennesseean's viewpoints and thinking by those who had earlier opposed and rejected them should be as satisfying to Senator GORE as they are to his friends and constituents in this State. Certainly the events of last week further prove the electorate's wisdom in giving him an overwhelming vote of confidence returning him to the Senate.

Whither the Constitution?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, on April 15, 1959, our colleague, the Honorable JIM WRIGHT, of Texas, was the main speaker at the annual meeting of the Virginia State Chamber of Commerce at the Hotel Chamberlin, Fort Monroe, Va.

The impact of this great speech on this distinguished audience was so readily apparent that I ask that his address be made a part of this RECORD and strongly recommend that it be read by my colleagues.

The address follows:

WHITHER THE CONSTITUTION?

(Speech by Congressman JIM WRIGHT, annual meeting, Virginia State Chamber of Commerce, Old Point Comfort, Va., April 15, 1959)

Last month, we celebrated the 170th anniversary of the Constitution of the United States.

Throughout the long, hot summer of 1788, while in the sweltering heat of Philadelphia's Independence Hall our Founding Fathers struggled to draft a Constitution, rumors spread throughout the Colonies like autumn leaves whisked about by the wind.

Speculation was rife. The 12-year-old Articles of Confederation, too loosely drawn in the beginning, had blundered and broken apart upon the rocky shoals of reality. A firmer and more adhesive foundation was clearly needed upon which to erect an enduring nation. The topic of the day in the taverns and general stores and stage coach inns concerned itself with what form the Government would take. Sophisticated couriers in the capitols of Europe speculated as to who would emerge as King.

Finally the work was ended. The document, hammered out upon the anvils of mutual compromise, was ready for public presentation. The delegates filed slowly out onto the broad portico to read it to a motley crowd which for days had been gathering outside the building. A curious little charwoman, unwilling to await its formal reading, plucked at the sleeve of Ben Franklin and insisted upon knowing what type of government they were to have.

Franklin replied: "A Republic * * * if you can keep it."

We have kept it for 170 years. I was startled some months ago when the Prime Minister of Ireland, addressing our Congress, brought greetings from an old nation and a new Republic to a young nation and the oldest Republic on earth. In point of continuous institution, ours is the world's oldest Republic.

That we continue to keep it seems to me one of the most important resolutions on earth. As valid today as when it was penned is Emerson's rhetorical question:

"For what avail the plough or sail,
Or land or life, if freedom fail?

With most of the world looking hopefully to us, not only for bread but for inspiration, the essential character of our Government is, more than ever before, "the last, best hope of earth."

Let me make clear at the outset that I am not seeking to alarm you. I do not think we shall lose it. With all my heart, I believe the fundamental faith of our Nation to be as strong today as ever it has been in our history. Yet there are certain developments which have taken us rather far afield from the points of our origin and which, unless corrected, could alter the direction of our destiny. Specifically, I should like for us to think very seriously above five particular trends * * * to consider how they have come about * * * and to resolve what must be done to correct them.

1. EROSION OF STATES RIGHTS

The first and in some ways the most obvious of these trends is a gradual and steady erosion of the rights of our States. Everyone talks about this tendency and most people lament it. Yet, as with the weather, hardly anybody ever seems to do anything about it.

In some respects, the tendency is a natural one. As the Nation has grown more compact and distance has been eradicated, attention has shifted from the States to the National Government. People more and more have looked to the Federal authority for a solution to their problems, particularly when frustrated in seeking solutions at the State level.

And the attitude of the States themselves has often hastened the trend. The impotence and corruption of State legislatures, their unwillingness to assume responsibility, have on more than one occasion driven the public to look to the Federal Congress for its remedies.

A House Committee on Intergovernmental Operations last year highlighted this truth with case history illustrations. Since 1925, the committee noted, Federal grants for nondefense programs have risen from $124 million to $5 billion for the current fiscal year. Tracing the birth and growth of activities ranging all the way from aid to State soldiers' homes to stream pollution control, the committee established that, in almost every instance, the Federal entry into the field had been preceeded by negligence and unwillingness to solve their own problems on the part of the States.

To wail against growing Federal influence in State and local affairs without being willing to support more dynamic and responsible State governments is to engage in a hollow and hypocritical gesture. If Federal Government is ever to limit its authority, then this will be tied up in one package with stronger Government close to home.

Yet, I realize fully that the converse also is true. It is like the question of the chicken and the egg. The Federal Government will not release responsibility until the States prove a willingnes to assume it. But the States cannot develop their own initiative if stifled under a blanket of growing Federal encroachment. This is the reason why many of us in the Congress believe in the importance of legislative reform such as embodied in the bill, H.R. 3. This bill, intended to restate the historic doctrine of concurrent jurisdiction, passed the House in the last session after many hard months of struggle. It is unfortunate that it became enmeshed in a parliamentary situation which prevented it from also receiving the approval of the Senate.

Let us be clear about what we mean. H.R. 3 did not presume in any way, shape, or fashion to confer upon any State a right to enact legislation which would be violative of or inconsistent with the Federal law. That question was settled when we abandoned the Articles of Confederation and adopted the Constitution of the United States. It was ratified forever in the indelible blood of the Civil War. We are not a confederation in which any State may set itself aside as an island wherein Federal law may be ignored. Ours is a Federal Union, "one Nation, under God indivisible." There is no attempt here to maintain that a State possesses any right to countermand or nullify Federal law.

What is involved in H.R. 3 is simply a protection of the historic rights of the States to exercise concurrent jurisdiction with the Federal Government and to enact statutes of their own so long as those statutes do not violate the Federal law.

This is an original and historic right. At the beginning of our history as a nation, it never occurred to anyone to question it.

Of recent years, however, the courts have held with increasing consistency that where Congress has enacted legislation on a subject, the States are deprived of all power to enact or enforce similar laws on the same subject, even though they present no direct conflict with the Federal act.

The judicial ruling in the case of *Commonwealth* v. *Nelson* which has a bearing on antisedition statutes now on the books in some 47 States is a notable case in point. It comes instantly to mind because of the publicity accorded this decision and because, ironically, it was the distinguished Congressman from Virginia, Mr. SMITH, the author of

H.R. 3, who had written the Federal act cited by the Court to nullify enforcement of the State laws in Pennsylvania.

That case, however, is no more than a symptom of what has been happening to the rights of States in the initiation of legislation and the handling of local problems. Similar decisions, involving somewhat less spectacular issues, are legion.

A fairly typical example is the recent case of *Cloverleaf Co.* v. *Patterson*. The State of Alabama, in an effort to protect the health of its citizens, had sought to inspect the product of a company, which was engaged in the renovation of butter. Some of the butter was shipped in interstate commerce, and thus subject to Federal pure food laws.

The Supreme Court ruled that Congress had therefore assumed entire jurisdiction over the subject, leaving the States powerless to enforce their own health laws. Dissenting, Justice Frankfurther argued that, if Congress had intended to preempt State enforcement entirely, it would have said so in its act.

This is the philosophy of H.R. 3, that in the absence of a clear congressional declaration depriving States of initiative in a given field of law, and in the absence of any conflict between State and Federal provisions, the States will be presumed to retain the right to enact and enforce similar laws.

The States have traditionally been valuable proving grounds for legislative policy. Many of our most far-reaching national reforms were first tested and proven in the laboratories of State government. Women's suffrage in Wyoming, antitrust in Texas, conservation laws in Pennsylvania, and lobby reform in Wisconsin, to name but a few.

Although the cry of States rights has often been abused, often used as a cloak to cover States wrongs, it is most assuredly not a reactionary doctrine to hold out for the rights of States to solve lcal problems when the solution presents no conflict with Federal policy.

Unless H.R. 3 or something substantially similar is enacted, it will be only a matter of time before the State governments will be deprived of practically all legislative initiative through this doctrine of preemption.

Congress is now required to legislate on an ever-widening variety of subjects. If, each time it does so, the States are to have another avenue of legislation completely closed to them, they will be inevitably deprived of the power to attack the problems of their people on any but a meager handful of subjects. These will be those not regarded as sufficiently important to warrant congressional action.

This legislative reform is needed unles we want consciously to abet the further erosion of the rights and prerogatives of the States. And I, for one, do not wish to do so.

2. EXECUTIVE USURPATION OF LEGISLATIVE POWERS

The second of these trends is a growing usurpation of legislative powers by the executive branch of Government. The great British statesman, Gladstone, spoke of our Constitution as "the most perfect instrument ever set down by the hand of man at a given time." He was speaking of its delicately contrived balance of powers between the separate branches of Government. It was born out of personal experience with a sovereign who had arrogated to himself authority which in its unrestrained exercise he had abused. If the Articles of Confederation had proven themselves too weak, there certainly was no wish among the authors of the Constitution to supplant them with a Government whose essential strength would be embodied in an all-powerful executive.

The greatest danger in all political systems is that of executive power. Benjamin Franklin was haunted by a dread that the executive branch would increase at the expense of the other branches until it would end in a form of authoritarianism. Commenting upon this fear, Jefferson said, "It is better to keep the wolf out of the fold than to trust to drawing his teeth and claws after he shall have entered."

Of the three branches, Congress should be the most responsive to the public wish because, by its very nature, it is closest to the public. While the population of the average constituency has grown enormously since the Constitution was drafted, it still is true that in our scheme of things, the average Member of Congress comes in closer and more continuous contact with the people whom the Government serves and represents than does any other Federal official.

During the congressional adjournment last fall, as an example, I publicly discussed our congressional activities in 114 different group meetings in my particular district. During the 4 months, I estimated that I had talked personally with some 11,000 people. This in greater or lesser degree is what most Members of Congress were doing. I believe that because of this we are better able to gage their thinking, better able to be what the term implies * * * their representatives.

Yet due to the growing variety and the burgeoning volume of legislation, Congress has come to rely more and more upon administrative interpretation to make assumptions of legislative intent. Executive agencies superimpose the details of administration upon what sometimes amount to skeleton statements of policy. In the last session of Congress, for instance, there were 6,591 bills introduced in addition to more than 11,000 which had carried over from the previous session. Of this number, 1,348 were enacted into law. With a workload of this magnitude, Congress simply cannot in each instance spell out in minute detail the manner in which each of these separate laws is to be carried out. To this extent, the growth of an executive bureaucracy has been a natural and unavoidable development.

But it is neither natural nor unavoidable for the administrative arm to replace what Congress intended with what its appointees think Congress should have intended. It is not natural, nor do I believe it has been unavoidable, for the device known as the executive order to have come into such widespread usage. Like the States, Congress must continually reassert its rights if it does not want them to diminish. Like the muscles of the body, rights if not exercised will wither and atrophy.

One of the vehicles by which the fundamental lawmaking prerogative has been sloughed away has been the Executive Reorganization Act which permits appointive agencies and commissions to revamp the administrative structure of Government.

Much good work has been performed under this act. Some savings have accrued to the taxpayer as a result of streamlining and elimination of overlapping functions.

One feature of the Reorganization Act, however, has come under sharp—and in my opinion, justified—criticism. This is the automatic nature of reorganization plans by which they summarily become law unless the Congress passes a resolution of disapproval within 60 days * * * and by a constitutional majority (a majority of all Members, not simply a majority of those voting).

Simple reflection will demonstrate how the lawmaking function can thus pass from the legislative to the executive branch. A Presidential commission can radically alter a vital function of the Government, leaving the Congress almost powerless to demur. Here's why: It takes 218 votes in the House under this provision to defeat any reorganization plan. During a recent Congress there were 181 rollcall votes. The greatest number of Members ever present for one of these votes was 426, the smallest number 233. On only 20 of those rollcalls were as many as 400 Members on the floor.

Supposing such a plan were up for consideration with only 233 Members present. Sixteen Members could defeat the will of 217 Members. If that's farfetched, assume the average rollcall attendance of 357, when 140 could thwart the will of 217.

Not only must 218 be against it, they must take the initiative, they must all be on the floor at once, and they must do it within 60 days * * * or the Executive sponsored reorganization plan will automatically become the law of the land.

Under this machinery, a number of the basic activities of the Government have been rather radically altered. It is my own conviction that we have here a departure from the traditional concept of separation of powers. For here the Executive legislates and the Congress has only a negative right of veto which seems more theoretical than actual. I believe that a portion of the integrity of the lawmaking branch could be restored by amending this sweeping Reorganization Act so as to permit legislative review by a simple majority of those present and voting, rather than by the required constitutional majority.

The one essentially indispensable power of Congress, of course, has been most clearly maintained in its control of the purse strings. Even this congressional prerogative has been the victim of an insidious encroachment. Led by a coalition of younger Members, the lawmaking body rebelled last year against this particular tendency when it enacted the bill known as H.R. 8002 to put the Government's budgeting practices on an accrued annual expenditure basis.

The fundamental issue before us in this legislation was the extent to which the people's elected representatives in the Congress can maintain actual control over the Federal purse strings.

There can be no doubt that the Constitution of the United States vested in Congress the clear responsibility to manage and control Federal expenditures. It obviously was believed by the Founding Fathers that administrative government should be directly responsible in its expenditure of public funds to the Congress, since in this way it would be responsible to the taxpaying public which elects the Congress and is responsive to its wishes.

In recent years, the practice of large sums, carried over unspect from previous appropriations, has impaired the ideal of congressional control of the purse.

We came into fiscal 1956, for example, with almost $54 billion in unexpended balances from previous appropriations. At the beginning of fiscal 1957, the figure has grown to some $70 billion.

Large balances of unexpended appropriations have thus been available annually to the agencies without any further action of the Congress. For all practical purposes, Congress had lost control of these sizable amounts of money. It was to restore congressional control that this bill was passed.

It may not result in the saving of billions, as some of its most enthusiastic advocates have estimated, but I think the requirement that agenices return to the Congress and prove up the value of programs underway will very definitely result in some saving and in greater efficiency, and any such result that accrues will certainly be to the good. Most important of all, it restores to the Congress its historic role as the keeper of the pocketbook.

But Congress, having done this much, cannot rest upon its laurels. The price of legislative rights which are the very enshrinement of representative government is eternal and unremitting vigilance.

3. WANING RESPECT FOR THE SUPREME COURT

The third alarming development, unlike the other two, has come about rather recently. It is the rapid decay of respect for the U.S. Supreme Court, brought about by

the general feeling that the Court has tended to abandon legal precedent as its guiding principle.

A very great deal, of course, has been said about this. Every newspaper pundit has commented upon it. It is easy to criticize, and perhaps the mark of statesmanship in this instance is that of restrained expression. No appraisal of the current scene, however, would be an altogether honest one without frankly acknowledging this development and examining it. When so august a body as the Conference of Chief Justices of all the States votes by a three-fourths majority to adopt a report calling on the Supreme Court for more judicial restraint, then something unique in our history has happened.

During the last Congress, there were no less than 50 bills introduced either to alter rulings of the Nation's highest tribunal or to curb the Court in one way or another. Seven of these bills passed at least one House of Congress.

But the Conference of Chief Justices in its pronouncement last August called attention also the fact that ultimate judicial power in our country must rest with the U.S. Supreme Court. "Any other allocation of such power would seem to lead to complete chaos," the report stated, adding that it is our common obligation to seek to uphold respect for law.

The Supreme Court is necessary in our system of government. If we are to have a government of law rather than a government of men, it is indispensable. If law is to have any ultimate meaning, if there is to be an anchor to keep our ship of state from being tossed about by every wave of popular fancy and taking a new direction with every expedient wind that blows, then we must have a Supreme Court, and that Court as the final arbiter of law must have respect.

Thomas Jefferson was among the first of our forefathers to see that judicial review was the only effective means of preserving the fundamental law. While our earliest advocate of popular government, he feared what he called the unrestrained "tyranny of legislatures." He knew that the legislative branch, simply because it was closest to the people, could be carried away by a tide of expediency in its desire to please the people, and he knew that it needed a checkrein.

Jefferson's law teacher, George Wythe, had expressed this philosophy as forcefully as it has ever been stated. Sitting as a judge in the case of *Caton* v. *Commonwealth of Virginia*, in 1782, he had stated his position in these words:

"If the whole legislature, an event to be deprecated, should attempt to overleap the bounds prescribed to them by the people, I, in administering the public justice of this country, will meet the united powers at my seat in this tribunal; and, pointing to the Constitution, will say to them, 'here is the limit of your authority; and hither shall you go, but no further.'"

Obviously, something needs to be done to restore the Court to the pinnacle of prestige which it must grace if the essential character of our Government is to retain its stability. I do not believe the answer lies in radically altering the jurisdiction or the responsibilities of the Court as has been impatiently suggested by some. As an institution it has served as well for 170 years. It has been under attack before. Twenty-one year ago a frustrated President was criticizing the Court as "too reactionary" and was asking authority to add to its membership. Calmer heads prevailed and the President's request was denied.

At that time, the distinguished and venerable New York Republican, the late Daniel A. Reed, posed this choice:

"I ask every American this question," he said, "Do you want to put your personal liberties in the hands of Congress and your State legislature? To those who think this is a wise thing to do, I call attention to the fact that 10 times since the year 1867 Congress, or one of its branches, has violated the provisions of the Bill of Rights. * * * The only power that stood between the citizens and these tyrannical acts of Congress was the Supreme Court * * * I cannot believe that in this period of worldwide dizziness the citizens of this Nation wish to destroy the only department of Government which can protect them from mob violence and encroachment."

What, then, can be done? If it is a duty of citizenship to respect and support the rulings of the Court, it also is true that the pronouncements of the Court, in and of themselves, should be such as to command public respect.

The Supreme Court of the United States should be composed of the nine ablest jurists in the Nation. On this Bench should sit the nine wisest and most learned legal authorities in the United States. They should be men of such judicial attainment and intellectual stature as to evoke from the public, the bar, and the bench the universal respect which is their due. Never should it be possible for anyone to say that their appointments had been essentially political in character.

The most constructive reform, in my judgment, would be the requirement that, as a minimum prerequisite to appointment, a member of this highest Court should be a person of previous judicial experience. Such a requirement could be made by a simple act of Congress, since on the matter of qualifications of Justices the Constitution is silent.

Adopt such a requirement as this, let all future appointments be confined to men who have performed previous service either on a Supreme Court of one of the States or on a Federal appellate court, and time will lay its soothing hand upon the turmoil that today surrounds the Court and heal the unhealthy ruptures that disturb our legal tranquility.

4. THE GROWING EMPHASIS OF BLOCS AND SEGMENTS

The fourth trend to which attention must be called is the ever increasing tendency to divide the United States into blocs and segments, economic factions, ethnic units, regional groupings.

Back in the 1940's, Stuart Chase wrote a book which he entitled "Democracy Under Pressure." If we were under pressure then, we are in a pressure cooker now. Schoolchildren pledge their allegiance to a flag which we hail as the symbol of "one nation, under God indivisible." If my observation of the past 4 years has given me any one great anxiety for the domestic future of our Nation, it is the dread that someday this essential indivisibility may disintegrate before the splitting onslaughts of selfish pressures.

Too many of us have come to think of ourselves not first as Americans, but first as members of the business community or indeed some segment of the business community, or as members of labor, and only secondly as Americans—as southerners or northerners first and Americans second—as belonging first to a particular racial heritage and only then, if at all, as belonging to America.

I am not certain that I know what can be done about this growing tendency. But I do know that it's growing and I do know that it is selfish at its core and insidiously un-American.

Marx and Lenin prophesied that capital and labor would be unable in the long run to coexist amicably. That class war here would inevitably come because of what they called the fundamental contradiction of a society such as ours—what they believed to be a natural hostility between the capitalist and his employee. When we allow ourselves to be divided into hostile camps, acting as though our differences were irreconcilable, each anxious to believe the worst about the other and each constantly poised to press an immediate advantage at the expense of the other, we tend to prove their satanic prophecy correct.

It is natural, I know, for Members of Congress to champion the causes of their own districts, their own States, their own regions. In this I am perhaps as guilty as any. But a Member of Congress and every public official—indeed, everyone who would set himself up as a leader of public thought—has the solemn duty to carry forever in the forefront of his mind the realization that he serves first the United States. Except as its future flourishes, his State and his town have no future. Except as the entire economy prospers, his economic segment of that economy will enjoy no lasting prosperity.

Except as business makes a reasonable return so as to permit expansion, there will not be jobs enough to go around for our growing labor force; and labor, in the long run, will suffer. Except as the working men and women of our Nation earn a decent and remunerative wage, there will be no market for the things business turns out, and business will suffer. If we forget this, we play a fool's game. He who enters the arena of politics pledged to champion exclusively any bloc or any segment, he who in public life uses his talents to divide class against class, or race against race, or region against region, prostitutes his talents; and in the end he plays the game of those who would divide us and in dividing would conquer us.

I think of one legislative reform which could minimize this growing tendency. It alone would not cure the basic malady, but it would help. The electoral college method of selecting our President and Vice President has surely outlived its original purpose. It is a relic of the powdered wig and snuff box era when nobody ever knew anything about presidential candidates and it was believed the public needed someone to do their actual choosing for them. If its only drawback were that it is archaic, there could be no harm in preserving it. The outmoded system, unfortunately, has given rise to numerous abuses, among them the glorification of voting blocs.

By lumping all of a State's electoral votes for the side which ekes out the barest margin of victory in that particular State, it has encouraged both parties to concentrate on those traditionally close areas of the country where a little extra effort can pay off most handsomely on the electoral scorecard. Undue and unintended influence thus has gravitated to the political bosses and ward politicians who can turn out the vote in those particular areas. We have come in this way to think of millions of Americans not as individual people but as members of one or another voting bloc. And in this it seems to me that we subtly degrade them as human beings and tarnish the image of a Nation of free and equal men.

We can correct this one particular cause by adopting any one of several electoral reform amendments which have been pending in every Congress for the past 20 years. I believe we need to reaffirm our faith in the average American as a person by enacting one of these proposals, to the end that one vote anywhere in the country shall be exactly equal to one vote anywhere else in the country.

Yet this alone will not cure the disease that increasingly separates and divides us. This is a task which calls for the most superb statesmanship and the most mature citizenship. Perhaps the danger has been no more clearly put than in the words of that distinguished jurist, Judge Learned Hand, who warned:

"That community is already in the process of dissolution where each man begins to eye his neighbor as a possible enemy, where nonconformity with the accepted creed is a mark of disaffection; where denunciation takes the place of evidence and orthodoxy chokes off freedom of dissent."

5. A STALE CONFORMITY AND THE BILL OF RIGHTS

Finally, to combat the stale conformity of the group-thinking which has huddled so many of us into separate camps, I think we need an urgent reemphasis of the Bill of Rights.

The most alarming revelation I have read in the past 2 years was made by Dr. H. H. Remmers, of Purdue University. His recently published book, "The American Teenager," is the result of 15 years of painstaking questioning of some 25,000 high-school students by the university's research staff.

Unless you're shockproof, you'll be shocked, not so much by teenage manners and morals, surprisingly enough, but by teenage opinions.

If the Purdue polls are accurate, the following eye-openers should be sufficient to start us thinking, and mighty seriously:

A solid 60 percent of the youngsters polled think that books, magazines, and newspapers should be censored.

A substantial 58 percent can see nothing wrong with employment of third-degree methods by police.

A third of them believe it would be okay for the Government to prohibit some people from making speeches.

Better than one-fourth think there are times when it's all right to search homes and private persons without a warrant.

Fifteen percent would refuse certain criminals the right to have a lawyer, and 13 percent even profess the opinion that religious belief and worship should be subject to legal restrictions.

The average one of these youngsters would probably fight you if so much as suggested that he wasn't a good American. Yet, if these figures are correct, an appalling number simply haven't been shown what America is all about in the first place.

If you asked if they believe in the Bill of Rights, they'd no doubt give you an emphatic "Yes." But the poll tends clearly to show that a lot of them actually do not.

Nobody, apparently, has explained to them that the Bill of Rights, the sanctity of the individual, is the one great peculiarly American contribution to the art of government.

Other nations have adopted, at least nominally, the republican form of government. Even Russia calls itself the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics. Other nations (Hitler's Germany included) have developed capitalistic economies.

Only America charted its bark by the course of a scrupulous observance of individual rights. Is a new generation losing the course?

Whose fault it is might be debatable. The schools, the churches, the families, perhaps we all share in the blame. Perhaps the younger set is merely reflecting an attitude they see in their elders. Can it be that in our frantic insistence upon "belongingness" we have made a god of conformity to our groups and have actually begun to mistrust ourselves to think for ourselves? Or to give the other fellow the right to think for himself as an individual?

When we wish to silence those who disagree with us we betray a shocking lack of confidence in our own convictions. When we confer social ostracism upon the fellow with a nonconforming opinion, we place a smothering stultification upon the very act of thinking.

There has never been a time in our history when we have needed more to encourage the processes of independent thought. Jefferson dedicated the University of Virginia to the "illimitable freedom of the human mind." The frontiers of the future are the frontiers of the mind. The future belongs to that nation, and to that society, which is not afraid of thoughts.

Ours is a nation which was founded upon the conviction that error of opinion may be tolerated so long as truth is free to combat it. Jefferson said that truth is the sufficient adversary of falsehood.

I do not despair of the future. The faith of our fathers was not misplaced. Their ennoblement of the individual is the very hope for which the world gropes in its awakening. Let us not hide that light under a bushel, for it is a light unto the gentiles and a lamp unto the world.

Alger Hiss Seeks Passport to Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 24, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a news story from the New York Journal American of April 8, 1959, a news story from the Baltimore News-Post of April 9, 1959, and an editorial from the New York Daily News of April 10, 1959, all of which relate to the issuance of a passport to Alger Hiss.

It will be remembered that Alger Hiss was convicted of perjury, following his denial of participation in the Communist apparatus of this country. It is almost unbelievable that Hiss should be permitted to travel abroad under the protection of a U.S. passport.

I feel strongly that appropriate legislative action must be taken by the Congress, authorizing the Department of State to withhold the issuance of passports in cases of undesirable and untrustworthy persons, including known Communists or those demonstrated to have been affiliated with the Communist conspiracy. For that reason, I believe that these news stories and this editorial warrant the alert attention not only of Members of Congress, but also of the entire American public.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Journal-American, April 8, 1959]

ALGER HISS SEEKS PASSPORT TO EUROPE

Alger Hiss has applied for a passport to go to Europe.

The New York Journal-American learned from reliable sources today the application was made to the State Department within the last few days.

In seeking to travel to the continent, divided by the Soviet's Iron Curtain, Hiss—onetime rising star in State Department officialdom—indicated he wanted to visit England, France, and Holland.

In 1950, Hiss was convicted in Federal court here for perjury after he denied a charge by onetime admitted Communist Whittaker Chambers that he passed secret Government documents to Chambers for transmission to Moscow. To this day, Hiss steadfastly has denied the charge.

SERVED 3 YEARS, 8 MONTHS

His was released from the Federal Penitentiary at Lewisburg, Pa., in November 1954, after serving 3 years and 8 months of his 5-year sentence.

The passport application was forwarded to the State Department through attorney Leonard Boudin. Secretary of State Dulles, in a passport application hearing once charged Boudin was a member of the Communist Party, in the early 1930's.

Boudin asked that speedy action be taken on the passport application.

Disclosure of Hiss' passport bid was expected to touch off an outburst in Congress, now considering legislation to correct what critics call passport loopholes.

Critics pointed out that under the current system, a Communist or fellow traveler, who has a passport issued by the State Department, can travel abroad, but does not have to request permission to continue on to Moscow if he wants to.

This can be done merely by getting another visa from the Soviet Embassy or consulate in any country, and without the knowledge of this country's officials.

In fact, this has been done. Harry Bridges, leftwing leader of the west coast longshoremen's union, went behind the Iron Curtain in this manner.

As a result of his travels to Moscow and other Red capitals, Bridges is going to be the subject of an inquiry by the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

He already has been subpenaed. The committee, it was learned, wants to ask him to give an account of his travels, which include laudatory stories about communism in Red publications.

A recent Supreme Court ruling declared there is no Federal statute to prevent the State Department from issuing passports to Communists.

The ruling does not force the Department to issue the passports. It simply pointed out the fact that Congress has not passed any legislation barring passports to Communists.

Hiss has not expressed any desire to travel behind the Iron Curtain. However, under the present setup, should he decide to want to see Russia he could do so by getting a visa abroad from Soviet officials.

From friends of Hiss it was learned his application states that he is married, but that he plans to make the trip alone.

Last January, Hiss, now 54, and his wife separated after 29 years of marriage when he walked out of their four-room apartment at 22 East Eighth Street, in Greenwich Village.

NO REASON GIVEN

No reason was given for the estrangement. His wife, Priscilla, about 55, had stood by him through his court trials and jail term and had helped him when he wrote a book after his release from jail.

The book, "In the Court of Public Opinion," was devoted to showing how and why he considered himself to have been wrongfully convicted.

Hiss now is a $12,000-a-year administrative assistant to R. Andrews Smith, president of Feathercombs, Inc., makers of combs for women, at 404 Fourth Avenue.

Hiss was convicted after two trials.

Chambers also had said that Hiss was a member of the "Ware group," a Red cell in the early 1930's.

At that time, Hiss was a lower echelon State Department official. Later he rose to a position of importance in the Department. In fact, he was so highly regarded that he acted as Secretary General of the United Nations Charter Conference in San Francisco in 1945.

Boudin, the attorney through whom Hiss' passport application was forwarded, himself was turned down for one when the State

Department fought his application for a passport to go abroad.

DULLES AFFIDAVIT

In a sworn affidavit in Federal court, in Washington, Dulles said that the basis for his opposition to Boudin's application was that the attorney's "associates and activities leads to the conclusion that the plaintiff has been, and continues to be, a supporter of the Communist movement."

Besides accusing Boudin of being a member of the Communist Party in the early thirties, Dulles said the lawyer was associated with Communist front organizations in 1947.

According to State Department charges, some of Boudin's clients included many persons seeking applications for passports who had records as Communists or being fellow travelers. They included Singer Paul Robeson, Artist Rockwell Kent, and Abraham J. Beck.

[From the Baltimore News-Post, Apr. 9, 1959]

PASSPORT PLEA MAY REOPEN HISS CASE

(By David Sentner)

WASHINGTON.—The case of Alger Hiss, of Baltimore, convicted of perjury in connection with passing secret Government documents to Moscow, may be reopened in a big way as the result of his application for a passport to go abroad.

The disclosure by the New York Journal-American that Hiss, through an attorney for well-known Communist Party members and Communist fellow travelers, had requested a quick passport for Europe was verified today by the State Department.

State Department spokesman, Lincoln White, said the application probably would be granted in the face of the recent Supreme Court ruling that there was no congressional legislation on the books to prevent issuance of passports to Communists or pro-Communists.

Consequently, a friendly race loomed between the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Senate Internal Security Committee as to which would question Hiss in connection with his passport application.

Both committees have scheduled hearings in connection with 14 bills introduced in Congress aimed at preventing issuance of passports to Communists.

If and when Hiss appears as a witness he will be asked similar questions to those which sent him to prison for a perjury conviction.

Among the questions will be the direct query as to whether he ever was a member of the Communist Party or a Soviet agent.

The revelation that Hiss had applied for a passport to visit England, France, and Holland—possible springboard for obtaining a visa from Soviet embassies for a visit to Moscow—provoked the following speculative questions in State Department, congressional, and Government investigative agency circles:

Has Hiss been placed under Communist Party discipline, for fear of his talking?

Has his emotional upset in connection with his pending divorce by his erstwhile loyal wife created a desire to leave the United States and exile himself abroad, perhaps defecting to Moscow?

Is his trip abroad possibly another MacLean-Burgess case? Donald MacLean, and Guy Burgess, British diplomats, suddenly defected behind the Iron Curtain.

Is the global Communist appartus anxious to get Hiss abroad so they can have a person-to-person, brain-picking session with him?

Government investigative agencies expressed surprise that Hiss would permit his case being espoused by an attorney, Leonard Boudin, who has represented numerous Communists and pro-Communists in passport applications. He himself has been charged on the court record by Secretary of State Dulles with having been a Communist Party member.

Boudin is the author of a sharp letter to the State Department insisting that the application of Hiss be speeded up. He also protested vehemently to the Department for allegedly leaking the matter to the New York Journal-American.

Incidentally, the New York Journal-American is known to have obtained its lead from friends of Hiss who feared he was being shanghaied into the global Communist propaganda system.

BRILLIANT SOCIAL, SCHOOL RECORD

Alger Hiss was born in Baltimore, November 11, 1904, at the family home, 1427 Linden Avenue.

As he grew to young manhood, Hiss established a brilliant social and scholastic record.

After a term at the Maryland Institute, he entered Johns Hopkins University, where he won a series of scholarships, carried off almost every student honor available, and was elected to Phi Beta Kappa.

At Hopkins he held the cadet rank of lieutenant colonel in the Reserve Officers Training Corps.

He went on to Harvard where he studied law, gaining the distinction of being selected to serve for a year as law assistant to Justice Holmes.

After starting his legal career in New York, Hiss went to Washington in the early days of the New Deal, and was employed by the Government in various capacities, serving with the Department of Agriculture, the Senate committee investigating the munitions industry, the Department of Justice and the State Department.

On August 3, 1948, his career was wrecked when Whittaker Chambers testified that Hiss was a member of an underground Communist group operating in Washington.

[From the New York Daily News, Apr. 10, 1959]

PASSPORT FOR A. HISS

Presumably Alger Hiss has been useless to the Kremlin ever since his exposure as a passer of secret Government papers to a Soviet courier. It is doubtful that he can do any valuable work for Khrushchev on his forthcoming European trip, for which the State Department has been forced by a recent Supreme Court decision to issue him a passport.

But the episode points up the fact that under this same decision State is being compelled to issue passports to droves of known or deeply suspected Communists who don't rate such a privilege. Can't Congress kindly act on this scandal, promptly and decisively?

Ham Operators Are Prepared for Disaster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 24, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, one of the difficulties which Civil Defense authorities have encountered on occasion is the feeling of "Let George do it." This is not true in Orange, Tex.

A number of organizations in Orange, Tex., have taken an active interest in the Civil Defense program and now render an invaluable community service. These include the Orange Pilot Club, the Boy Scouts, and the amateur radio operators or hams.

Mr. President, as an example of what can be done when public spirited citizens take an interest in their community, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Robert Burns which was recently printed in the Beaumont (Tex.) Journal under the heading "Hams Answer Daily Rollcall in Orange Civil Defense Unit."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAMS ANSWER DAILY ROLLCALL IN ORANGE CIVIL DEFENSE UNIT

(By Robert Burns)

ORANGE.—At about 7 p.m. every day, Gene Steele, Orange civil defense network control operator, makes a rollcall of the 27 ham operators in the area. It's not just for fun. These calls assure Orange County residents that the civil defense organization is in a constant state of preparedness for any emergency or disaster.

Gene, known simply as K5EVE to the 27 hams who answer his calls, lives in Orangefield and goes to the Orange Memorial Hospital every night to make the rollcall, which also assures a daily test of the equipment there.

Martin Thomen, civil defense coordinator, explains that the calls could be made from any place where a ham has his communicator. Seventeen of the transmitting and receiving devices were provided by the county and the cities of West Orange, Pinehurst, and Orange. About 10 of the 27 hams, all of whom are members of the Orange Amateur Radio Club, use their personal communicators.

Frequently, some of the hams answer rollcall while traveling. The portable units can be disconnected quickly and placed in a car, boat or airplane. Most of the hams take their communicators along day or night when they leave home.

The network operates on a frequency of 50.8 megacycles. It is understood among the hams that no one is to use the frequency except in an emergency and for the rollcall.

"If anybody comes on the frequency other than at 7 p.m. we know it is either an emergency or a mistake," one explained.

Organized about 8 years ago as the Orange City and County Disaster Relief and Civil Defense Committee, the group's chief aim is to provide information to the public as quickly as possible in time of disaster.

"When a disaster strikes, people should immediately tune in their radios to station KOGT in Orange," Mr. Thomen said, "that is where all information is channeled."

The city of Orange last week purchased an emergency generator to be installed at the radio station, thus assuring that information will be broadcast in the event of a power failure.

During the flood last September, broadcasts were being made before daybreak. Mr. Thomen said City Manager Marlin Thompson notified him at 4:20 a.m. the day of the flood. He immediately contacted three civil defense operators, who contacted the other men. Within an hour information was coming in at the radio station from key points in the city and county.

The civil defense unit, however, is not limited to radio operators. At least 34 members of the Orange Pilot Club have stations where they report in the event of a disaster. About 35 Boy Scouts also have assigned stations.

The ham operators quickly locate themselves in strategic points, the naval station,

Salvation Army headquarters, schools, hospitals, and a number of the other places.

A unique alert system has been worked out to let the people know when a disaster occurs. Mr. Thomen said the fire, sheriff's, and police departments, and the funeral homes, have agreed to run vehicles over the county with sirens on.

In his home, Mr. Thomen has a small battery unit plugged into an outlet. In case of a power failure, the unit will buzz loudly and provide light for him to operate his communicator and to alert the other operators, if necessary.

Mr. Thomen said the main problem in case of disaster is advising the public.

"Every person should listen to the local radio station when a disaster strikes. When the new generator is installed, we will be assured of getting information to the public as quickly as possible," Mr. Thomen said.

Flight in the Jet Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, the First World Congress of Flight was held in the United States in April 1959. The speakers and the participants, aerospace leaders of the free world, numbered in the dozens. The subjects which were examined at the World Congress of Flight ranged the whole gamut of space and flight.

One of the major conferences at the World Congress of Flight was devoted to the jet age. Fittingly, Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, Vice Chief of Staff of the U.S. Air Force, was one of the speakers and conferees at this jet age session attended by specialists, industrialists, and manufacturers. In his presentation he gave a succinct recap of jet age requirements and showed the pioneer role of the Air Force in the development of jet flight. In addition to providing this capsule history, General LeMay discussed—from a military standpoint—some of the common problems of jet flight which all participants in the jet age, civilian as well as military, may expected to encounter. Specifically, General LeMay pointed to a number of problems in the air operations and safety field which are becoming more and more critical with the attainment of the high speeds which jet flight permits. He touched on the sonic boom and the need for public understanding and acceptance of this phenomenom. He pointed to problems needful of a solution, and he listed areas which require more careful thought, study, and research. All and all, he provided a telling progress report on the subject of jet flight.

General LeMay's paper will be of interest to that increasing body of Americans who are striving to increase their familiarity with the jet age. I feel that his carefully chosen words should be brought to a wide audience of American readers and, consequently, with your leave, Mr. Speaker, I wish to enter his paper in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY GEN. CURTIS E. LEMAY, VICE CHIEF OF STAFF, U.S. AIR FORCE, BEFORE THE JET AGE CONFERENCE, WORLD CONGRESS OF FLIGHT, LAS VEGAS, NEV., APRIL 13, 1959

Ladies and gentlemen, I am honored to be here today and to have this opportunity to greet many friends and acquaintances who have gathered here from all over the world to participate in the World Congress of Flight.

I also wish to extend the congratulations of the U.S. Air Force to those individuals and organizations whose efforts have contributed to the success of this congress. This occasion certainly deserves the wide recognition which it has received from aviation interests all over the world. The many representatives who have come here from over 50 different nations are ample evidence of the universal aviation interest which this conference has generated.

The first World Congress of Flight represents a formal announcement to the world of the arrival of the jet age. Although jet aircraft have been with us for many years—first in the military services, and more recently in the civil air fleets of several nations—full recognition of their permanent status and their contributions to the advancement of worldwide air transportation, is only now taking place. Jet airpower is here to stay.

The airpower of any nation is comprised of many elements—too many for me to list here this morning. But the primary forces which influence and further the development of a nation's airpower are science, industry, and civil and military aviation interests. Each one of these forces enters the aviation development cycle at a different point—but all of them must eventually form the first-team of airpower. The speed at which this cycle moves depends not only upon the rate of technological advance in the science of aviation, but also upon the pressures of the moment. Development of jet aircraft, for instance, was expedited by military necessity—first by the requirement to win a war, and then by the continuing necessity to keep strong military airpower in face of a constantly growing threat. For this reason, military aviation, in conjunction with science and industry, has been the pioneer force behind the growth of jet airpower.

To briefly review a little history—development of jet aircraft in the United States commenced in 1941. With the assistance of our British allies, we were able to put the first American jet—the Bell XP-59—in the air in 1942. A prototype of the first American operational jet fighter—the Lockheed P-80—was flown in early 1944. Production versions of this fighter were not distributed to operational units until the latter part of 1945—not in time to gain any combat experience with this equipment in World War II. It would be accurate, then, to mark the beginning of U.S. jet airpower as December 1945—nearly 15 years ago. Since that time, approximately 22-million hours have been flown by Air Force jet aircraft—an impressive figure, particularly when it is translated into terms of accumulated experience. All of this experience has been reinvested in the pioneering of American jet airpower.

Significant new advances usually bring new problems and jet operations have provided their share. "Bugs" in early aircraft and engine designs had to be worked out—the more advanced the design, the more complex the "bugs." High speed and high altitude operations opened up new problem areas. Support facilities—that is, airfields, navigation aids, fuel, ground support equipment, maintenance and supply systems—were no exceptions. Whole new concepts had to be devised to accommodate jet aircraft. Some of these problems were peculiar to military operations—the majority of them, however, belonged to all jet operations—civil and military. This morning I want to touch briefly on a few of our common problems. These problems are the basis for our future jet-age requirements.

High aircraft speeds and increased aircraft population have crowded the usable air space of this country—and for that matter, the world—to the degree where air safety and traffic control have become our major limiting problems. No matter what remarkable developments are achieved in newer and more modern aircraft—aircraft which fly faster, higher, further, and with a greater payload—our jet potential can advance only as fast as our air safety and traffic control measures will let it.

The mid-air collisions and near misses in recent years are grim and positive evidence of the existence of this critical problem. Recent mid-air accidents can be traced almost exclusively to the cumulative effect of higher speeds, higher traffic density, relatively slow human visual scanning capacities, and man-machine reaction time. Today, closing speeds between two of our late model military aircraft are as high as 2,000 miles per hour, and two of today's civil jet airliners have a closure rate of over 1,000 miles per hour. In order to initiate evasive action under these conditions, pilots must know that they are on a collision course while they are still miles apart. Under certain light and sky conditions, even this small margin is eliminated.

Since there are practical limits to the expansion of usable airspace around the world, other positive measures must be taken to improve—if not eliminate—this type of air safety problem. Sole dependence upon human reaction is no longer adequate, and we will have to look to "black boxes" to assist pilots in doing their jobs. Some of our immediate needs in this area of development are warning devices to agument "eyeball" methods in alerting pilots to other aircraft in the vicinity; additional devices which will keep pilots from getting into "near miss" situations in the first place; means of making aircraft more readily visible from much greater distances, both day and night; in other words, any device which will afford an aircraft operator the necessary time to make his decision and to act effectively.

However, as important and as beneficial as developments of this type might be, efforts in these areas are only nibbling around the edge of the main problem—and that is effective air traffic control. A comprehensive and continuously modernized system of control, with a capacity for handling high speed and high density traffic, is a basic requirement for safe and effective jet air operations. Traffic control equipment and procedures must be kept modern at all times to meet the needs of each new development as it appears. Furthermore, this control must be exercised at all times throughout the flight—from takeoff to landing—and it must be accurate and rapid.

Control of all air traffic which operates in a nation's airspace at any given time, is an overwhelming task—and it is growing larger and more complex as traffic density and speed increase. As you well know, positive control of the current volume of traffic at all times is impossible today. If it were attempted now, about three out of every four aircraft would never leave the ground. The present system does not have the capacity to control a heavy volume of traffic to such an extent.

Although additional funds, personnel and facilities have been provided during the past years for the purpose of improving air traffic control, the system under which we operate today is still inadequate. The emergency nature of this situation here in the United States has been recognized, and as a result,

the Federal Aviation Agency was formed last year. The creation of an agency does not, in itself, solve any problems. But it supplies the means for a closer civilian-military approach to the task and thus provides the basis for a national approach to a national problem. It is a long step in the right direction.

The key to effective air control is, in my opinion, the capacity for rapid decision. Precision navigation and accurate reporting are mandatory, of course—a breakdown in these areas will cause trouble. But the essential factor in any controlling process is the decision making machinery. To meet the requirements of jet aircraft, the speed at which decisions are made on the ground must match the speed that events are taking place in the air.

Technical developments in electronics, navigation and communication equipment have generally met the needs of our newer aircraft. For instance, radar has proved to be one of the most effective measures of providing improved safety and efficiency in air traffic handling to date. Right now, as an emergency step to alleviate our present problems, 28 of the air defense radars of this country are being used for the additional purpose of air traffic advisory. A few additional radars are now in use in some of our more crowded terminal areas for active traffic control. If we are to take full advantage of the potential of this equipment, its use as a means of active air control must be extended substantially. Further, our present VORTAC system, aside from providing a means of precision navigation, establishes an infinite number of fixes thereby allowing greater flexibility in traffic handling, particularly in the denser terminal areas where rapid movement of traffic is essential. In the field of communication, use of ultra high frequencies has eliminated many of the earlier technical problems. Newer models of this equipment have made available an almost unlimited number of frequencies for traffic control and other uses.

But none of this equipment—or equipment which might supersede it—can be used to its fullest capacity, unless there is some means of assimilating and storing the information which it furnishes. Further, the information must be presented to the controller so that he will at all times have an up-to-the-minute picture of exactly what is happening in the air. Correct decisions can only be based upon timely and accurate information. Old manual, voice methods of data handling cannot keep up with our present and future needs, we will have to go to automatic equipment. The Air Force has had considerable success controlling air defense interceptors through our SAGE—semiautomatic ground environment—system. Equipment similar to this offers excellent possibilities for use in air traffic control work.

All of these problems are dynamic and their solutions must be a continuing process. Already jet transports are under development which are expected to operate at speeds of mach 2 and above. Each substantial increase in speed will bring its share of new and more complex problems. The Air Force is in the throes of one of these right now—the problem of the sonic boom. Some of our latest aircraft, cruising at speeds of mach 1, are laying down a wave of sound and pressure which in some cases is as much as a hundred miles wide—and which progresses with the aircraft along the full route of flight. So far as we know today, there are no technical or scientific solutions to counter this phenomenon. We also know—from the amount of "fan" mail we receive on this subject that these pressure waves, aside from causing considerable apprehension and discomfort, in some cases inflict physical damage to property. Today, there are relatively few aircraft capable of long cruises at supersonic speeds. It is not pleasant to imagine the widespread effect that increasing numbers of such aircraft—including supersonic jet liners—will have on the problem.

A nation's public will have a lot to say about the success of future jet airpower. Future developments will fall into the "Buck Rogers" category—and at a time when many of us can still remember when such things were only fantasies in the mind of comic-strip cartoonists. It is difficult for anyone to grasp the impact of some of the recent developments, no matter how much of an expert he might be—but it is almost impossible for someone, who is completely unfamiliar with the problems of air operations to grasp the meaning of some of these new phenomena without assistance. Public acceptance of these developments must be assured, if they are to continue.

I mentioned before that these advances are bound to bring a certain amount of annoyance or discomfort with them. This is not new—in the field of aviation alone, we have already had the noise problem, and now the sonic boom. There will surely be others. Since the technical solutions to these problems will, in all likelihood be slow in coming—if at all—public apprehension must be alleviated in other ways. If we are to continue to develop better equipment and to fly this equipment in the manner it was designed—and failure to do this will not only degrade our military forces, but will also retard the growth of civil jet aviation—people must be given the opportunity to understand these problems. The facts—good and bad—must be presented clearly—and as early as possible. It is certainly far better to grow up with a problem, understanding what lies ahead, than to be suddenly confronted with something which is completely incomprehensible. In light of this, public relations and public education on aviation problems will assume even greater importance in the future.

It is a matter of deep satisfaction for those of us who have devoted a lifetime to the field of aviation, to see the great progress which has been made to date—and the rate at which this progress has been achieved. All of us want to see this progress continue—all of us want to push the state of the art to the maximum. If we are to be successful in our efforts, it will only be through the combined resources and knowhow of every individual or agency who has a stake in this program.

We cannot operate as separate interests—researching, developing, and operating to satisfy only our own particular needs. Naturally, each one of us wants to see his own particular interests served. But the unavoidable realization that we now face overriding common problems—and common requirements—which can only be met by cooperative effort and by mutual give and take, must serve as the guiding factor. In this way—and only in this way—can we provide our various countries with effective and efficient military airpower and a thriving and safe civil transportation force and have a satisfied, cooperative, and understanding public.

Value of Cultural Exchange

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial taken from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch editorials, April 13–19, 1959:

ON WHOSE TEAM?

When the Bolshoi's dancers get back to Russia—after a visit to St. Louis, we still hope—and talk of those 18 solid minutes of applause they received in New York, they will be careful to add that some of the enthusiastic hands were those of capitalist exploiters, warmongers, and such like. They will be balancing their appreciation, having in mind one of their choreographers, Igor Moiseyev, who forgot all about balance when he and his folk dancers returned from the United States.

Moiseyev entranced a select audience of actors, dancers, musicians, and writers for 3 hours with an eloquent account of life and culture in this country. Even well-informed Russians, he said, did not know how grand was American humor, insight and grace, nor how widely and richly the arts flourished in America. Moiseyev soon was invited to repeat the speech, but he also was invited to call on the Minister of Culture.

The gentleman suffered just as did the California footbal coach after Roy Riegels carried the ball across the wrong goal line. It was an unprecedented feat, the coach admitted, but he couldn't refrain from a question: "On whose side do you think you are playing?" The Minister of Culture was too pained for anger. He simply expressed his surprise that Moiseyev could have made such unbalanced comments. The dance director said he was disappointed that great Soviet artists should be called onto the carpet. But he did not repeat his speech. Other returning Soviet artists also reported on a warm, cultivated America, but they added, according to formula, that "Americans are often deprived of political and cultural self-expression by archaic institutions that favor the rich."

Since Russians must be as immune to balance as Americans are to plug-uglies, this demonstrates the value of cultural exchanges. The actors and dancers and musicians do tell what they saw and liked in the United States. Fine.

Franco's 20 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Daily News for April 4, 1959:

FRANCO'S 20 YEARS

So many things have happened in the last 20 years, it is rather a jolt to be reminded it's been that long since the Spanish Civil War ended and the dictatorship of Generalissimo Franco began.

Much of the world has acquiesced in recognizing the Franco regime, after many years of blackballing Spain from international society.

But as the inevitable end of Franco's regime approaches, there are increasing worries about what happens next. Succession is one thing even dictators are unable to dictate.

On this 20th anniversary Franco shows little signs of deviating from rigid authoritarianism or recognizing the desires of a new generation.

Speaking of "anti-Spanish" forces (and by that phrase Franco means all who disagree with him), he said:

"Periodically we see them raise their heads and in their arrogance and blindness attempt to poison and stimulate anew the innate curiosity and ambition of the young. For this reason it is necessary to shut out the deviations of the bad educators of the new generations."

Much of the unrest in Spain is among the young and the students because Franco has failed to stimulate their curiosity and ambition. If he thinks he can "shut out" thoughts and ideas other than Francoism, he has learned less than he should have over the past 20 years.

Capital Budget Bills Win Support in Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 24, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in the Salem, Oreg., Capital Press for April 10, 1959, appears a thoughtful and informative column endorsing the legislative proposals of the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] for a capital budget, which would separate reimbursable Federal items from those which are entirely outgo and produce no income. I am a cosponsor of their bills.

Mr. Dewey Rand, editor of the Capital Press, endorses the Morse-Humphrey bills. I share this endorsement, Mr. President. Many of us who have studied the effective capital budget system in Sweden are aware that budget items creating their own revenues are certainly distinguishable from such expenditures as military weapons and soil bank payments, which often have no revenues to offset the huge spending involved.

I ask unanimous consent that Dewey Rand's column from the Salem Capital Press, of April 10, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PASSING IN REVIEW
(By Dewey Rand)

In a story from Washington this week Oregon correspondent Robert Smith reports a move by Senator WAYNE MORSE and Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY to revise the Federal bookkeeping system. The plan is to set up a capital budget of those items on which the Government can expect a tangible return separate from the actual costs of runing the Government.

This reviewer of the political scene, for one, wishes MORSE and HUMPHREY success in the plan. Billions of dollars are confusing enough to a citizen trying to understand the Federal budget without the political hocus-pocus practiced by the spenders and economizers in Washington. With appropriations for investments and other funds for expenses mixed together and numbering thousands of millions the situation lends itself to deception.

It has long bothered this writer when investments in self-amortizing projects such as power dams, mortgage loans, Federal housing projects, schools, minerals stockpiled, and many others are classed as expense. Also, with the national debt nearing $280 billion one wonders if this is all money down the drain. If so the business is in a sad state. But if this liability is offset by substantial assets the picture is not so gloomy.

Under the Morse bill capital investments are severely defined. To be so listed investments must represent a useful economic life of over 10 years and must be revenue-producing or self-liquidating. Flood control and irrigation projects would not meet the test. REA and FHA loans and Federal corporations such as the Bonneville Administration would qualify.

What change in the appearance of the collosal Federal debt would the Morse-Humphrey accounting system make for the layman? There would still be about $8 billion annual interest to pay, which is a shocking sum. But it all would not look so much like owing for, and paying carrying charges on a dead horse. It would give a business-like answer as to what part of a budget is expense and how much is investment. It would tell an honest story about the debt.

Smith, in his story on the Morse bill, reports that the House Government Operations Committee has tabulated the real and personal property of the Federal Government. The Federal property inventory as of June 30, 1958, amounted to $263 billion, within $14 billion of the Federal debt of $276 billion on that date. This sheds some light on the solvency of the biggest business in the world, the U.S. Government. It is not as bankrupt as the reactionaries in business and Government would lead us to believe.

With the sensible accounting the Morse bill would provide, another thing would be accomplished. The politics that rages over the making of the budget and voting appropriations would be subdued. If the nature of the items could not be misrepresented by bookkeeping camouflage the layman could judge the merits of the appropriation and could see what he is getting for his money.

Since the election campaign last year, President Eisenhower has been calling all those who disagree with his ideas of economy reckless spenders. In turn his 19th century ideas on the Nation's economy has been called obsolete, and worse, by those who feel a balanced budget is not the most important thing in the Nation's life.

The Morse bill, if it passes, and by properly and honestly picturing the items in the budget, would be of considerable aid to those who wish to judge this controversy.

Asbury Howard and the Right To Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEWART L. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, it is a commonplace that our system of government, based as it is on the principle of equal justice under law, functions best where suffrage is widest.

It is discouraging to me that to date the right-to-vote civil-rights law passed 2 years ago by the 85th Congress has had litle effect on restrictive voting practives in some communities. Efforts of Negro citizens to register and vote have been thwarted in many instances by local authorities.

One of the most flagrant examples of interference with voting rights occurred in Bessemer, Ala., last winter. This incident, which involved Mr. Asbury Howard, one of the vice presidents of the International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers, was the subject of an article in a recent issue of Reporter magazine.

Mr. Speaker, those in my part of the country who know Mr. Howard and his record of service as a union official deeply resent the treatment accorded him, and I am appending the Reporter piece to these remarks to protest this gross miscarriage of justice:

[From the Reporter magazine, Apr. 16, 1959]

THE DUE PROCESSING OF ASBURY HOWARD
(By Jeffrey E. Fuller)

Many of Asbury Howard's white neighbors in Bessemer, Ala., have looked on him for some years as what they call an "uppity Nigra." At 52, Howard is a massive man, close to 6 feet tall and weighing—at least he did when he began serving a 6-month sentence on a prison road gang a few weeks ago—about 250 pounds. Although his pigmentation, as black as one ever sees among Negroes, would seem to preclude his being elected to public office in Alabama in the near future, Howard speaks with the vocabulary and hearty tone employed by many southern politicians. He has never been known to affect a "yassuh boss" subservience in order to conceal the good-humored self-confidence he derives from his position as a successful businessman and a recognized leader of his community.

As an independent gas-station operator, Howard is not dependent on a white employer for his livelihood. When he was first arrested, he said that his customers, black and white, were sticking with him and that business was actually better than before. For nearly three decades Howard was superintendent of the Starlight Baptist Church's Sunday school and he has been for many years a member of its board of deacons. His son, Asbury, Jr., after serving in Korea as sergeant first class, came home and graduated from Morehouse College in Atlanta; his daughter, Cleopatra, is now a student at Howard University in Washington, D.C. Although some of these biographical facts may provide clues as to why Asbury Howard was arrested, they were not, of course, mentioned in the official charges against him.

Bessemer is a steel town near Birmingham, in an area where the usual social tensions are further inflamed by the competition for industrial employment. Howard, who has long been active in the labor movement, now serves as eastern vice president of the International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers. In 1950 this union was ousted by the CIO as Communist dominated, but even that fact has no specific bearing on the Howard case.

We are certainly getting closer to the reason for Howard's arrest, however, when we discover that he was vice president of the NAACP's Bessemer branch until it (and the NAACP throughout Alabama) was forced out of business in 1956 after a $100,000 fine was imposed for its refusal to turn over its membership list to the State police. What's more, he helped organize the Bessemer Voters League, and in the 8 years he has served as its president the number of Negroes registered to vote in Bessemer has grown from 75 to 2,000. In a city of 31,000, of whom 17,000 are Negroes, the activities of the Bessemer Voters League have naturally been ob-

served with increasing interest by the forces of law and order.

Early in January, Asbury Howard went to Albert McAllister, a white man who operates a small sign-painting business, and asked him to reproduce on a yard and a half square of canvas a cartoon which had previously appeared in the December 26 issue of the Kansas City Call and in other Negro weeklies that subscribe to the Call's cartoon service. Howard told the white sign painter to add the words "Vote Today for a Better Tomorrow," because the poster was going to be used in the Bessemer Voters League 1959 campaign urging Negroes to register and vote. Howard has said that the poster was never going to be shown publicly: it was to hang on a wall inside the voters league hall.

McAllister agreed to do the job for $12 and was told not to hurry about finishing it. When he had almost completed the poster—only the words "Hands that can still pray" had not been painted in—Bessemer's police chief, George Barron, took the unfinished job from McAllister's workbench and called at Howard's service station. He asked Howard what he was going to do with the poster and was told it would be placed inside the voters league hall. Chief Barron asked Howard why he didn't have copies printed and tack them up on telephone poles all over town. Howard replied that he was a law-abiding citizen and knew that to do that was suggested would be a violation of the law.

The police chief then placed Howard under arrest—without showing a warrant—and took him to the city hall, where he was detained for 45 minutes before being released under bond. Howard was not told the charges against him until the next day, January 22. He learned that he had violated Bessemer City Ordinance 25–72, which deals primarily with publications alleged to be "of an obscene, licentious, lewd, indecent, libelous, or scurrilous nature" or with "any abusive or intemperate matter tending to provoke a breach of the peace, or any matter prejudicial to good morals."

If nothing else, Bessemer justice is swift in civil-rights cases like this. The trial was held 2 days later, on January 24. On the way into the city hall, Howard's defense counsel, David H. Hood, Jr., was informed by a policeman that he had orders to search him and his briefcase before he and his client were allowed to enter the courtroom. Judge James D. Hammonds opened proceedings by reading the charges against Howard and McAllister. The white sign painter's case was quickly disposed of when he pleaded guilty. (He is now serving his sentence in a city jail.) But when asked how Asbury Howard pleaded, the reply was "Not guilty, Your Honor."

Defense Counsel Hood spent a good part of the morning—the trial record is 32 pages long—attempting to extract from the prosecution some indication as to how the city of Bessemer felt its ordinance 25–72 had been violated by a poster showing a Negro praying for his rights. "If an attempt to induce or cause people to register to vote is an offense," Hood argued, "then the 14th and 15th amendments to the U.S. Constitution are void." At one point Judge Hammonds said: "David, you are making a $50 case out of a $10 case."

The last minutes of the trial proceeded as follows:

City Attorney J. Howard McEniry: "Judge, it comes down to whether in your opinion the sign tends to provoke a breach of the peace or is prejudicial to good order. If you feel it does, the defendants are guilty. If you feel it does not, then the defendants are not guilty. It is my opinion that showing a man in chains is prejudicial to good order."

Judge Hammonds: "I find you both guilty and I fine both of you $105 and 180 days."

Mr. Hood: "Like to make a note of appeal; if it please the court, Your Honor."

Judge Hammonds: "$200 bond."

As he left the courtroom after posting bond, Howard found some 40 white men lined up along the walls of the lobby and stairway leading down to the main floor of the city hall. Here is how he has described what happened next:

"As I was about to take the last step down, I was struck a terrific blow from the rear which landed on the right side of my head. * * * It knocked me off my feet. The crowd of men around the wall rushed toward me. * * * They lashed out with their feet in a vicious effort to stomp and mutilate my face, head, and body. I struggled the best I knew how upon my back upon the floor. I finally managed to reach a corner.

"In the meantime my son, Asbury, Jr., was struggling down the staircase to my rescue. The mob turned on him. My son put up a furious battle against unequal odds. After he refused to give up but kept on fighting back, they gave ground and began to scatter. There were about 15 or more policemen in and about the courtroom. The only arrest they were able to make was that of my son. All members of the mob were allowed to escape unmolested. My son was charged with disorderly conduct and resisting arrest. He was placed under $600 bond. * * *

"After escaping the mob, I needed medical care. I was badly shaken up, bruised, and bleeding badly. The blow I received on my head opened up a very bad wound that took 10 stitches to close. I was very weak because of the amount of blood I had lost.

"As I waited outside the city hall for an ambulance, I was ordered to move along by a police officer. He told me 'Get away from here or else I will carry you upstairs and lock you up.' Two of my friends helped me to walk a block or more to a car and I was taken to the Bessemer General Hospital and was given the medical care that I needed.

Asbury Howard, Jr., was later sentenced to 1 year's hard labor for his efforts to defend his father in the Bessemer City Hall. He is now out on bail pending appeal, but his father is now serving his sentence on what the Negro press usually refers to as a chain-gang. Recent observers report that while at work on the roads, prisoners do not actually wear chains. But another old southern custom is apparently still observed: On the way to and from work, Negro convicts are driven, for educational purposes, through the colored sections chained to each other and to the cagelike truck in which they ride.

"Stump Run" To Be Produced in Lane County, Oreg.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, a lot of Californians visit Oregon to appreciate our beautiful scenery and every now and then some of them come up to take advantage of our mountains and rivers in order to make a beautiful movie.

It is, however, especially gratifying when a local corporation, headed by a local man, featuring a nationally prominent actor from Oregon; Edgar Buchanan, undertakes to produce a movie on its own in Lane County.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the following story from the Eugene Register-Guard for Monday, April 6, telling of this enterprise, which will be headed by my friend, William "Red" Reynolds, of Eugene, president of the new corporation and executive producer:

CAMERAS TO START ROLLING IN MID-MAY

(By Joanne Braunberns)

Filming of a feature-length motion picture starring Edgar Buchanan and Slim Pickens is scheduled to begin in mid-May near Eugene, as the first production of the newly formed Oregon Picture Corp.

The movie is "Stump Run," and also will star Kaye Elhardt and Rand Brooks in a story about hillbilly moonshiners. The name for this light comedy was derived from the practice of aging corn whisky in a hollow stump.

According to William "Red" Reynolds, of Eugene, president of the new corporation and executive producer for "Stump Run," shooting will start May 18 and continue for 2 weeks. The film company will be on location in the Marcola area, with scenes to be filmed in downtown Marcola and on Parson's Creek.

Interior shots will be filmed at the facilities and sound stage which Oregon Picture Corp. plan to erect immediately on the outskirts of Eugene. Negotiations are now underway for purchase of property.

LOCAL ACTORS

In addition to the Hollywood personalities who will star in "Stump Run," all extra and bit parts will be played by local people, said Reynolds.

He plans on using a crew of 25 to 30 technicians in his first feature film effort, having already contracted for 16 trained people from Hollywood. Other technical assistants will be recruited from the Lane County Theatrical Union.

Reynolds emphasized that there are only about four speaking parts available to local people in "Stump Run," and he will not cast those roles until after May 4. An announcement regarding tryouts will be made later.

Buchanan, now a noted character actor, is a former Eugenean and the son of retired Eugene dentist, Dr. W. E. Buchanan of 1158 High Street. Although born in Missouri, he came to Oregon as a young boy and was graduated from high school in Ashland.

Buchanan attended the University of Oregon, majoring in medicine, but becoming interested in the theater. Later he served as an assistant in dramatics at the university.

The younger Buchanan went on to complete his studies in dentistry and had an office in Eugene for some 10 years. Maintaining an active interest in dramatics, he helped establish Portland Civic Theatre and was active in the Very Little Theatre in Eugene.

CAREER LAUNCHED

In 1937–38, Buchanan attended Pasadena Playhouse, and his motion picture career was launched. Among the best known movies in which he has appeared are "The Sheepman," "Shane," "Sea of Grass," "Penny Serenade," "Texas," and "Arizona." He has played in more than 80 feature pictures and 150 television shows.

Slim Pickens, in addition to appearing as a rodeo entertainer, has a string of movies and television shows to his credit. He has had character and feature roles in the movies "Tonka," "The Sheepman," "Escort West," "Down Arizona Way," "Return of Geronimo" and "Santa Fe Calls." On television he has appeared in the Andy Burnett series, in "Maverick," "Rifleman," "Wells Fargo," and "Restless Gun."

Rand Brooks is Corporal Boone of television's "Rin Tin Tin" series and has appeared in more than 40 motion pictures.

EXPERIENCE IN EUGENE

Formation of Oregon Picture Corp., means reality for an idea "Red" Reynolds has worked on for years. He was on the staff of KVAL–TV for the past 5 years, where he produced and starred in his own daily program, "The Big Roundup," a children's variety show. At the same time he was art director and studio supervisor for the station.

Reynolds has had theatrical experience with the Phoenix Civic Theatre, Very Little Theatre in Eugene and Willamalane Players of Springfield. He has acted, produced, and directed plays as well as serving as set dsigner and stage manager.

His motion picture experience includes a bit part in "Tonka," the Disney production which was filmed last summer in central Oregon. Reynolds also has appeared in the television series "Death Valley Days."

The 31-year-old Eugenean has the financial backing of Lane County businessmen in formation of the new movie corporation, and he expects the corporation to add a quarter of a million dollars to the economy of the Emerald Empire within its first year.

FILM SET PLANNED

The corporation is formed to produce and film feature-length movies and episodes for syndicated television. The facilities also will be equipped to produce filmed television commercials.

In addition to the sound stage, Reynolds expects to construct a two-block early western street, a walled fort and an Indian village. Permanent offices of the corporation will be located on the site. An announcement regarding the location is expected this week.

Reynolds added that having the sound stage will be his big drawing card for getting Hollywood producers to make movies in this area. He explained that Hollywood's movie industry is decentralizing, with a constant search for new sites.

"They've already filmed 'Sunset Boulevard' from four different directions," said Reynolds. "And people are getting tired of seeing the cowboys run around the same rock."

Speech of Hon. A. Willis Robertson at Meeting of Tidewater Group of Building, Savings, and Loan Associations, Norfolk, Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 24, 1959

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able speech made by my distinguished colleague, Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, at the annual meeting of the Tidewater Group of Building, Savings, and Loan Associations at Norfolk, Va., on April 22, 1959.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR A. WILLIS ROBERTSON AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE TIDEWATER GROUP OF BUILDING, SAVINGS, AND LOAN ASSOCIATIONS, NORFOLK, VA., APRIL 22, 1959

Former President Herbert Hoover, telling in his memoirs of the reasons for the establishment in 1932 of the Home Loan Bank System, said: "The poignant American drama revolving around the loss of the old homestead had a million repetitions straight from life, not because of the designing villain but because of a fault in our financial system."

A happy ending to that old melodrama has been written in the history of the savings and loan industry which was founded for the dual purpose of promoting home ownership and encouraging individual thrift.

Some of us can recall the time when the average first mortgage on a home ran for a period of 5 years or less with no assurance of renewal and when it had to be supplemented by second mortgages at exorbitant interest rates. This meant that too often the borrower, who was prepared to pay carrying charges, could not meet an unexpected demand for principal payments and his home ownership was forfeited. And these individual tragedies became national calamities in times of financial stress when foreclosures pyramided until demand was generated for Federal controls that threatened to wipe out our private enterprise system.

The early savings and loan associations attempted to deal with the problem by larger first mortgages, running for longer periods, which were self-amortizing. But the associations themselves were subject to failure in a period of recession. It was to meet this need that there was created the Federal Home Loan Bank System, to give the savings and loan associations the kind of backing which the Federal Reserve System had given to commercial banks.

The success of the home loan system is indicated by the fact that the 11 banks, now owned completely by members with the original Government investment retired, had in 1958 a capital of more than $800 million and assets well over $2 billion.

Public acceptance of this method of saving and financing home building is indicated also by the steady growth of the member associations. In 1951, when I had the pleasure of addressing the annual convention of the U.S. Savings and Loan League, meeting at Miami Beach, I referred to savings and loan association assets of $17 billion, but the 1958 total for those assets was close to $54 billion and represented a gain of almost $7 billion from 1957 to 1958. In 1951 I spoke also of an annual total loan rate of around $5 billion, but the 1958 rate was just under $12 billion. Meanwhile, savings accounts in these associations had grown by 1958 to a total of nearly $48 billion and exceeded by a small amount the total holdings of individuals in Government savings bonds.

Because I believe in thrift and because I believe that one of the bulwarks of our democracy is individual home ownership, I would have been happy to come here on this occasion just to commend the members of this group on their past success and to wish them well for the future.

It is a double pleasure, however, to be privileged to congratulate a great Virginia newspaper, the Virginian-Pilot, on the public service it has performed in promoting the cause of thrift.

Everyone in this room is aware of the fact that our capitalistic society is founded on the principle of thrift. It is through savings that capital can be provided for business expansion on the basis of a stable dollar and, of course, the incentive to save would be greatly reduced if citizens did not have the privilege of accumulating assets which they can pass on to their heirs.

Largely because the right is guaranteed under our Constitution to acquire, use and to dispose of property we have become the richest and most powerful nation in the world. Some lose sight of the fact that property rights and human rights are root and branch of the same personal freedom tree.

Another factor in the success of our private enterprise system is the privilege of freely communicating ideas through the press and the newer media of radio and television. As Thomas Jefferson wisely said: "The liberty of speaking and writing guards our other liberties."

So I am happy to join with you in commending the Virginian-Pilot on the exercise of that right in the public interest.

While my ability to lift the veil of the future is no better than yours, I welcome this opportunity to bring to you the best information I have been able to obtain from financial agencies of the Government concerning current economic trends and to make some comment on the significance of those trends.

We are recovering from what has generally been called a recession, marked by a declining volume of business and a level of unemployment which has caused considerable alarm, but facts which I obtained from Government agencies just before coming here present a rather encouraging picture of current business recovery.

In the fourth quarter of 1958 our gross national product surpassed its prerecession level in terms of dollar volume and during the first quarter of this year it rose above the previous high in terms of adjusted value. Industrial production in February was 144 percent of the 1947–49 average and only 2 points under its 1957 high. By this measure, recovery from the recession could be considered completed.

Also, while the pace of recovery has slowed somewhat in the last few months, there are numerous signs of a strong and broadly based expansionary movement. Personal income is rising steadily, furnishing a basis for continued strength in consumer expenditures, which dropped only slightly during the recession. Automobile sales, which showed a weakness in 1958, are up this year. Housing construction, which expanded sharply throughout the last three quarters of 1958, continues at a high level. The decline in business inventories which occurred last year has been reversed and business spending for plant and equipment has again started to rise.

On the whole, recovery in output compares favorably with experience in comparable phases of the two preceding postwar recoveries. There has been some lag in recovery of employment compared with previous experiences, but unemployment in March was 800,000 less than a year earlier, with much of the remaining unemployment concentrated in large cities producing hard goods, such as Detroit, or in spots like the coal-mining areas which have special industry problems.

The existence of unemployed manpower and excess plant capacity may be a cause for concern, but it also can be taken as an indication of our potential for further growth, rising prosperity, and an improved standard of living.

One of the most debated issues today is whether an adequate and sustainable rate of economic growth and price stability can be achieved simultaneously. Some argue that creeping inflation provides the environment most conducive to substainable growth, while others argue that such growth is possible only under conditions of price stability within the framework of a free market system.

I am frankly on the side of those who feel that a little inflation is a dangerous thing and that more inflation can be disastrous.

With general demand expanding, including the demand for investment, it is essential for stability that the volume of saving in the economy be sufficient to finance investment demands. If the supply of saving falls short, there will be pressure to meet these demands through expansion of bank credit, but too much expansion of bank credit

would result in excessive expansion of the money supply and lead to inflation.

There has been debate in and out of Congress about controls which are used to avert this type of imbalance. The monetary authorities, by raising reserve requirements, can create a tightness in credit markets with a resultant rise in interest rates and those higher interest rates serve as a brake on credit demands and also as an added incentive to savers to increase their savings, thus helping to bring back into balance the flow of savings and the demand for funds.

Critics of the way these controls have been used complain that higher interest rates increase the cost of Government for servicing our national debt—which is true. They also say that the Government could keep interest rates down by open market purchasing of Government bonds and that this would be helpful to all borrowers, including local government units engaged in public works and businessmen planning expansion. They ignore the fact, however, that such a process of artificially supporting a low interest bond market increases bank funds which become the basis for credit expansion several times the volume of the original transaction and that this is highly inflationary.

Those who say there has been too much emphasis on tight money and raising interest rates should not ignore the fact that steps taken by monetary authorities in 1957–1958 to ease credit conditions resulted in the sharpest rise in the money supply of any of the postwar recessions. The active money supply, consisting of demand deposits and currency, increased at an annual rate of 5½ percent on a seasonably adjusted basis in the first part of 1958 and for 1958 as a whole the money supply expanded by $4.5 billion or about 3½ percent.

But, in addition to the volume of money, we have to consider the velocity of its turnover in order to see the proper relation to possible inflation. The turnover of demand deposits has been rising ever since World War II and during the first 2 months of 1959 it was estimated at the six financial centers outside of New York at a peak of 31.3 times a year while the New York City rate of turnover was 54 times a year.

Balances that people hold idle in their pockets or in banks can be increased with no immediate effect on demand and supply conditions or prices, but when people use their balances more actively, this can add to the aggregate demand without any change in the dollar volume of deposits and currency.

Illustrating the changes in use of funds, in 1955 consumers provided the main impetus to economic expansion through increased purchases of durable goods and homes by a sharp reduction of their financial savings and an increase in the volume of their debt. In 1956 and early 1957, on the other hand, increases in consumers' financial savings made an important contribution toward moderating the rate of economic expansion which was becoming inflationary. In 1958, with a slackening of general economic activity, but with little reduction in the level of personal income, consumers continued to save at a relatively high rate. The savings pattern for 1959 is not yet clear but growth in time deposits at commercial banks is down sharply from the unusually high rates of the previous 2 years. Deposits in mutual savings banks seem to be rising less rapidly than a year ago, but shares in savings and loan associations appear to be rising at close to last year's rate. Consumer decisions later this year as to what they will do with their potential savings can be an important factor in accelerating business demands or slowing down the present expansionary movement.

The problem of monetary authorities in the months ahead will be to govern the rate of monetary growth so as to avoid inadequate expansion, on the one hand, which might choke off further growth, and on the other hand to avoid excessive expansion which might lead to inflation.

But all of the wisdom of the Federal Reserve Board in regulating monetary growth through the manipulation of reserve requirements and rediscount rates and all the fine work being done by building, savings, and loan associations and our commercial banks to encourage thrift, and the investment of savings in business expansion, can be set at naught by a reckless spending program on the part of your Congress.

For instance, during the past 6 years, with personal incomes running at an alltime high, the Federal Government will have added to the national debt by the end of next June the sum of $16 billion. The $8 billion required to service that debt is twice the total expenditures of the Government when I was first elected to the House of Representatives in 1932. The proportion of deficit financing which has been handled by commercial banks has been inflationary since it created bank check money faster than the production of goods and services and lacked the saving grace of the Ricardo theory that a managed currency can be sound provided money is issued solely with relation to the money work to be done.

Marriner S. Eccles, a former Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, recently said in Washington that our present economic situation was characterized by "a dangerous inflation psychology." This, he said, was reflected in the strength of real estate prices, the soaring prices of stocks, and the skidding market for bonds and mortgages, particularly securities of the Federal Government. Undoubtedly, the Government spending to which I referred has contributed to this psychology of inflation and the big question mork of the financial future revolves around the question: When will we have a balanced budget again?

The greatest contribution which the Federal Government could make toward a climate where thrift and savings could flourish is to restrain the urge to spend and to balance the budget.

I am chairman of a Senate committee that has authority to report spending bills, including what is known as the "backdoor approach to Treasury funds." I serve on five subcommittees of the Senate Appropriations Committee that handles 96 percent of the budget. I am confident that my efforts in behalf of economy, a sound fiscal policy and a stable dollar in both the Banking and Currency and Appropriations Committees of the Senate will have the active support not only of this savings and loan group, but also of the bankers I am pleased to see in attendance. While savings and loan associations are more interested in the current home building program than are commercial banks, both organizations have a common goal of preventing inflation, of preserving the stability of the dollar, and of encouraging the American people to save and to put those savings to productive use.

During the last Congress I had the pleasure of working with an advisory committee appointed to assist the Senate Banking and Currency Committee in the study of Federal laws governing our financial institutions. This advisory committee was composed of representatives of every segment of the financial life of our country and it offered a fine example of harmony and cooperation for the national welfare.

Each member of this group took a broad view of the problem of reviewing all the Federal financial statutes and recommending amendments to bring them up to date. They decided issues on the basis of what was the best way for these institutions to serve the public and compromised their differences in an equitable manner.

A majority of the committee's proposals were incorporated in my bill known as the Financial Institutions Act and, as you know, that bill was passed by the Senate but was killed in the House by the delaying maneuvers of one or two Members. There is no doubt that if the bill had been permitted to come up for a vote in the House it would have passed overwhelmingly.

This, of course, is history now, but I remind you of it to point up one of the most important issues facing the financial world today—that is, you must stick together, because if you don't the political power of those who oppose you will destroy you.

As chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, I am subject to constant pressures from groups that demand more Government grants and loans for housing, depressed areas, community facilities, small business, and many other areas of direct concern to you. These groups wield a tremendous amount of power, both economic and political, and if they have their way we shall have more and more financial business handled by the Federal Government and less and less under the private enterprise system to which both banks and savings and loan associations belong.

If you do not want the Government to usurp your functions through grants and lending programs; if you do not want the dollar inflated by spendthrift programs to the point where we can have only printing press money, you must use all of your influence, in a united way, on behalf of a sound and independent economy.

You know where I stand in this fight and so long as you keep me in Washington as your representative, I shall continue to battle for economy in government, a reduction in the heavy burden of taxation, and the preservation of our system of free, competitive enterprise.

How Much Federal Aid Did the Pilgrims Get?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 24, 1959

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which appeared in the U.S. News & World Report entitled "How Much Federal Aid Did the Pilgrims Get?"

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW MUCH FEDERAL AID DID THE PILGRIMS GET?

They were in a depressed area. No one guaranteed them high prices for anything. Their only roads and schools were built by themselves. For security they did their own saving, or starved.

All they had was character. All they did was work. All they wanted was self-respect.

The sum of those three traits became America.

But what's going to be the sum of the traits you see today—the traits of character, or, rather, lack of it, that demand more money for less work, put security above self-respect, pamper self-pitying criminals instead of punishing them, give away resources we desperately need to protect ourselves, listen to weaklings that want Government to take care of them when they should take care of themselves.

Long years of early-American self-respect and hard work built America, but the traits you see today can destroy it, in half the time.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate continued its consideration of labor-management reform bill.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 5931–5942

Bills Introduced: 7 bills were introduced, as follows: S. 1788–1794. Page 5932

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

Report of Committee on the Judiciary entitled "National Penitentiaries," filed pursuant to S. Res. 230, 85th Congress (S. Rept. 220);

S. 1368, to amend the Federal Aviation Act so as to facilitate financing of new jet and turboprop aircraft, with amendments (S. Rept. 221); and

S. 226, to amend Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, with amendments, and with individual views (S. Rept. 222). Pages 5931–5932

Water Resources: Pursuant to S. Res. 48, establishing committee to study development and coordination of water resources ($175,000), the following appointments were made from certain standing committees of Senate, as indicated, to the Select Committee on Water Resources:

From Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs—Senators Anderson, Jackson, and Kuchel;

From Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce—Senators Magnuson, Schoeppel, and Engle;

From Committee on Agriculture and Forestry—Senators Ellender, Hart, and Young; and

From Committee on Public Works—Senators Chavez, Kerr, and Case (South Dakota). Pages 5935–5936

Civil War Centennial Commission: It was announced that pursuant to P.L. 85–918, Vice President appointed Senator Scott to Civil War Centennial Commission, in lieu of Senator Morton, who has resigned therefrom. Page 5931

Labor-Management Reform: Senate continued its consideration of S. 1555, Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959, taking the following further actions on amendments:

Adopted: By 78 yeas to 15 nays (motion to reconsider tabled), Cooper amendment to let State agency other than a court take jurisdiction of labor cases involving interstate commerce as to which NLRB has declined jurisdiction (so-called no-man's-land cases), after rejecting by 40 yeas to 53 nays Prouty amendment in the nature of a substitute therefor; modified McClellan amendment requiring bonding of union officers; by 86 yeas to 4 nays (motion to reconsider tabled); modified Prouty amendment imposing certain limitations on organizational and recognition picketing; a series of Morse amendments, (1) providing that union trusteeships established in conformity with constitution and bylaws shall be presumed valid for 12 months rather than 18 months as in the bill, and providing for type of proof necessary to overcome presumption of good faith, (2) providing for hearing in accordance with Administrative Procedures Act in certain cases for removal of serious misconduct of elected officer of the union, (3) providing for application of Administrative Procedures Act in certain cases under titles of bill covering reporting and disclosure and trusteeships, (4) of a clarifying nature respecting information required to be filed in reports (modified), (5) providing for actions against unions to be brought in district court or other court where violation occurred but in event of inconvenience to parties then in D.C. district court; and (6) providing that in event of denial of an exemption from making report, the Administrative Procedures Act shall apply; and

Rejected: Case (New Jersey) amendment to eliminate from bill exemption from financial reporting of unions having less than 200 members or less than $20,000 in annual gross receipts; Prouty amendment (in the nature of a substitute for Cooper amendment on no-man's-land cases above set forth under heading "adopted"); by 30 yeas to 59 nays McClellan amendment setting up criminal penalties against certain picketing activities for organizing workers or forcing employers to bargain, after rejecting by 25 yeas to 67 nays, Ervin amendment (to McClellan amendment on this subject) to allow peaceful picketing for organizational purposes; by 41 yeas to 50 nays (motion to reconsider tabled), modified McClellan amendment directed against secondary boycotts; by 41 yeas to 51 nays (motion to reconsider tabled), Dodd amendment providing that no subordinate union shall be placed under trusteeship except under certain conditions; Morse amendment providing for application of Administrative Procedures Act in certain cases respect-

Appendix

Industrial Payrolls and Tourist Trade Provided by St. Lawrence Seaway Can Furnish Example for Columbia River Basin

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, April 25, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, it is unfortunate that many people in the great Pacific Northwest still do not realize what low-cost water power and cheap river transportation can mean to the development of a vast region like ours in the Columbia River Basin.

An example of the prosperity which can come to an area by these methods is being created in Northeastern United States on the St. Lawrence Seaway. There, the huge Moses-Saunders Dam is about to generate 1,880,000 low-cost kilowatts, which will make it second in the Western Hemisphere only to our own colossal Grand Coulee Dam on the Columbia. In addition, the slack-water navigation and locks produced by the Moses-Saunders Dam will make possible oceangoing shipping all the way to the Great Lakes in the very heart of the American breadbasket.

An illuminating article in the Wall Street Journal for April 24, 1959, entitled "St. Lawrence Valley Booms as the Seaway Lures Industry, Tourists," details just what this development can mean to important sections of both the United States and Canada.

I commend a thorough and careful reading of the Wall Street Journal article to my own constituents in Oregon. There, we have had to struggle for 5 years to obtain construction appropriations for the great John Day Dam, over the opposition of the Republican national administration. Now we are about to begin our efforts to secure adequate funds to keep the construction of John Day Dam on schedule in the years ahead. Furthermore, we seek to implement the 308 report of the Corps of Army Engineers, which recommends an expenditure of some $63 million to provide effective and safe navigation all the way up the main stem of the Columbia to the orchard city of Wenatchee, Wash., a citadel of the inland empire. Any resident of the Pacific Northwest who reads this Wall Street Journal article about the prosperity brought to Northeastern United States by cheap power and inland navigation on the St. Lawrence Seaway will inevitably become a booster for the same type of development on the Columbia River system.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Wall Street Journal article, by Ray Vicker of that newspaper's staff, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. LAWRENCE VALLEY BOOMS AS THE SEAWAY LURES INDUSTRY, TOURISTS—REYNOLDS METALS, CHASE BUILD PLANTS—MOTELS, MARINAS SPRING UP ALONG THE RIVER—A MILLION VISITORS TO MASSENA

(By Ray Vicker)

MASSENA, N.Y.—Tomorrow the first deep-draft, oceangoing ship to traverse the St. Lawrence Seaway will ease into the Bertrand H. Snell lock 5 miles east of here on its precedent-setting passage.

As the ship's propeller churns the cold, green water, mighty turbines of the nearby Moses-Saunders Power Dam, which plays a role in controlling water levels for the Seaway, also will be translating the St. Lawrence River's power into electricity, turning this once sleepy valley into a bustling center of industry.

More than $125 million has either been invested or committed for plants on the American banks of the St. Lawrence by companies attracted by the proximity of large quantities of electricity and the transport facilities of the seaway. Messena, which calls itself "The Aluminum City," will boast 10 percent of the aluminum capacity of the United States when spending is completed here. And it is electricity which accounts for the expansion, because it takes 10 kilowatt hours, enough to light a 40-watt bulb for 10 days, just to process 1 pound of primary aluminum.

The new 3,220-foot-long dam thrust across the St. Lawrence near here will rank as the second largest producer of hydroelectric power in the Western Hemisphere. When its 32 generators are installed only Washington State's Grand Coulee Dam, with 1,900,000 kilowatts of capacity, will top the 1,880,000-kilowatt capacity of the Moses-Saunders Dam.

COSTS, POWER SHARED EQUALLY

Twelve of 16 generators on the American side now are turning out power, while 11 of a second 16 are in operation on the Canadian side of the dam. The $650 million cost of the power phase of the more than $1.1 billion Seaway project was shared equally by the Power Authority of the State of New York and by the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario. The power is divided equally between the two agencies.

In a modest office in New York City's Coliseum Tower, William S. Chapin, tall, brisk general manager of the New York Power Authority, exults, "We had expected to reach peak operations at Massena next fall. But we're months ahead of schedule, and our expenditures are within the original estimates." And with a broad smile, he adds: "Our power is sold out. We're assured of our revenues and we know we can pay off our bonds."

The authority floated a $335 million bond issue for its share of the Moses-Saunders project.

An expanded Aluminum Co. of America factory and a new plant of Reynolds Metals Co. will take half of the authority's power. The other half is divided among Niagara-Mohawk Power Corp.; the State of Vermont; the city of Plattsburgh, N.Y.; Plattsburgh Air Force Base; New York State Electric & Gas Co.; Paul Smith's Electric Light, Power & Railroad Co.; a new plant of the Chevrolet division of General Motors Corp., and a group of municipal and rural electric cooperatives, with a small amount reserved for the Power Authority and for operation of the seaway. The amount reserved for the Power Authority includes power for operations at a $3 million plant of Quebec Lithium Co., at Rouses Point, N.Y.

The cost of producing power here is 4.3 mills a kilowatt, considerably better than the 7 to 8 mills it costs to produce a kilowatt of electricity by coal, gas, or oil in this area.

The effect of the dam on industry is not clear cut on the Canadian side. Ontario Hydro's power is funneled into the company's regular power pool and there is no rate advantage for users adjacent to the project. So there is not the same impetus to locate near the dam as there is on the American side, where the dam already is stimulating industry.

A BIG NEW PLANT

Biggest plant attracted by the power is the new 100,000-ton-a-year primary aluminum plant Reynolds Metals has under construction near Massena. Total cost, including auxiliary facilities, is estimated at $88 million.

This new plant sprawls on a 1,700-acre site beside a St. Lawrence River channel called Polley's Gut. Construction is nearly completed; aluminum siding glitters in the weak sunlight of a spring day, and workmen are busy installing machinery and pot lines in long, airy buildings. Already alumina, the raw material manufactured from bauxite, is arriving from Texas and Arkansas via rail to feed the plant once production gets underway.

"Our first metal will be tapped in the first week of July," says V. G. Kneeskern, pipe-smoking plant manager. "We should be in full production before the end of the year."

The plant now employs 120 people, with 600 to be employed when output is in full swing. Its three lines will have 168 pots each, and electricity fed into these pots to manufacture primary aluminum would be enough to service a city of 100,000 people.

On a tour through the spacious plant, Mr. Kneeskern describes new techniques and equipment being introduced to step up efficiency. When plans originally were drawn for the plant it was expected that employment would start at 750 and eventually rise to as high as 1,000. These figures were based upon methods used in the most efficient plants at the time. Now the new techniques devised here have pared the estimate to 600 at full operation.

"Starting a new plant like this, we can introduce many new labor-saving things which might be difficult to introduce in an old plant," observes Mr. Kneeskern.

Reynolds will sell some of its aluminum in molten form. Molten metal will be drawn from pots and rushed in crucibles to a nearby Chevrolet foundry which also is nearing completion. This foundry is the first set up by Chevrolet to turn out only aluminum products, a fact that emphasizes the trend toward the use of aluminum now underway in the auto industry. In 1940 the average auto had only 6 pounds of aluminum in it; last year this figure hit 52 pounds.

Chevrolet already is in pilot production of aluminum castings at its new 213,000-square-foot plant near the end of the International Bridge spanning the St. Lawrence near here. Current plans call for Chevrolet to take about one-third of the production from Reynolds' plant here, although the figure could rise later.

Volume production of castings is expected around July, with employment of about 600 anticipated by the end of the year. Rumors persist that, among other things, the foundry will be producing aluminum engine blocks for the new General Motors small car to be introduced this fall, but Chevrolet officials refuse to comment.

Here at Massena, Aluminum Co. of America runs the oldest aluminum smelting plant in the United States still operating. With the advent of power from the Moses-Saunders Dam, Alcoa spent $25 million to renovate its plant and boosted capacity to 150,000 tons a year from 112,500.

THE FIRST CONSUMER

Prior to construction of the seaway, Alcoa obtained its power from a company-owned dam. When the seaway power project got underway, the company was its first industrial consumer.

The Alcoa plant sits on the bank of the North Grasse River, just outside Massena. Within its 8 miles of fences are 25 miles of paved highways and 22 miles of railroad track. The plant, which has some 100 acres under roof, employs about 4,000.

"All our smelting capacity now is in operation," says Paul A. Crouch, an Alcoa official. "We could use more power if more were available."

Both Reynolds and Alcoa have plans to build marine terminals at their plants for handling of incoming and outgoing shipments by water. An economics study of the area completed by Forzley and Co., Riverside, Conn., economic researchers, estimates that 250,000 tons of aluminum output a year at Massena requires 664,000 tons of raw materials, so the incoming and outgoing shipments would represent a substantial volume.

The St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corp., the U.S. Government Seaway agency, now is housed in a one-story glass and aluminum building which sits on a curved drive surrounded by winter-browned lawn in Massena. Sitting at a desk with a carved elephant tusk at his elbow, Lewis G. Castle, administrator, says, "We will be employing 180 people during the summer and 150 in the winter."

The one-time Duluth banker explains that the crew will include operators for the two Seaway locks on the American side, electricians, maintenance employees, toll collectors, and clerks.

EMPLOYMENT OF 1,200

In a temporary office building in Ottawa, a spokesman for the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority, Canada's Seaway agency, reports employment of about 1,200. This agency handles five seaway locks, and also is responsible for traffic through the Welland Canal, the Sault Ste. Marie Canal and the Lachine Canal near Montreal, the latter part of the old canal system which is being retained for vessels which can navigate in a 14-foot channel.

The Canadian Seaway agency controls both the entrance and exit of the St. Lawrence Seaway. This agency spokesman says: "Thirty hours should be a good time for a big vessel going from Montreal to Lake Ontario via the seaway."

Power to turn the wheels of industry, plus a new ship route, are concrete benefits resulting from the seaway. But there's another important benefit: Tourists.

"For this area the greatest benefit of this billion-dollar project is its value as a tourist attraction," says Chester J. Malley, regional manager at Ogdensburg for the New York State Department of Commerce.

Last year 375,000 people visited the Massena area to gawk at Seaway facilities under construction, and about 1.5 million came into the St. Lawrence Valley. This year, some 1 million tourists are expected in the Massena area alone.

Says Alcoa's Mr. Crouch: "This is the biggest new recreational area in the United States. Tourist attractions include the dam, the locks with big, ocean-going ships passing through them, the new 42-mile-long lake, the new St. Lawrence State Park near Massena, new parks and attractions on the Canadian side, and such long-established attractions as the Thousand Islands." And, he predicts, "Within 5 years this area will be attracting 3 to 5 million tourists annually compared with the 1.5 million who come into the area now."

At the end of the dam on the American side is a five-story headquarters building, with marble interior, murals by Thomas Hart Benton, and an atomsphere of refined luxury. Included in the building will be a display for tourists of models of the dam, a 40-foot relief map of the Seaway area, and a glass-panelled control room which will have all the privacy of a Macy's window.

THE VITALITY OF ELECTRIC POWER

On the Canadian side, a sister structure will house Ontario Hydro's headquarters, a viewing point of the dam for visitors, and a 150-seat movie theater where films of the Seaway will be presented. A 31-foot by 10-foot abstract painting in the observation lobby is almost certain to become a controversial topic for Seaway visitors. Painted by Harold Town, 34-year-old Toronto abstractionist, the canvas is a splatter of color and patterns which symbolize the life and vitality of electric power, according to the artist.

Shortly after the painting was hung, a wag among the workmen painting the walls of the building called his foreman, telling him one of the painters had gone beserk. The foreman rushed to the observation deck, took one look at the riot of color splattered on the wall, and gasped, "Good night. What happened?"

In the lobby of the Highland Hotel at Massena, where a billboard displays the attractions of Stunning Smith, "The Girl With The Purple Hair," who appears nightly in the ball room, Edward J. Kaneb, manager, enthuses: "We're expanding to meet the anticipated business increase."

A BUILDING BOOM

The hotel, which now has 53 rooms, has a 20-room addition under construction. Plans call for a further expansion to 110 rooms next year. Bob's Motel, which has 18 units at present, is adding 9 more. Storey's Motel is adding 6 units to the 29 now in operation. Two new motels are slated to be built soon just west of Massena, while the Schine Hotels broke ground recently for a 103-room hotel.

At Ogdensburg, the new $250,000 Gran-View Motel, a luxury establishment, is under construction. Other motels also are rising on both sides of the river. Ten new boating marinas are in or due for construction on the U.S. side, with several more being built on the Canadian side. A swarm of outboard motor and boat retailers are opening for business.

In Morrisburg, Ontario, silver-haired George H. Challies, Chairman of the Ontario-St. Lawrence Development Commission, a Provincial park agency, comments, "We are developing 5,200 acres as a park where we will preserve some of upper Canada's history for future generations."

Upper Canada is the term first applied to what is now the Province of Ontario. This is the name, too, being given to a village of the Revolutionary War period now being restored in the park, in the manner of the Williamsburg, Va., restoration.

The village is being established on the rustic north shores of Lake St. Lawrence. Already about 20 old homes, churches, and other buildings are in place, with many more to come. Many were saved from flooding when the manmade lake overran some of the historic old river towns which traced their roots to settlement by Loyalists fleeing the American Colonies during the Revolution.

The village is located in Crysler Memorial Park, scene of a battle of the War of 1812. Park literature relates how a greatly superior U.S. force was whipped by British and Canadian troops in that Battle of Crysler's Farm. Plans call for the village to be opened to the public in 1961.

A wildlife preserve is being developed near the village, while a bay of the lake will have some of the best fishing in Canada, Mr. Challies claims. Contracts for a boat marina have been let; a 9-hole golf course, a 40-unit motel, and a restaurant also are to be built.

When completed, most of the 28 miles of shore between Cornwall, Ontario, and Morrisburg, Ontario, will be a park area.

Massena is the focal point for the changes that are taking place up and down this valley. In addition to the power dam, the seaway, industrial developments and the new State park just northeast of the city, a new high-level bridge has been built across the St. Lawrence to Cornwall, Ontario; a new bridge has been thrown across the Grasse River near the center of town; four new elementary schools and a new high school have been constructed, and there has been considerable highway construction and a big expansion of retailing outlets.

"OUR DEPOSITS HAVE DOUBLED"

C. J. Ward, president of the Massena Banking & Trust Co., says, "Our resources now total $10.7 million, as compared with $3.5 million in 1954 before the seaway got underway." Across the street, Allen E. Sutton, vice president of Northern New York Trust Co., and manager of the Massena branch, adds: "Our deposits have doubled since 1954."

Total gross receipts at the local post office, which amounted to $80,438 in 1950, hit $187,175 in 1958. Population in the village of Massena has climbed from 15,000 in 1954 to 20,000 now.

Such growth has sparked a $9.6 million school-building program which culminated with the opening of the new one-story aluminum, glass, and concrete high school here this week.

Along with other evidence of progress Massena soon may have a jurisdictional labor dispute to spice life in the community. The AFL–CIO Aluminum Workers International Union has organized Alcoa workers and has been seeking to bring Reynolds employees into the union fold. This month the United Steelworkers Union opened an office in the old telephone building here.

"We will organize the Reynolds Metals Co.," says Adron Coldiron, steelworkers official in charge of the Utica-Adirondack area.

Day Care for Children When Mothers Must Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, April 25, 1959

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on March 5 I introduced the Day Care Assistance Act of 1959, S. 1286, to authorize a program of Federal aid for the day care of children outside the home. Hundreds of thousands of children throughout the Nation will continue to be the chief los-

ers so long as we fail to recognize that providing suitable day care for the children of working mothers is a national problem which urgently requires Federal aid to activate State and local efforts in this field and to back up the outstanding voluntary programs now in effect. Until a Federal program such as the one contemplated in my bill is enacted, we are not looking after the neeeds of these children in households where economic necessity forces the mother to work outside the home. In cases where adequate adult supervision is not available, children are often exposed to influences which may lead to juvenile delinquency and the serious rise in yourth crime.

An article appeared in the May issue of Parents Magazine dealing with the question of working mothers and the need for day care for children, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DAY CARE FOR CHILDREN WHEN MOTHERS MUST WORK—A CALL FOR FEDERAL AID TO HELP SOLVE A NATIONAL PROBLEM

(By JACOB K. JAVITS, U.S. Senator from New York)

Seventy years or so ago, half the women in this country never held a job in their lives. Today, 9 out of every 10 women in the United States will have worked at some time or another during their lifetimes. What's more, over half of today's workingwomen are married. This last statistics means that about 3 million children under the age of 6 have mothers who work; 3,500,000 more children between the ages of 6 and 11 also have mothers who work outside their homes.

Despite our current 7 million working mothers; despite the fact that our national economic trend points to a more likely increase than decrease in their numbers, our social trend is to disapprove of working mothers, to view them with alarm. Opinion surveys among both women and men show an overwhelming majority in favor of the concept that a mother's place is in the home. Psychologists—and the whole battery of social scientists who work in the field of child development—agree. Children under 3, they say, need their mothers' personal care. All children, they add, need the care, the guidance, the warmth, the feeling of being wanted that mothers have immemorially provided. As a parent myself, I believe in the importance of a mother's care for a young, growing child. On the other hand, and again drawing from personal experience, I know that in many homes, due to modest circumstances or the death or physical inability of a husband, it is necessary for the mother to work. I came from such a home myself. No amount of moralizing about the mother's place can override the harsh necessity that faces great numbers of families in the United States where the mother is obliged to be away from home and to work.

The concern of the Federal Government with the welfare of our children has been long established. It dates from the establishment of the Office of Education a little less than a century ago, the establishment of the Children's Bureau in 1910 and of the Women's Bureau in 1920.

This concern matured into a more material expression with the enactment of the aid to dependent children program in the Social Security Act of 1935. To keep needy children in their own homes as much as possible, the program provides aid for those who are living with relatives but are deprived of normal support and care. It was hoped thereby that a widow would not find it necessary to leave her children behind in order to earn money for their support, but could remain home to care for them. The Federal dependent children program has since been supplemented by other programs, such as railroad retirement, old age and survivors insurance, and veterans' benefits designed to provide benefits for the orphaned child. But these programs are insufficient—particularly in the face of the rising cost of living. The average monthly payment per family in the aid to dependent children program is $105; the widow of a veteran with two children receives as little as $122 monthly. No wonder so many women seek employment to supplement these subsistence payments.

But what of the millions of children of working mothers? Their care and supervision varies from that given by other members of the family to almost none at all.

To meet the needs of the very young child of the working mother, there was established in Philadelphia in 1927 the first program of family day care. Under this program the child is placed in the home of a foster mother (who often has children of her own of like age) and returned to his own mother at the end of the working day. The program operates under a system of supervision and controls, all carefully checked. Family day care was slow to catch on at first, but during World War II, when defense requirements drew so many women into the labor force, some 90 communities had family day-care programs. However, for the most part these programs were makeshift and died out after the war.

The most firmly established and widespread programs are those instituted for the care of preschool children at the age when they develop a group consciousness and can be cared for within a group—the years from 3 to 6. In this category are the nursery schools and day-care centers. Nursery schools usually provide care for only half a day or, when a full day is provided, cover normal school hours. Their pupils are not necessarily all children whose parents absolutely require supplemental care for them. Nursery schools can serve working mothers in a part-time job, but the woman with full-time employment must go elsewhere.

The day-care center or day nursery, however, has as its primary function, according to the Department of Labor, provision of good group care and supervision of children in need of supplemental parental care during the day because their own parents are unable to care for them due to employment, sickness, or for some other reason. Today there are day-care centers throughout the United States. All but six States—Maine, Nevada, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Vermont, and Wyoming—have laws providing for their licensing. Many of the States with licensing laws, though, do not provide adequately for their enforcement or else have statutes which do not meet what is regarded as minimum standards today. In some half-dozen States, State financial assistance is given. My community, New York City, helps to support 115 day-care centers operated by 74 private agencies at a cost of $4.5 million annually.

The Federal Government at the present time has no program of support for child-care centers, although the concept of such support is not by any means new. It was accomplished with some success during the depression and the war years when young mothers in the greatest numbers were in the labor force.

In 1945 a program which received part of its operating costs from Federal funds was operating in 395 communities in 46 States. Hawaii, and the District of Columbia. The program expired at the end of hostilities and was not revived until the Korean war crisis. In 1951 the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act included day-care centers in its definition of community facilities and services. But no funds were appropriated and the effort did not get off the ground.

While these programs indicate congressional recognition of the important and helpful role of day-care centers, they are not the only programs with Federal support that have been undertaken. Others include those day-care centers at the Atomic Energy Commission facilities at Oak Ridge and Los Alamos and in local housing projects financed by the Public Housing Administration. In addition, the Congress in 1954 permitted working mothers to deduct expenses for the care of their children up to $600 annually in computing their income tax. Furthermore, the Federal Government has for years made grants not only for aid to dependent children but also for maternal and child health, child welfare, crippled children's services and a National School Lunch Program.

In recognition of the need for day-care centers in our present social order, I sponsored last year the Day Care Assistance Act to make annual grants to assist in providing facilities and services for children needing day care outside their homes. I have reintroduced this measure, somewhat revised after study by experts in day care, in the current 86th Congress. It would make such care available not only to children of working mothers but also to children requiring special attention because they are mentally or physically handicapped or lacking adequate home care.

Legislation of this type is long overdue. In sponsoring it, I am not, of course, advocating that mothers of young children be encouraged to work, but many of these mothers have no other choice. To turn our backs on this fact is to do a disservice to our national future. To wait until a national emergency arises before we give recognition to the need would be folly. The Federal Government has an obligation to work cooperatively with the States and municipalities to provide day care for the overwhelming majority of children for whom such care is not available. The time to discharge this obligation is now.

Expanded Program of Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. CARROLL

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, April 25, 1959

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by me relating to Senate Concurrent Resolution 24, submitted by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], providing for an expanded program of education on an international level.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CARROLL

This week the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE] submitted a concurrent resolution calling for an expanded program of education on an international level. I was most happy to be one of the sponsors of the resolution as I feel that it is one of the surest and most economical methods of insuring peace in this troubled world. The same resolution has been introduced in the House by Congressman BYRON JOHNSON, of my home State.

The Fulbright program has been immensely effective in bringing about a greater understanding between people in various countries, but the success of the plan only indicates it should be expanded and we should encourage the development of colleges and technical institutions of higher learning outside the continental United States.

In this regard I want to point out the sixth annual dinner meeting of the Institute of International Education will be held in Denver, Colo., April 27.

This institute administers the exchange student program between the United States and foreign countries and at the meeting students from 20 different foreign countries who are attending Colorado schools will be in attendance.

The speakers will be two members of the institute's board of trustees, the Honorable CHESTER BOWLES, of Connecticut, and Miss Blanche Thebom, widely known prima donna.

Representative BOWLES, who has had a distinguished career in foreign service, knows at first hand of the great amount of good that can be accomplished by the student exchange program. He served this country well when Ambassador to India and did much to smooth the relations between countries. Miss Thebom also has been active in the program and I am happy that they will be able to attend the meeting in Colorado.

Thousands of Americans have participated in the educational exchange program and nationals from over 70 countries have come here to study and broaden their knowledge of how the free world operates.

We have made most commendable progress, but I, along with many others, feel that this country should encourage the United Nations Organization to go even further in the educational program. No appropriation will be necessary as the plan can be financed out of unconvertible foreign currency. I can think of no way these funds could be used to better advantage.

It will afford this country an opportunity of taking a constructive leadership in bringing about better understanding between nations.

Since the international educational exchange program was started in 1938 thousands have participated. From experience in my own State, I know the thousands who have participated in the educational program have done much to improve our foreign relations. But an expanded program would multiply these benefits many fold.

Representative BOWLES will take this message back to Colorado; and I am certain that the Institute of International Education will accept with enthusiasm a move to expand the educational program that is so effective in bringing about understanding, faith, and peace between nations.

Restoration of World Court as Force for World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, April 25, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, all mankind seeks some means to prevent nuclear war and maintain peace. An uneasy peace is far to be preferred to a destructive war, as we all know. The distinguished columnist, Roscoe Drummond, has written a thoughtful column supporting various proposals to rehabilitate the World Court. These have originated with the American Bar Association as part of its crusade in behalf of "world peace through law." ABA deserves great credit for this undertaking.

Mr. Drummond's informative column was published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of April 25, 1959, and I believe it ought to be printed in the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD because of its pertinence to many of our deliberations. In addition, Mr. Drummond's column has appeared simultaneously in many leading newspapers throughout the Nation, including the New York Herald Tribune, and the Oregon Daily Journal of my native city of Portland.

I ask unanimous consent that the column may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIFE FOR WORLD COURT—SENATE MUST REPEAL CONNALLY AMENDMENT FIRST

(By Roscoe Drummond)

The American Bar Association is getting terrific support for its crusade in behalf of world peace through law.

Its objective is to put some life and law into the World Court and to begin to use it by giving it some business.

Not many projects can enlist the backing of President Eisenhower, Prime Minister Harold Macmillan, Chancellor Adenauer, Premier Nehru, President Frondizi, of the Argentine, President Garcia, of the Philippines, Sir Winston Churchill, John Foster Dulles, and Thomas E. Dewey. Vice President NIXON is for it—and so is Senator WAYNE MORSE of Oregon. Attorney General William Rogers is for it—and so is Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota.

This is, indeed, an impressive endorsement. In fact, it suggests that this move to activate the World Court is either exactly the right step at the right time or it is a wistful, meaningless gesture which nobody quite has the heart to oppose.

I believe it is radiantly right.

But there is one great danger. The danger is that as the leaders of this crusade are generating mounting and massive support for the large ideal of putting the World Court to work, they will fail to generate adequate support focused sharply on the vital, first step without which the whole thing will falter and fall to pieces.

The fact is that unless the Senate repeals or radically amends the Connally amendment—the amendment which almost completely nullifies our adherence to the World Court—the United States is effectively inhibited from doing anything to promote the wider and better use of the Court.

This means that unless President Eisenhower and the leaders of both parties, who say they are for strengthening the Court, and the leaders of the American Bar Association, who have sparked this whole thing, set about promptly to persuade the Senate to alter the Connally amendment, they will end up with a cargo of idealism and no engine in the ship.

Or at least the engine won't work because the Connally amendment disconnects it.

Here is what happened: In 1946 the Senate approved our adherence to the Court and accepted compulsory jurisdiction by a vote of 62 to 2. Simultaneously, the Senate stipulated that not only would we refuse the Court's jurisdiction in domestic disputes but also that the United States alone would decide what constituted a domestic dispute.

Thus by action of the Senate, the United States has simultaneously accepted compulsory jurisdiction of the Court and reserved the right to escape jurisdiction of the Court any time it wants to say that the issue is domestic.

When we sought to hail the Soviet Union before the Court for damages caused by shooting down an unarmed American plane over the Sea of Japan, Moscow blandly denied the Court's jurisdiction on the ground that it was a domestic matter. The Court had to agree on the premise that so long as the United States reserved to itself the right to decide when an issue was domestic, the right must be conceded to all countries.

The American Bar Association is keenly aware that the Connally amendment must be changed, or the grand design of its crusade will come to nothing.

So far the Eisenhower administration, though avowing its intention to propose changes in the Connally amendment, has put nothing before the Senate. The alert Senator HUMPHREY has introduced a repeal resolution.

This whole American Bar Association-World Court project is so right, so timely, that it ought to have wide-ranging bipartisan initiative and it seems to me that the active leadership of the President is indispensable.

Action of Five Teachers' Colleges in Refusing Federal Loans for Students Is Foolish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, April 25, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Texas State Teachers Colleges Board of Regents has refused to allow five colleges under their jurisdiction to participate in the student loan program under the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

In view of the critical shortage of teachers in Texas and in the Nation, I believe this action was extremely ill advised. It is financially foolish to refuse Federal loans for needy students on the trumped-up specter of Federal control of schools—which has not materialized in numerous similar situations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Corpus Christi Caller for Tuesday, April 21, 1959, under the heading "Aid for Teachers." This is a farsighted editorial, calling on the board to reverse its ill-advised action.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AID FOR TEACHERS

A primary and pressing purpose of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, now swinging into full operation, is to assist the States in overcoming a chronic shortage of qualified teachers. That problem is as acute in Texas as anywhere else in the Nation, a point underlined by the political favor for new taxation in this legislative session to raise teachers' salaries as a means for attracting more and abler people into the profession.

In this situation, Senator YARBOROUGH is understandably caustic in his criticism of the Texas State Teachers Colleges Board for refusing to allow the five institutions in that group to participate in the Federal student loan program. It is a decision that certainly should be reconsidered by that board.

The Federal program, partially matched by colleges' public or private funds available for this purpose, extends loans to deserving students. The loans must be repaid after graduation, with interest. The only "Federal aid" involved, as that term is usually understood, are the grants authorized in the form of excusing repayment of portions of loans extended to students who subsequently teach for a specified period.

It is absurd to fear that a Federal student loan program, with local administration guaranteed by the statute, could lead to any undesirable Federal interference in college management or undue Federal influence over students. And it is self-defeating for any State or private college system to reject participation once such a program has been nationally approved and inaugurated.

Any young man or woman who wants to be a teacher would be financially foolish not to go to a college that cooperates with a loan program that writes off a large portion of student costs as incentive to enter the teaching profession. And these are the very students that the Texas State teachers' colleges are supposed mainly to serve. The pressure of events is most likely to reverse their board's decision if wisdom fails to do so.

Editorial Comment on COPE

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, April 25, 1959

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, during the recent campaign in Arizona there was an open secret of the extended, but futile, efforts on part of a number of labor bosses to thwart by foul means the reelection of our esteemed colleague, Senator BARRY GOLDWATER. When the electorate overwhelmingly voted confidence in Senator GOLDWATER and his record, it proved that the insidious tactics of his opponents, while persistent, were incapable of destroying a man whose honest convictions and high integrity continually cause him to stand up and be counted.

An editorial appearing in the Arizona Republic of April 8, 1959, is timely in this regard, and I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD this editorial entitled "Orders From COPE."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ORDERS FROM COPE

The recent COPE meeting in Phoenix was a star chamber affair, with the press barred, so it is impossible for the public to know exactly what organized labor's political arm plans for Arizona. But Al Green, the labor boss with a record of union violence in California, was reportedly on hand for the meeting, which was conducted by COPE's national director, James L. McDevitt, of Washington. Green is the leader who ran last fall's ill-fated "Get Goldwater" drive, and his reappearance on the scene leads one to wonder if COPE has read the Arizona election returns.

Mr. McDevitt aparently has read the returns, because he blamed the publisher of Phoenix Newspapers, Inc., for electing Senator GOLDWATER. This would be a good chance to cast modesty to the winds, but Eugene C. Pulliam set the record straight when he said the newspapers merely told the truth, the voters elected GOLDWATER. Incidentally, with only one or two exceptions, the rest of the daily newspapers in Arizona supported GOLDWATER, but Mr. McDevitt either didn't know, or ignored this fact of life.

Although the COPE meeting in Phoenix was a secret affair, it isn't hard to imagine what took place behind the closed doors. Early in 1958, COPE drew up a seven-page single-space typewritten document headed "Five Point Victory Campaign for 1958." The objective, at the top of page 1, was "To lay out a program and procedures; to unite labor in a common effort; to elect labor's friends and defeat labor's enemies in the National Congress and the State legislature."

The program included a month-by-month schedule of activities, starting with a session in Tucson on January 18, 1958, and running right through election day. The customary blast at the "Pulliam Press" was saved for the last page.

What happened to COPE's "Five Point Victory Program for 1958" is history. The conservatives, both Democrats and Republicans, rejected outside interference and won a smashing victory at the polls. But the directors of COPE, like the Bourbons, forget nothing and learn nothing. The same old discredited out-of-staters, including the notorious Al Green, are back at the old stand. This time, however, they are shooting for the 1960 elections, more than 19 months away, although it is possible they will take a crack at the Phoenix city elections this fall.

One thing is certain. To be forewarned is to be forearmed. The people of Arizona are being given plenty of warning that the AFL–CIO Committee on Political Education is going to move heaven and earth to dictate the outcome of the State's election next year. McDevitt in Washington and Green on the west coast have already lined up the hoops they expect Arizona voters to jump through.

Fidel Castro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, April 25, 1959

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by George Todt entitled "Another Step in Judging Castro."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANOTHER STEP IN JUDGING CASTRO

(By George Todt)

"It were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and he be cast into the sea." (Luke XVII: 2.)

Last January 23 I wrote in this space of the repugnant Cuban dictator, Fidel Castro, in part, as follows:

"Once again it now appears that the pinhead intelligentsia of the Nation—in counseling us to accept the latest agrarian reformer type we have lately encountered in Cuba—have in reality engineered upon us something of a monstrous intellectual fraud. * * * We are referring to the new trigger-happy dictator of Cuba, of course—a bloodthirsty gent named Castro. * * * Some of these days Uncle is going to lower the boom on one of these little flies. Too bad it can't be Castro. As a matter of fact, it couldn't happen to a more deserving fellow. If he isn't tied in with the worldwide Communist conspiracy, my name is Powatchtrdorgl. Who is he trying to kid, anyway?

"For the moment he makes it appear like 'Com Ze, Com Za'—maybe yes, maybe no. Wait and see, sucker. But the cold truth is that he received his arms from Russian submarines surfacing in the Carribbean—and Ivan doesn't give away such playthings for nodink, Tovarich. Catch on?

"The sad part about these incredible operations which bring so much joy to Communist hearts around the globe is that we usually manage to finance 'em. Nice work if you can get it. (Ah, there, Mr. Khrushchev.)"

On that occasion, I also took the opportunity to commend Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, for having the good sense to stand up in the Senate in January and at least partially call Castro to account.

Shortly afterwards, Congress was treated to an almost daily spectacle of an Oregon Congressman, CHARLES O. PORTER, tirelessly filling the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS with the most fulsome and complimentary articles about Dictator Castro. Under this one-man barrage, all opposition seemed to melt away like an Arab into the night. Looked like Castro was in.

I mention this background in view of a most curious statement from a somewhat disillusioned Congressman PORTER which appears on page 2815 of the Appendix of the April 7 issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

"Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, Dale Francis, correspondent for the Catholic periodical, 'Our Sunday Visitor,' knows much about Cuba. In the past, I have inserted many of his articles in the Appendix, because I was convinced of his good faith and accuracy as a reporter. I have never met him but I have talked with him on the telephone.

"Now he writes, 'My own confidence in the possibility of a victory for freedom with Fidel Castro as the head of the government has been considerably shaken.' He says that in his earlier articles he failed to anticipate the consequences of the unstable character of Castro and he overemphasized the importance of the fact that the vast majority of the Cuban people do not like communism.

"He says the biggest complication in the democratic forces was their organization. He says that he recognizes the strong possibility that Castro may be a Communist and he says Castro's behavior is 'if you say it gently, irrational.'

"Based on my own observations in Cuba and elsewhere, I have been disturbed about many developments. However, I still believe in the good faith of Fidel Castro and I do not believe that he is a Communist. I have written him at length about several important matters that do disturb me. I am looking forward to hearing his explanation by mail or next week when he comes here.

"Castro's job is tremendous and he was not very well prepared for its great responsibilities. Very few people could be. Cuba has been dominated for years by dishonest, terroristic governments. An honest and democratic government cannot be created overnight. However, we can ask that the leadership recognize its affinity with the free world against communism and we can insist that verdicts of acquittal by duly authorized tribunals not be reversed by executive decision. We can also be much disturbed about

the overthrow of able, democratic labor leaders who were open and effective enemies of Batista.

"I do not think Castro is a dictator yet, but I do see an ominous trend. I agree with Dale Francis that 'if it is true that Castro is another dictator and worse, a dictator who does the will of the Reds, then the consequences of this truth are so terrible no one wants to face them.' Face them we will have to if they do occur, but far better that we examine the trend at this time and make certain that Fidel Castro understands it for what it is and has an opportunity to reverse his policies before it is too late, both for himself and Cuba."

This, then, is the present version of Castro by his most ardent American champion in Congress. The words of Mr. PORTER, as well as the revealing article by Dale Francis which followed the remarks of the gentleman from Oregon, give us the deepest forebodings of unpleasant things yet to come. I think the final verdict on Fidel Castro is going to be a most unpleasant one—for all of our gullible U.S. citizenry who bought this red pig-in-a-poke with an irresponsible blank check.

And that includes, among others, the New York Times, the Columbia Broadcasting System, and syndicated columnist Drew Pearson—who 3 months ago ran a favorable report on Castro. The celebrated writer has recently done an about-face on this controversial matter, however, and now has Castro tabbed correctly in a recent frank story about this fellow traveler, if not an outright Red. Better late than never, of course.

I think there are going to be a lot of red faces, in addition to the one worn by Mr. Castro, among our quite numerous fourth-estaters who backed him up so assiduously in the past. Why are we so easily fooled, anyway?

Reaction on Reactors: America Lags in Building Atomic Reactors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, April 25, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, mankind is just beginning to learn the many uses of the mighty might of the "mighty mite," the atom.

The power of the atom can make dreams suddenly become realities for the betterment of all mankind through the creation of a more modern, healthier, and more peaceful world of tomorrow.

Yet, I believe the United States can profitably recall a childhood fable in relation to the Atomic Energy Commission's reactor program. The fable of the tortoise and the hare has a moral we point out to our children, but overlook ourselves.

I feel this Nation needs to move rapidly and purposefully into the field of atomic reactors in order to build into realities our dreams of a better world for tomorrow.

This function, I believe, can quite properly be assumed by the Federal Government, which has at its disposal the tremendous resources required for such a project.

Rapid, judicious action will enable atomic energy to bring closer the full realization of the words from the preamble of our Constitution: "To provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

Mr. President, in support of my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch for Sunday, March 1, 1959, under the heading "A Weak Atomic Energy Program."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A WEAK ATOMIC PROGRAM

The Atomic Energy Commission's new atomic power program is disappointing. It offers neither vision nor leadership.

Of the six reactors proposed, only one would be built by the Government, and the five others are therefore problematical. The lone reactor which the Commission would build is scaled down sharply from the size of the project approved last year.

Most of the proposed projects are prototype or experimental reactors, which means that they are small-scale models leading up to the eventual development of a commercial sized plant.

Prototype plants are a necessary prelude to life-sized atomic power producers; but it is the latter in which the U.S. deficiency is most marked, and in which the Commission continues to steer a timid and uncertain course.

Not only are the AEC proposals puny, they are contingent. Chairman John A. McCone continues to insist, as did his predecessor, Adm. Lewis L. Strauss, that private industry should first have a chance to build, with Government aid.

Like Admiral Strauss, Mr. McCone says that if private industry does not seize this opportunity—and it has been showing an increasing reluctance even to being dragooned into it—the Government itself will take hold. What Mr. McCone does not say is how long public initiative should wait on private initiative before going into action.

The AEC proposals are deficient for not taking a forthright and sensible stand about generating power with the new plutonium-producing reactor being built at the Hanford plant in the State of Washington. Plutonium is necessary for tactical atomic weapons and its production generates large quantities of heat, which the AEC is now wasting into the Columbia River while buying its electric power for Hanford from the Bonneville grid system.

The byproduct heat of the new plutonium reactor could power a 700,000-kilowatt generating plant and provide that much of Hanford's electric requirements at the same time that it was paying off the cost of the total investment three times as fast as would otherwise be possible.

Yet we go on wasting the heat, buying the power it should be producing, and forgoing the opportunity to learn more about reactors that produce both plutonium and power—and all because of theoretical notions that a public versus private power ideology is involved.

The question of Government subsidy becomes more and more formidable as time goes on.

In the present state of the art no one can tell how much it will cost to build an atomic powerplant. Subsidy, therefore, is in the very nature of things a blank check.

Mr. McCone is proposing that the Government now should pay not only for research and development costs of a private atomic powerplant but up to half the cost of the entire plant—perhaps all but the cost of the conventional, nonatomic part, the turbine and generator.

If the Government's financial participation must be so preponderant, then why should not the Government itself build and operate the plant, and turn the product into the AEC installations throughout the country for which power is now having to be purchased?

Must there be waste on a massive scale simply to preserve an illusion that private enterprise is doing it all, though as a matter of fact Government subsidy is doing it?

We think Chairman McCone, far from being able to justify enlarged subsidy, will be hard put to show that it has been good business for the American taxpayer to shoulder the subsidies already expended.

Praise for Secretary Herter From State of Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, April 25, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, all of us wish success to Secretary of State Christian A. Herter in the difficult and arduous task which is his. He confronts a dilemma which has faced few Secretaries of State in our history, because of the emerging might of Soviet Russia in the realm of military weapons, and economic production. A thoughtful and reassuring editorial about Secretary Herter, entitled "Able Successor to Dulles" was published in the Oregon Daily Journal, of Portland, on April 20, 1959. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ABLE SUCCESSOR TO DULLES

In the wake of the Dulles cancer tragedy, this country and its allies are fortunate that so well qualified a man as Christian Herter is ready and able to move into the Secretary of State's shoes at this critical stage of international negotiation.

The American people do not know as much about Herter as they should, but he is known and respected in the circles in which his influence will need to be felt in the period immediately ahead.

The quick and warm response from Democratic Senate leadership to Eisenhower's selection of Herter assures a continuance, possibly even a strengthening of the bipartisan posture which this country has presented on the Berlin and other foreign policy issues. Prompt Senate confirmation is a foregone conclusion.

Herter has been in the State Department only since 1956, but more than two-thirds of a lifetime has been spent in the kind of public service which prepares him for the task ahead. This includes an early introduction to diplomacy as acting minister to Belgium at the age of 21 and service as secretary of the American peace commission and executive secretary of the European Relief Council following World War I.

Twelve years in Congress and two terms as Governor of Massachusetts attest to the confidence which people who know him have in him. In 1956, when Herter was first named Under Secretary of State, one newspaperman

wrote that he had won friends all over the world with his quiet but warm dignity.

As Secretary of State, he will operate differently than Dulles. He will travel less. He will listen more. He will delegate more authority. He will make fewer quick decisions. But this does not necessarily mean he will be less able to make critical decisions or that he will be less firm in dealing with the Russians.

Every man has his own particular talents. Dulles has been a man of great intellect and tremendous strength of will and purpose. Some have called it stubbornness. But whatever it was, it proved its value in some critical situations. Herter is also a man of powerful intellect. His greater warmth and flexibility do not need to mean lesser will and purpose. He has the potential to be an outstanding Secretary of State.

Community Facilities Act of 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, April 25, 1959

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very thoughtful statement by Ernest H. Newman, Jr., of Chattanooga, Tenn., in support of the Community Facilities Act of 1959.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY ERNEST H. NEWMAN, JR., TO THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Good morning, gentlemen. My name is Ernest H. Newman, Jr., of Chattanooga, Tenn., where I am branch manager of the W. S. Dickey Clay Manufacturing Co., whose headquarters are in Kansas City, Mo. We are the largest manufacturer of vitrified clay sewer pipe in the Nation.

By request, I am here to speak for H.R. 5944, the Community Facilities Act of 1959. Along with others in the manufacture of clay sewer pipe, I am in wholehearted accord with what this proposed legislation intends to do, as a practical solution to an urgent national problem.

Gentlemen, a very real, a very serious problem exists.

As manufacturers of clay sewer pipe, we are thoroughly familiar with the growing needs of growing communities, and we are a distinct part of the problem each of them faces for today, and the immediate tomorrow. In the course of my work, every single day in the office or out in the field, I am constantly reminded of the mounting pressures created by the urgent needs of our communities for all manner of public facilities. In this, the greatest Nation on earth, the small political or geographical subdivisions face a serious threat to actual survival. There are critical shortages of schools, hospitals, and water distribution systems, to mention only those most often widely publicized.

There are many other grave needs that, perhaps unfortunately, do not get the banner headlines. One example of the latter is the matter of water pollution control which accentuates the need for adequate sanitary sewer systems and sewage treatment facilities. There is nothing glamorous about a sewer line or a sewage treatment plant.

But no matter what the difficulty, every alert city father or town councilman, is most decidedly aware of the existence of these needs. These people are often abused, maligned, and certainly badgered to distraction by aroused citizens demanding something be done at once. Well, hospitals, and schools, and sewers, are not built overnight. Something more than an awareness of such needs, something more than desire and determination to provide for them, is necessary before the hoped-for stage can be passed. Adequate planning and construction funds must be readily available.

Cities and towns across the land are unable to finance these vital public projects. Their financial resources are too limited, their sources of long-term credit are too restricted and yet, populations keep growing and their service needs continue to increase. Under this bill, some of this pressure can be eased if not entirely eliminated. More and more, our communities are faced with the problem of trying to meet the urgent demand for only the very minimum of basic public facilities, at a time when their sources are sorely taxed to meet day-to-day operating expenses. Often, long-term financing through municipal bond sale cannot be had due to the statutory debt limitations, or, if such financing is available, excessive interest rates make it impractical.

Couple this with the factor of the large initial investment required for the construction of major community facilities, and you have the best reason for the abuses that have grown out of all proportion.

Our communities have had to resort to unrealistic, unhealthy, and uneconomical approaches toward a solution of these demands. For example, the most economical sequence of construction of the three major community facilities, water, sewers, and streets, is to install water and sewer systems prior to paving streets. In actual practice, however, streets are generally paved first, to make an active community more attractive, enabling it to grow and prosper. The second step is usually the installation of water facilities, which often means the newly paved streets are torn up, the water lines put in, and the streets repaved.

You can't really say that money spent in this fashion is spent needlessly, for it does fill the existing need. But surely you can't claim it is being spent economically. The same uneconomical operation is repeated when sewer lines are finally put in under existing pavements.

It is not that our city fathers are unaware of the wastefulness of this construction sequence, rather, it is the result of having to make do with inadequate capital for major public improvements. Although not always the most desirable method, city streets can be constructed little by little, a few blocks at a time, as money for public construction becomes available, a little at a time.

But, gentlemen, there is no way to start from scratch and build a sewer system one block at a time. Initial construction of a sewer system requires an integrated and well planned system of collector lines, trunk lines, and final discharge lines, including sewage treatment facilities. There is no way to construct a sewer line that doesn't go anywhere. It must be a part of a system that ultimately discharges its contents into a suitable and sanitary disposal system.

So what we are encountering more and more is the situation that a sewer system, which entails one of the largest municipal capital expenditures, is being made even more expensive as our cities are finding it difficult if not impossible to secure adequate financing. And yet, you gentlemen agree that adequate sewer systems are both necessary and desirable. You have proven this again and again, by strengthening our public health laws * * * and there you have an impasse.

The Federal and State Governments rightfully are placing greater stress on the problem of pollution. There are instances where complete halting of home and commercial construction has been threatened unless adequate sewerage systems are provided. That, of course, means stagnating and stunting a town's growth potentials. Any town threatened with extinction and legal bars to further construction, finds itself cornered. Bond capital is virtually exhausted as the credit is used up to build streets and other improvements. Thus, when the law steps in demanding something be done about wastes, it is imperative that the town find new sources of financing. This bill makes an attempt to relieve that problem. It is an extremely difficult thing to accept how many full-grown cities do not yet have a sewer system or adequate facilities for coping with wastes.

Yet when the city fathers become sorely pressed and must start thinking about building something adequate for at least their present needs—without thought of any probable expansion—the cost often staggers them, particularly when there are no financial propsects in sight to pay for these vital projects. But if they are not built, that town's growth stops by the very laws you have passed and must insist on enforcing.

There has been some criticism of spending the amount of money proposed. But I fail to see any reference in this bill to where any community is to obtain any sort of facility as an outright gift. You aren't making presents of hospitals, water or sewer systems. It is my understanding that you are hoping to save the smaller communities from serious threats to their health, welfare, and public safety. The larger towns will have equal access to funds from which they may borrow to cover the costs of similar construction.

Those who carp and criticize you for spending are often the most vocal when it comes to demanding increased facilities. But, gentlemen, a loan is scarcely the same as a grant or a gift. All you propose here is a fund from which money may be borrowed. In appearing before this committee today I have not tried to suggest that you wave a magic wand for anyone. Instead, I want to emphasize what I believe you intend to accomplish with this bill.

As good citizens, as the elected representatives of good citizens, you seek here to enact enabling legislation to help village, town, and city, to help itself. As a manufacturer of clay sewer pipe, that is also my interest. You want to replace the privvies, the cesspools, the septic tanks, and this must be done. You want your children and mine, and their children, to have a safe, a sanitary place to live and to grow in good health.

What will happen if you make these funds available at an interest rate any community can pay? For one thing, you can insure and assure proper planning for most economical building and growth. Building a sewage-treatment plant, for example, is something rarely considered in advance of building a town and striving to make it grow. The days when waste could be dumped into the nearest stream or river are gone—fortunately for ours and future generations. Yet after you have built a treatment plant, you must still lay the pipe to bring the sewage to it.

This bill will make that possible from one coast to the other, from Mexico to Canada, within these United States. This is an economic assistance program, if you will, gentlemen, that begins and ends at home—your home and mine. On the one hand you insist that communities clean up the mess—they know that inadequate sanitary facilities are a menace to public health—now you are giving them the means whereby they can economically, honestly, and practically, comply with the laws passed by you in their interest.

Thank you.

Does the CIA Dominate U.S. Foreign Policy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, April 25, 1959

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Does the CIA Dominate U.S. Foreign Policy" written by Frank Bellamy and published in the National Guardian of April 20, 1959.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOES THE CIA DOMINATE U. S. FOREIGN POLICY?

(By Frank Bellamy)

("If war is too important to be left to the generals, it should be clear that intelligence is too important to be left unsupervised." (Hanson Baldwin, N.Y. Times, Jan. 15, 1956.))

Spying has become a major industry of American Government. According to Harper's magazine (April 1958) no fewer than nine separate cloak-and-dagger outfits are at work, carrying out clandestine intrigue on a worldwide basis and spending each year in the neighborhood of $750 million of the taxpayers' money.

"Though exact figures are secret, estimates suggest that between 20,000 to 30,000 fulltime intelligence specialists currently are on Government payrolls," said Harry Howe Ransom, author of Central Intelligence and National Security, in the Christian Science Monitor (Dec. 1, 1958). "The cost probably approaches $750 million annually."

The most lushly financed, of course, is the Central Intelligence Agency. The other eight, which have to get along on lesser amounts, are the intelligence branches of the National Security Agency, State Department, Atomic Energy Commission, U.S. Information Agency, FBI, Army, Navy, and Air Force.

NO CONTROLS

The CIA, now housed in 30 or more scattered buildings in Washington, is erecting an enormous $55 million edifice for itself across the river in Virginia. When completed it will be the world's biggest spy center, accommodating more than 10,000 CIA employees. Best estimates place CIA's total domestic payroll at 14,000 and its budget near $500 million a year.

After it was established in 1947 under President Truman's administration, this professional undercover army was granted by law a degree of immunity from accountability for funds, personnel, and activities probably never exceeded by any other Federal agency in American history.

It is the only major agency not subject to congressional committee control.

Nobody except the President and a few other persons, including 10 or 12 select Congressmen who are briefed once a year at budget time, know how much the secret legion spends. All funds for CIA are disguised and concealed in appropriations for other agencies.

The funds themselves are not subject to audit. Top gumshoe Allen Welsh Dulles can write a $1 million check without explaining the expenditure to anyone. He is the only man in Washington, including the President, with such power.

The CIA is exempted by law from the Civil Service requirements imposed on most Government agencies; it can hire and fire at will.

SACRED COW

This is too much power and supersecrecy for Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, Montana. Four times he has sponsored bills to create a joint Senate-House watchdog committee to scrutinize CIA. Despite editorial backing from such influential papers as the New York Times and Wall Street Journal, MANSFIELD lost each time. Most of his colleagues in Congress still look on CIA as a sacred cow.

Why is the CIA so inordinately jealous of its power and prerogatives, so anxious to maintain itself beyond the reach of the lawmakers? One reason, the record seems to indicate, is to cover up bungles—some ludicrous, most of them expensive—which would open it to ridicule.

On the ludicrous side, "there are such stories as the news account in a Washington paper some months back of a free-for-all in a downtown restaurant between CIA and FBI men. Each group, the paper reported, had mistaken the other for Communist agents." (New York Times, Mar. 16, 1958.)

On the expensive side, there was the time—as reported by columnist Westbrook Pegler—that "agents of the CIA handed over $10 million in unmarked $10 bills to the secret service of the Communist Government of Poland in the belief that they were dealing with some underground organization which was opposing that government."

Pegler, by the way, thinks the CIA is "no good and ought to be wiped out."

PLAIN LOUSY

Then there are intelligence failures for which CIA would rather not be held accountable. The most publicized fumble was its flatfootedness on the eruption of revolutions in Lebanon and Iraq. Both took place without advance forecasts from our vast espionage network. "They didn't know what was going on," Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, angrily charged. "Our intelligence is just plain lousy."

The New York Times' military expert Hanson Baldwin said (Jan. 15, 1956): "The intelligence record of the Nation and the CIA in particular is spotty. There have been notable successes but also notable failures. * * * A great many other incidents also suggest that all is not well with our intelligence establishments."

A more significant motive for secrecy than concealing bungles and fumbles is CIA's desire to keep its bag of "dirty tricks" from the eyes of the public. It realizes that millions would disapprove if many of its devious dealings came to light. Protests would surely follow exposure of the extent to which CIA adventurism has shaped U.S. diplomacy and, in policy toward some nations, replaced it altogether.

POLICYMAKER

Charles Edmundson, who spent 8 years in the U.S. Foreign Service before resigning 2 years ago over Secretary Dulles' policies, accused the CIA in February's Progressive magazine of being "an activist group which steps in boldly to dictate foreign policy in areas not covered by decisions of Congress, the State Department, or the White House." Edmundson went on:

"It executes its projects without concern over the reaction of the public. The incidents it provokes are never acknowledged, yet can be decisive in shaping—or misshaping—public opinion and foreign policy. * * *

"The most fundamental of all civil liberties is the right of the citizen to make up his mind on public issues without having the facts concealed or distorted by his Government. The record shows that the CIA, in cooperation with the State Department, systematically contravenes this principle. A few examples of what is happening creep obscurely into some of the better newspapers, but nowhere, save in a few liberal publications, are Americans warned of the potential consequence of the farflung operations of the secrecy-ridden CIA."

Liaison between the State Department and CIA is close. Both are headed by a Dulles. Both employ about the same number of people (16,000 for the State Department versus an estimated 14,000 for the CIA). If the CIA's $500 million budget is correct, it is more than twice as much as the State Department spends on its 282 diplomatic outposts around the world.

In any case, the secret decisions of the Brothers Dulles affect the fate of the world. When ill-directed, they make enemies abroad and cause great damage at home.

Hanson Baldwin summed it up well (New York Times, Jan. 15, 1956):

"Uncontrolled secret intelligence agencies are in a position to dominate policymaking, and hence government. Their very secrecy gives them power; there are few to accept or reject their findings. * * * Any overpowerful secret intelligence agency is dangerous, not alone to the formulation of sound policy, but to the viability of democratic institutions."

Will Clayton and the Marshall Plan—The New Leader Discusses Ellen Clayton Garwood's Book

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, April 25, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Marshall plan, which helped so many peoples when they most needed assistance, is one of the finest examples of democracy in action.

One of the men who played a major role in the fashioning of this plan was Will Clayton, of Texas, a man noted for his work in helping people. Will Clayton is one of the foremost citizens of Texas and the United States.

William E. Bohn discusses the part which Will Clayton played in the formulation of the Marshall plan in an article in the New Leader.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD Mr. Bohn's article, published in the New Leader for April 27, 1959, under the heading "Will Clayton and the Marshall Plan."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILL CLAYTON AND THE MARSHALL PLAN

(By William E. Bohn)

Until I got well along in Ellen Clayton Garwood's short biography of her father, "Will Clayton," I saw small reason why I should devote to it the best part of a fine, rainy day.

The leftists, the writers of PM, for example, were just naturally suspicious of Clayton, the tall, straight and successful Texan. He had been head of the biggest cotton company in the world. And then, without selling his stock, he had become vice president of the Export-Import Bank, Assistant Secretary of Commerce, Surplus War Property

Administrator, Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, and half a dozen other things in Washington. The fact that he had become a millionaire and lived in a fine house in Texas made everything worse.

But Clayton did not, like some other successful men whom we have had around lately, regard Federal positions as cafeteria opportunities. Reaching agreements with Europeans, Asians, and Africans was no new experience to him. His heart bled for the poverty and suffering which he witnessed around the world. During World War II he had continued his business trips over much of what we now call the Free World, doing his best to keep markets open and countries and companies afloat. Practically everywhere Clayton had friends who trusted him and whom he trusted.

Starting as a poor boy, he had developed the habit of success. His political positions were not just fortunate and accidental. He was used to organizing projects which led to improvements. When people were not producing enough to feed and clothe themselves, something had to be done. And the something was not in the line of books, articles, and speeches. Business had to be reorganized, capital redistributed, goods shipped where they were needed.

After the war, the world was in such a tragic state that these things had to be done quickly. If at the time we had had in the State Department the kind of pronouncement-making routineers we have been watching for some years, Europe would surely have gone to pot. But, fortunately we had at the helm a set of realistic, energetic men.

Among them was the subject of this biography, which is a daughter's loving tribute to an admired father rather than a comprehensive and satisfactory slice of history. Mrs. Garwood hints in her preface that a later and more expensive biography is on the way. But she does furnish enough documents to show that Clayton pulled a strong oar in the State Department while the Marshall plan was being fashioned.

This historic proposal was launched at Harvard University on June 5, 1947. The address which sent it forth was a magnificent expression of human understanding and international sympathy. If young people still learned to read as they used to do by pursuing fine speeches, this oration, simple as it is, should be a feature of all advanced reading books.

Secretary George Marshall spoke in the most restrained terms: "In considering the requirements for the rehabilitation of Europe * * * it has become obvious * * * that [the] visible destruction was probably less serious than the dislocation of the entire fabric of European economy. * * * The remedy lies in * * * restoring the confidence of the European people in the economic future of their own countries and of Europe as a whole. * * * Before the U.S. Government can proceed much further in its efforts to alleviate the situation * * * there must be some agreement among the countries of Europe as to the requirements of the situation and the part those countries themselves will take in order to give proper effect to whatever action might be undertaken by this government. * * * With foresight and willingness on the part of our people to face up to the vast responsibility which history has clearly placed upon our country, the difficulties I have outlined can and will be overcome."

These words were spoken, as I said, on June 5. On March 5 of the same year, the Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, Will Clayton, wrote a memorandum while enjoying the quiet of an airplane journey. Referring to Communist efforts to win the peoples of Eastern and Central Europe he set down: "Feeding on hunger, economic misery and frustration, these attacks have already been successful in some of the liberated countries, and there is now grave danger that they may be successful in others. The security and interests of the United States and of the world demand that the United States take prompt and effective action to assist certain of these gravely threatened countries. This assistance should take the form not only of financial aid but of technical and administrative assistance as well." Continuing, Clayton went more deeply into the whole matter than did Secretary Marshall.

The affectionate and admiring daughter makes no claims as to her father's services, but anyone who takes a look at the evidence must conclude that he was right at the center of the group of men who devised the Marshall plan and had a good deal to do with saving the free world.

Congressman Boggs Scores Hit in Chicago With Talk on H.R. 5

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include a remarkable address by the Honorable HALE BOGGS, our distinguished colleague from Louisiana, at the 22d Chicago World Trade Conference. Congressman BOGGS spoke on the subject of "How To Encourage American Investment Abroad" with especial reference to H.R. 5. From the many letters I am receiving from Chicago I would conclude that few speakers have ever impressed a Chicago audience as did the gentleman from Louisiana on that occasion. The following letter is from Walker B. Davis, counsel of the Chicago Bridge & Iron Co.:

The Chicago Bridge & Iron Co. designs, fabricates, and erects large steel plate structures, such as tanks used for the storage of petroleum products at refineries and bulk stations, as well as tanks and other containers for many other industries. We have done a great deal of work in foreign countries. Sometimes we have furnished the fabricated steel, while in other cases we have erected fabricated steel supplied from outside the United States. We are anxious to continue our foreign operations, and also to expand them, but the tax burden imposed by the Government of the United States on the results of such operations puts us at a competitive disadvantage as compared with foreign contractors. Indeed, these considerations may force us to transfer the conduct of such operations to a subsidiary organized in another country.

I have had the pleasure of meeting Mr. BOGGS and listening to him speak on this subject. I think he knows a great deal about it and, of course, I need not tell you what a fine gentleman he is. Perhaps you will be interested in the enclosed copy of the address he delivered at the 22d Chicago World Trade Conference on February 27. I think it is as good a statement as I have seen of the reasons why this bill should, as I believe, be enacted into law.

Congressman BOGGS' address follows:

HOW TO ENCOURAGE AMERICAN INVESTMENT ABROAD

(Address by Hon. HALE BOGGS, U.S. Congressman from Louisiana, member, Committee on Ways and Means, at the 22d Chicago World Trade Conference, Palmer House, Chicago, February 26–27, 1959; sponsors: Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry and Export Managers Club of Chicago, Inc.)

I was delighted to receive the invitation to address this the 22d Chicago World Trade Conference. I am always glad for an opportunity to come to Chicago. Chicago typifies in so many was the dynamic industrial, commercial, financial and political leadership which has made America great. I find here so much in common with my own home city of New Orleans. We, too, have problems of slum clearance, rehabilitation of blighted areas, and long-range planning for civic improvements and industrial development. And now Chicago, like New Orleans, is to be a major seaport and center of world trade. As you know, New Orleans is second only to New York in the dollar volume of world trade clearing through its port facilities.

The leadership of the Illinois Congressional Delegation under my esteemed colleague and dear friend on the Committee on Ways and Means, Hon. THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, is so persuasive that I have supported him on most matters in which you are interested—particularly in his valiant fight for increased diversion of water from Lake Michigan.

The spirit of friendly competition which may now develop between the new and expanded port facilities in the Chicago area, and other established centers of world commerce in the United States will be beneficial to all. As reflecting this spirit of friendly competition from New Orleans, I should like to remind you that the Port of New Orleans has maintained in Chicago for several years now an executive general agent, Mr. André Mouton, who holds membership both in the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry and in the Export Managers Club of Chicago, Inc., the two sponsoring organizations of this World Trade Conference. These two great centers of world commerce, united as they are via the Mississippi River, can provide a firm foundation for the great volume of world trade which I am convinced holds the key to the longer range hopes for peace.

It is difficult to overstate the importance of an expanding volume of world trade to the long range security of the United States and the free world. To me, peace, freedom and world trade are indivisible. World peace hinges on world trade—not a permanent program of foreign aid. And trade can be mutually advantageous over a prolonged period only if all countries have the facilities to produce whatever the combination of their natural resources, the natural capacity of their people, and their available capital will permit.

I am convinced that the people of the United States have about had their fill of what appears to be an endless program of Government economic aid to foreign countries. I find in my travels throughout the world that the really responsible people in recipient countries question the soundness of an aid program on any permanent basis. As a temporary program to insure rapid revival of the economies of Western Europe following World War II, I firmly believe that the Marshall plan may have preserved from Communist unrest a most important part of free world culture.

But it should be apparent to all that something more dynamic and less artificial must now be employed to develop the economic resources of all countries outside the Communist orbit. The last Congress recognized the significance of further expansion

of trade by extending the reciprocal trade agreement legislation for another 4 years. It is most encouraging that this program, conceived and inspired by one of the greatest Secretaries of State of all time, Hon. Cordell Hull, has now become truly bipartisan.

President Eisenhower has frequently stated that increased private investment is essential to the economic progress of less developed countries. In his recent budget message the President said:

"The greater share of investment capital and technical ability in the United States and other highly developed countries is to be found in private hands."

Thus far, however, the President in his series of messages to the Congress has failed to recommend any legislation in this area other than expansion of the program of guarantees to American private investors against losses caused by inconvertibility of currencies, expropriation, or war. Unfortunately, the administration still is in the study stage of possibilities for stimulating private investment abroad. As stated in the budget message:

"Studies are being conducted by the Department of State and the Business Advisory Council of the Department of Commerce on ways to increase the role of private investment, management, and technical training abroad."

It has fallen upon the Congress to assume the initiative in this as in many other areas which are vital to the American economy and the peace of the world. I say with some pride, we have a program equal to the task. Last December my Subcommittee on Foreign Trade Policy held a full week of hearings on the future prospects for U.S. private investment abroad. At that time statements were made by more than 50 representatives of agriculture, commerce and industry, and experts from government and academic life.

Most frequently mentioned in the testimony before our subcommittee was the recommendation for changes in the Federal tax structure to enable American private investment to go abroad on a basis competitive with investors from other countries. A number of specific recommendations were made for changes in the treatment of income from foreign sources. From these recommendations I selected those which seemed to have the greatest merit and common support. I have adapted these recommendations to conform with my own views, of course, and included them in a bill which I introduced on the opening day of the 86th Congress. This bill, the Foreign Investment Incentive Tax Act of 1959, will, I believe, encourage a substantial increase in American investment abroad.

The cornerstone of H.R. 5 is the provision for a new class of domestic corporation to conduct the foreign operations of American firms. Known as foreign business corporations, these companies would be permitted to retain the earnings derived from foreign operations for use in the expansion of foreign investment and trade activities without any immediate payment of U.S. tax. They would pay U.S. tax on foreign source income only when it is withdrawn from foreign operation, either by a distribution to shareholders or upon diversion to purposes unrelated to foreign operations. Income from foreign sources will qualify for deferral only if the foreign business corporation derives substantially all of its income from business done outside the United States.

In recent years, in order to compete with British, Canadian, French, or German businessmen, American businessmen have been compelled to seek tax shelter havens in Tangier, Lichtenstein or Panama, et al. Consequently, the proposed deferral of Federal tax burden upon earnings reinvested abroad will result in no significant loss of United States revenue; in fact, one of the witnesses before our committee predicted that, absent a change in Federal tax law during the next 5 years and assuming the world stays prosperous, he has no doubt that there would, at the end of this 5-year period, be little export income on which the United States will collect taxes. I firmly believe that United States businessmen should not be compelled to abandon the American flag when they go abroad: they should not be compelled to organize and operate under foreign flags but, instead, should be encouraged to go abroad and take with them their country's flag—and along with it the great combination of ingenuity, skill and daring that has made our free enterprise system the most dynamic economic system in the world.

You are all familiar with the tax treatment provided since 1942 for Western Hemisphere trade corporations. These corporations have been taxable at a rate 14 percentage points lower than the tax rates applicable to other corporations. These benefits are limited to a corporation which does all of its business in the Western Hemisphere. Section 4 of my bill would extend the same benefits to United States companies doing business in any foreign country if specified conditions as to kind and source of income are met. These qualifications are substantially the same as those now prescribed for Western Hemisphere trade corporations except for an increase from 5 percent to 10 percent in the leeway allowed for incidental income from sources within the United States. Experience has shown that the present 5 percent limitation is too restrictive.

I understand there was some surprise when I included this section in my bill. I have been told that the budgetary facts of life will not permit even the temporary loss of revenue. I am certainly in favor of a balanced budget and shall do all in my power to curtail unnecessary Government expenditures. But I say to you that our chance for a balanced budget will be greater, if we provide encouragement for American business to assume directly more of the risk of economic development in the countries in the free world. Indeed, there is very likely to be a greater tax yield from a 38 percent rate of return on the increased volume of foreign activities of American business than from a 52 percent rate on the more restricted activities under existing law.

The reason for enacement of the Western Hemisphere trade corporation provision in 1942 was that American corporations in South America were placed at a considerable competitive disadvantage with corporations from other countries. Since the same competitive inequity now exists throughout the free world, it is only fcir that all U.S. corporations engaged in foreign trade should be treated alike. It is high time that we discard the provincialism which gave rise to this artificial distinction between East and West.

The 14 percentage point tax differential is justified by the same considerations whether the foreign operations be conducted in Pakistan ,on in Peru—in Burma or in Brazil—in the East Indies or in the West Indies.

One of the most perplexing problems encountered by American corporations which have engaged in foreign trade through subsidiaries organized in a foreign country has been that of shifting capital from a subsidiary in one foreign country to another subsidiary in another country, where the capital can be more effectively utilized. Under existing law it is not possible to make such transfers without recognition of gain or loss unless prior clearance is obtained from the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. Likewise, if the U.S. corporation finds it necessary to transfer appreciated assets to a foreign subsidiary, a taxable gain is recognized unless prior to the transfer the Commissioner looks into the transaction and senses no potential of tax savings.

I understand that some favorable rulings have been issued in some situations, but only after much delay—accompanied with considerable pain and suffering—and frequently on a very arbitrary basis. Section 3 of H.R. 5 would relieve this situation by providing that no advance ruling shall be necessary for property actually used in a trade or business outside the United States, or for stock in a corporation actively engaged in such a trade or business. The elimination of the requirement for advance clearance in such cases will be most beneficial to corporations which have been engaged in foreign trade for a long time; however, it will also afford assurance of companies now entering foreign trade that their capital can be shipped to other areas without arbitrary delays and uncertain tax consequences.

A potentially important technique for fostering private investment in underdeveloped areas is that of tax sparing. Many underdeveloped countries try to attract capital by waiving taxes for a limited period of time upon new enterprises, or upon investments in existing enterprises. However, a program of tax sparing offers no incentive to U.S. companies, for they must pay U.S. taxes on the waived profits. It has been suggested that American companies which accept in good faith tax waivers extended to them by foreign governments should be deemed to have paid the waived foreign taxes for the purpose of the foreign tax credit provisions of the Revenue Code. The Treasury and State Departments have been much interested in this policy, and have recommended that it be accomplished by tax treaties. While many of these underdeveloped countries are not yet committed to the Soviet bloc, they are readily susceptible to domination by the Soviet bloc if that should appear to them to be their only source of capital. We may alienate otherwise friendly nations by thwarting their efforts to attract American capital by nullifying their tax sparing program with our tax laws. A serious difficulty exists in the efforts to implement tax sparing by tax treaty. Tax sparing by tax treaty circumvents congressional authority in the field of taxation. I prefer a legislative mandate which recognizes incentive tax sparing by foreign countries as taxes paid for the purposes of the U.S. foreign tax credit. Section 6 of the bill provides such a mandate, but the Secretary of State will be authorized to certify unilaterally which foreign tax-sparing legislation will be recognized for U.S. tax purposes. Under this approach the Secretary of State will not be required to negotiate complicated and time-consuming tax treaties. He may, of course, if he deems it a wise policy, negotiate executive agreements with foreign nations in order to obtain reciprocal benefits. On many occasions, this should prove to be an extremely useful instrument in implementing the foreign policy of our country.

Since the foreign tax credit provisions were first introduced into the taxing system, there has been a need for a liberalization of the strict country by country limitation. Equality of treatment has long demanded that each taxpayer have an option to choose between the country by country limitation and an overall limitation in determining his foreign tax credit. I have provided for this liberalization by prescribing an alternative means of computing the maximum amount of credit which can be allowed against the U.S. tax with respect to any taxes due foreign governments. It is only in this manner that the fundamental purpose of the foreign tax credit—the prevention of double taxation of income earned abroad—can truly be achieved.

Section 7 of my bill would correct an inequity in the present law, relating to gain realized by a parent company upon the involuntary conversion of property belonging to a foreign subsidiary. Frequently, a domestic corporation must do business through a subsidiary in a country in which it is either impossible or difficult to secure adequate insurance coverage. In these instances it is a

normal practice for the domestic parent corporation to insure the property of the subsidiary doing business in that country. If the property of the foreign subsidiary is destroyed, say by fire or by storm, the domestic parent is required to pay a tax at ordinary income rates on the insurance proceeds received even though it uses these proceeds to replace the lost property. This tax penalty deters investments in foreign countries where this insurance problem exists. There is no justifiable reason for denying the parent corporation the usual nonrecognition of gain upon involuntary conversions of this kind.

I have been much encouraged by the response which has followed my introduction of H.R. 5. Many of you undoubtedly have other equally sound proposals that you feel should be enacted. I am sure you will all recognize that there is a real danger in trying to accomplish too much. Many groups similar to yours have evidenced a genuine interest in this matter and have displayed an understanding of the necessity for the realistic approach which I have taken in this bill. I have been informed that the public advisory groups established by the President in the world trade area can be expected to come forward with constructive recommendation in the tax field. I would hope that these reports may be forthcoming at an early date. In any event, I am encouraged by the fact that the administration in Washington is at least interesting itself in this very vital problem.

Some of the proposals included in H.R. 5 have been discussed for years and have been recommended by careful students of the impact of Federal taxes upon private foreign investment. We have had enough study. Now is the time to put them into effect. The immediate importance of private investment in providing a sound basis for supplementing and replacing foreign economic aid calls for action at this session of Congress. The American people must be given a practical alternative to the indefinite continuation of $1½ to $2 billion a year in appropriation for foreign economic aid and technical development.

The most effective way to carry the message of the American way into the uncommitted countries of the free world is to make available to them private capital and business management, which this country can provide. In the long run we shall not make friends by giving handouts, and we can only teach the dynamic character of the free enterprise system by demonstrating directly how it works. This is a great cause, and I should hope that you might make it your cause.

The final decision on the future of this measure really rests with the business community—alert businessmen such as yourselves—genuinely concerned with private enterprise and with assuring that our foreign economic policy truly reflects the basic principles of our free enterprise system. You are aware of the challenges that confront us. With your support, we can reach our goal.

Thank you.

The Role of the Federal Government in Basic Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, April 25, 1959

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I had the pleasure and privilege of hearing the address of Dr. L. E. Burney, the Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service, at the dedication of new laboratory facilities of Wistar Institute in Philadelphia on April 17, 1959. The address was on "The Role of the Federal Government in Basic Research." It is so timely, so informative, and so very able, that I would like to bring it to the attention of the Senate and of the country. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ROLE OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN BASIC RESEARCH [1]

(By L. E. Burney, M.D., Surgeon General, Public Health Service, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare)

There is a sentence in "The Education of Henry Adams" which reads: "A teacher affects eternity; he can never tell where his influence stops." One hundred and fifty years ago Dr. Caspar Wistar began a collection of specimens to be used in the teaching of anatomy at the University of Pennsylvania. Today we honor him in the rededication of an institution bearing his name, an institution which has contributed significantly to the scientific life of our Nation and which will continue to do so in increasing measure.

When the Wistar Institute was dedicated in 1894 the principal speaker was that giant personality in medical science, Sir William Osler. If he were here today I am sure Sir William would welcome the institute's commitment to an expanded and more diversified research effort, a commitment implicit in these ceremonies.

At those same dedication exercises 65 years ago, Dr. William Pepper, then provost of the University of Pennsylvania and president of the Wistar Institute's board of managers, discussed the relations between the institute and the university. "When," he asked, "will we learn that concentration and cooperation are consistent with the maintenance of absolutely distinct individuality, and that they are the secret and the source of power and of rapid progress?"

I believe that question is answered here. Since its inception, the Wistar Institute—a privately endowed institution—has cooperated with many other groups and interests, but at the same time has retained its full independence.

Nevertheless, Dr. Pepper's question is as provocative today as it was in 1894. It is especially so for me, in view of my assigned topic: "The Role of the Federal Government in Basic Research." I should like to direct my remarks to the question, and to the way it is being answered across the Nation. I shall first comment on the term "basic research"; then I wish to discuss the essentials in any system of support for scientific research, as well as the role of the Federal Government in such a system; and finally, to illustrate the foregoing by describing how Public Health Service programs aid the Wistar Institute in carrying out its new mission.

BASIC RESEARCH

There are perhaps as many definitions of basic research as there are individuals who are willing to have the record show their views on the subject.

Basic research can be defined in terms of how the sicentist perceives his investigation. It can also be defined in terms of how other scientists appraise the results of his studies.

Basic research is a term often used to help the public understand a segment of the total scientific endeavor; it is also used to help foundations, government, and industry in the classification of the research they support or conduct.

Basic research is often used as if it were in itself a measure of excellence; in this connotation, any research that is not basic is somehow deemed inferior.

I do not propose to explore the multiple facets of what I feel to be essentially an artificial exercise in semantics. I tend to agree with Dr. H. A. Shepard, who wrote in the "Journal of the Philosophy of Science" (23, 57, 1956): "Efforts to define basic research operationally are misleading and bring about neglect of the forces that produce it—the training, discipline, values, way of life, and system of social control that motivate men to advance knowledge for its own sake. * * * Support of basic research means support of a social system which so motivates men."

There are, however, two points that I wish to make relative to the vitally important aspect of undirected inquiry in science referred to as basic research.

First, if basic research is truly to progress, if it is to have greater emphasis and broader support, we must find ways to increase the prestige, dignity, and reward associated with intellectual and scholarly pursuits of all kinds, both the sciences and the humanities. Inseparable from this is the need for elevating the status of our institutions of higher learning. Given these conditions, basic research will flourish. In the absence of these conditions, with social values focused on the immediate, material yield from investment, basic research will not progress at a rate commensurate with the need for knowledge.

Second, it is of utmost importance for those who foster basic research to recognize that the mechanisms and dollar levels of support are means, not ends. In the recent evolution of science policy in the United States, a great deal of attention has been focused on the means. This is a vital and never-ending matter of concern. But it seems clear that society now recognizes the importance of supporting research; that the essentials of sound support have been delineated, and, for the most part are applied.

Now that this foundation has been laid, we can, and should, devote more and more attention to the ends. We cannot predict whither the limitless advances of science will lead us as a Nation in an increasingly interdependent community of nations. Yet we need to comtemplate the obscure future and consider earnestly how we may assist its unfolding toward the preservation and improvement of human life.

ESSENTIALS OF SUPPORT

I have mentioned the essentials of sound support for scientific research. Simply stated, they incorporate the following conditions. The freedom of the investigator must be protected. The integrity of the institution must be maintained. There must be continuity of support with adequate sums of money. In the absence of any one of these essentials, the mechanism of support is faulty.

At the present time, these conditions may be created by the use of either private funds or public funds. In point of fact, the differences in the terms and conditions of support which formerly characterized both public and private sources have virtually disappeared. I would subscribe to the principle of diversity in the origins of support for research, both in terms of the balance between public and private support, and in terms of many sources as contrasted with a single public source of support. It is gratifying, however, that the various agencies and organizations which support scientific research are more alike than dissimilar in their policies and procedures, and can be treated in a broad sense as if they were one.

With such wide agreement in practice, can we not accept as guiding principles some of

[1] Presented at the dedication of new laboratory facilities of the Wistar Institute, Philadelphia, Pa., April 17, 1959.

the conditions which are essential for the conduct of scientific research in our society, but which are continuously restated as though they are still debatable issues? In accepting such guides, we need not specify the political and administrative mechanisms through which they operate in the various sources of support. But we would, I believe, clear the air in discussions of the roles of different sources.

I would propose the following guides for your consideration:

1. Funds for science and research must be available on an expanding scale—derived from a diversity of public and private sources; with satisfactory distribution among the fields of science, and with an enlarging proportion available for fundamental inquiry.

2. The terms and conditions of support for research should increasingly provide for broader areas of inquiry and longer periods of committed support.

3. For the investigator, the terms of support should assure freedom in choosing areas of study and flexibility in their pursuit; encourage creativity and diminish administrative burdens; permit freedom of communication and assure continuity and stability of support.

4. For the institution, such terms and conditions should provide for the full payment of the costs of research; seek a productive balance between research and teaching functions; and permit a substantial degree of freedom in the use of funds in the furtherance of institutional goals, objectives, and standards of excellence.

5. The further growth of science requires the early indentification of promising talent and motivation of talented persons toward scholarly pursuits. Hence, the educational and training process must not only provide knowledge and skill, but also encourage curiosity and imagination, impart comprehension of the unity of all scientific effort, and instill a sense of the moral and social values of science as part of a democratic society in a world community.

6. Science is but one facet of the constantly expanding panorama of human endeavor. Hence, the advancement of science must stimulate and parallel progress in political judgment, economic sophistication, creativity in the arts, humanities, and other scholarly pursuits.

The foregoing points may be stated in different ways. But I feel quite certain that however stated, they would suffice as guides equally well for a philanthropic foundation, an industry, or a governmental agency engaged in the support of research and in the creation of resources for research in the future.

ROLE OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

From the founding of the Nation, the Federal Government has had to have scientific information pertinent to its responsibilities for national resources, defense, and welfare. A government may advance knowledge through research in its own agencies or through the support of scientific investigations by individuals beyond its control. The motivation of the individuals conducting such investigations may be to acquire knowledge for its own sake; but the motivations of governments are practical and political.

The welding of such motivations in a joint endeavor may be illustrated in the history of the United States by reference to the Lewis and Clark Expedition in 1805. The explorers may have been conducting basic research of their times, since they certainly carried out a disciplined search for the unknown, using creative and analytic thought and the instruments of measurement then available. For the U.S. Government, the expedition had the practical, political purpose of opening up the great Northwest. Bernard De Voto writes movingly of this early search for knowledge by the young Government:

"They toiled westward in the sun's path * * * fulfilling a dream which Meriwether Lewis had had in his boyhood, fulfilling an older, more complex dream of Thomas Jefferson's, and by strength and skill and valor they rolled the unknown back before them. The country ahead of them was an untraveled chaos, the boundary of man's knowledge moved with them, they passed—and the map was made forever."

Scientists, institutions, governments, and the public now have a much more sophisticated view of scientific research and the role of the Federal Government in its advancement. Basically, however, there is little change in the motivations and the roles. The Government has responsibilities to get the Nation's work done—be it the advancement of hydroponic farming, the conquest of space, or the conquest of cancer. Fundamental knowledge throughout the range of scientific disciplines is indispensable to the discharge of these responsibilities.

The specific means by which the Government advances fundamental knowledge have evolved with the evolution of science, and with the growth of the Nation's intellectual and economic resources, its institutions, and its needs. The contemporary scientific revolution, worldwide in scope and nuclear-powered in drive, has broadened the responsibilities of the Federal Government for science policy and program. Its responsibilities include participation with Federal and non-Federal groups in the formulation of research policies in particular areas; conduct and support of research; and provision of other types of assistance to scientists and institutions in meeting their obligations to the national scientific effort.

These responsibilities can be examined more satisfactorily when they are reduced from the general to the specific. Let us, then, scan briefly the national research effort in the medical, biological, and related life sciences, and the part played in these activities by the Federal Government. I shall use the term "medical research" in its broadest possible connotation, to include all health-related sciences.

The total national expenditure for medical research this year is approximately $575 million. This level has been reached in a period of rapid growth beginning in the 1940's.

Half of the current expenditures comes from non-Federal sources. It is significant, I believe, that the proportion of non-Federal support is higher in medical research than in many other areas of research, such as electronics, engineering, and rocket propellants.

Prominent among non-Federal sources of support for medical research are the chemical and pharmaceutical industries, foundations and endowments, voluntary health agencies, and State governments. Although we lack comprehensive data on the expenditures of these sources, it is important to recognize that their activities are intimately related to the sound evolution of health and medical programs. One of the most encouraging trends of recent years is the increasing attention of State governments to medical research, over and above their large commitments to medical education. And I would observe here that the State of Pennsylvania is one of the most enlightened and aggressive States in this area.

The pattern of medical research in the Federal Government reflects both the importance of research as a component of any broad operating mission and the commitment to diversity in public sources of funds. Thus the National Science Foundation, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Departments of Defense and Agriculture, the Veterans' Administration—all carry out broadly conceived research programs in the life sciences, either direct or through grants and contracts. The recently established National Aeronautical and Space Agency is preparing to mount a significant program of research in biology and medicine as related to the flight of man in space. And the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in its primary concern with the health and well-being of the American people, administers extensive programs of medical and health-related research.

The bulk of the Department's health research activity is in the programs of the Public Health Service. Within the Service, the National Institutes of Health is our major research arm, in the scope and volume of its activities and in the formulation of research policies. This year, appropriations to the National Institutes of Health comprise 70 percent of the Federal Government's expenditures for medical research, and nearly 30 percent of the Nation's total expenditure in this field.

THE WISTAR INSTITUTE AND THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Since the interests of the Wistar Institute and the programs of the National Institutes of Health are merged today, it may be useful to examine this relationship as an example of the general points I have been discussing.

The Public Health Service, like the Wistar Institute, has a long tradition and a capacity for change. Only a few years and a few miles separated the dedication of the Wistar Institute and the initiation of bacteriological research in the Service. The latter occurred in 1887 when Dr. Joseph Kinyoun set up one of the first bateriology laboratories in this country, in our hospital at the port of New York. For us, this marked the beginning of an ever-increasing research involvement, first in the infectious and nutritional diseases, spreading to occupational disease, and more recently to mental and chronic diseases.

Concurrent with the general expansion of medical research, the programs of the Public Health Service took on new dimensions in the 1940's. New facilities were added for our own scientific investigations at Bethesda, Md., and, what is more important, we entered upon a broad program for the support of research in non-Federal research and teaching centers.

Initially, the few thousands of dollars we had were disrtibuted to a handful of scientists working in established centers. In recent years, however, the research support programs have grown rapidly in response to many evidences of public interest. We began with the support of research projects; to this was added support of research and related training; and more recently, a beginning was made in the award of matching grants for the construction of research facilities.

These have become big programs. This year, they include some $140 million for the grant support of nearly 8,000 research projects, $60 million for a broad spectrum of research and related training, and $30 million as matching grants for the construction of research facilities. Thus the decisions affecting the size and characteristics of this program are of vital importance to the American medical research scene.

We do not consider these to be our programs. They are reflections of the people's aspirations for better health. We are merely a vehicle through which the people's money, derived from taxes and appropriated by the Congress, is used to achieve better health through research.

The Public Health Service, then, has no direct responsibility for, and no control over the decisions of non-Federal groups and organizations in the formulation of their research policies. We do, however, have a responsibility to take part in the formulation of national research policies, to make our views known, and to carry our direct and

indirect share of the total national research effort.

Thus, the Public Health Service itself does not make the scientific decisions as to how the money appropriated to us for the support of research shall be spent. These judgments are made by panels of distinguished scientists, educators, and leaders in public affairs, without whose recommendation the Service cannot approve any grant application.

Our first role, then, is simply to establish and maintain an administrative mechanism which permits a cross-section of the Nation's professionnl and public leaders to determine the most effective use of the people's dollars so that both the scientific and the public interest will be served. Our second role is to be alert to the ever-changing problems and needs of medical and health-related research, both immediate and long-range, and to do what we can to see that the problems are solved and the needs met.

These characteristics of our program make one aspect of my participation in these dedication exercises very comfortable indeed. It is true that Public Health Service matching grants provided nearly $206,000 to assist in the Wistar Institute's building program. It is true that during the present year, staff members of the Institute have received Public Health Service grants of $210,000 for research and $50,000 for training. But neither I nor any of my colleageus at the National Institutes of Health is in the position of being a donor.

We are happy, as are all friends of the Wistar Institute, that the stature of your staff, the past accomplishments and future promise of the Institute have been recognized by these representative groups as warranting a substantial investment. This has come about through selective processes based on scientific excellence, in which scientists and institutions across the Nation compete. It is not Public Health Service money given to the institute; it is a public investment in your promising future.

I am particularly pleased to tell you of another development in the relationships of the Wistar Institute and the Public Health Service. Recently, the Director of the Institute, Dr. Koprowski, has been awarded a long-term grant for study of the possible role of viruses in the etiology of cancer.

Dr. Koprowski is one of about 20 leading scientists in this country and abroad who are participating in a recently planned grants program for the exploration of this exciting and challenging field.

This one grant well illustrates the growing strength and flexibility of research support mechanisms. It is relatively large and long term, providing $118,000 this year with gradual increases committed for the subsequent 9 years. Altogether, the grant will amount to more than $2 million over a 10-year period.

Also, the grant is nonspecific. It is in support of fundamental lines of inquiry which may or may not lead to better understanding of the etiology of cancer, although the studies undertaken will derive their support directly from appropriations made to the National Cancer Institute. Moreover, Dr. Koprowski and his colleagues are free to shift their lines of inquiry at any time and in any direction. With the talent and resources combined here in productive and sustained inquiry, however, we can surely anticipate major contributions to the life sciences, from which advances in human health come.

Let me close with a thought about Dr. Pepper's question: "When will we learn that concentration and cooperation are consistent with the maintenance of absolutely distinct individuality, and that they are the secret and the source of power and of rapid progress?"

We have learned a great deal and will learn more of this secret source of progress. The relationships of the Wistar Institute and the Public Health Service emphasize the interdependence of independent institutions in medical research today. By this I mean that the acceptance of funds from outside sources, whether private or public, and collaboration with other groups in programs of mutual interest, are indeed "consistent with the maintenance of absolutely distinct individuality." These mutually supportive activities actually can enhance, rather than jeopardize, an institution's independent status.

The Wistar Institute has a splendid heritage of scientific and educational accomplishment, of institutional and intellectual freedom. I know that these characteristics will be strengthened and enhanced as the Institute moves ahead into challenging new fields.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer, plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

3420

Appendix

Oregon Dunes Park Suggested as National Tourist Mecca

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the unique sand-dune area of Oregon's seacoast can become an outstanding mecca for vacationing Americans. That is the objective of the bill which I have introduced to establish the Oregon Dunes National Seashore area.

Recent public discussion of the proposed park development has clarified unedrstanding of the procedures involved in establishing such a national recreational facility. Especially cogent analysis of the Oregon Dunes proposal appeared in the April 21, 1959, issue of the Medford (Oreg.) Mail-Tribune, and the April 6, 1959, issue of the McMinnville (Oreg.) News-Register. Both of these editorials emphasize the great benefits which would come to the area if and when the park is authorized.

I wish to stress one particular sentence in the editorial from the McMinnville News-Register, which reads:

The national publicity given by the very presence of the national park is beyond price.

If people on the Oregan seacoast will realize the truth of this very simple and logical statement, they will be aware that the proposed Oregon Dunes National Seashore will attract thousands and thousands of tourists to one of the most beautiful shorelines in the world, that of Oregon beside the Pacific Ocean.

I ask unanimous consent that these excellent aditorials be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the McMinville (Oreg.) News-Register, Apr. 6, 1959]

NATIONAL PARK ON COAST—WE'RE FOR IT

When on March 25 Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER introduced on behalf of himself and of Senator WAYNE MORSE a bill in the U.S. Senate to establish the Oregon Dunes National Seashore south of the Siuslaw River in Lane and Douglas Counties, he surely had no suspicion of the hornet's nest of opposition which would come from certain circles in the Florence area. The park would consist of not more than 34,660 acres of duneland and another area north of Florence, the locale of the Sea Lion Caves, in extent 340 acres.

According to NEUBERGER's bill the purpose of the park would be "to preserve for the benefit, inspiration, and use of the public certain unspoiled shoreline in the State of Oregon which possesses scenic, scientific, and recreation values of national importance."

We have been amazed at the amount of opposition to this measure from those who stand most to gain from it. Yet we should not have been too surprised, for there was opposition in Aberdeen to the formation of the Olympic National Park, and some of the residents of communities in and near the boundaries of the present Yosemite were radically against national park status for that scenic treasure. Those most opposed are, of course, persons who have vested interests which would be affected.

It is too bad that there was not more groundwork laid among the local people before the matter was broached. Nevertheless they should give it a real hearing before becoming so antagonistic. It is always difficult to back down once a person had become a partisan.

The dune areas on the Oregon coast have rare interest both as scenic and geological features. Due to the prevailing winds from the ocean, the accumulative sand is blown toward the east forming gigantic dunes. The dunes march and invade the inland areas. One feature on the unique side is that they dam up the mouths of the creeks and smaller rivers from the Coast Range, thus forming those attractive lakes not far from the shoreline. So we have right within arm's length of each other the great salt sea and a string of fresh-water lakes. In some places they are only a few hundred feet apart, with photogenic sand dunes between. The area is being used as an experimental project to test various grasses as to their effectiveness in pinning down the sand dunes and in this respect has drawn worldwide attention.

The Sea Lion Caves are probably the most interesting single feature along the Oregon coast and the one that attracts the most visitors. We have been down to smell the sea lions several times and always find them interesting. There are giant bulls, sleek females, and sometimes cute pups. This is the largest rookery of its kind in continental United States—Whatever that may mean now that Alaska has become the 49th State. Making the caves part of the National Park System would assure the best possible care and unkeep for this national treasure.

There are undoubtedly features of NEUBERGER's bill which should be clarified, but by and large the people of Oregon should give it support. Any time a national park is brought to an area it adds a dimension otherwise unattainable. The tourist influx along Highway 101 would be increased immeasurably. All towns along the coastal route would profit by this, and those of us along Highway 18 would also derive benefits due to traffic from the coast to Portland.

The national publicity given by the very presence of a national park is beyond price. The Oregon coast would begin to receive the attention it has always deserved as the most beautiful and dramatic scenic coastline in the United States. It is to be hoped that Senator NEUBERGER will be able to see this proposal through to fruitation. It seems to us that if he could go personally and talk to the Florence folk, most of their fears would be allayed. Meanwhile, those who are deeply concerned that the project go through should give it all the support possible.

[From the Medford (Oreg.) Mail-Tribune, Apr. 21, 1959]

CHANCE FOR THE SAVAGES

In common with other newspapers in Oregon, we were in receipt of a "news story" last week, written in the office of the weekly Siuslaw Oar of Florence.

It told, tongue-in-cheek, of the proposed establishment of the Frog Bog National Park on the shores of the Columbia River near Portland. It was motivated, obviously, by the proposal to create a national seashore in the area between the Siuslaw and Umpqua Rivers along Oregon's magnificent coast, including beaches, dunes, forests, and lakes.

Opposition to the proposal has developed, particularly in the Florence area, and the news story was one symptom of it.

The story said:

"Hearings just concluded in the vine maples by the Vine Maple Savages indicated strong public support for the establishment of the Frog Bog National Park on the shores of the Columbia River near Portland.

"The Frog Bog National Park would be comprised of some 35,000 acres of valuable Frog Bog country from Portland approximately 18 miles upstream, adjacent to and abutting the Columbia River.

"Senator JAMES E. MURRAY (Democrat, of Montana), chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, will be requested to introduce legislation which would 'preserve for the benefit, inspiration and use of the public' certain river shores in the State of Oregon which possess scenic, scientific and recreational values of national importance. Under term of the bill the Secretary of Interior would be authorized to establish the Frog Bog National Park.

"Senator MURRAY will be requested by the proponents, if at all possible, to enter the bill in conjunction with the Senate bill by Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER, which would authorize the establishment of the Oregon Dunes National Seashore, an area similar in size, comprising lakes, homes, businesses, resorts and already established beautiful parks.

"One individual who testified at the hearing and identified himself as a frog-watcher, stated he believed that the establishment of Frog Bog National Park would be the greatest single gift that Oregon could receive during the Centennial year."

(It might be noted that one Portland newspaper printed the item, just as received, in its regular news columns without any comment—which might have tended to confuse some of its readers.)

Behind the levity in the story are some dead-serious property owners in the area, who dislike the idea of having their homes and businesses condemned for use as a national park.

While we can understand their objections, we believe there are three points which should be considered:

1. The fact that the coast in this area is of national significance, and should be preserved for the people of the Nation.

2. The impact on the area may not be as serious as they now expect.

3. The proposed boundaries are preliminary and subject to revision, during the several years it would take to put the plan

for a national park area on the coast into effect.

Further down the coast, people are not nearly as upset about the proposal, presumably because they are a little further away from the lake and resort area where the opposition centers, and also, possibly, because of the restrained way the subject has been handled in the Port Umpqua Courier, the weekly newspaper in the Gardiner-Reedsport area, edited by Bill Tugman, one of the State's outstanding editors.

Following informational meetings in the two areas, the Courier summed the main points up as follows:

1. Nobody in the area affected—from the mouth of the Umpqua area to the mouth of the Siuslaw, including all of the frontage on Woahink and Cleawox Lakes, plus Sea Lion Caves, north of Florence—will be dispossessed without full compensation and due process of law.

2. Industrial, and community rights for necessary services in or across dedicated park areas will be recognized.

3. Immediate losses of taxable valuations for school districts and other public agencies can be compensated if Congress follows precedents in other national parks.

4. Over the years the revenue losses for communities on either side of the reservation will be more than offset by tremendous gains in tourist trade and in permanent business and residential development.

In view of these facts, we believe the Vine Maple Savages would be well advised, not only to drop their opposition to the plan, but to jump heartily on to the bandwagon—and then get set for one of the most remarkable booms any area ever had, after the national status is granted to the dunes area.

Not only would they receive fair compensation for their property now, they would be in on the ground floor of a development which could well make that part of the Oregon coast the mecca for tourists from all over the world for years to come.

Effect on American Industry of Competition From Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Milwaukee Journal has made a thoughtful and perceptive analysis of my recent proposal for an investigation of the effect of the sharp increase in the investment of American private capital abroad. The lead editorial declares, in part:

By all means there should be a finding of fact on the investment of American capital abroad along the lines that Senator PROXMIRE of Wisconsin proposes.

Of course, I am delighted that my proposal has received the support of this highly responsible newspaper. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BY ALL MEANS, STUDY EFFECT OF COMPETITION FROM ABROAD

By all means, there should be a finding of fact on the investment of American capital abroad along the lines that Senator PROXMIRE, of Wisconsin, proposes. We need to know the dimensions of this development if intelligent policy is to be evolved. Indeed, we need to know the full facts about all aspects of foreign competition.

There can be no doubt but what foreign competition has increased substantially. Segments of American industry have been hurt. But whether the overall effect has been harmful or beneficial remains to be determined.

Foreign competition is of various kinds. Most common is price competition. The president of Inland Steel Co. told his stockholders the other day that European and Japanese steel has recently been sold in this country below Inland's costs. A Peoria builder can buy a keg of Belgian nails for a dollar less than he would pay a local mill. An Illinois farmer can buy imported barbed wire for $40 a ton less than the American product.

Imports have won big parts of the American market for bicycles, sewing machines, typewriters, transistor radios, fishing tackle, watches, clothespins. As for autos, America imports four times as many as it exports; 4 years ago exports were four times as large as imports.

Some American manufacturers buy parts abroad for assembly in this country. Other American firms are expanding foreign sales. But instead of shipping American-made products abroad, many are setting up branch plants in foreign countries or buying into foreign firms. American exports, as a result, are reduced or their expansion at least restricted.

The ability of foreign firms to undersell is usually credited to substantially lower labor costs. American mass production and inventiveness formerly more than compensated for this advantage. But many foreign manufacturers now have modern plants, use modern techniques, and have learned how to market effectively.

If foreign firms have become too competitive, it can be said that America asked for it. The purpose of the Marshall plan and other postwar economic aid was to restore and modernize the European economy. We helped Japan and other countries in the same way.

So before we condemn the new foreign competition and set up defenses against it, we ought to find out just what the effects have been and what they are likely to be in the future. An investigation to provide these answers should be of tremendous value.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial entitled "The Seaway and Us," published in the Boston Daily Globe of April 23, 1959.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SEAWAY AND US

The St. Lawrence Seaway has bobbed up, appropriately and inevitably, at the current Canadian-American business and industrial conference here in Boston. It is an excellent theme since that vast project bears massive testimony to the benefits of cooperation between our two peoples. The inevitability of its intrusion at these meetings stems, of course, from the seaway's certain impact upon economic growth on both sides of the border.

There is a certain timeliness involved, too. Though not to be dedicated officially for another few weeks, the seaway will witness next Saturday an initial transit of shipping which will be, in a sense, a symbolic pioneering for the traffic in trade, the vision of which has made the undertaking a reality.

Lionel Chevrier, former president of the Seaway Authority, reminds us that this enterprise is the signal gun for a period of industrial development on both banks. His words merit attention in New England. It is already clear that the seaway will spur industrial growth in eastern Canada and will bring certain benefits to our Midwestern States. Less emphasis has been given the fact that the new water artery will have constructive influence upon the future of New England.

Yet that relationship is as certain as geography. Its eventual consequences may remain vague to some here, but it is emerging more clearly to others. To imagine that the industrial growth now well begun or planned on both sides of the seaway will proceed without effect in New England is surely shortsighted.

Maine is conscious of the portents. Her conformation appears, for the time being, to limit the immediate benefits of the seaway to Aroostook County, the marketing of whose potato crop will be affected beneficially. The State's planners are eyeing the seaway carefully in the meantime. How the new traffic lane and its attendant industrial surge will affect population movement in the largest of our New England States is a question only another decade can answer.

Maine's remoteness from the power generated by the dual seaways project, like her geographical position vis-a-vis Quebec, pushes appraisal into the future.

The opposite is true of Vermont. The Green Mountain State is already experiencing the stimulus of a new flow of power from the seaway's hydroelectric system which has forced an industrially valuable 10 percent cut in electric rates. The pace of industrial growth has quickened. A program for industrial land-traffic routes north to south and east to west has been launched.

These economic signals are secondary, however, to Vermont's major plan regarding the seaway. Together with southeastern Quebec and New York State, Vermont is pressing for a cutoff to link the seaway directly to Lake Champlain, and on thence past Plattsburgh to the Hudson. That would make deepwater shipping feasible and open up the entire Champlain basin on both sides for heavy industry. At present only light industry is operating along the Vermont lake shore. A cutoff would give Vermont economically useful water lanes on three sides of her territory.

Whatever benefits some of New England in terms of economic growth benefits all of it. The seaway's influence in the long run may prove revolutionary.

UNCLE DUDLEY.

Can New Laws Solve the Farm Problem?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as we know, the Nation's farmers still face serious economic problems.

Despite the high cost of the farm program, despite a multitude of laws affecting farm prices and production, despite a dedicated effort by the administration, Members of Congress, farm organizations, the farmers themselves, and others in the economy to find a solution for the farm problem, we still have not found one.

Over the years, agriculture has experienced a tremendous mechanical and technological revolution. While this has brought blessings, the fact is, also, that the capacity to produce his outstripped the volume of consumption, thus producing a production-consumption imbalance, with accompanying economic hardships.

The great question now confronting the Nation is how to deal with this dilemma. Should there be more new laws? Should there be fewer laws?

We recognize, of course, that legislation cannot cure economic ills. Over the years, however, legislative action has proved helpful to the farm economy while it has been attempting to make adjustments. Unfortunately, however, the farmer still finds that his income is too low in proportion to the high costs of equipment, labor, taxes on property and other operating expenses.

Recently, a questionnaire was submitted to agricultural economists in our land-grant colleges. The question posed to the 49 economists was: "Can new laws solve the farm problem?"

Among the 37 economists who replied to the inquiry, 4 out of 5 said that any laws further ham-stringing the free market will hurt the farmer, the consumer and the Nation; and that legislation has not solved, and cannot solve, the farm problem, although the "right kind might help." But few economists believe we have had the right kind of such legislation in the past, and most are pessimistic about getting it in the future;

They pointed out that schemes in foreign countries to guarantee all farmers a fair income have been costly failures. They also pointed out that the law of supply and demand is not out of date, and that there is no substitute for the free market.

Mr. President, those views are not necessarily a reflection of my own views on the farm problem. Nevertheless, since they represent conclusions of highly qualified persons in the field of agriculture, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which sets forth additional ideas on the question of whether new laws are desirable. The article was recently published in the Farm Journal.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAN NEW LAWS SOLVE THE FARM PROBLEM?

(By John Strohm)

Those questions you see at the extreme right were part of a list that I recently sent to agricultural economists at every one of our 49 land grant colleges.

I wanted to know what these "economic doctors" had to say about our farm problem, and what they thought of congressional efforts to solve it.

I believe that the answers I got back (from 37 of the 49) will shock a lot of Congressmen. Because four out of five economists say that:

Any laws further hamstringing the free market will hurt the farmer, the consumer, and the Nation.

Legislation has not and cannot solve the farm problem, although the "right kind might help." But few economists believe we've had the right kind in the past, and most are pessimistic about getting it in the future.

Schemes in foreign countries to guarantee all farmers a fair income have been costly failures.

The law of supply and demand is not out of date—there is no substitute for the free market.

"I doubt that legislation of the type we've had will help," warns a University of Georgia economist. "On the contrary, I think it adds to the problem."

How would the economists do it then? Three specific proposals bobbed up in most of their replies:

1. Bring capacity to produce into balance with markets by shifts in land use and migration out of agriculture.

2. Get Government out of agriculture.

3. Put agriculture on the same basis as business and industry from the standpoint of price protection.

A University of Nebraska economist puts it this way: "We need more energetic policies to adjust land use and remove people from low-income, labor surplus areas."

Which farm programs have worked best? Sugar and wool by a wide margin, say the economists. But most pointed out the reason: The United States imports both commodities and therefore is trying to stimulate domestic production.

Which have been the worst failures? Wheat and cotton won this dubious distinction. Unwise legislation has piled up unmanageable surpluses, lost markets, and delayed badly needed adjustments, they said.

By an overwhelming margin, they agree that our free market system, with its weaknesses, is still vastly superior to any developed anywhere in the world. Only two think that the cooperative marketing systems of the Scandinavian countries might be better.

"Producers now selling in relatively free markets have probably fared at least as well as those selling in Government-supported markets," says a University of California economist. "Adjustments under free market conditions tend to be more severe but usually occur more quickly."

All economists warn that Government-guaranteed prices inevitably bring regulations over production, although few feel that farmers recognize this fact.

Has Congress learned anything from the failures of the past? The economists aren't sure. A majority feel that farmers will have "less freedom to plan, plant, and sell in the next 5 to 10 years." They predict we'll have farm programs and controls with us for a long time.

WHAT FARM ECONOMISTS SAY

1. Can legislation solve the farm problem? Yes, 2 percent; no, 46 percent; right kind can help, 50 percent; maybe, 2 percent.

2. Have Government attempts to raise prices hurt or helped farmers? Hurt, 38 percent; helped, 38 percent; hurt and helped 24 percent.

3. Some people argue that the law of supply and demand is out of date. Agree, 3 percent; disagree, 94 percent; both, 3 percent.

4. In foreign countries that have fixed farm prices and controlled production, are farmers better off financially as a result? Yes, 6 percent; no, 94 percent.

Do consumers there pay more or less for food, if you include taxes they pay for subsidies? More, 86 percent; less, 9½ percent; same, 4½ percent.

5. In your opinion, will U.S. farmers have more or less freedom to plant and sell in the next 5 to 10 years than they've had? More, 19 percent; less, 47 percent; same, 34 percent.

Unemployment Compensation Saves Many From Charity, the Houson Post Reports

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, there are 4.3 million jobless persons in this Nation today. More than 2 million of them are enabled to feed their families and retain their self-respect until they can find other employment because of payments from their State and Federal Governments.

This unemployment compensation plan is accepted as routine today. Yet it was passed only in 1935, and is, therefore, a fairly recent innovation, a pioneering social experiment.

In this time of recession, the unemployment compensation plan has more than proved its worth.

James V. Mathis, chief of the Washington bureau of the Houston (Tex.) Post, has written an especially fine article about this farsighted program. Mr. Mathis is a reporter of exceptional caliber, with a distinguished record both in Houston and with his paper's bureau at the State capitol in Austin. The Post is one of the State's outstanding daily newspapers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the article by James Mathis published in the Houston Post for Monday, April 13, 1959, under the heading, "Jobless Pay Saves Many From Charity."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOBLESS PAY SAVES MANY FROM CHARITY

(By Jim Mathis)

WASHINGTON.—Consider a job hunter subsisting on an average of $30.60 a week a privileged person?

He is just that, the blue-ribboned of the unemployed.

Like the owner of a pot of stew in a jungle where others own nothing, he is a true man of distinction.

There are 4.3 million without jobs in the United States. Only a little more than half of these are drawing a weekly check as rightful, legal unemployment compensation.

The rest are on the outside looking in—on relief rolls or living on the bounty of friends or relatives. In short, on charity.

That more than 2 million are each week receiving checks to tide them over unemployment and allow them to avoid the igno-

miny of charity is a 20th-century development that is accepted casually by the bulk of the people.

But it has been a lifeline to those who need it.

Unemployment insurance, passed by Congress in 1935, is designed to guarantee a worker a portion of a wage loss when his job ends through no fault of his own. It is a social approach born in Europe, pioneered in the United States by Wisconsin, and given impetus with the depression in the 1930's.

Employers contribute to a State fund held in trust in the Federal Treasury. The contribution, or tax, may be written off up to 3 percent of the employer's income tax return.

Currently, 47 million Americans making up nearly 75 percent of the civilian labor force are covered by the provisions of various State laws. An estimated 2.1 million employers contribute from taxable payrolls in excess of $110 billion.

The Federal statutes laying out the ground rules for unemployment insurance provide chiefly for the protection of the trust funds, for prompt payment of benefits, for a fair hearing if payment is denied, and for denial of the right of either side to use the program for strikebreaking or company defeat.

Within these general provisions, the State lays out its own employment security measures.

Complete State latitude is allowed in specifrying qualifications, amounts, and duration of payment. In practice, the fair-hearing procedure is one for State decision and control. Of all the State-Federal programs—the Federal Government contributes to the administration—none is so free from Federal controls in so many basic policy areas.

BENEFIT PROGRAMS VARY WIDELY

It's not surprising, then, that such wide variation occurs in the program. Payments per week range from $45 in New York State and Alaska to $26 in Arkansas, North Dakota, and South Carolina. Duration of benefits varies from 20 to 39 weeks, and may by penalties drop to 7 weeks or nothing.

Qualifications and disqualifications run up and down the scale. Generally, qualification is based upon the claimant having worked at a specified earning level for periods prior to the filing of a claim. Payments go up and down according to the amount earned.

As a minimum, State laws deny benefits to those who are unavailable for work, are involved in labor disputes, have quit, or refused to work without good cause, or have been fired for misconduct. Denials may be for specified periods, or for only the time in which the disqualification is in effect.

In some States, the receipt of other funds either from old-age pensions, an employer's pension, vacation pay, or separation allowances, or workmen's compensation, is reason for either disqualification or lowering the amount of unemployment compensation.

Texas, for instance, reduces its benefits by the full amount of old age survivors insurance.

At least 17 States disqualify women who leave work for marital reasons, either because their husbands leave the community or because of being expectant mothers.

In the quarter year October 1 to December 31, 1958, there were 434,850 disqualifications, a ratio of 16 to every 1,000 claimants in the Nation.

Texas ran far above the national average, with 19,908 disqualifications, a ratio of 28.5 per 1,000 claimants.

There are a number of problems causing current concern in the unemployment insurance program.

To begin with, the benefit levels are in question. A survey completed late in 1958 by the Department of Labor showed that on the average, weekly benefits paid to single persons cover between 57 and 73 percent of total weekly expenses, and all their nondeferable expenses.

The story is somewhat different with heads of households who must live on the benefits. The payments amount to only 38 to 48 percent of weekly necessities, and to between 60 and 78 percent of their nondeferable expenses.

HALF-OF-SALARY PLAN URGED

President Eisenhower has urged, and the Department of Labor constantly promotes, the raising of all benefits to where they will cover 50 percent of the workers' pay. This would give some solid sustenance and at the same time would not remove the incentive to return to work.

Duration of benefits have been met on the Federal level with congressional approval of two extensions to be paid for from Federal funds. The emergency extension in 1958, from June until April of this year, put $370 million in the economy as well as the unemployed pockets during the remaining part of 1938. Roughly 70 percent of those covered and unemployed were brought in under this emergency program.

On March 25, Congress again extended the duration of benefits along the same lines until July 1, 1959. But Congress refused to extend the program for 15 months as urged by some Senators, and clearly gave as its intention that the Federal participation be temporary in nature.

President Eisenhower also holds that the issue of unemployment insurance is one for the State governments. The administration will ask, however, that some 3.2 million persons not covered by the insurance now be brought into the program.

In addition, the President will urge Congress to strengthen taxing systems to increase the reserves.

There are measures before the Congress which would set Federal standards on the program. Senator JOHN KENNEDY, Democrat, of Massachusetts, has proposed sweeping changes.

The executive committee of the Governors' Conference has expressed its opposition to further Federal intervention. States should be allowed to act in accordance with their respective needs, the Governors said, without the imposition of Federal standards on eligibility, duration or amounts of benefits.

The Bureau of Employment Security, the administrative and study agency on unemployment insurance in the Department of Labor, is one of the sources of unemployment figures through its collection of claims filed with State commissions or agencies.

REPORTS ON CLAIMS ARE ISSUED

This Bureau issues weekly reports, by States, on the number of initial claims and the volume and rate of insured unemployed under the State programs.

These figures also include the volume of unemployment compensation for veterans by States and the national figure for the Railroad Retirement Board program.

The count of uninsured unemployment represents the number of persons reporting a week of unemployment under State programs. Included are some persons who are only partially employed.

The report excludes those who have exhausted their benefits, new workers who have not earned rights, and persons losing jobs not covered by the systems. This last category covers agricultural, State, and local government workers, domestic service, self employment, unpaid family work, nonprofit organizations, and firms below a minimum size.

The initial claims are those giving notice that they have lost jobs and are starting periods of unemployment. If the claimant continues to be without a job for a week, he is counted among the insured. These initial claims are valuable as the first indication of emerging new unemployment.

Joined with the Bureau of Labor Statistics payroll count of the employed in 155,000 firms, expanded to give a national figure, and the Census Bureau estimate of total unempoyment, the figures get a working over at a meeting in the Budget Bureau. The result is a coordinated report which is the official combined employment and unemployment release.

Each of the bureaus release simultaneous reports on their individual efforts.

This system has been operating since 1954. Last year, the Department of Labor won out in a long fight to gather to its bosom all statistics and releases on labor. After July 1, the Census Bureau will collect the data and turn it over to the Labor Department for analysis.

This is a procedure followed by the Census Bureau with the Public Health Service. It reduces the agency to a collection operation, but signs are that the Census Bureau will insist upon fairly objective use of its data.

"We will be looking over their shoulder," one official at the Census Bureau said.

The Housing Bill and the Airport-Aid Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the letter that follows is most unusual in this day and age. Mr. Robert P. Mulligan, branch manager of the Owens-Corning Fiberglas Corp. writes opposing the housing bill in its present form and the airport aid bill. The writer points out that his company is a large manufacturer of building materials and would benefit by any enlarged program of residential construction and urban renewal.

The company opposes the bills in their present form because they would unbalance the budget, force deficit financing upon the Treasury and lead inevitably to inflation. The company is certainly to be commended for placing the welfare of our Nation and a sound economy above any special benefit that they would get out of proposed programs.

I hope the Congress will read and consider the sound advice included in Mr. Mulligan's letter:

OWENS-CORNING FIBERGLAS CORP.,
New York 9, March 31, 1959.

Hon. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WIDNALL: Recent passage of the housing and the airport-aid bills raises such extremely serious fears that we would like you to know where we stand, and the point of view we are communicating to our own people across the country, including those at our Barrington plant in your own State. We hope these views receive your most serious consideration when these bills come up again for vote, either to resolve differences between the House and the Senate, or in an attempt to override any veto.

Although our company is a large manufacturer of building materials and has a big stake in both the residential construction and urban renewal programs, nevertheless we oppose the housing bill as passed (to the degree that it goes beyond the original amount) because it will unbalance the budget, force deficit financing upon the

Treasury, and lead inevitably to inflation. Once on the statute books, there will be no end. This was dramatically forecast when the mayor of one of our great cities was appearing before a committe hearing on the bill, and was asked "How much money do you need, and when?"; and his candid reply being: "Just as much as I can get, and just as soon as I can get it."

There are a number of good features in the bill (realistic interest rate, urban renewal), but, even with the most favorable budget outlook, the subsidy features are unwarranted and not needed at this time. Housing construction is certain to be at a high level in the year ahead and, at a reasonably competitive interest rate, adequate financing will be available.

We also strongly oppose the airport-aid bill, at least in the increased amount added before passage. The bill as originally proposed was certainly far from penurious. But the bill, as passed, we simply cannot afford. We feel very strongly that there is no real need for this inflated bill, because in the Toledo, Ohio, area everyone joined together and built, and have been operating successfully, a modern airport (one of the best in the country), without 1 cent of Federal aid.

These two bills will throw the budget hopelessly out of balance unless, in order to save such "pork-barrel" legislation, this Congress should commit the unthinkable act of cutting back the expenditures required for our vital military defense and those of our friends. In short, we strongly oppose any legislation which goes beyond the expenditures provided for in the budget unless the Congress has the courage concurrently to provide for additional tax revenues which cover such excess expenditures. After all, $77 billion is not austerity.

We realize that various selfish groups will bring enormous pressure on you to spend, spend, spend. Pressure groups have vast experience in getting the spending programs they want, while the ordinary taxpayer, who has to pay the bills, is usually no match for them. But we also know that all of the people cannot be fooled all of the time and that inevitably (and probably sooner than anyone suspects) the average American will come to his senses, and turn upon those who have been the architects of the unbalanced budget and an inflation which destroys the purchasing power of his earnings, eroded the value of his savings, lessened the protection of his insurance, and destroyed the basis of his pension or retirement plan. And he will know where to turn. For Congress, and Congress alone, holds the strings of the Nation's purse.

Finally, it should be obvious that the masters in the Kremlin would want nothing better than for our country to embark upon a course of fiscal irresponsibility and inflation. It is sound Marxist doctrine, recently reiterated by Khrushchev, that communism need not fight a war to conquer the West—because the system of free enterprise carries within itself the seeds of destruction, the most virulent of which is inflation. And, possible even more importantly, our friends abroad (whose loyalty and confidence we must retain) are even now wondering—as reported by Chairman Martin of the Federal Reserve Board—whether we Americans "have the moral fiber to put their finances in order." A nation which aspires to world leadership cannot make deficit financing a way of life.

The distinguished senior Senator from Virginia has pointed out that, of the increase of $14.3 billion in our annual budget since 1954, 75 percent has been outside the areas of national defense, atomic energy and mutual aid, and that it is in the nondefense areas that we have drifted into the greatest increases in spending. And so we submit that it does not take moral courage to authorize expenditures beyond our income (as some pressure groups are now preaching) but, on the contrary, it takes moral courage to limit our spending to our income.

We are fast approaching the beginning of the final reckoning. The refusal of the holders of one-third of the currently maturing Government bond issue to accept new bonds at a higher interest rate is the ominous warning. It means that this Congress will most certainly have to increase the debt limit to history's highest point, and very probably will have to increase the interest authorization above the 4½-percent maximum that was set back in the World War I era.

This has been a long letter, but we feel that the decisions reached by this Congress are the most important and vital that have confronted any Congress since 1789. We have faith in our elected representatives, and in the sound commonsense of our fellow citizens. And once it is generally understood that the way to curb inflation is not by more inflation, then our ship of state will have been safely steered past the dangerous shoals which now threaten. Now is the time for selfless statesmanship.

Yours respectfully,
OWENS-CORNING FIBERGLAS CORP.,
ROBERT P. MULLIGAN, *Branch Manager.*

Great Dangers of Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I feel it is essential that we all be aware of the tremendous dangers which inflation can hold, not only for our economic health, but for the entire political future of our Nation.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include at this point excerpts from a letter I have received from Mr. Warren Chase of Ashfield, Mass., one of my constituents. I commend his remarks to all of my colleagues:

ASHFIELD, MASS.,
March 24, 1959.

The Honorable SILVIO O. CONTE,
Congressman, First Massachusetts District, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: * * * Perhaps the most fateful matter in domestic politics in the country's history is whether or not the country is to enter of its own free will, heedless of the consequences, and irrevocably, the path of national insolvency with all its attendant crippling effects.

Let me say, first of all, that I do not feel as strongly as I do on the matter solely because of fears of personal loss and discomfort although they would not be negligible, for as long as my vigor remains, probably I should be less adversely affected on my farm by deepening inflation than vast numbers of less fortunate citizens. My strong antipathy to the course in which we seem to blithely slide proceeds from long familiarity with inflation and consequent national insolvency, some of it first hand, while serving nearly 30 years in our country's foreign service.

To begin, as a student at the University of Paris in the years 1926 and 1927, I watched closely Poincare's valiant efforts to save the franc, and then in the following years the gradual disintegration of France as repeated doses of "little inflation" gradually eroded the franc. During all of those years, 1926 to 1940, I was in Paris, Amsterdam, Hamburg, and Berne, Switzerland, where I heard the echos from the German inflation of the early 1920's and watched the French one of the 1930's. Likewise, I spent the years 1937–39 at Hamburg reporting to our Government on the insipient German inflation of those years. In the late 1940's I watched the inflation in Finland where I was on duty at Helsinki. The most rampaging inflation of all, however, that I witnessed first-hand was that in Western Germany and Berlin, where I was on duty from 1945 to 1948. There the American cigarette in effect displaced German currency as the medium of exchange. The German currency was quoted among the citizenry and the occupation forces in terms of American cigarettes, and I believe for a time reached the fantastic sum of 2,000 marks to a carton. Upon returning to duty in Washington in 1951, I discussed often at length with colleagues who had served in China the gross inflation there until the Communists finally prevailed there in 1948 and 1949.

I know that in theory one can have a little, or even a lot of, inflation without necessarily an immediate or even early collapse; but such feats seem to be possible only by the most dextrous maneuvering and, since the First World War at least, apparently only when such maneuvering is accompanied by the most stringent of politicoeconomic controls. The most successful of such controls, of course, have been in the totalitarian states; i.e., Nazi Germany and the Communist States. Rarely has it been possible to control an inflation without the discipline of a totalitarian state and all of the consequent deprivations for the citizenry. Witness Dr. Schacht's amazing wizardry in Nazi Germany in the late 1930's; please note, however, that the inflation that there grew by leaps and bounds with the citizenry being deprived of all except a tightly rationed list of necessities in favor of an expanding (growing) economy was devoted almost wholly to the new war machine—but all under the mailed fist of the totalitarian Nazis. Witness a similar mailed fist control of inflation. Since 1945 in the totalitarian U.S.S.R with its decreed decimation of individual bank accounts and effective cancellation (euphoniously called postponement for 20 years) of great portions of the national debt.

In France, China, and Latin American countries such as Chile and Brazil, where the mailed fist of a totalitarian regime has not been available to control the respective inflations, the latter surpassed control with consequent great impoverishment. Perhaps it is only coincidence, but the weak democratic governments in China and France that tolerated, when they did not actually encourage, their respective inflations were swept away eventually by a totalitarian (Communist) regime in China and by a regime of a benevolent autocrat, for a time at least, in France who fortunately for the French and us, too, is too humane to use the mailed fist. * * *

Unless the Members of the House of Representaives and the Senate are prepared to consign the fate of our country to totalitarian controls, and, perhaps practical suspension if not liquidation of at least the legislative arm of our constitutional apparatus, it would appear that those Members have little choice but to take every step however, painful to maintain the solvency of our country. Who knows whether we should be so fortunate as France in having in reserve such a high principaled human being as De Gaulle to assume the burden of saving the country without extinguishing our freedoms? I don't see such a one meditating in his tent anywhere here.

You and your fellow legislators face a most cruel dilemma, for according to the press and

radio many of the recently elected legislators have been whetting the already by no means unstimulated appetites of the citizenry for things which the country simply cannot afford while we must keep our swords sharpened. It will take a heroic effort by many of you to shut off the spigot.

Very truly yours,

WARREN M. CHASE.

Aftermath of Sputnik

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. HESS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a speech delivered by Albert W. Highsmith, to the Deer Park High School PTA in Cincinnati, on April 9, 1959.

Mr. Highsmith is a loyal American, who knows that the future of our country depends upon the education and ability to think of the youngsters now in school.

In these days of vast spending I hope every Member of this House will read this address, and particularly ponder the statement by Mr. Highsmith, including this quotation from the Wall Street Journal:

It is possible that parents will have to resume their job of both curbing and inspiring their youngsters, teaching them at home some of the elementary principles of good citizenship and also of intellectual achievement. As one leading educator recently put it, "This requires no money—only a change of heart."

Mr. Highsmith's speech follows:

AFTERMATH OF SPUTNIK

(Speech by Albert W. Highsmith before Deer Park High School PTA, Cincinnati, Ohio, April 9, 1959)

Any red-blooded American schoolboy would envy me tonight. Imagine what he would give for an opportunity like this to stand up before an audience of parents and teachers and tell them what he thinks is wrong with school.

The message that I bring you tonight will be a bit different, I suspect, from what it might have been when I was a seventh grader. Then I might have reflected the sentiment of the young man who reported that he had no objection to going to school—his objection was to staying after he got there.

Now I have a different perspective, and this may make my message a bit more mature and constructive. For one thing, now I am older and, I like to think, wiser. But a changed factor that contributes even more to my difference of perspective is the fact that now I am on the outside looking in.

I do not come here tonight pretending to be an expert on my subject. I am not an educator. I am a businessman, but perhaps this view from the outside will have some value for you.

We Americans have a tendency to feel a bit smug about the way we do things—to believe that we do things better than anyone else. It usually takes a sudden, dramatic, and forceful event to shock us into a frank reappraisal of anything American.

About a year and a half ago such an event took place.

For the first time in all of history, a man-made satellite whirled over our startled heads. This in itself was surprising enough but an even more surprising fact to many Americans was that it did not carry a made in America label. The Russians had beaten us into outer space.

Today, manmade satellites whirl overhead with an almost monotonous regularity, but in October of 1957 there could be no doubt that the launching of Sputnik I was a Russian triumph.

It is to the credit of America that we were not too proud to acknowledge this fact and to go a step further and see if there was a lesson for us to learn in this Russian spectacular.

One of the most far-reaching results of this was that the white light of public scrutiny was turned full on our educational system. It was obvious that Russian education had contributed to an intellectual and scientific climate that had made this event possible. In America we began to consider how our educational system might be overhauled and brought up to date to meet the challenge of the space age. And that reappraisal still continues.

The answer is not simple.

From some quarters came the familiar cry that more dollars was the answer. Now, I doubt that I will find much disagreement among members of this audience that more and better equipped schools are desirable, or that higher pay for teachers would contribute to attracting and keeping persons of the highest competence in the field of education. Many teachers are in the field of education because they are driven by a deep dedication to help young people make the most of their lives. But there are not enough of these. And even if there were, teachers have to eat, too, and deserve to be compensated commensurate with their responsibilities of guiding our children during their formulative years.

However, we must not revert in this instance to the tendency of some Americans to feel that any problem can be solved by a congressional appropriation. Attuning our educational system to the space age cannot be done by dollars alone. It is going to take a basic readjustment of the entire system.

For example, let us compare our school curriculum with that of the Russian school system.

President Eisenhower has reported that "when a Russian graduates from high school he has had 5 years of physics, 4 years of chemistry, 1 year of astronomy, 5 years of biology, 10 years of mathematics through trigonometry and 5 years of foreign language." And, all of this is accomplished in 10 years of schooling.

In our own country, only one-third of our high school graduates have ever studied science. Only one in three has had more than 1 year of algebra. Only one in five studies foreign language.

I must agree with Adm. Hyman Rickover's observation that we must get away from the idea that "every American child has a God-given right to march in a commencement procession, clad in mortarboard and academic gown with the rolled-up parchment clutched in his hot little hand."

We need to make certain that diplomas from our schools are symbols of accomplishment and mental discipline, and not just certificates that the holders have spent the required number of hours warming school benches or can perform certain basic skills. We need to build in our young people that sadly rare, but vitally needed, ability to think for themselves.

There are those who contend that the answer to all our academic problems lies in deemphasizing sports. Perhaps they do interfere with scholastic endeavor. Certainly the outstanding scholar does not receive the same adoration from his fellow students as the football hero, and no school debate teams commands a fraction of the following the basketball team enjoys.

But before we tie the athletic programs to the stake, perhaps we should look closely to see if they hold any lesson for the scholar.

The job of a coach is to develop in his young charges muscles and speed. He doesn't try to do this by letting the team members sit all day munching candy bars and watching television. Physical development comes from hard work and repetitive exercise.

Hard work and repetitive exercise are also necessary to develop mental agility. It can't be done by courses designed only to entertain students. It takes an academic diet that challenges him on which he can build the mental speed and muscles to meet the future.

I believe that this ability can best be built through the concentration that goes hand in hand with courses like mathematics, English, sciences, and foreign language. We need to emphasize courses like these in our curriculum.

It is possible that we have been trying to be too practical in establishing the curriculum of our schools. Perhaps we have been placing disproportionate emphasis on subjects with immediate application at the expense of academic, thought-building courses. It is true that auto driving and cooking classes, for example, are worthwhile, but not at the expense of courses like English, mathematics, languages, and science.

In business, of course, we are pleased to find employees with knowledge of how to perform certain basic tasks, but the more valuable employee is the one who can think through for himself how to perform even more complicated jobs.

For that matter, perhaps we need to reexamine our national attitude toward the proper role of schools. We talk piously of the responsibilities of the family but at the same time we shove more and more of what was traditionally the responsibility of the family onto schools.

I learned to drive a car from my father. It was a valuable lesson but, of greater importance, at the same time, I learned from my father a great deal about how to be a man. Many a girl has learned how to be a lady while she and her mother shared the kitchen and she learned to cook. I am afraid that today too often children seldom see their parents except in the glow of a television set. Let's not lose sight of the relative roles of the home and the school. We must never make the role of school custodial care. It has much more important work to do.

Another word of warning—we must not let the fact that the current reappraisal of our schools was born of a scientific event lead us into the fallacy of too much stress on science at the expense of basic courses. Scientists themselves have warned that success in their field comes easiest to those with a broad liberal arts base as a foundation for their scientific know-how.

Liberal arts courses, too, have their practical applications but, in addition, they offer the challenging mental exercise of which the ability to think is made. Developing such ability should be the role of education.

One of the things that has contributed to diverting our educational curriculum from basic courses of study is the lack of adequate counseling of students in the selection of courses. Left to select their own courses without proper mature guidance, too often students tend to pick snap courses or ones that appeal to their immediate juvenile interests.

Every student in America should be counseled as Senator ALEXANDER WILEY has

advised the students of Wisconsin. In an open letter to them he said:

"Use your freedoms wisely. Please don't fritter it away. Don't just take easy courses, or read easy books, because they are snaps. Don't just try for passing grades.

"Remember that the harder you work, the harder you study—the more you will tend to learn. And the greater will be the dividends to yourselves and to your country."

This is good advice for all school students, but the job is not theirs alone. We have our part.

We must go back to establishing curriculum on the basis of the real value of the courses as viewed after the fact and to counseling students in that light rather than leaving such selection entirely to teenagers. I know of no more dramatic proof of the fact that students need mature advice in selecting courses than the frequency with which we hear businessmen remark that they are sorry they did not take a particular course while in school, or the steady stream of them who are turning to night school to fill the gaps.

In establishing curriculum and scholastic requirements, we must not be afraid to make schoolwork hard. In our efforts to make sure that our children get even more out of life than we have, we must guard against overindulging them and shielding them from hard work. Such is essential in preparing them to meet the future with success.

The function of education has been summed up very well by Theodore McKeldin, former Governor of Maryland. He has pointed out, "Every great spiritual religion—not Christianity alone—but Judaism and Islam as well—agree that the Creator is very mindful of man, and none of them claims that it is on account of man's own worth and dignity. His body is one with the beasts of the field, and even his reasoning power seems to be an extension and development of that of higher animals. But, in man alone, of all living creatures, his Maker has planted a spark of His own dignity; and for that He is mindful of him. To fan this spark into flame is the highest achievement; and the education that contributes to that achievement is the only schooling worth all the effort and expense we can give it."

Of course, it is not enough just to offer courses capable of provoking thought and counseling students to enroll in them. If students are to get full benefit from such academic courses, they must find interest in them.

For this, it is first necessary that the teacher himself be genuinely interested in the course. He must have the light of natural enthusiasm that will inspire his students and whet their appetites for the knowledge he possesses. He must impress upon them that he is not taking them all the way to full mastery of the subject or even to the extent of his mastery but is showing them the way and challenging them to go on to seek greater knowledge.

He must not let the students get the idea expressed by one first grader when she lamented having to leave her favorite teacher and remarked, "I wish she was smart enough to teach second grade next year."

Nor must we let them think, after completing a course, that they know it all as did the young lady who inquired about the work of the man next to her at a dinner party. He, a famed astronomer, replied, "I study astronomy," to which the young lady commented with disdain, "Oh, I finished that last semester."

A theory that has played a seriously damaging role in lowering the standards of our schools holds that outstanding students should not be permitted to go beyond their less proficient classmates and that mentally slow students should not be held back when the rest of the class goes on. This theory holds that all students should be given the same academic diet regardless of their appetites or digestive abilities.

This is, I believe, sheer nonsense. Some people are naturally endowed with more gray matter than others and some will excel if encouraged to apply themselves with their full vigor. Such encouragement has been a foundation on which the success of our way of life has been built.

To hold a naturally bright and ambitious student to the level of the average or below average bores him and destroys his ambition. Jean Felix Piccard, the famed scientist, reported that when an exceptionally bright lad of 14 visited his laboratory he asked the boy what he was learning in school. The boy might have been answering for many outstanding students when he replied, "Nothing. Nothing at all."

To him and his fellows, the subject matter, leveled to the requirements of the less proficient, was elementary and offered no challenge.

On the other hand, to let an inferior or just lazy student pass on with the rest of his class without mastering elementary requirements is equally unrealistic and damaging. For one thing, it shields him from the realities of life that he is going to have to come up against sometime—possibly when he will be less able to adjust to their impact. And, of course, injecting him in a scholastic atmosphere beyond his reach compounds his frustrations.

What I have tried to say tonight is that, as a businessman, I believe that to meet the challenge of the space age our schools must offer each student a challenge. They must give him mental discipline and exercise. They must awaken in him an intellectual curiosity—a respect for learning.

And, speaking of respect, I think that a vital element is building respect for teachers by their students. Recently, one of my young neighbors was heard singing to the tune of the "Battle Hymn of the Republic":

"Mine eyes have seen the glory of the burning of the school
We've tortured every teacher and broken every rule
We're marching to the office to hang the principal
We brats go marching on."

Although I think my young neighbor was being facetious, evidently some of the schoolchildren of America really have little more respect for schools and teachers than this.

I believe that the sort of situation in which a teacher cannot discipline a child is the cause of much of the juvenile delinquency in our country. I think that a situation in which school corridors must be patrolled by policemen to protect life and property is a sad commentary on our attitude toward schools.

Building proper respect for authority is a proper function of the home but, if the parents fail or its training needs reenforcement, teachers should not be denied necessary reign to discipline students. There can be no doubt that one of the most important functions of teachers is to help mold the character of their charges—to supplement the training of the home in preparing children to be good and responsible citizens as well as teaching them academic subjects. In this they are partners with parents.

On the matter of the partnership of teachers and parents, the Wall Street Journal had the following editorial last spring:

"The other night, we were at the school in our hometown to see a skit. But this time all the actors were teachers. The title was 'Teachers Are Human' and plainly the present crisis in education was the inspiration.

"These teachers were human enough, leading lives riddled with annoyances petty and not-so-petty, some deeply interested in their students and some less so. But obviously their play also could have been titled 'Teachers Are Not the Parents.' As one of the teacher-actors put it, it is difficult to be a full-time daytime babysitter while trying to launch a sputnik in a classroom.

"The teachers seemed to make a point that has been made too seldom in all the talk about the shortcomings of teachers and education. Leaving aside their natural pique at being made the target of the national failure in science, there is much truth in the idea that parents still bear the chief responsibility for their offspring and their attainments or lack thereof.

"It is possible that parents will have to resume their job of both curbing and inspiring their youngsters, teaching them at home some of the elementary principles of good citizenship and also of intellectual achievement. As one leading educator recently put it, 'This requires no money—only a change of heart.' "

It has been observed that the trouble with the school system is the teachers are afraid of the principals, the principals are afraid of the parents, the parents are afraid of the children, and the children are afraid of nobody. Such a situation is just not conducive to good education.

Let me close tonight by saying that here in Greater Cincinnati we have good schools. Most of the problems I have discussed apply more readily to schools in other areas, yet it does not hurt to reexamine even the best to be sure that evils are not creeping in or if they can be improved.

This must be a constant job—not just an aftermath of sputnik. And that job belongs to you—teachers and parents alike. The fact that you are active in the PTA here at Deer Park indicates that you realize this and I congratulate you on it. But you need to redouble your efforts to get your neighbors to join you.

Here also we have fine teachers for the most part. In this we are particularly fortunate. To them and to our schools is entrusted America's most precious resource—our youth.

To fan the spark of the Creator in them into flame is the job of education. It should be the concern of every American that this job is performed with the greatest possible excellence.

Fruitful Career

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of April 23, 1959, upon the retirement of Prof. George V. Sheeder as instructor in music at Wyoming Seminary, Kingston, Pa., after 45 years service:

Retirement of Prof. George V. Sheeder, teacher of violin at Wyoming Seminary's School of Music, in June terminates a fruitful career, spanning 45 years. His wife, Mrs. Helen Fritz Sheeder, is teacher of piano at the same institution.

A graduate of Wyoming Seminary, Professor Sheeder continued his studies in the United States and Europe before joining the

seminary faculty in 1913. His pupils have included many outstanding musicians in the community and country.

Nanticoke knows Professor Sheeder as well as seminary because of his ties with the school district as supervisor of music and director of its band and orchestra until his retirement there in 1952. He also enhanced a reputation for service through his club and fraternal activities.

An adopted son of Wyoming Valley, Professor Sheeder found in the community an outlet for his superior talents and he made the most of the opportunity. It is a pleasure to salute him on behalf of a grateful community.

What the Educational Benefits of the GI Bill Mean to a Family

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, one of the principal features of my proposal to extend the benefits of the Korean conflict GI bill to cold war veterans is the provision for educational assistance.

Recently I received a letter from a family in Houston, Tex., telling what the enactment of this bill would mean to them and their son, who is now serving with the U.S. Air Force in Germany.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Mr. and Mrs. W. S. Nail, of 2220 West Alabama, Apartment 3, in Houston, Tex., written February 24, 1959.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSTON, TEX.,
February 24, 1959.

The Honorable RALPH YARBOROUGH,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: It was a real consolation to read in a recent paper of your interest in the GI bill. We can certainly describe your efforts as a job well done and they deserve a sincere word of gratitude.

We, too, believe that those serving our country are entitled to some benefits, and particularly an educational allowance. This is of special interest to us as parents—with some assistance along this line we could have the assurance that our son would have college training. Upon his return from Germany in August of this year, he will have completed a 4-year period in the Air Force. Certainly, he would have a more secure feeling if he could make definite plans to enter college and know that he would be able to get a degree. We feel that it would be something that he has worked for and something he would make the most of. Nowadays, it seems that only the rich can afford higher training and this leaves people like us looking to people like you for ways and means of keeping things on an even keel.

You have our very best wishes for continued success.

Respectfully yours,
SALLE NAIL
MR. AND MRS. W. S. NAIL.

Defense Procurement Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK KOWALSKI
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am alarmed by the Department of Defense's statistics which indicate that small business is participating to a lesser and lesser extent in this Nation's defense programs. These statistics show that last year just 10 companies received more than 38.7 percent of the defense contracts. About 100 firms received over 74.2 percent of the contracts. Moreover, of the $23 billion spent on procurement last year, over 86 percent was spent on negotiated contracts—which included large sums of public money spent for new facilities, when, as in my own State, Connecticut, millions of square feet of production facilities and thousands of skilled men are either completely idle or only partially productive. Only about 14 percent of the procurements last year went to advertised bidding.

The evils here involve this country both economically and militarily. It is economically unsound to concentrate over 74.2 percent of this country's defense procurement in just 100 concerns. It appears militarily unsafe to concentrate production in such a few areas. In my own State, Connecticut, defense spending has fallen off approximately $350 million in the last 2 years. Many companies, large and small, are working with no backlog or have been forced to shut down.

I believe that legislation is in order to insure that negotiated contracting is reviewed before the fact rather than after contracts have been let. I intend to introduce legislation in this session which will establish a review board to investigate the advisability of awarding negotiated contracts when certain amounts of moneys are involved. The letter I am inserting in the RECORD outlines the views of an organization, the Electronics Small Business Council, which is very close to this problem, and, as a small business council, represents members who have had years of experience in dealing with procurement policies:

ELECTRONICS SMALL BUSINESS COUNCIL,
Washington, D.C., April 10, 1959.

Congressman FRANK KOWALSKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KOWALSKI: The congressional liaison committee of this organization, of which I am chairman, has asked me to contact you in the hope that you, and other Members of Congress, might be willing to evaluate present Defense Department procurement policies to determine if these are best serving this country.

The Congress is clearly responsible, under section 8, article 1, of the United States Constitution, for the expenditures of moneys for the Armed Forces. I believe you will agree that this responsibility is such that the Congress is obliged not only to provide the necessary funds but insure that they are spent wisely and prudently.

Defense Department figures prove conclusively that small business is not participating to any great extent in the defense effort. We have gotten to the point where only a handful of giant corporations receive more than four-fifths of the defense contracts. Negotiated contracting is the order of the day. Five-, six-, and seven-year backlogs are not uncommon among the big firms. These firms, through their position by controlling the support of maintenance parts, are able to "dictate obsolescence" of expensive systems, aircraft and other weapons.

This organization believes that it is expedient and proper to award research and development contracts to the large companies capable of performing this work. But, when research ends—and production begins—sufficient data should be available to give many concerns, of all sizes, the opportunity to bid for production of the many thousands of items which are now being negotiated for on a sole-source basis.

There is far too much authority at the lower echelons of the Defense Department which enables too many people to allow negotiated contracting. This authority—usually involving hundreds of thousands of dollars—should remain with the Secretary of the Department concerned. Before contracts are let, it appears that a review board of qualified technical personnel should determine whether or not to negotiate.

We are not, as small businessmen, asking for special favors. We are only asking that Congress accept its responsibilities and take the action needed to prevent military procurement funds from being wasted.

We ask that we are given an opportunity to bid on those items which we are capable of producing. In these cases we know that we can produce thousands of items cheaper and faster than they are being produced under negotiated contracts.

We also know that by breaking up the concentration of contracting which exists now because of negotiated procurement, that the economy will receive a boost. In addition, vital defense components will be built in widely dispersed areas, rather than being constructed in a few easily accessible points.

I hope that we may count on you to further investigate the matter of negotiated contracting and you may be assured that this council is ready and willing to give you further assistance or information you may need.

Sincerely yours,
GEORGE ESTOK,
Chairman, Congressional Liaison Committee.

Effects of Continuing Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PRINCE H. PRESTON
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a very timely and significant letter written by the Honorable J. Theodore Wolfe, president of the American Gas Association, to the President of the United States. His letter serves so well

to emphasize the frightening effects of continuing inflation. I commend this letter to my colleagues and the American public as worthwhile reading material:

AMERICAN GAS ASSOCIATION,
New York, N. Y., April 2, 1959.

The PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The question now before Congress—whether the Federal budget to be passed for 1960 shall be a balanced one—is of major importance to every citizen, whether an employer or employee, stockholder or consumer. A balanced budget will be the basic economic factor in determining everything that we can do as a Nation at home and abroad.

In my recent conversations with industrial leaders and others across the country, I found the overwhelming majority in favor of a balanced budget for general reasons. But there seemed to be scant realization of the inflationary consequences and special effects that an unbalanced budget will have upon those businesses whose operations and earnings are regulated. These include the gas utilities and pipeline companies which constitute the main public service elements of the gas industry.

Because their rates and earnings are limited to those necessary to compensate stockholders for the use of their capital and to attract the additional capital needed for expansion, their earnings cannot absorb the rises in operating costs resulting from inflationary pressures. During the years of creeping inflation since the last war, gas utilities experienced serious difficulty in obtaining prompt and adequate regulatory recognition of their special need for rate increases to cover the increasing costs of providing service.

Continued growth of inflationary pressures will bring more rate increase applications than ever to State and Federal regulatory bodies, making prompt and adequate relief impractical. Such a situation will mean that the gas industry, the fifth largest in the Nation, will be unable to contribute its proper share to the strength of the Nation's economy.

During the next few years, the gas industry, which now provides 28 percent of the Nation's total energy requirements, will require upward of $2 billion of new capital each year for plant expansion to supply the growing public demand for its services. Inflationary pressures will raise the cost of securing these funds and thus minimize the industry's services or increase their cost to the public.

In short, the regulated industries and the public services they render are peculiarly susceptible to the impact of inflationary pressures. Their special status justifies prompt and vigorous support of your balanced budget proposal on behalf of their customers and themselves.

I am writing to advise you of my concern in this matter, first, as a private citizen; as president of a regulated public utility; and finally, as president of the American Gas Association, which represents such regulated groups within the gas industry.

Very respectfully,

J. THEODORE WOLFE,

Hon. Christian A. Herter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HASTINGS KEITH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, may I join with my colleagues in the Congress in commenting on the appointment of Christian A. Herter as Secretary of State of the United States.

I served in the Massachusetts Senate for 4 years while our new Secretary of State was Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. And whereas many of my colleagues have commented favorably and enthusiastically on his competence in the field of foreign affairs, which I endorse, it is of his many accomplishments as chief executive of Massachusetts that I wish to speak at this time.

Mr. Herter reorganized several of our State's departments of government. He expanded its educational system and built hospitals and highways. He balanced the State budget and gave Massachusetts its first and only substantial reduction in taxes.

We have every reason to be confident that under Mr. Herter's leadership, the Department of State will have a positive approach to the problems of foreign policy.

Furthermore, we have every reason to believe—on the basis of past performance—that his program will be effective.

I consider it a distinct honor to have been associated with Mr. Herter at the State level, and to have this privilege of speaking in his honor today in the Congress of the United States.

Sixth District of Missouri Results of Opinion Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. R. HULL, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to make available for the information of other Members of Congress the results of a legislative poll I recently conducted among residents of the Sixth District of Missouri.

The opinions expressed in the poll assume national significance, I believe, in view of the fact that the district, comprising 17 counties in northwest Missouri, strikes a near-balance between farms and industrial and business communities, with responses coming from persons in a wide range of occupations.

Of special interest is the fact that a majority of the large number responding to the poll did not confine themselves to voting on the questions contained in the 28,000 questionnaires I mailed out, but demonstrated their great interest in the conduct of our national affairs by adding affirmative comments of their own on the pressing issues of today.

Residents of the district are most concerned about the high level of government spending, the continued failure of the Federal Government to live within its means, and the threat of inflation.

Also, a large majority voiced their approval of legislation designed to protect the rights of union members and the public against the machinations of the few unscrupulous labor union officials whose misdeeds have been exposed in recent congressional hearings. A typical remark was that of one man who stated:

I am a union member and I favor a tough labor bill.

The results, stated in percentages, follow:

	Percent yes	Percent no	Percent undecided
1. Would you favor increased taxes if necessary to maintain national security, as opposed to continued deficit spending?	70	23	7
2. Do you favor a cut in foreign aid spending?	70	22	8
3. Do you favor Federal aid for school construction?	43	51	6
4. Would you support legislation to regulate labor organizations?			
(a) By requiring secret ballots for union elections?	85	5	10
(b) By publication of financial records?	87	4	9
(c) By restricting secondary boycotts?	70	11	19
(d) By restricting jurisdictional strikes?	69	13	18
5. The President has requested an increase in postal rates and the Federal gasoline tax. Do you favor these proposals?	[1] 30	61	4
6. Do you believe the earning limitation for social security should be increased?	58	36	6
7. Are you in favor of the administration's farm program?	22	64	14
8. Do you favor an increase in the Federal minimum wage from $1 to $1.25 an hour?	38	58	4
9. Would you favor price and wage controls if necessary to halt inflation?	71	23	6

[1] An additional 2.5 percent favored increasing postal rates only, if necessary, and 2.5 percent favored increasing the Federal gasoline tax only.

Herbert W. Voorhees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, citizens of New Jersey and others throughout the Nation were shocked last week at the death of Herbert W. Voorhees in an automobile accident. Mr. Voorhees was the president of the New Jersey Farm Bureau. In Washington, D.C., and elsewhere, he was known as a great spokesman, not only for the good of the farm bureau, but for the good of the entire State and Nation. Many tributes have been paid to Mr. Voorhees in his life, and many have been paid since his untimely death. The following editorial, which appeared in the Trentonian of April 23, gives expression to the sense of shock and grief shared by all those fortunate enough to have known Mr. Voorhees. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HERBERT W. VOORHEES

The news columns of this and other newspapers have reported the accomplishments of Herbert W. Voorhees in depth; and even if they had not there would be little need for our recounting them in this space. What he was and what he achieved during his all too brief lifetime need no embellishing.

Instead, we join with uncounted others in mourning the shocking death of a friend. There are no words to adequately express the profound sense of loss that burdens those who knew his ready smile, who basked in the welcome warmth of his affability, who were privileged to share the keeness of his mind, who responded to his inspiring leadership.

Too few men of his caliber pass this way, and when one such is removed from our midst we are made infinitely poorer. Herb Voorhees contributed in great measure to the community, the State, and the Nation—yes, even to the world. For that he earned the accolades which are now being showered upon him. But he contributed in even greater measure to his loved ones, his friends, his associates. They will long cherish the memory of one who had so much to give and gave of it happily.

Each Right Yielded to Reds Is a Cold War Battle Lost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CARLTON LOSER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, having obtained unanimous consent, I place in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Nashville (Tenn.) Tennessean, a southern newspaper of renown. This editorial points up the views of Tennesseans generally, and I believe it conforms to the views of Americans everywhere. I commend its reading to the Congress. It follows:

EACH RIGHT YIELDED TO REDS IS A COLD WAR BATTLE LOST

Briton's leaders and people are weakening the Atlantic alliance by their jittery reaction to America's stand on its rights in approaching West Berlin by air.

They seem to have forgotten that to give up any right in dealing with Russian communism is to lose it, or that appeasement, once begun, is difficult to end.

Nor are our island allies helping the situation when, in their semihysteria, they openly charge that American generals have become so powerful that they are able to defy President Eisenhower in sending planes into Berlin above the 10,000-foot level decreed by the Soviets.

There is no basis for the charge that big brass in Washington is acting against President Eisenhower's wishes or orders. Instead, if anything can be taken for granted it is that the military is carrying out the President's policy of not giving an inch on its basic responsibilities.

The welter of propaganda now filling the British press appears to be as unwise as it is unfair.

If there is apprehension over what may happen before negotiations get underway, that is one thing. But no claim is advanced that the United States is doing any more than the British themselves have done, though not lately. A foreign office study of Royal Air Force log books shows that British planes have flown above 10,000 feet to Berlin in the past, though these flights have not been repeated in the current crisis.

In other words, as long as the Soviets did not object, the high-level approach was used. But when the word goes forth that this no longer pleases Mr. Khrushchev, there is quick acquiescence lest Mr. Macmillan's summit conference be adversely affected.

And what of the open charge, though not an official one, that the military is dominating the executive department in Washington? Evidence is all to the contrary, since one Army chief of staff, a very good one, has been given the bum's rush by Mr. Eisenhower for protesting some of his economy policies, while another has recently resigned rather than face further disappointment and humiliation. There has not been an administration in many years in which the military was more under civilian control, and the situation was in no sense changed by the illness of Mr. Dulles.

Fear of nuclear war is not confined to Britain and Mr. Macmillan. But fear in itself is not a calamity as long as it does not paralyze action. It exists, we may be sure, in the Federal German republic and in France, but it has not panicked anyone. That is why some of the British press accused Dr. Adenauer and President de Gaulle of waging war on Mr. Macmillan's cherished summit policies.

Certain dangers are clearly involved in the United States action, and perhaps we stand at another brink. But this is one brink for which Russia is wholly responsible, and we see no desire by the Moscow government to do away with it.

"In peaceful negotiations ahead the West will have to be united; it would be foolish for Americans to endanger this peace (sic) or this unity by too risky a bluff on smaller issues," the London Times says, editorially.

As a matter of fact, however, there seems to be unity among the Big Three on this point, save for Britain where Mr. Macmillan's leadership assumes too much importance and where the commendable goal for nuclear disarmament is being sought with a faintness of heart which could defeat its own purpose.

On grounds that the United States is sabotaging his country's policy of negotiation with Russia, a number of British Labor Party M.P.'s are going to demand formal protest to Washington by the Government.

One of them, Mr. Harold Davies, sounds off in this manner: "If the United States does not give us full assurances that these threats of war are repudiated and the generals kept under control, then the whole policy of allowing American bases in Britain must be reviewed."

This has all the earmarks of an ultimatum, based on false premises, which deals a blow to mutual confidence and plays squarely into Mr. Khrushchev's hands. It is one which should be met squarely and firmly in Washington.

The Montgomery County Sentinel, of Rockville, Md., an Honored Weekly Newspaper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. FOLEY
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, 30 years ago a small town weekly newspaper publisher gave me my first job as a printer's devil. Since then, as I have traveled from place to place in our country, it has been my custom to read the local weekly hometown newspapers. The vigor of their editorials, their dedication to the basic principles to which all Americans adhere, have been a constant source of inspiration.

For these reasons, I am proud to note that close by the Capitol in my own county we have one of the truly outstanding weekly hometown newspapers, the Montgomery County Sentinel, of Rockville, Md. Last week the Maryland Press Association awarded five certificates of honor to Mr. Cy Campbell, publisher, and Mr. Rogers B. Farquhar, editor, of this weekly newspaper that has a paid circulation of over 11,000. First place for best news picture in 1958 went to Hugh Gillespie, staff photographer. Other certificates for 1958 were second places for best editorial, for excellence in typography, and for community service, and third place for general excellence.

The Sentinel and its contemporaries are a hardy lot. They breathe genuine meaning and purpose into the words, "freedom of the press."

Historic Shrines Should Be Preserved From Commercial Exploitation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the current sentiment for obtaining the sites of some of the major battles of the War Between the States for national parks is, I believe, a most commendable and worthwhile project.

If we are to preserve for future generations the fields where so many of our ancestors fought and died, fields which have such battle-scarred names as Manassas, Antietam, Gettysburg, and others, we must move now. Delay in obtaining the sites of these national parks will cost us a great deal of additional expense since some of the land is about to be subdivided for commercial developments. To acquire the land later would be a very much more expensive undertaking.

America has a mighty and colorful heritage, and these lands on which dramatic acts of our history occurred, should be preserved as they existed when the great decisions of history were made there.

Mr. President, as an illustration of the necessity of this project, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Jean M. White, printed in the Washington Post and Times Herald for Thursday, April 23, 1959, under the heading, "Isolated Monument—Battle Parks Needs at Manassas Cited."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ISOLATED MONUMENT—BATTLE PARK NEEDS AT MANASSAS CITED

(By Jean M. White)

A few days after Union veterans gathered at Manassas, Va., in July 1865, to build a monument to the fallen patriots of the North and the South, a contemporary newspaper commented:

"In no better way can the deeds of hundreds of nameless dead * * * be kept green in the memories of future generations."

Right now those deeds are indeed being kept green—in the midst of a woodland with access only by a rough, unmarked foot trail a quarter mile from the road.

What's more, the monument rests squarely on privately owned land. Tourists, hardy and sure-footed though they be, can get to see the monument now because the owner has given the National Park Service his permission.

NO WAY TO HELP

Because it does not own the land on which the monument stands, the Park Service cannot spend a dime to repair the crumbling stones or mark out a trail. Vandals long ago made off with the shells and shot that the veterans used when they built the monument.

The State of the Union Monument is one of the reasons the Park Service cites to back up its request for some $900,000 to buy privately owned land within the Manassas Battlefield Park. This would add 1,740 acres and double the present size.

Here's what is happening to some of this land:

A sign on a roadside corner of a farm proclaims loudly: "Slow down * * * 300 feet ahead. Snack Bar." The 300 feet ahead is the Confederate Cemetery owned by the United Daughters of the Confederacy.

Someone has tacked an apple cider sign on the wooden stairs leading to the cemetery.

Down the road on Route 29–211, a big sign carries a for sale notice on the Dogan farm. There has been talk of a housing subdivision to go up on the land.

Less than 2 years ago there was a threat of a filling station on land close to the Stone House—one of the two remaining Civil War buildings still standing at Manassas. The Park Service scraped up enough money to save the land.

SUBURBIA CLOSING IN

Like the battlefields at Gettysburg and Antietam, Manassas is beginning to feel the squeeze of commercialism and suburbia. The urban sprawl from Washington is reaching the 26 miles to the rolling hills.

Battlefield Supt. Francis F. Wilshin feels the Park Service must move fast to buy the land. The Chantilly Airport, 11 miles away, and Interstate Highway 66, which will skirt the battlefield site, will bring a commercial boom and double the tourist flow, he predicts.

"If we are ever going to preserve this battlefield," Park Service Chief Conrad L. Wirth told a House committee, "we have very few years to do it before it will be built up and gone forever."

The Federal Role in Public Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, in lieu of the fact that the House Education and Labor Committee may soon report personally on a bill to provide Federal aid to education, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an excellent speech on this subject by Elliott L. Richardson, Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare:

THE FEDERAL ROLE IN PUBLIC EDUCATION

(Address by Elliot L. Richardson, Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, before the Boston Elementary Teachers' Club 15th educational conference and luncheon, Somerset Hotel, Boston, Mass., Apr. 4, 1959)

It is a privilege to have this chance to discuss with you one of the most important problems of our time—the cooperative functions of local, State, and Federal Governments in the support and improvement of public education.

The basic question which must be answered in any discussion of this problem is, of course, what is the proper role of Federal aid to education? As I need not tell this group, the term "Federal aid" when applied to education is a phrase that conjures up the ugly specters of regimentation and control.

It is a curious thing, but it is a fact, that only in the field of education does the mere suggestion of a need for Federal assistance arouse instant emotions of suspicion, hostility, and fear. In all other areas of State and local governmental responsibility, opposition to Federal aid may be based on budgetary considerations, or on the belief that there is no need for Federal action. From time to time, concern may be expressed that Federal funds applied in these areas may be followed by Federal requirements. It is only in the field of education, however, that proposals for Federal aid inevitably engender bitter controversy over the issue of Federal control.

Even proposals to provide Federal funds for bricks and mortar are greeted by charges that Federal officials with federally prescribed curriculum in their pockets are determined to install themselves in any building constructed with Federal help. The fact is, as President Eisenhower has put it, that once the bricks are laid, the mortar is dry, and the schools are built, the Federal mission has been completed. All control and use of the schools will be left in the hands of the States and localities.

In any event, the various proposals for Federal aid to education have provided a lively focal point of controversy for the past decade or more. Usually, the controversy has generated more heat than light. Since I first became actively concerned with the development of education legislation, it has become increasingly apparent to me that much of this heat could and should be dissipated by an objective effort to focus clearly and realistically on the alternatives which confront us.

No one questions the fact that public elementary and secondary education has traditionally and historically been the responsibility of our States and local governments. No one, so far as I know, wants to change this situation. Indeed, I believe it is fair to say that the decentralization of control and the responsiveness to local requirements which characterize this country's system of free education are generally recognized as precious assets.

It is—or should be—equally axiomatic that the Federal Government has a vital interest and an intimate concern with education. The Federal Government cannot be indifferent to the quantity and quality of the educational opportunities which our system provides, for ultimately these factors are vital to our very national survival. The Federal Government must, therefore, be concerned with the sufficiency of State and local efforts to meet the needs of education.

This national concern is reflected in a history of aid to education which is as long as that of the Nation itself. As early as 1785, 3 years before the Federal Constitution was ratified, the Congress of the Confederation adopted an ordinance setting aside the 16th section of land in every township in the new territories for the maintenance of public schools. Two years later, in the Northwest Ordinance, the concept of education as being a part of the national responsibility was expressed in the declaration that "religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged."

These measures are significant not only as manifestations of a national concern with education. They also rest on the premise that the actual provision of education is a local responsibility, for it was to the individual township that land for the endowment of education was granted.

This reliance on local autonomy in the management of schools was a practical necessity under the conditions of pioneer life in America. The frontier was characterized by the relative isolation and necessarily self-contained nature of community life. Out of such life there developed a unique and powerful habit of local responsibility for the schooling of children. Nevertheless, despite this conviction, despite the early American's fear of the tyranny believed to be inherent in centralized government, the States accepted repeated instances of Federal aid with no loss of autonomy and no diminishment of control.

From the Revolution to the Civil War, the Federal Government encouraged and financially aided education in the States. It endowed higher and common schools with lands, and made grants of surplus tax moneys. On no occasion did the Federal Government attempt to regulate the purposes, define the programs, supervise the teaching, or otherwise seek to control public education in the States.

In 1862, under the Morrill Act, the Federal Government provided an eventual grant of 11 million acres of land for the endowment of at least one college in each State or Territory that would devote itself to the teaching of agriculture and mechanics. Although the Morrill Act designated specific purposes for the use of its grants, the recipients of its benefits, the so-called land-grant colleges, have not experienced any difficulty in maintaining control of their academic programs. Moreover, the extensive public services rendered by these institutions are proof of the enduring value of Federal-State cooperation.

This pattern of Federal stimulation without Federal domination, Federal help without Federal control, has characterized every subsequent program of Federal aid to education. The Smith-Hughes Act of 1917 and the George-Barden Act which assisted the States in strengthening and extending vocational education, the numerous legislative provisions for education during the depression years, the post-World War II measures of assistance to federally affected areas—all these programs illustrate the application of these basic principles to changing times and circumstances.

Present times and immediate circumstances have heightened the national concern with education. In the last half century our society has become an intricate composite of diverse but related interests, each dependent on all others for effective functioning. As a people, we are inter-connected, inter-racial, intercultural, and international. No individual, no State, no local community can any longer stand alone and survive.

The obligations of world leadership, the increasing demands of industry and the armed forces for highly trained scientific personnel, the requirements of foreign trade and international diplomacy for personnel having mastery of languages other than their own, the increasing complexity of our economic and social arrangements—all these developments have imposed on every school district and on every institution of higher learning insistent demands for a greater quantity and improved quality of educational opportunties, facilities, and results in terms of well trained and intellectually enlightened young men and women.

On top of all this, the high birthrate of the 1940's and a generally heightened prosperity that has permitted more students to remain in school for a longer time have resulted in crowding schoolrooms far beyond their capacities and have burdened teachers to the limits of their endurance.

These conditions challenge the administrative ingenuity and the financial resources of even the wealthiest States. They pose serious problems for States of low per capita income and meager tax revenues.

Under these conditions the issue is not whether there shall be Federal aid, but what form that aid should take.

Broadly speaking, the alternatives are either to identify specific national needs and help to meet them through concentrated short-term Federal efforts, or simply to assume a permanent Federal share of the total costs of education without further regard to the purposes for which Federal funds are used.

Two fundamental considerations favor the first alternative. First, it keeps clearly in the forefront the principle that education is primarily a State and local responsibility. Second, it relates Federal assistance to specific educational needs which have a particular and current relationship to the national interest.

The other alternative rests on the proposition that the Federal tax base is the broadest and most equitable means to finance the needs of education in communities whose available tax resources are strained to the limit. Only the Federal tax base is capable of reaching resources wherever they may be and bringing them to bear wherever they are needed, and therefore, it is argued, we should face up to the necessity of utilizing this tax base if the needs of public education are to be met.

It is, of course, a fact that State and local resources are severely strained, and that efforts to squeeze more money out of the real estate tax and other forms of State and local taxation are daily becoming more difficult. At the same time it is also important to understand that what the traffic will bear in the way of State and local taxation is largely a matter of determination of relative values. We can afford what we want to afford. It simply is not true that State and local tax resources cannot stand any additional load for public elementary and secondary education when the average amount annually expended for these purposes in this country represents only 3 percent of the national income.

It should be recognized, moreover, that the argument for utilizing the Federal tax base as being the broadest and most equitable is one which, carried to its logical extreme, would lead to the virtual abandonment of State and local government. For certainly the argument made on behalf of education—that a substantial and permanent share of its costs should be shifted to the Federal Government—can be made with equal force on behalf of every other State and local service. And if it is desirable to shift part of this load to the Federal tax base, why not all of it?

We have to decide, then, whether we believe that the limited, sometimes inefficient, but time-honored institutions of State and local government are worth preserving because of the very fact that they are diverse, that they are local, that they are close to us.

Of the two alternative forms of Federal assistance, this administration has firmly and consistently held to the view that, on balance, the first is better designed in the long run to assure the sound development of our educational system. This approach, accordingly, has been taken in all the administration's legislative proposals in the field of education, starting with the school construction program recommended to the Congress in 1955.

Consider, for example, the recommendations which formed the basis for the National Defense Education Act of 1958. The general outline of this historic legislation was sketched by President Eisenhower in his famous speech at Oklahoma City in the fall of 1957, when he discussed the critical need to strengthen the educational system and develop a greater proportion of the talent of the Nation.

In his speech th President called for a nationwide reexamination of school curricula and standards to determine whether they meet the stern demands of the era we are entering, an era which would, he warned, demand not just engineers and scientists, but, in every field, leaders who can meet intricate human problems with wisdom and courage. He went on to list several specific steps as having a particularly high priority in terms of the national interest:

"We should, among other things, have a system of nationwide testing of high school students; a system of incentives for high-aptitude students to pursue scientific or professional studies; a program to stimulate good-quality teaching of mathematics and science; provision of more laboratory facilities; and measures, including fellowships, to increase the output of qualified teachers."

After exhaustive deliberation, Congress Congress agreed that the need for these particular programs was of such proportions as to justify Federal assistance. The recommendations of the administration were substantially embodied in the final act, which declares that "the present emergency demands that additional and more adequate educational opportunities be made available.

"We must increase our efforts to identify and educate more of the talent of our Nation. This requires programs that will give assurance that no student of ability will be denied an opportunity for higher education because of financial need; will correct as rapidly as possible the existing imbalances in our educational programs which have led to an insufficient proportion of our population educated in science, mathematics and modern foreign languages and trained in technology.

"To meet the present education emergency requires additional effort at all levels of government. It is therefore the purpose of this act to provide substantial assistance in various forms to individuals, and to States and their subdivisions, in order to insure trained manpower of sufficient quality and quantity to meet the national defense needs of the United States."

The National Defense Education Act, therefore, while establishing the most comprehensive program of Federal assistance in the history of education legislation, provides renewed congressional endorsement of the traditional principle that the Federal role in education is best limited to emergency and short-term assistance in attacking problems which the States acting independently cannot solve as rapidly as the national interest demands.

During the present session of Congress, this administration has submitted four proposals in the field of education, all adhering to the same basic principle. One is designed to assist the States in elementary and secondary school construction, another to help institutions of higher learning build new and remodel old facilities, a third to aid in meeting the costs of special professional services needed to carry out school desegregation programs, and the fourth to provide for the education of the children of Armed Forces personnel in places where public schools are closed.

The proposal to assist in financing elementary and secondary school construction recognizes a Federal responsibility to help States and communities overcome the tremendous backlog of school construction needs accumulated over the decades of depression, war, and population growth—needs which must be met before we as a nation can provide adequate opportunities for the children whose education is now handicapped by overcrowded classrooms. This program would authorize the U.S. Commissioner of Education to advance annually half the principal and interest on school construction bonds issued by needy school districts, provided the State undertakes to advance the remaining half of the payments. For the 5-year period in which commitments could be made, construction amounting to $600 million a year could be assisted. This sum would be allocated to the States on the basis of school population, per capita income, and school financing effort. In the 5-year period, the program could initiate $3 billion worth of classroom construction in needy and deserving school districts.

We recognize that pressures to provide the States matching share of school construction aid could, without proper safeguards against it, have the effect of retarding needed teachers' salary increases. Testifying on this point before the Education Subcommittee on Labor and Public Welfare, Arthur S. Flemming, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, said, "No program of Federal assistance to school construction should operate in such a way as to depress teachers' salaries * * * it should, as far as possible, encourage improvements in salary levels. Certainly there is no national goal deserving greater effort than the goal of salaries which will increase the attractiveness of the teaching profession." The Secretary then proposed an amendment to this legislation that would specifically provide for taking into account a school system's effort to pay adequate teachers' salaries in determining its eligibility for school construction assistance.

The second proposal would authorize a two-part program to accelerate construction of college and university facilities to help meet anticipated enrollment increases. Here, too, the Federal responsibility for assistance stems from a recognition that the present inability of our institutions of higher education to provide for these enrollment increases imposes a serious handicap to the fuller development of our human resources which must be achieved to meet national manpower needs. Under this program the Federal Government would:

1. Guarantee the principal and interest on non-tax-exempt bonds sold by educational institutions to finance construction of housing, academic and related educational facilities. The aggregate amount of guaranteed bonds outstanding at any one time would be limited to $1 billion.

2. Provide debt retirement assistance in the form of Federal commitments to pay 25 percent of the principal on long-term bonds issued by the institutions to finance construction of needed facilities. Federal payments would be made in 20 equal annual installments.

This twofold program is expected to approximately triple the construction rate of

academic facilities that are financed by borrowing. By making long-term financing more readily available, it would stimulate an aggregate of $2 billion worth of new and needed facilities.

The administration's remaining two proposals are each directed toward problems arising out of the Supreme Court's desegregation decisions, unquestionably an area of acute national concern. It is, indeed, by virtue of their belonging to the Federal Union established by the Constitution that those States which previously required or permitted racial segregation in their school systems are now required to bring about desegregation. In making this transition, these States and their communities may, in varying degrees, experience temporary but real financial and educational burdens. Significant problems of organization, transportation, curriculum planning, and school-community relationships may arise.

Recognizing, therefore, a Federal responsibility to help State and local agencies meet such problems, we have proposed grants toward the costs of developing and carrying out policies and programs for school desegregation, including the cost of providing technical assistance to local agencies in connection with their desegregation programs.

Our last proposal is directed toward a different aspect of the desegregation problem. It would provide for the education of all children of members of the Armed Forces, whether or not they live on Federal property, when public education is otherwise denied them due to school closings resulting from State and local attempts to avoid compliance with Federal court decisions or decrees requiring desegregation. This proposal recognizes that the Federal Government has a unique responsibility for the education of these children, since members of the Armed Forces serve under orders, and public education is normally available to their children only as it is provided in the communities in which they live.

I have only highlighted the current administration program in the field of education, but I hope you can see how these legislative proposals are designed to advance and strengthen our schools in ways having a clearly definable relationship to the responsibilities of the Federal Government. We believe such aid to be of vital importance, not only as a means of strengthening our educational system, but as a means of maintaining and strengthening the principle of State and local control of education.

Rather than relying on massive, permanent Federal help for the solution of our educational problems, we ask that each problem be met individually, with all available resources—Federal, State, local, and private—contributing to the solution in varying degrees according to the nature of the task at hand.

In the final analysis, we believe that this answer has been tried—and proven—by the tration of resources, with inevitably greater effectiveness. Further, we know that this answer will provide a greater total concen- long tradition and history of Federal aid to education.

A Program for the National Forests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CATHERINE MAY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 27, 1959

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, from time to time the Congress receives a message which in following years comes to be looked upon as a milestone in the progress of our country. Such a message was received during the Easter recess. It is from the Secretary of Agriculture. It submits for our consideration a program for the national forests.

The national forests are one of our great public heritages. They belong to all Americans. Their resources and services are available for use by everyone. Demands on the forests are now such that a program for the development of their resources and services for sustained production at practicable capacity is of the greatest urgency.

The program which Secretary Benson has recommended to us is designed to accomplish this development. It recommends both long-range objectives and a short-range program necessary to get the job done.

The short-range program is of great immediate importance. It is important for two reasons. First, the need is here, right now, to catch up with current use of these public properties. Hardly a day passes that I do not receive an appeal from mill owners large and small to do what I can to help put more timber on the market. We could do so if roads and other necessary facilities could be provided. Recreation use of these areas by people from my State—and from your States, too—has long since passed the capacity of existing facilities to handle these people—to handle this use in a way that will safeguard the purity of water supplies and provide safe places for campfires. I could cite other examples of increased use of these public forests.

This increased use is fine. The national forests belong to all the people, and we want them used. There is plenty of opportunity for even more use than present use. But the immediate problem is to catch up with the use we already have.

Moreover, what is done in the next 10 or 15 years will determine whether this great public estate contributes its fair share of the needs and necessities of our people by the end of the century and that is not many years distant.

This fair share is more important than many people realize. Large segments of agriculture and industry, many cities and urban areas, are dependent on water flowing from national-forest watersheds. Hundrdes of thousands of people earn their livelihood processing timber grown in national forests. The national forests are grazed by millions of livestock. Millions of people depend on the national forests for all kinds of outdoor recreation.

I think it is especially important to note that this program is not all outgo and no income. Last year the national forests of my State had cash receipts of nearly $16 million. It will be larger this year. Returns to the Treasury could be very much larger if we build the necessary timber access roads and do the other things outlined in Secretary Benson's proposed program.

Mr. Speaker, this program is a practical approach to a practical problem. It should have our vigorous nonpartisan support.

All That Glitters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, everybody is interested in money, but few people know much about it. In an effort to reduce my own ignorance to some degree I wrote a letter on March 12 to the Secretary of the Treasury and am setting forth the text of the illuminating answer I received.

I have written to the Treasury Department again to ask them why we must pay a subsidy for gold and silver. It seems to me that we should pay the market price, not prices above the market, for both these metals.

From time to time a constituent writes me that he believes we should promote an increase in the price of gold. I think a perusal of the letter set out below will convince the person that that is not at all practical nor, indeed, reasonably to be anticipated. Under a previous consent here is the text of the letter I received from the Treasury Department dated April 8, 1959:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, April 8, 1959.

Hon. C. O. PORTER,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PORTER: This is in further reply to your inquiry of March 12, 1959, concerning gold and silver.

The reprint, "Hard Facts About Soft Money," which you forwarded for our examination, calls for a revaluation of gold on the erroneous thesis that U.S. gold holdings are insufficient to meet domestic gold reserve requirements, and incorrectly attributes to the Treasury Department the allegation that $22.3 billion in gold is needed for domestic obligations. Since the error in the reprint argument apparently results from a misunderstanding of the role of gold in our monetary system, let me take this opportunity to distinguish between gold certificate claims and domestic gold reserve requirements, or as used in the reprint, domestic obligations.

Our gold stocks, which constitute the reserves behind our monetary and credit structure, are represented in the monetary system primarily by gold certificates or gold certificate credits issued against the gold by the Treasury to the Federal Reserve System. Data concerning gold assets and liabilities are published every day and distributed to banks, libraries, the press, and others. The enclosed Daily Statement of the U.S. Treasury, for example, shows that on March 25, 1959, there were outstanding gold certificate claims of $20.1 billion (including $200 million held as reserves against outstanding U.S. notes) against our gold assets of approximtaely $20.5 billion. The item "Balance of gold" under "Gold liabilities' represents gold against which no certificate claims have been issued.

When the Treasury buys gold it issues gold certificates or gold certificate credits to the Federal Reserve System, and when the Treasury sells gold it retires such certificates. Consequently, the amount of gold certificates and gold certificate credits can never exceed the total amount of our gold holdings, and as a matter of policy, is generally below

that figure. Besides, the March 1958 certificate and other claims of $22.3 billion could not be related to the March 1959 gold holdings of $20.5 billion. In the intervening 12-month period, both our gold stocks and gold certificate claims declined $2.2 billion. The following table, I believe, will clarify the relation between our gold holdings, gold certificate claims, and required gold reserves:

[In billions]

	Mid-March 1958	Mid-March 1959
A. Gold stocks	$22.7	$20.5
B. Gold certificates, gold certificate claims, etc	22.3	20.1
C. Required gold reserves	11.7	[1] 11.9
D. Excess of gold stocks over statutory gold reserve requirement (A–C)	11.0	[1] 8.6

[1] End of February; March data not available.

In any case, it is not correct to say, as the reprint alleges, that we now neeed $22.3 billion in gold for domestic obligations. Actually, at the end of February 1959, our gold reserves of $20.5 billion were some $8 billion in excess of statutory gold reserve requirements. Although the Federal Reserve System must maintain a 25-percent reserve in the form of gold certificates or gold certificate credits against its note and deposit liabilities, at the end of February 1959, this ratio was 43 percent, far in excess of our statutory gold reserve requirements.

With regard to United States policy concerning the sale of gold, which is discussed in the reprint, I should like to point out that we do not extend to foreign private citizens or institutions the privilege of converting their dollar assets into gold. We maintain, as an important phase of our monetary policy, the practice of buying gold from and selling gold to foreign governments, central banks, and under certain circumstances, international institutions for the purpose of settling international balances and for other legitimate monetary purposes. There is no reason to anticipate that the aforementioned entities will want to convert all their dollar assets into gold. As a matter of fact, net sales of gold by the United States this year have been at a comparatively slower rate, and as of March 25, 1959, our gold stocks declined only $92 million since the first of the year, despite the increase in foreign dollar earnings.

The administration has made it clear on many occasions that the United States has no intention of increasing the price of gold or devaluing the dollar. We do not believe that any increase in the price of gold would be in the best interest of the United States and the free world. The value of the dollar is firmly linked to gold; the official value of $35 per fine troy ounce was established in 1934. This relationship has contributed to the maintenance of a stable and strong financial structure in this country, and thus to the soundness of our domestic economy. Foreign countries have also come to rely on the dollar as a strong and secure currency, firmly fixed in value in terms of gold.

With respect to legal provisions affecting the price of gold, the United States has an international obligation contained in article IV, section 2 of the Articles of Agreement of the International Monetary Fund not to buy gold at a price above the par value of its currency (plus a margin prescribed by the Fund of 1 percent) or sell gold at a price below par value (less 1 percent). The United States has communicated to the Fund a par value for the dollar of 15 5/21 grains of gold 9/10 fine. This par value which is the equivalent of a price of $35 per fine troy ounce of gold, is the same as the gold value of the dollar as established by Presidential Proclamation of January 31, 1934, issued under the authority of section 43, title III of the act of May 12, 1933, as amended. Accordingly, the United States has an obligation under the articles not to purchase gold at more or sell gold at less than $35 per fine troy ounce plus or minus 1 percent so long as the par value of the dollar declared to the Fund remains unchanged. Section 5 of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act provides that a change in the par value of the U.S. dollar declared to the Fund shall not be proposed or agreeed to without authorization by Congress by law.

With respect to the price of silver, the U.S. coinage mints receive silver which any mint is satisfied has been mined subsequently to July 1, 1939, from natural deposits in the United States or a place subject to the jurisdiction thereof. Under the act of July 31, 1946, the return to the depositor for silver mined after July 1, 1946 is 90.5 cents per fine troy ounce. The return for silver mined before this date but after July 1, 1939, is 71.11 cents per fine troy ounce, as provided in the act of July 6, 1939. As of March 20, 1959, the New York market price for silver was 91⅜ cents per fine troy ounce.

I trust the above explanation will clarify for your constituent the misconceptions inherent in the reprint from the California Mining Journal, which is returned herewith. As of additional assistance, we are also enclosing the following materials which you may wish to transmit to your correspondent: an excerpt from the Federal Reserve Bulletin, which provides information concerning changes in U.S. gold holdings since 1946, and a copy of the Federal Reserve System, Purposes and Functions, chapters VI, VII, and VIII of which explain in some detail the relation of Federal Reserve banking to currency and gold.

Please be assured we are always glad to have an opportunity to be of assistance to you.

Sincerely,

T. GRAYDON UPTON,
Assistant Secretary.

Medical and Moral Problem of 5 Million Victims of Alcoholism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, under the title of "A Progressive Disease," the distinguished medical editor of the New York Times, Dr. Howard A. Rusk, has discussed the rising tide of alcoholism in the United States in his paper for April 26, 1959.

Dr. Rusk emphasizes that alcoholics are sick persons, just as much as though they suffered from other known and recognized diseases.

Dr. Rusk also has stressed that the industrial costs of alcoholism are staggering, for most of the incidence of alcoholism occurs in the 35-to-50 age period when a man or woman should have attained the highest productivity during a career.

And Dr. Rusk tells us that alcoholism can both be prevented and cured, but that first we must recognize it as a definite disease. He also notes that alcoholism confronts not only the United States but also all other nations. And, by way of distress and some shame, he tells us that only France has a higher rate of alcoholism than the United States among the countries of the globe. The French rate is 5,200 alcoholics per each 100,000 adults while ours is 4,360 among the same number.

Because Dr. Howard A. Rusk is so learned and eminent an authority in this and other fields of medical and health problems, I ask unanimous consent that his article in the New York Times regarding our 5 million victims of alcoholism be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Dr. Rusk also adjures us to back up Senator LISTER HILL'S bill for a new National Institute of International Medical Research, which could devote some of its energies and facilities to the question of alcoholism, which Dr. Rusk lists in his informative article as America's third major disease.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 26, 1959]

A PROGRESSIVE DISEASE—AN ANALYSIS OF ALCOHOLISM AND MOVES TO CURE THE NATION'S 5 MILLION VICTIMS

(By Howard A. Rusk, M.D.)

This past week a group of professional business and civic leaders met in New York at a private dinner to discuss one of mankinds oldest plagues—alcoholism.

The conferees were not temperance workers in the usual sense of this term. Among them, however, were some teetotalers who now refrain from drinking because they have learned they cannot control their drinking.

Today it is estimated there are 70 million persons in the United States who drink alcoholic beverages. These 70 million persons are primarily men and women who have a cocktail or two before dinner or a highball or two later in the evening. Among them are some persons who get high on rare occasions.

It is not with this group that the National Council on Alcoholism, which met to discuss this problem last Wednesday evening, is concerned. To them drinking presents no particular problem.

The concern is with 5 million sick people needing medical, psychiatric, and social help who are alcoholics.

Contrary to general belief, these sick people for whom drinking has become such a problem that it interferes with the unfortunates on skid row whose medical, psychiatric, and social problems have become so great that little can be done to help them.

MOST STEADILY EMPLOYED

Eighty-five percent of these 5 million alcoholics are men and women who usually are married and living with their families. Most have histories of steady employment in positions requiring skill and responsibility.

They are the hidden alcoholics. There is one or more in every business or social circle, but they are protected from general recognition not only by themselves, but by their fellow workers, foremen, union stewards, and management, for a time.

But alcoholism is a progressive disease. Left untreated, it progresses until the symptoms become so acute that the disease can no longer be hidden. Business and industry have no recourse then but dismissal.

Alcoholics are sick persons just as much as though they suffered from other known and recognized diseases. They are persons who are peculiarly susceptible to alcohol or who are suffering from some tension, physiological or psychological, for which alcohol

provides temporary relief. They are utterly unable to control their drinking themselves, but they can conquer their problem with help.

As in all health problems, this help is needed on three fronts: increased direct services through which the victim of either acute or chronic alcoholism can receive high quality professional services; increased research on the problem, and increased professional and public education.

The industrial costs of alcoholism are staggering. The great majority of the problem drinkers are in the 35–50 age group, the period when a company after years of investment in the individual's training and experience expects him to be the most productive.

Most problem drinkers were drinking for years before their disease progressed to the point that it became impossible for them to hide it from fellow workers and supervisors. By this stage absenteeism increases until the average alcoholic is losing 22 working days each year from alcoholism alone.

Many of our forward-looking industrial organizations have recognized these tremendous losses in both human happiness and money, and have initiated programs to help the alcoholic control his disease. In some instances, absenteeism because of alcoholism within various industrial organizations has been reduced by as much as 75 percent within 6 months.

Alcoholism can be both prevented and cured. The first step is its recognition as a disease.

Alcoholism is a problem that confronts not only the United States but many nations of the world. Authorities report that France, with 5,200 alcoholics for each 100,000 adults, is the only major nation where this disease problem is greater than in the United States. Our rate is 4,360.

Other nations in which alcoholism is a major health problem are Chile, Sweden, Switzerland, Denmark, Poland, the Soviet Union, Canada, Norway, Finland, and Australia.

It is also of significance that these rates are increasing in most parts of the world. Yet very little money is spent on research in the medical-psychological-social aspects of alcoholism.

The National Institutes of Health and the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, have made some relatively small grants for research in alcoholism. Last year Congress, however, for the first time made an appropriation specifically for research in alcoholism. The appropriation of $700,000 was given to the National Institute for Mental Health.

Since alcoholism is an international problem, it is an area of research that could profitably be supported on an international basis if Congress enacted pending legislation known as the International Health and Medical Research Act of 1959.

This measure, introduced in the Senate by Senator Lister Hill of Alabama, with 59 cosponsors, would create a new National Institute of International Medical Research within the National Institute of Health.

The proposed new institute would have an annual appropriation of $50 million to support international medical, health and rehabilitation research. The bill, which has had widespread professional and public support, will probably come to a vote before the Senate this week.

Through increased research efforts, tremendous gains have been made in recent years against many of mankind's greatest killers and cripplers. It is indeed unfortunate that the full resources of research have not been brought into play against alcoholism, for this is Amercia's third major disease, being exceeded only by the mental illnesses and cardiovascular disease.

An Inroad to Federal Control of Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am encouraged when I receive a letter such as the one I herewith insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I have received hundreds of letters from the people whom I have the honor to represent in Congress opposing Federal aid to education. This letter from my esteemed friend, Mr. R. E. Wollenhaupt, of Fontanelle, Iowa, sets out well and concise the general feeling about Federal aid to education which prevails in the Seventh Iowa District.

Of course, I also receive a few letters in favor of it, but such letters are becoming fewer and fewer as time goes on, because more and more people are becoming thoroughly convinced they do not want the education of their children controlled from Washington, D.C.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 26, 1959.

Mr. R. E. WOLLENHAUPT,
Fontanelle, Iowa.

DEAR MR. WOLLENHAUPT: Thank you so much for your wonderful letter of April 13. It is so reassuring to have a thoughtful and well-considered message. One letter like yours, pleading for fiscal sanity, overcomes a dozen of the opposite variety, which insist that the Federal Treasury pay for everything from cradle to grave.

So that you will know your letter came to a sympathetic correspondent, please let me refer you to the attached speech I made in the House last summer on the subject of Federal aid to education.

Sincerely yours,

BEN F. JENSEN.

Mr. Wollenhaupt's letter and my remarks above referred to, follows:

FONTANELLE, IOWA, *April 13, 1959.*

Hon. BEN F. JENSEN,
U.S. Representative,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. JENSEN: At a parents and teachers meeting held recently at our public school, a film was shown entitled "Breakthrough to Better Schools." This particular film has been developed by the National Education Association and emphasizes the passage of the Murray-Metcalf bill which provides a measure of Federal aid to education for school buildings and teacher salaries.

I personally felt that the film was quite "slanted" to create a favorable attitude toward Federal aid. I also feel that the film does not in itself reveal the total picture as to what may be involved in the implementation of such Federal aid. It would seem to me that there are many ramifications relative to the administration of a Federal-aid-to-education program which might have numerous bad results. Further, that measures of this type are not consistently American in nature but instead reflect a measure of discredit on our forefathers, who, instead of pleading to the Federal Government for assistance, would by the sweat of their brow and hard work, manage to get the job done for themselves.

There is no question that we all want good, adequate schools for the children of our State and Nation and I am sure we are desirous of paying our teachers adequate and proper salaries. I feel, however, that this is not the function or the immediate problem of the Federal Government. Surely this should be, and can be handled at the local levels of Government if people will but put their minds to the task at hand. While costs of building, maintaining, and operating schools are high indeed, I cannot believe that there is any community in this State of Iowa which is unable to meet its financial obligations for adequate school purposes.

It seems to me that for too many years, now, we have been conditioned to follow the course of least resistance and instead of facing our local problems and taking necessary action, we turn to the already overburdened Federal Government to pour out money for measures which we should be providing ourselves. Unfortunately, the Federal Government is itself to blame for this situation due to its removal of the gold standard and inaugurating an irredeemable monetary system.

I firmly support the stand of President Eisenhower to hold the line on Federal expenditures to balance the budget. I hope that all good Republicans give him their unwavering support toward eliminating the reckless and irresponsible spending ventures which have been prevalent for so long.

If additional funds are necessary to care for our schools, additional taxes must be raised at the local levels involved. We all dislike taxes, but it is better to pay as we go than to have the Federal Government make handouts derived from no other source than deficit financing. Presumably such a measure as this bill would be financed in that manner. This method may seem more painless temporarily but in the long run will surely lead to our economic destruction and provide an inroad to socialism or worse.

Perhaps you would be good enough to express your views on Federal aid to education generally and on the Murray-Metcalf bill in particular.

Sincerely yours,

R. E. WOLLENHAUPT.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Aug. 8, 1958, House proceedings, p. 19359]

(Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point.)

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, the basic purpose of education is to develop the minds of a people so they can govern themselves and thus be the masters of their own destiny instead of being a mere servant of an all-powerful government, controlled from the seat of a powerful paternal government. That was one of the compelling reasons why our Founding Fathers placed great emphasis on the individual and established our free private enterprise system. It was never their purpose that the Congress should establish such laws as would finally bring about a system here where any freeborn American would be beholden to a paternal government for their education.

Mr. Speaker, it will be a bad day for America if the day should ever come when our boys and girls can say to their mothers and fathers, "We owe you little for our higher education," and I fear that day will come if this bill is made the law of the land. For then we will be educating our children to depend too much on a paternal government, and to expect and accept all sorts of Federal controls as is the case in every nation on earth where liberty is gone and where the individual is only a pawn in the hands of a Socialist all-powerful government, because such an act as is here proposed by H.R. 13247,

had been ruled the law of the land. We have already gone too far in that direction. Remember that age-old adage:

"Just as you bend the twig so will the tree be when it's big."

That admonition holds just as true today as when those words were first uttered.

Also, let us not forget that, at this very minute, we have a staggering Federal debt of over $275 billion—but not with my vote. Yet, here we are considering a bill which will, over a period of a few years, add billions more which our children and their children will have to pay. Yes, most of the very same Americans that this bill seeks to help will have to pay the bill in burdensome taxes, if they can, or suffer the consequences. The true facts are, there is not a school district, or a county or a State in this Union which is not more able financially than the Federal Government to provide proper and adequate facilities for their children, and I am sure if most of the parents and their good thoughtful children knew that Federal control is written into every title of this bill they would say, "kill it," as would their sons and daughters.

The first responsibility for the education of our children rests on the shoulders of the parents, next on the school district, next on the State, and only in impacted areas where Federal establishments have created a school expense too great for the taxpayers of a school district to support, there and only there should the Federal Government aid, interfere, or dictate.

Untold Story of Panama: Radio Review by Maj. Gen. James E. Edmonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, a significant event in the cumulation of historical material relating to the launching of the Panama Canal enterprise, out of which grew the Republic of Panama, is the book, "The Untold Story of Panama," by Mr. Earl Harding, of New York, which was announced in a radio broadcast by Maj. Gen. James E. Edmonds, distinguished citizen-soldier, World War II commandant of Camp Lee, Va., war correspondent, and news commentator.

Under leave granted, I include excerpts from General Edmonds' radio broadcast of April 19, 1959, relative to the Harding book and the mounting crisis at Panama, as follows:

EXCERPT FROM RADIO BROADCAST BY GEN. JAMES E. EDMONDS ON RADIO STATIONS WEAM, ARLINGTON, VA., AND WISE, ASHEVILLE, N.C., AND FOUR OTHERS IN NORTH CAROLINA, SUNDAY, APRIL 19, 1959

There was another bit of news related to our struggle, maybe our life and death struggle, against communism. It was the announcement of the early appearance on the booksellers' shelves of a slim volume of less than 200 pages, entitled "The Untold Story of Panama."

It is a punctiliously documented, comprehensive, succinct account of how in the days of the first Roosevelt the United States came into full power over the construction of the canal to link the Atlantic and Pacific. The project had been talked about for centuries. The book relates the immense difficulties, the maneuvering and the diplomacy—the actuality of the diplomacy, much of it hitherto secret—which produced the result.

In the book is suspense, the drama of history-forming events in dangerous making. The volume could not be more timely. It appears just when, in Panama and end to end of Latin American unhappily, there is anti-American agitation, probably often Red-formented, demanding that Panama—little American-initiated and created Panama—seize or nationalize the Canal—take it over as Nasser did Suez.

The book appears just after the normally well regarded quarterly Foreign Affairs contained a lengthy article guardedly supporting the idea that the United States scuttle away from its obligations at Panama by accepting internationalization—a field in which we have not fared so well for years.

The Panama Canal is truly the lifeline of our national defense by sea and the backbone of our ocean commerce. It is under threat. Those who would save it for us and for the free world owe it to their duties to read this book by Earl Harding, of New York.

I have known him since our young manhood together as newspapermen—in peace and war. A more careful, skilled, recorder of history as he saw it made, does not live. Like Earl Harding I also as a young newsman knew Panama when that work of the ages was at its beginnings. I would hate to have my country scuttle away from its operation and defense at this late day. It might well mean our final step toward vast disaster.

Hon. George H. Christopher

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include resolutions adopted by the Missouri Senate and the Missouri House of Representatives upon learning of the death of our distinguished colleague, Hon. George H. Christopher, and also include extraneous material:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE MISSOURI SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES UPON LEARNING OF THE DEATH OF THE HONORABLE GEORGE H. CHRISTOPHER

HOUSE RESOLUTION 44

Whereas the house has learned with deep regret of the death on January 23, 1959, of the Honorabale George H. Christopher, Representative from Missouri's Fourth Congressional District, of Butler; and

Whereas Congressman Christopher, having been identified with many governmental, agricultural, and civic activities, and was well known and loved throughout Missouri and the Nation; and

Whereas throughout many years of public service Congressman Christopher became acquained with and a friend of the people throughout the State; and

Whereas Congressman Christopher's sincerity of purpuse and true devotion to the cause of better government and the welfare of his fellow citizens endeared him to all with whom he became associated: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the members of the house of the 79th general assembly express their sincere regret at the passing of this fine citizen; and be it further

Resolved, That the speaker of the House be instructed to appoint a delegation to represent the house in attendance at the funeral services to be held Wednesday, January 28, 1959, at 2 p.m., in the city of Butler, Mo.; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the house of representatives be instructed to send a properly inscribed copy of this resolution to each Congressman Christopher's children; Mrs. Charlotte Ward, Butler, Mo.; George D. Christopher, Amoret, Mo.; Homer W. Christopher, Butler, Mo.; Wallace A. Christopher, Butler, Mo.; Stanley Christopher, Butler, Mo.; Robert Christopher, Butler, Mo.; Monty Joe Christopher, Butler, Mo.; Moreland Christopher, Passaic, Mo.; and Mrs. Moina E. Ratliff, 1912 R Street SE., Washington, D.C.

SENATE RESOLUTION 26

Whereas the senate has learned with deep regret of the death on January 23, 1959, of the Honorable George H. Christopher, Representative from Missouri's Fourth Congressional District, of Butler; and

Whereas Congressman Christopher, having been identified with many Government, agricultural, and civic activities, and was well known and loved throughout Missouri and the Nation; and

Whereas throughout many years of public service, Congressman Christopher became acquainted with and a friend to the people throughout the State; and

Whereas Congressman Christopher's sincerity of purpose and true devotion to the cause of better government and the welfare of his fellow citizens endeared him to all with whom he became associated: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the members of the senate of the 70th general assembly express their sincere regret at the passing of this fine citizen; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be instructed to send a properly inscribed copy of this resolution to each of Congressman Christopher's children: Mrs. Charlotte Ward, Butler, Mo.; George D. Christopher, Amoret, Mo.; Homer W. Christopher, Butler, Mo.; Wallace A. Christopher, Butler, Mo.; Stanley Christopher, Butler, Mo.; Robert Christopher, Butler, Mo.; Monty Joe Christopher, Butler, Mo.; Moreland Christopher, Passaic, Mo.; and Mrs. Moina E. Ratliff, 1912 R Street SE., Washington, D.C.

(Offered by Senator Journey.)

[From the Bates County (Mo.) Shopper, Feb. 5, 1959]

IN MEMORY, RESPECT AND ESTEEM

(By E. H. Hardinger)

Bates County, our State of Missouri, and the Nation has suffered a distinct loss in the passing of the late Honorable George H. Christopher.

He was truly a friend of the people who tilled the soul and all who so depend on it directly or indirectly for a living. His talents which he so willingly shared and his ability which he so ably performed, places him among the great. Every family in this entire Midwest, country, town or city has lost a capable sincere friend. Although another Congressman will be elected to perform the duties of Fourth Congressional District, no man can take the place of George Christopher.

Like other great men before him, now that he is gone, his true greatness and importance will indeed be realized and missed. His entire life leaves a great challenge to us all, especially our youth. It can truly be said with God's help he was a self-made and self-educated man. Born of the most lowly, step by step, ever keeping his goal in mind, overcoming all obstacles to reach great heights. One important characteristic which George seemed to always display was good commonsense. This is indeed important. Sometimes

the passing of a loved one in early life or an important public servant taken at the height of their career seems hardly fair, however, these are things for us not to question and to strengthen our faith. I deem it a great privilege and a great honor to have been a good friend of George Christopher all my life.

[From Roll Call, Jan. 28, 1959]

REPRESENTATIVE GEORGE H. CHRISTOPHER

The character of Representative George H. Christopher, Missouri Democrat, was clearly revealed several hours before he died of a heart attack Friday night. He phoned a Republican Congressman to offer his help on any action needed to help flood-stricken sections of Ohio.

Representative Christopher's desire for service crossed party lines not only in this instance, but throughout his distinguished career in the Congress.

Courageous, good-natured even after undergoing a leg amputation, able and kind, George Christopher will be missed by all who had the good fortune to cross his path.

[From the Nevada (Mo.) Daily Mail, Jan. 26, 1959]

GEORGE H. CHRISTOPHER

The American farmers, particularly the farmers of Missouri, lost a good friend and a champion of their cause Friday night when Congressman George H. Christopher, of Amoret, was called to his rewards by his Maker.

Congressman Christopher, a battling Democratic lawmaker, was proud of the fact that he was a dirt farmer. He was also proud of the fact he grew up in the true American way—hard work, honesty and the burning desire to be of service to his country and his fellow men.

Mr. Christopher knew hard times and tragedy during his lifetime but he kept right on working toward the ideals which guided him through life. He became strengthened by the setbacks he encountered and used the experience to be a better servant to his neighbors and his Government.

History records the acts of many more famous men than Mr. Christopher, but to his legion of farm friends, supporters and to his numerous acquaintances in all walks of life, George Christopher was a great man.

He was a wise, energetic and competent politician and lawmaker. He prided himself in the role of champion of the farmers' cause and well he should because the farmers of Missouri and America are the people he fought for in the Halls of Congress. He wanted his fellow farmers to get a fair deal from the Government and he died continuing that difficult task.

Mr. Christopher was also a champion for the laboring man. Always alert and sympathetic to their cause, he was interested in legislation which would insure them better working conditions and a fair wage for their efforts. He was also an advocate for honesty in the upper echelons of organized labor as a means of protection for the workers.

We pride ourselves in having been numbered amongst Mr. Christopher's friends and confidants. Oftentimes he called us from his Washington office to keep us informed about something of interest in this, the Fourth Congressional District, which he represented so well. His many appointments of Vernon County young men to our military academies is but one evidence of his service to this area.

George H. Christopher was truly a representative of the people of his district and State in Congress and he will be greatly missed. His successor, in our opinion, will be required to possess a lengthy stride to be able to walk in Mr. Christopher's footsteps.

[From the Kansas City (Mo.) Times, Jan. 24, 1959]

CHRISTOPHER IS DEAD AT AGE 70—MISSOURI FOURTH DISTRICT CONGRESSMAN SUFFERS HEART ATTACK IN WASHINGTON—VOTE IN 1958 AN UPSET—LEGISLATOR, WITH VIRTUALLY NO ORGANIZED SUPPORT, WON IN DEMOCRATIC PRIMARY

WASHINGTON, January 23.—Representative George H. Christopher, Democrat, Missouri, died of a heart ailment tonight at his Washington home. He was 70.

Christopher complained of feeling ill while watching television, lay down to rest and died a few minutes later at about 10:50 p.m.

BORN NEAR BUTLER

Christopher was born near Butler, Mo., and lived there almost all his life. He was a farmer with a special interest in soil conservation.

At the time of his death his 975-acre farm at Butler was operated by a son, a daughter, and a son-in-law. He had seven sons and two daughters. His wife died in 1952.

Christopher served in the 81st Congress, then became assistant to the director of the agricultural conservation program of the Department of Agriculture.

He was returned to Congress in the 84th Congress, and reelected to the 85th Congress. The present Congress is the 86th.

From 1948 to 1950 Christopher served from the old sixth district but there was a redistricting and when he returned to Congress in 1954 he represented the fourth district.

PRAISE FOR RECORD

Christopher was often lauded by labor for his voting record and received strong support from the farmers and rural people, to whom he was extremely close.

In the last primary campaign, often ill and recovering from a leg amputation, he fought the battle of his political life, virtually alone. The Jackson County coalition threw its support to Robert P. Weatherford, Jr., former mayor of Independence. The Jackson County faction leaders said Christopher had gone back on his promise not to seek reelection.

The State and national committees of the AFL–CIO and the local committee of the CIO stuck by him but the powerful AFL political club headed by John J. Kopp, presiding judge of the county court, supported Weatherford.

Former President Harry S. Truman gave his support to the coalition candidate.

Weatherford banked on piling up a huge majority in heavily populated Jackson County to win. Christopher concentrated on the farm vote that had been faithful to him in his other political battles. When the votes were counted Christopher had won by more than 1,100 to the surprise of city politicians.

BEATS GOP CANDIDATE

In the November election he won by 30,000 votes over James Rahm, Warrensburg lawyer, the Republican candidate.

James L. Williams, chairman of the Jackson County Democratic committee, said last night he was shocked and sorry to hear of Christopher's death.

Williams said the Governor would make an appointment to fill out the term.

The Congressman's farm was near Amoret in Bates County, near the Kansas line. His farm, and agriculture in general, were his prime interests. He served as community committeeman in the first corn-hog program and held many other local agricultural positions in Bates County.

He had long urged aid to farmers and was a strong supporter of all farm legislation. He attributed last November's Democratic sweep to farm unrest.

In Congress he served on the Interior and Insular Affairs and Veterans' Affairs committees.

LOST LEG IN 1957

In November, 1957, Christopher's right leg was amputated above the knee because of an arterial ailment.

"I never really made up my mind to run again until I knew I was going to lose my leg," he said a few weeks after the operation. "That will give me something to worry about which will make me forget my missing leg."

Upon hearing of the death of Mr. Christopher, Weatherford issued this statement in Phoenix, Ariz., where he is executive director of plans for progress, a metropolitan area planning organization:

"The passing of a great Missourian is a loss to his State and Nation. I always held a warm affection and deep respect for 'Mr. George.' Never was a more high-level campaign conducted than by him, and not an unkind word came from his lips. Our last visit was at a party given for me by President Truman at the Hotel Muehlebach in Kansas City, and I was deeply honored that my good friend, Mr. George, attended. His passing has taken a good friend, a great orator, and an able statesman from the American scene."

The Congressman, born in 1888, was a member of the Methodist church, the Shrine, and the Independent Order of Odd Fellows. He was educated in Butler and Sedalia and in 1913 married Miss Lelia Poore of Bowling Green, Mo.

The fourth district, represented by Christopher, covers the eastern part of Kansas City, the rest of Jackson County, and Barton, Bates, Cass, Henry, Johnson, Lafayette, and Vernon Counties in western Missouri.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Jan. 24, 1959]

GEORGE H. CHRISTOPHER, HOUSE MEMBER, DIES

Representative George H. Christopher, 70, Democrat, of Missouri, died of a heart ailment last night at his home, 1912 R Street SE.

He lived here with his daughter and son-in-law, Mr. and Mrs. Ray J. Ratliff.

Mr. Christopher, whose leg was amputated some time ago, complained of feeling ill while watching television. He lay down to rest and died a few minutes later.

The death of the Missouri Congressman, an expert on soil conservation, made the new House lineup 282 Democrats and 153 Republicans.

Mr. Christopher represented the district that included Independence, the home of Harry S. Truman. He first came to Congress in 1949, served in the 1954 session and was reelected in 1956 and last year. He was a farmer with a special interest in soil conservation, which led to his participation in various House agricultural affairs.

ONE-TIME U.S. OFFICIAL

After one term, Mr. Christopher left Congress to become assistant to the director of the Agricultural Conservation Program of the Agriculture Department. A firm believer in the use of lime, sweet clover and alfalfa for preserving soil, he was himself the owner of a 975-acre farm near his native Butler, Mo.

While in the House, Mr. Christopher served on the Agriculture, Veterans' Affairs, and Interior Committees.

FATHER WAS FARMER

Mr. Christopher was a graduate of the public schools in Bates County, Mo., and of Hill's Business College in Sedalia in 1907.

The son of a farmer, he repeatedly preached the urgency of widespread adoption of scientific erosion control methods. It was the responsibility of every farmer to do his part, he insisted, but the city dweller also could not ignore the land problems.

Mr. Christopher was a Mason and a Shriner. He spent his life in Bates County except for brief periods as a young man spent in Oklahoma and Illinois. He was known among his congressional associates for his humor.

[From the Kansas City (Mo.) Star of Jan. 24, 1959]

A CHRISTOPHER ATTACK FATAL—THE MISSOURI FOURTH DISTRICT MEMBER OF CONGRESS DIES IN WASHINGTON—BETTER SOIL HIS GOAL—BATES COUNTY FARMER, 70, PUT SPECIAL STRESS ON NEED FOR CONSERVATION

WASHINGTON, January 23.—Representative George H. Christopher, Democrat, of Missouri, died of a heart ailment tonight at his Washington home. He was 70.

Christopher complained of feeling ill while watching television, lay down to rest and died a few minutes later at about 10:50 p.m.

BORN NEAR BUTLER

Christopher was born near Butler, Mo., and lived there almost all his life. He was a farmer with a special interest in soil conservation.

At the time of his death his 975-acre farm at Butler was operated by a son, a daughter and a son-in-law. He had seven sons and two daughters. His wife died in 1952.

Christopher served in the 81st Congress, then became assistant to the director of the agricultural conservation program of the Department of Agriculture.

He was returned to Congress in the 84th Congress, and reelected to the 85th Congress. The present Congress is the 86th.

HALTS WEATHERFORD BID

In last year's primary, Christopher defeated Robert P. Weatherford, Jr., former mayor of Independence, who was supported by the Jackson County coalition.

Christopher was endorsed by both the State and national committees of the AFL-CIO and the local committee of the CIO.

In May 1958, the Fourth District Congress Member denounced what he termed "unfounded rumors" that he would withdraw from the primary race.

Christopher had long urged a sound farm program and said he would always support farm legislation. He attributed last November's Democratic sweep to farm unrest.

FAVORED HIGH PROPS

Calling for a return to a price support program of at least 90 percent of parity last November, Christopher said the former program should be expanded to include vegetables, feed grains, poultry and other commodities.

[From the Kansas City (Mo.) Star, Jan. 24, 1959]

DEATH SWIFT TO ARRIVE—CHRISTOPHER DIES WHILE VIEWING TV PROGRAM

(By Jack Williams)

WASHINGTON, January 24.—George G. Christopher, Representative in Congress from Missouri's Fourth District, died here last night before an ambulance could reach the home.

Details of the death of the 70-year-old Congressman were given this morning by Mrs. Moina Ratliff, his daughter. When in Washington Christopher makes his home with his daughter and her husband, Ray J. Ratliff, who is a doorkeeper in the House.

Mrs. Ratliff said her father was watching television when he began complaining that his chest was bothering him.

"He said it felt like the heart attack he had back in 1951," Mrs. Ratliff said. "We called an ambulance, but he was dead before it arrived."

Mrs. Ratliff said a funeral service would be held at 3 o'clock Monday afternoon at the Hines chapel in Washington. Then the body will be flown to Missouri for services in the Congressman's home community in Bates County. Relatives in Missouri will not attend the Washington service, Mrs. Ratliff said.

Details of the Missouri services have not yet been completed.

The House is expected to meet briefly at noon, Monday, eulogize Christopher and then adjourn out of respect to him, and in order that the Members can attend the Washington service.

It is anticipated SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House, will name a delegation from the House to represent that body at the services.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post and Times Herald, Jan. 25, 1959]

CONGRESSMAN CHRISTOPHER, 70

Representative George H. Christopher, Democrat, Missouri, who considered himself a farmer first, died Friday night in the home of his daughter at 1912 R Street S.E. He was 70.

Born on a farm in Butler, Mo., in 1888, he lived in the Fourth Congressional District near Independence, Mo., home of former President Harry S. Truman. He was first elected in 1948.

Former President Harry Truman paid tribute to Representative Christopher:

"I'm as sorry as I can be to hear of his death," said Truman. "He was a fine Congressman and a fine man. I've known him for many years. Christopher was the best-informed man on farm policy of any man I knew."

Representative Christopher returned to his 975-acre farm after he lost to a Republican in 1950 but he came back to Washington to stay in 1954.

In Washington he lived with his daughter, Moina, and his son-in-law, Ray J. Ratliff, a doorkeeper in the House. Mrs. Christopher died in 1952.

Representative Christopher was a member of the Interior and Insular Affairs and the Veterans Affairs Committees. But agriculture was his main interest.

Representative Christopher was bitter about the waste of land resources. He criticized his fellow farmers for carelessness about soil erosion and he stumped for effective conservation programs. He was proud of the miles of terracing on his own farm.

Father of seven sons and two daughters, Representative Christopher proudly boasted that all his sons were farmers. Aside from Moina, all of his children live near the ancestral home in Missouri.

Four years ago, Representative Christopher suffered his first heart attack. In November 1957, his right leg was amputated just above the knee as the result of a circulatory defect.

Funeral services will be held at 3 p.m. Monday at the S. H. Hines Funeral Home, 2901 14th Street N.W. Representative Christopher will be buried in Butler, Mo., with the Missouri congressional delegation serving as honorary pallbearers.

[From the Kansas City (Mo.) Star, Jan. 25, 1959]

CHRISTOPHER RITES SET—SERVICES WILL BE IN BUTLER, MO., WEDNESDAY

BUTLER, Mo., January 24.—Funeral services for George H. Christopher, Representative in Congress who died in Washington Friday night, will be at 2 o'clock Wednesday at the First Baptist Church here.

The body of the Congressman will be brought here after services in Washington Monday afternoon.

HIS HOME COUNTY

The services in Christopher's home county will be conducted by the Rev. Orval F. Woolery, pastor of the church. Burial will be in the Oak Hill cemetery here. The Christopher farm home is 7 miles northwest of here, near the Kansas-Missouri line.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Jan. 25, 1959]

HOUSE SCHEDULES TRIBUTE TO CHRISTOPHER TOMORROW

Funeral services will be held at 3 p.m. tomorrow at the S. H. Hines Funeral Home for Representative George H. Christopher, 70, who died of a heart ailment Friday at his home, 1912 R Street SE. The body of the Missouri Democrat will be sent to his native Butler, Mo., for burial, where a memorial service is planned Wednesday.

The House planned to meet briefly tomorrow at noon to eulogize Mr. Christopher and then adjourn out of respect for him. His death resulted in a new House lineup of 281 Democrats and 153 Republicans.

His right leg was amputated in 1957 as a result of a circulatory defect. He suffered an earlier heart attack 4 years ago.

Mr. Christopher was an advocate of progressive soil conservation policies.

Representative NEWELL A. GEORGE, Democrat, of Kansas, and one of Mr. Christopher's closest friends, said yesterday:

"With the death of Representative Christopher the farmers and little businessmen have lost a real champion and a true friend. His loss will not be easily replaced."

Mr. Christopher, who was born near Butler, Mo., and graduated from public schools in Bates County, was a farmer first and last. He had a special interest in soil conservation and was active in various House agricultural affairs. The son of a farmer, he repeatedly preached the urgency of widespread adoption of scientific erosion control methods.

Mr. Christopher represented Missouri's Fourth District, which included Independence, the home of Harry S. Truman. He was elected to Congress in 1949, served in the 1954 session and was reelected in 1956 and last year.

After one term, Mr. Christopher left Congress to become assistant to the director of the agricultural conservation program of the Agriculture Department.

While in the House, he served on the Agriculture, Veterans' Affairs, and Interior Committees. He was known among his congressional colleagues for his humor.

Mr. Christopher was a graduate of Hill's Business College in Sedalia, Mo., in 1907. He was a Mason, a Shriner, and Odd Fellow.

A widower, he leaves two daughters, Mrs. Ray J. Ratliff of the home address, and Mrs. Edward Ward of Butler, Mo.; and seven sons, George D., Moreland F., Homer W., Charles S., Wallace A., Robert L., and Joseph M., all of Butler. Also surviving are two brothers, Frank, of Lake Grove, Oreg., and Edward, of Hardin, Ill.; and a sister, Mrs. Julia Reavis of Corcoran, Calif.

[From the Kansas City (Mo.) Star, Jan. 26, 1959]

A CHRISTOPHER TRIBUTE—LAWMAKERS GIVE EULOGIES IN CONGRESS—SESSION THEN IS RECESSED TO PERMIT MEMBERS TO ATTEND RITES

(By Jack Williams)

WASHINGTON, January 26.—Twenty-three Members of the House of Representatives today eulogized the late George H. Christopher of Missouri, who died Friday.

"His career was a striking example of freedom of opportunity and limitless possibilities under our form of government," Representative CANNON, dean of the Missouri delegation in Congress, said "He started as a young man without land, capital or influence."

SERVICES IN CAPITOL

The House adjourned after the eulogies so that Members could attend funeral services here this afternoon. Flags atop the Capitol flew at half mast. A scheduled meeting of the Interior Committee, of which Christopher was a member, adjourned in honor of the deceased member.

The body will be taken by train tonight to Kansas City, from where it will be moved to Butler, Mo., for services there at 2 o'clock Wednesday afternoon. A resolution was adopted by the House expressing sympathy to the family and naming the other 10 Missouri Representatives to be honorary pallbearers. Several of them will attend the funeral services at Butler.

The fight the Congressman made for renomination last year was referred to by CANNON and Representative BOLLING, of Kansas City.

"A DECISIVE VICTORY"

"When he announced his candidacy he was handicapped physically and politically," CANNON said. "He was marked for slaughter by his opponents. He fought through the primary and won a decisive victory on his record of service."

Bolling said that in the last primary campaign Christopher was "opposed by forces so strong he was not thought able to survive." He added that after Mr. Christopher's victory he held no malice against those who had sought to prevent his renomination.

Representative MCCORMACK of Massachusetts, Democratic floor leader, praised Christopher's hard work in Congress and summarized him as "a great man who took his work but not himself seriously."

Representatives BOLLING, KARSTEN, CARNAHAN, SULLIVAN, and BROWN of Missouri are planning to attend the services in Butler.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 27, 1959]

CHRISTOPHER EULOGIZED—HOUSE MEMBERS PAY TRIBUTE TO MISSOURI REPRESENTATIVE

WASHINGTON, January 26.—Twenty-three House Members today eulogized Representative George C. Christopher, Democrat of Missouri, who died of a heart attack here Friday.

The House then adjourned out of respect to Mr. Christopher after delegating its other members from Missouri to attend a funeral service here and in Missouri.

The service was held at a funeral home here this afternoon with the Rev. Bernard Braskamp, House chaplain, and the Rev. Arthur Underwood of St. Timothy's Protestant Episcopal Church in Washington officiating.

Another service will be held in the Baptist church at Butler, Mo., Wednesday afternoon. Burial will be at Butler.

Representative CLARENCE CANNON, a Democrat and dean of the Missouri delegation, cited the courage of Mr. Christopher, who, although handicapped by a leg amputation a year ago, had fought to victory in the election.

[From Roll Call, Jan. 28, 1959]

REPRESENTATIVE CHRISTOPHER FIRST DEATH OF 86TH

Ten of his congressional colleagues accompanied his body west to Butler, Mo., as the House of Representatives paid its reverent respects to George H. Christopher, 70, who died of a heart attack Friday.

The veteran legislator succumbed at the home of his daughter and son-in-law after complaining of feeling ill early in the evening. He had served for nearly 10 years and represeented ex-President Harry Truman's home district.

Members of the House eulogized Christopher, the first death of the 86th Congress, and the House adjourned Monday out of respect for the solon, whose final services will be held today.

He was the son of a Missouri farmer, grew up in Bates County, and was an expert on agriculture and veterans affairs. He served on the Agriculture, Veterans Affairs, and Interior Committees.

Funeral services in Washington were held Monday at the S. H. Hines Home. He is survived by two daughters and seven sons.

[From the Kansas (Mo.) City Times, Jan. 28, 1959]

RITES TODAY AT BUTLER—BODY OF REPRESENTATIVE CHRISTOPHER ARRIVES HERE—LABOR AND POLITICAL FIGURES AND BATES COUNTY CITIZENS MEET TRAIN

A large delegation of labor and political figures and Bates County citizens was at the Union Station last night when a train arrived with the body of U.S. Representative George H. Christopher.

In a private car on the back of the train were three Missouri Representatives who served with Christopher in Washington. They were RICHARD BOLLING, of Kansas City, A. S. J. CARNAHAN, Elisinore, and MORGAN M. MOULDER, Camdenton.

EIGHT TO ATTEND

The three are among eight of Missouri's Representatives to the House of Representatives who will attend services for Christopher today at Butler. Christopher, Missouri Fourth District Representative from Butler, died Friday in Washington.

CHARLES HARRISON BROWN, Springfield; W. R. HULL, JR., Weston; Mrs. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, St. Louis, and FRANK M. KARSTEN, St. Louis, arrived last night by plane. KARSTEN is acting head of the House delegation.

Kenneth R. Harding, sergeant at arms of the House, said the congressional delegation will go to Butler this morning by motor car.

DAUGHTER ON TRAIN

Mrs. Ray J. Ratliff, Christopher's daughter, met the train. She, with her husband and 4-year-old daughter, Ramona, attended memorial services for her father Monday at Washington, then drove here.

Also present was Leonard Irving, congressman from the fourth district from 1949–53. He is now president and business representative of Laborers Local 264.

H. L. Oberweather, mayor of Butler, met the train. He had issued a proclamation requesting that all businesses in Butler close tomorrow from 1:45 until 2:45 o'clock. Services for Christopher will be at 2 o'clock at the First Baptist Church.

[From the Kansas City (Mo.) Times, Jan. 29, 1959]

BIG CROWD ATTENDS CHRISTOPHER RITES—ABOUT 1,500 PERSONS AT BUTLER CHURCH FOR SERVICES FOR U.S. REPRESENTATIVE COME FROM MANY AREAS, FELLOW LEGISLATORS, LABOR, MASONS, AND OTHER GROUPS ARE REPRESENTED

(By James R. Ashlock)

BUTLER, Mo., January 28.—George H. Christopher, the 70-year-old Member of the House of Representatives from the Fourth Missouri District, was buried today beside his wife and mother in Oak Hill Cemetery, 2 miles east of Butler. Representative Christopher died Friday night in Washington.

About 1,500 persons crowded into the small Butler Baptist Church for the funeral. Only about 600 could be seated in the sanctuary. Others sat in Sunday school classrooms and the basement, listening on a public address system.

Seated in the front row were seven of his House colleagues. They were FRANK M. KARSTEN and Mrs. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, St. Louis; RICHARD BOLLING, Kansas City; W. R. HULL, JR., Weston; CHARLES H. BROWN, Springfield; A. S. J. CARNAHAN, Elsinore, and MORGAN M. MOULDER, Camdenton.

HILLELSON IS PRESENT

Jeffrey P. Hillelson, acting postmaster at Kansas City, was representing Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, Webster Groves. Hillelson, a Republican, once held the Fourth District House post and was unseated by Christopher. Also present was Kenneth B. Harding, Sergeant at Arms for the House.

The Reverend Orval Wooley sketched Christopher's career. He told of Christopher's soil conservation practices and of his efforts in Congress to assist farm interests.

Not far from Butler, near the Amoret community, is Christopher's 950-acre farm where he spent most of his life. It was his farm background that won him favor among the agricultural people. But he had support, too among nonrural labor groups.

Christopher had sought benefits for postal workers. In appreciation of this, five members of Kansas City Local 67 of the National Federation of Postoffice Clerks attended the funeral. William H. Cady, 7706 East 112th Street, Hickman Mills, president of the local, headed the delegation.

LABOR IS REPRESENTED

Other labor groups who supported Christopher were represented by H. E. Carroll, area director for the United Auto Workers and Julius Frazer, international representative of the UAW. Both are from Kansas City. Oren Lee Staley, Rea, Mo., president of the National Farmers organization, was present.

Christopher was a member of the Amsterdam Masonic lodge, which meets near his farm home. He joined the lodge in 1937. Eighteen members of the lodge were among the 200 present for the Masonic ceremony at the graveside.

Richard H. Ichord, speaker of the Missouri House of Representatives, appointed a five-member delegation which attended the service. They were Mrs. Olive Hedger McGuire, Bates County; Curtis Vernon Davidson, Henry County; Calvin Holloway, Sinclair County; W. C. McGraw, Johnson County, and George Duensing, Jr.; Lafayette County.

[From the Bates County Democrat, Butler, Mo., Feb. 5, 1959]

A crowd of 1,500 crowded into the Butler Baptist Church last Wednesday afternoon to attend final rites for Congressman George Christopher, who died at his home in Washington, D.C., Friday night, January 28. Services had been held earlier in the week in Washington and the body was escorted to Butler for the memorial and graveside services.

Included in the throng of mourners were people from all walks of life—from congressional and farm organization dignitaries to personal friends and acquaintances of the colorful Democratic Congressman from the Fourth District.

Rev. Orval Woolery, pastor of the Butler Church, in his sermon recounted Christopher's distinguished career as a farmer and lawmaker. Passages from the Sermon on the Mount and Golden Rule (Christopher's favorites) were recited in the brief but impressive service. The memorial actually began at 2 p.m., but the mourners began streaming into the church before noon to pay their last respects.

At the conclusion of the services, the body of Christopher was laid to final rest in the Oak Hill Cemetery east of Butler. These services were conducted by Christopher's home Masonic lodge of Amsterdam, Mo.

Deep personal loss of a friend and lawmaker was reflected on the face of each

mourner as he passed by the casket of George Christopher. The countless floral displays paid a final tribute to the fallen Congressman.

Governmental dignitaries here to attend the funeral services included:

Congressman Frank M. Karsten, St. Louis, Mo.; Richard Bolling, Kansas City; W. R. Hull, Jr., Weston, Mo.; Charles H. Brown, Springfield, Mo., A. S. J. Carnahan, Ellsinore, Mo.; Morgan M. Moulder, Camdenton, Mo.; and Mrs. Leonor K. Sullivan, St. Louis, Mo.; Assistant Sergeant of Arms of the House, Kenneth R. Harding, Washington, D.C.; House of Representatives, Jefferson City, Mrs. Olive Hedger McGuire, Bates County; Curtis Vernon Davidson, Henry County; Calvin Holloway, Sinclair County; W. C. McGraw, Johnson County; George Duensing, Jr., Lafayette County; State Senator Kelso Journey and Mrs. Journey, Clinton, Mo.; National N.F.O. President Oren Lee Staley, Rea, Mo.; National Director Gordon Shafer, Elm, Mo., Fourth District chairman; Glenn Nelson, Nevada, Mo.; Fourth District chairman J. E. Hambright, Harrisonville, Mo.; LaFayette County Democratic Chairman Q. J. Bernard, Lexington, Mo.; Vernon County Democratic Chairman M. L. Welty, Nevada, Mo. Labor union, John E. Rinkenbaugh, H. E. Carroll, Julius Frazier, and J. A. Sanders, all of Kansas City.

EXCERPTS FROM THE SERVICE CONDUCTED BY THE REVEREND ORVAL F. WOOLERY, BUTLER BAPTIST CHURCH, BUTLER, MO., JANUARY 28, 1959

THE BLESSING OF WORK

Scripture (Matthew 5: 1–16):

"And seeing the multitudes, He went up into a mountain: and when He was set, His disciples came unto Him. And he opened His mouth, and taught them, saying, 'Blessed are the poor in spirit: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. Blessed are they that mourn: for they shall be comforted. Blessed are the meek: for they shall inherit the earth. Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness: for they shall be filled. Blessed are the merciful: for they shall obtain mercy. Blessed are the pure in heart: for they shall see God. Blessed are the peacemakers: for they shall be called the children of God. Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness' sake: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. Blessed are ye, when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely for My sake. Rejoice, and be exceedingly glad; for great is your reward in heaven: for so persecuted they are prophets which were before you.

"Ye are the salt of the earth: but if the salt have lost his savor, wherewith shall it be salted? It is thenceforth good for nothing, but to be cast out, and to be trodden under foot of men. Ye are the light of the world. A city that is set on an hill cannot be hid. Neither do men light a candle and put it under a bushel, but on a candlestick; and it giveth light unto all that are in the house. Let your light so shine before Me, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven."

Text (Matthew 5: 16): "Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven."

Poem, "Friends," by Lloyd Carleton Shank:

"Can any earthly possession
Be esteemed above a friend?
Can other in time of sorrow
Greater comfort lend?

"Across the pages of history
And down to the present time
No sweeter theme is recorded
Than friendship's pact sublime.

"He that is guilty of using
His friends for selfish gain
Should never again feel worthy
Their confidence to retain.

"True friendship's highest regard
The Master clearly commends
In setting forth the lesson
Of loyalty to friends."

We seek comfort in various ways: First, friendship; second, meditation; third, work. All three are important and can bring much comfort.

I. Friendship truly is of such worth we would be rich if we had friends but none of the world's goods.

Again, should we not have earthly friends but know Him who is the friend that sticketh closer than a brother, we are rich.

II. Meditation has been vital in every life that has achieved. It has been the springboard to accomplishment. Meditation has been a blessing to those who sorrow. For through it we often find the key that unlocks the treasure house of blessing; we find the light that dispels the darkness that surrounds us; and we find the courage to overcome our fears.

With the psalmist we would say, "Let the words of my mouth, and the meditation of my heart, be acceptable in Thy sight, O Lord, my strength, and my redeemer."

Poem, "The Secret of His Presence," by Lloyd Carleton Shank:

"It is good for us to wander
Through the fields and far away
From the trials and temptations
That beset us every day:
To the secret of His presence
Where He teaches us to know
That 'tis here we find refreshing
Where His living waters flow.

"O, the rapture of this meeting
With the friend who understands
And calms out every tempest
Through the power of His commands.
So my brother, I entreat you
That you seek without delay
And you'll find in Him the quenching
For your thirsting soul today."

III. Work, "The tree of life is laden with promise for him who works." (Rev. S. R. Bratcher, Methodist minister.)

George Christopher was a worker.

The Sermon on the Mount teaches us that to work is blessed.

Poem, "Work," by an unknown author:

"This is the gospel of labor,
Ring it, ye bells of the kirk;
The Lord of love came down from above
To live with the men who work.

This is the rose He planted
Here in the thorn-cursed soil.
Heaven is blest with perfect rest,
But the blessing of earth is toil."

We who remain today can find comfort in work.

The Apostle Paul said, "I am debtor."

Three things that prompt us to work:

1. An awareness that we owe something to ourselves and families.

2. We are indebted to others: (a) for our heritage, (b) for our blessings.

3. We are indebted to God:

(a) Therefore, my beloved brethren, be ye steadfast, unmovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as ye know that your labor is not in vain in the Lord. (I Corinthians 15: 58.)

May we find comfort then in friendship, in meditation, and work.

ORIGINAL AND UNPUBLISHED POEMS WRITTEN BY THE HONORABLE GEORGE H. CHRISTOPHER

JIM

He had religion's blessed hope
Of mansions in the sky.
But it so happened that one day
Jim took his bed to die;
"Up yonder" then he whispered as the
Preacher closed his prayer,
"But going from Missouri
I'll get lonesome over there."

REMEMBERED NAMES

Remember the names we knew long ago
When in youth we first lived in this land?
There was Westover, Armentrout, Bailey, and
Scott
And Marshall and Allen and Hand.
There was Rabourn and Cowdry and Maddy
and Park
And Dawson and Barton and Burns;
They are gone like dry leaves in a November
wind
And scarcely a memory returns.

YOUTH'S SPIRIT

A few more years—a few more years
The past will be behind,
Sweet in the shroud of faded hopes
Dear to my inmost mind.
I think 'twill haunt my after life,
That spirit young and bold
That will take me back to the long ago,
Ere I became so old.

MY VANISHED FRIEND

Around the corner, I had a friend,
I knew not he was nearing the end;
The days slipped by and weeks wore on
And before I knew it, my friend was gone.

And for months I had not seen his face
For life sets a swift and terrible pace
And that's what I get and deserve in the end:
Around the corner—a vanished friend.

ETERNAL SPRING

There came a spring so long ago
The winter's sleep was scarcely broken,
The south wind and the sun returned
Listening for words that were never
spoken.

Though two score years and more are gone
Spring now comes just the same as then,
And if we had it all to do
We'd do it just the same again.

There was a spring that never came
But we have lived enough to know,
That what we never have—we keep
While everything we have must go.

LOST LOVE

I walk alone beneath a wishing moon
Where love bends low to kiss a dream good-
by;
Since God has said, with me she could not
stay
Each morn I wake to greet a loveless day.

MY BELOVED

A moss-covered cabin by a flowing brook
At the foot of a mountain in a shady nook,
With a winding path to a sparkling spring
Were bluebirds warble and the cardinals
sing.

It was there we came on Easter Day
And the jonquils nodded their heads so gay.
And we kindled a flame on our heartstone
there
For the fog was chill in the mountain air.

But our hearts were warm with youth and
love
Though the fog shut out the sun above.
And happiness dwelt in our first home there
As the firelight gleamed in your golden
hair.

WASHINGTON D.C., *January 26, 1959.*

DEAR MR. AND MRS. RATLIFF: Words can't seem to express the many thoughts and sincere sympathy that are with you at this time.

WOMAN'S AUXILIARY,
CHURCH OF SAINT TIMOTHY.

JANUARY 27, 1959.

The officers and members of the Washington Heart Association gratefully acknowledge a contribution from his friends in the Agricultural Conservation Program Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, and Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Vellone (former neighbors), in memory of the Honorable George H. Christopher toward the conquest of heart disease.

KANSAS CITY, MO., *January 25, 1959.*

To the Family of the Hon. George H. Christopher:

May you find strength and courage
And understanding, too
In deeply sympathetic thoughts
This message brings to you.

We were married 50 years the 24th of December, and we received a congratulatory letter signed by your dear father. We were so surprised and so happy to receive it, and cherish it so much—we wouldn't take anything for it.

He must have been a wonderful man, and we would have been pleased to have met him. When we read in our paper of him passing away we were so sorry.

Please accept our deepest sympathy and we pray that God will give you physical strength and spiritual power to carry you through your great sorrow.

May God bless and comfort you all.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. O. A. FELCH.

WASHINGTON, D.C., *January 25, 1959.*

DEAR MOINA AND RAY: My family and I wish to convey our deepest sympathy on the death of your father, the Honorable George H. Christopher.

While our grief can never match yours, his passing meant a great loss to us also.

We came to know Mr. Christopher well as a neighbor and a friend and we're going to miss his kindness, wisdom, and ready wit every day of our lives.

I shall always remember especially those evenings when your father, relaxing on the patio after a strenuous day on the Hill, would hold us spellbound with his reminiscences of things past and his wise interpretation of things present and future. I'll never forget, either, the early morning coffee, which we all enjoyed so much. After his coffee and a restful night, your father could always face the day with high spirits and zest. His example was an inspiration to all who knew him and I'd like to think that I'm a better man for having known him and called him friend.

Again let us attempt to tell you how much we sympathize with you in your loss and to assure you that he is going to be missed by everyone as a fine legislator and a fine gentleman.

Sincerely,

CHARLES H. STEPHENSON AND FAMILY.

CLINTON, MO., *January 30, 1959.*

DEAR MOINA AND RAY: Two years ago tomorrow Pet (Mrs. Sperry) left. My sorrow was so deep that I felt that life would not be worth living. My sorrow now is just as deep, but I learned that I must live whatever time may be allotted, and that I must adjust myself to the finality of death.

Pet and I attended your mother's funeral and your father wept with us in his sorrow. He wept with me a few years later, in mine. We have many times talked with each other about our great loneliness.

I told him at the cemetery, where he now rests, that I had come with him as far as mortal man can go, to the graveside of his beloved. Thereafter, he must seek his own solution, a new way of life, bereft of that which he held most dear. He understood. So it was with me, when Pet was laid to rest. So it must be with you, now that George is gone. Even my children could only walk with me to the graveside, they can't really share my terrible sorrow, although they, too grieve for their mother; but their grief, they alone must bear; mine, I alone must bear and learn to live with.

But friends can still love the families of those who are gone. I shall always love and respect his friendship, and my affection for his family and close friends will continue through the years that I have left.

Sincerely and affectionately,

Hon. FLOYD L. SPERRY,
Judge, Kansas City Court of Appeals.

P.S.—I write this to you because I knew you better than I did other members of the family, but I would like them to know how I feel.

ARLINGTON, VA., *January 24, 1959.*

DEAR MOINA and RAY:

THE PATH BEYOND THE BEND

Have you ever walked along a path
And looked ahead of you
To where the road turned suddenly
And seemed lost awhile to view?

Think of your dear one living still
Where the road goes on without end
It's only we who do not see
The path beyond the bend.

Nell and I extend to you and all the family our sincere and heartfelt sympathy in this dark hour of your bereavement. We are sorry.

George Christopher has been one of my best friends for many, many years. I was deeply shocked to learn of his passing. We had a nice visit by phone earlier in the week and he was in his usual cheerful frame of mind.

Like you, we shall miss him terribly. He was a fine gentleman, a conscientious one, who was devoted to his family and his work.

Sincerely,

NELL and CHARLES HASLET,
Charles Haslet,
Associated Press, Washington, D.C.

ROSCOE, MO., *January 31, 1959.*

Mrs. MOINA RATLIFF,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. RATLIFF: I extend to you and your family my sympathy in the loss of your father. He had endeared himself to many by his sense of humor and his sincere friendliness. I personally feel that I have lost a very close friend. I know that all of the Missouri farmers have lost a friend that fought to solve their problems to the utmost of his strength. I realize that, in the last few years, much of his strength and courage came from the loving care that you had given him.

I hope that you will find solace in your sorrow that he was doing the work that he had chosen, up to the very end of his life. His closeness to God and nature during his life, can only mean that he has reached the eternal home that we all seek.

Sincerely yours,

CALVIN HOLLOWAY AND FAMILY,
Associate in the PMA program and now State representative.

ALEXANDRIA, VA., *January 29, 1959.*

DEAR FOLKS: I was terribly shocked to learn of the sudden death of your father this morning, upon our return from a short vacation. Although we will attend the service in Washington today, I deeply regret that we cannot be in Butler on Wednesday.

I am quite sure it is not necessary for me to tell you how much I thought of your father. He was a warm and loyal friend of my father and mother, and of me, for all the years he knew us, and he has done many great favors for all of us. I have always been very proud of him and of the outstanding record he made in the various positions he has held. It has been a source of great regret to me that I was in Europe during the past 4 years. It kept me from seeing your father and visiting with him as we used to do when I was living in Butler and Hickman Mills.

I can't help but feel that you have been very fortunate to have had your father with you as long as you have. My father died when I was 9 years old, and I can't really say I ever knew what it was to have a father. George lived a full life, he leaves a wonderful treasure of memories, of accomplishments, and of outstanding performance in positions of public trust and responsibility. Somehow, I don't believe any man can do more in one lifetime.

May God bless you and comfort you in this time of sorrow and sadness.

As always,

DONALD DAWSON,
Former Prosecuting Attorney, Bates County, Mo., now assigned to the General Accounting Office.

WASHINGTON, D.C., *February 15, 1959.*

DEAR MOINA: I was so sorry to hear of the death of your father. I have been thinking of all of you knowing that you all loved and respected him deeply and that you and Ray especially will miss him very much.

He was a courageous person and a dedicated man to his principles and ideals and did not hesitate to try and carry out that which he felt was right.

You and Ray, however, know that you were his greatest help and were so devoted to him. It is not everyone that has such loyal children. I know this was appreciated by all your friends.

My most sincere sympathy to you all.

Affectionately,

KATHERINE COX
Mrs. Joseph Cox,
Widow of former President of Michigan State College.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OFFICE OF THE MAJORITY LEADER,
Washington, D.C., September 1, 1958.

Hon. GEORGE H. CHRISTOPHER,
Member of Congress,
Butler, Mo.

DEAR GEORGE: The 85th Congress made outstanding history. In the making of this great record, you played a most important part. I take this opportunity for myself and for Speaker RAYBURN to convey to you our sincere thanks for the splendid cooperation you have so loyally and unselfishly given to us.

The people of your district are justified in feeling proud of you. You represent them in the Halls of Congress with ability, vision, and courage. Your voice and vote have always been favorable in support of legislation to make our beloved country strong, so essential to our national security, in the face of the world challenge of international communism. You have always been on the side of a firm foreign policy and strong defense, so essential to our Nation. In the field of domestic affairs, your vote and voice have always been on the side of the people; in support of progressive legislation; of measures that will strengthen our family life and benefit our country as a whole.

You are, in every sense, "a people's Congressman."

You richly deserve reelection. I sincerely hope, as I am confident, that the people of your district will reelect you to the 86th

Congress, enabling you to continue in their behalf, your great record of service in the Halls of Congress.

With kind personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Majority Leader.

NEW YORK, *December 1, 1958.*

Hon. GEORGE H. CHRISTOPHER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This is a belated note but I want to tell you how pleasing it is that you will continue to serve your State and the Nation as a Member of the House. You have my very best wishes for another happy and successful term.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES A. FARLEY.

KANSAS CITY, MO., *February 1, 1959.*

MRS. RAY RATLIFF.

DEAR MRS. RATLIFF: Your dear father sent my mother such a beautiful letter on her 90th birthday which was a year ago.

We are so sorry he has been called to his eternal rest, but God always knows best.

We just wanted to send our sympathy.

Thinking of you and remembering your father in our prayers.

We are,

Respectfully,

MRS. OLIVER CORRIGAN AND MOTHER,
MRS. ELLA BICKENBACH.

WASHINGTON, D.C., *January 25, 1959.*

FAMILY OF THE HONORABLE GEORGE H. CHRISTOPHER: With sympathy.

There is little one can say
And little one can do
Except to express the heartfelt wish
That comfort be granted you.

THE MISSOURI SOCIETY OF WASHINGTON, D.C.,
HARRY WAKE, *President.*

BOLIVAR, MO., *February 10, 1959.*

FAMILY OF THE HONORABLE GEORGE H. CHRISTOPHER: We were so sorry to hear the sad news of Mr. Christopher's death. It is not only a loss to his relatives but to our State and Nation as well.

We shall never forget him.

Mrs. F. L. STUFFLEBAM,
Editor and Publisher,
Bolivar Herald.

JOPLIN, MO., *January 27, 1959.*

FAMILY OF THE HONORABLE GEORGE H. CHRISTOPHER: With sympathy in the loss of your father.

Your father meant so much to you
In such a special way
That all who know you know how deep
Your sorrow is today,

But may your loving thoughts of him,
Your cherished memories, too,
Lend comfort to you now and keep him
Always close to you.

Mrs. G. W. BERRY and
GEORGIA E. BERRY,
Widow and daughter of Dr. Berry.

FEBRUARY 11, 1959.

DEAR MOINA AND FAMILY: I want to send my sincerest heart felt sympathy to you and yours in the loss of your wonderful father. I too, have lost a dear father and mother and I can really and truly say I sympathize with you. Your heartache will always be there—you will always miss him—more as time goes on, but the wonderful memories you have of him will ease that ache. They are proud memories. Memories that will make your personality unfold into a bigger, better, lovelier lady.

His funeral was the biggest funeral ever held in Butler, the services were very nice, altho the minister did not eulogize him too much. The presence of all his friends displayed the best eulogy of any unspoken words.

I shall always remember my wonderful privilege of working with you 2 years ago.

Love,

GLADYS AND JESSE BLAKEMAN.

(Long a family friend and former employee of the Congressman.)

WARRENSBURG, MO., *January 25, 1959.*

To the Family of the Honorable George H. Christopher, Butler Mo.

DEAR FRIENDS: Please permit us to express to you our deep sorrow upon reading in the Kansas City paper of January 24 of the sudden death of Mr. Christopher. Little did we realize last October during the campaign when we talked to him here in Warrensburg, it would be our last meeting with him. Mr. Christopher was one of those rare individuals who went the second mile in behalf of all of his constituents of the Fourth Congressional District. His place can not be filled by anyone. He will be missed by those of us who regarded him as a very close personal friend.

With deepest regards,

We are

Mr. and Mrs. ROLLA F. WOOD.

(Mr. Wood, professor, Central Missouri State College.)

[From the Evening Star, Washington (D.C.), Jan. 24, 1959]

Christopher, George H.: To the officers and members of Columbia Chapter, No. 15, OES, notice is given of the death of our late brother, George H. Christopher. Funeral services will be held at 3 p.m., Monday, January 26, 1959, at the S. H. Hines Co. Funeral Home, 2901 14th Street NW.

DOROTHY M. WIGHTMAN,
Worthy Matron.
E. GERTRUDE SMITH,
Secretary.

WASHINGTON, D.C., *January 25, 1959.*

DEAR SISTER MOINA AND BROTHER RAY: "For I am thy God: I will strengthen thee; yea, I will help thee." (Isaiah 41: 10.)

May God who watches over us
Be with you in your sorrow
To give you comfort for today
And courage for tomorrow.

Most sincerely and fraternally,
DOROTHY and RALPH WIGHTMAN,
Worthy Matron and Worthy Patron,
Columbia Chapter, No. 15, OES.

KANSAS CITY, MO.,
January 26, 1959.

FAMILY OF HON. GEORGE H. CHRISTOPHER: May you find some measure of comfort in this sincere expression of sympathy.

EDWIN W. KETTLESEN,
Secretary-Scottish Rite (Masonic group).

WASHINGTON, D.C., *January 24, 1959.*

DEAR SISTER MOINA AND BROTHER RAY:

This brings you deepest sympathy
And comes to let you know
That you will be thought of often
Through the days that come and go.

Our love and sympathy to you. May God give you strength and comfort.

Fraternally and Sincerely,
ROY AND ELVIRA OSTROM.

(Roy Ostrom, past patron, Columbia Chapter, No. 15, OES and worthy grand patron, grand chapter, District of Columbia, OES. Elvira Ostrom, past matron, Columbia Chapter, No. 15, OES.)

WASHINGTON, D.C., *January 25, 1959.*

DEAR MOINA and RAY: In this hour of sorrow may you be comforted by the heartfelt sympathy of your many friends and loved ones.

No one can take the place of your father or mother, but we know the parting is only temporary.

Fondly and Fraternally,

VIRGINIA KEMP,
Associated Matron Columbia Chapter,
No. 15, OES.

WASHINGTON, D.C., *February 4, 1959.*

DEAR SISTER MOINA and BROTHER RAY: To express sincere sympathy to you in your sorrow in the loss of your fine father.

Fraternally yours,

GRACE and HARVEY GODDARD,
Past Matron and Patron,
Columbia Chapter, No. 15, OES.

WASHINGTON, D.C., *February 2, 1959.*

DEAREST MOINA and RAY: Please accept my sincere sympathy over the loss of your loved one. Words mean so little at a time like this, but I want you to know my thoughts are with you. Jack, too.

With my love,

PEGGY SHAW KERR,
Past Matron, Columbia Chapter,
No. 15, OES.

WASHINGTON, D.C., *January 25, 1959.*

DEAR MOINA and RAY: All who knew your loved one are thinking of you today, and sharing your loss with understanding and deepest sympathy.

Please feel free to call upon me at any time if I can be of assistance in any way.

"I will lift up mine eyes unto the hills from whence cometh my help." (Psalms 121:1.)

Sincerely and Fraternally,

JAMES L. EVANS,
Past Matron, Columbia Chapter
No. 15, OES.

WASHINGTON, D.C., *January 26, 1959.*

DEAR SISTER MOINA AND BROTHER RAY: May it help you now in some small way to meet each new tomorrow just knowing someone shares your grief and understands your sorrow.

With love and deep sympathy,

MYRTLE HUMPHREYS,
Past Grand Matron, Grand Chapter,
District of Columbia, OES.

WASHINGTON, D.C., *January 25, 1959.*

DEAR SISTER MOINA AND BROTHER RAY: With sincere sympathy to you in your sorrow—our deepest sympathy to you and yours in the passing of your beloved father.

Sincerely and fraternally,

LOLA AND HARRY BEACH.

(Harry Beach, past grand patron, grand chapter, District of Columbia, OES.)

WASHINGTON, D.C., *January 25, 1959.*

DEAR MOINA AND RAY: Please accept the deepest sympathy of us in your bereavement.

If there is anything we can do to ease the heaviness of your hearts or assist you in any way, please call upon us.

Sincerely and fraternally,

IRENE LANGDON,
Secretary, Golden Sunbeams of 1957
Association.

WASHINGTON, D.C., *January 24, 1959.*

DEAR MOINA AND RAY: Sister and I want to express our heartfelt and understanding sympathy to you in the passing of your dear father.

No matter the length of time they have been spared to us, we are never quite ready to part with our loved ones.

May God grant you His comfort and peace.

With love,

ETHEL CALVERT,
Member, Columbia Chapter No. 15, OES.
FRANCES DUFFY.

WASHINGTON, D.C., *January 25, 1959.*

MOINA, MY DEAR: I've just learned of the sudden passing of your father and do want you to know my heart goes out to you in sincere and loving sympathy and I pray our Heavenly Father will give you strength to bear your great sorrow.

If there is anything I can do, just let me know.

Sincerely and fraternally,

RUTH DURNO,
Member, Columbia Chapter No. 15, OES.

Washington, D.C., February 13, 1959.

DEAR MOINA:

Somewhere the Sun is shining
Thru mists of hazy blue.
Somewhere there is no sorrow
And hearts are happy and true.

Somewhere there is no parting.
Somewhere there is no pain.
Somewhere loved ones are waiting
To greet us once again

And tho beyond our understanding
May this set your heart at rest—
Somewhere in all His wisdom
A loving God knows best.

So sorry this is late to remind you more of your sorrow, but although time passes quickly, it somehow can never erase memories of our loved ones.

Want you to know my thoughts have been with you.

I still have the inspiring letter your father wrote to me when he was in the hospital. You can be sure he is in "His loving care" now. Columbia has lost a dear member.

Sincerely,

ETHEL GOUGH,
Member, Columbia Chapter, No. 15, OES.

WASHINGTON, D.C., JANUARY 26, 1959.

DEAR MOINA:

"I cannot say, and I will not say
That he is dead—he is just away!
With a cheery smile and a wave of the hand
He has wandered into an unknown land
And left us dreaming how very fair
It needs must be since he lingers there.
So think of him faring on, as dear
In the love of there as the love of here,
Think of him still as the same, I say
He is not dead—he is just away!"

—*James Whitcomb Riley.*

Sincerely,

Mrs. AGNES (TED) DORSEY,
Member, Columbia Chapter, No. 15, OES.

WASHINGTON, D.C., *January 16, 1959.*

DEAR MOINA AND RAY:

"Near shady wall a rose once grew,
Budded and blossomed in God's free light,
Watered and fed by morning dew,
Shedding its sweetness day and night.

"As it grew and blossomed fair and tall,
Slowly rising to loftier height,
It came to a crevice in the wall,
Through which there shone a beam of light.

"Onward it crept with added strength,
With never a thought of fear or pride;
It followed the light through the crevice Length
And unfolded itself on the other side.

"The light, the dew, the broadening view,
Were found the same as they were before;
And it lost itself in beauties new,
Breathing its fragrance more and more.

"Shall calm of death cause us to grieve
And make our courage faint or fall?
Nay, let us faith and hope receive;
The rose still grows beyond the wall.

"Scattering fragrance far and wide,
Just as it did in days of yore,
Just as it did on the other side,
Just as it will forevermore."

—*A. L. Frink.*

Deepest sympathy,

EDWARD and JEAN WHITE,
Family Friends and Members, Columbia Chapter, No. 15, O.E.S.

Argentina and the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, all of us recall with pleasure the memorable visit of President Frondizi of Argentina to the United States a few months ago.

I call to the attention of the Members a thought-provoking editorial on this subject from the Diaro las Americas. This important newspaper is a clarion voice on Latin America. In this editorial it makes a very significant observation regarding the visit of an outstanding and distinguished Argentine citizen, Rogelio Frigerio, Secretary of Socio-Economic Relations.

I feel sure all of us join in the hopes and expectations expressed herein that the tangibile results of his visit will be renewed and invigorated relations between our two countries. Certainly to be counted among these results in a more mutual understanding of one another's problems, and a deeper and clear appreciation of one another's aims in the achievement of worldwide freedom and peace.

The editorial follows:

[From the Diario Las Americas, Apr. 23, 1959]

THE UNITED STATES AND ARGENTINA

A retrospective analysis of President Frondizi's visit to the United States produces a reaction which is a mixture of positive satisfaction and just anxiety. The tradition of cold political relations between the "Casa Rosada" and the White House was broken after a lapse of 23 years, when the President of the Argentine nation returned the visit to Buenos Aires made by President Roosevelt in December 1936.

President Frondizi made his trip in the midst of a domestic political tempest and an undeniable inter-American crisis. His doings were carefully watched by impartial observers, by his critics, and by his friends. Still to be resolved is the final chapter of this great event, and it cannot be anything but tangible results which should benefit—without any doubt—the daily life of both nations. The opposite would be to reinforce the thesis of those who opposed the trip and indicated that its only purpose was that of facilitating the historical halting of Argentina's international policy with no advantages for the nation.

A distinguished citizen of the political and industrial world of the great nation to the south is in the United States as a guest of the universities of Boston, Columbia, Harvard, and Stamford. We refer to Rogelio Frigerio, the man who, as Secretary of Socio-Economic Relations of the Presidency, was the main architect of a renovated Argentine policy based in the close collaboration with all the nations of the hemisphere, on free initiative in economic matters and the full development of all of Argentine resources.

Mr. Frigerio's presence in the United States is the logical continuation of President Frondizi's visit inasmuch as he was the most enthusiastic supporter of that visit which defined new routes in the relations between this country and Argentina. The defined inter-American concept of Mr. Frigerio, better expressed by the violent attacks of which he is the object on the part of the official organ of the Communist Party, gives policymakers of the United States a brilliant opportunity to continue studying, unhampered by the rigidity of official missions, a series of paths that may lead to strengthening the success of President Frondizi's visit to Washington.

To obtain solutions to the very grave economic and social problems facing the government of President Frondizi, and to obtain these solutions through the comprehensive aid of the U.S. Government, is to demonstrate the error of the tradition of international policy formerly followed by Argentina and which was no other than one of aloofness from Washington. The United States would attain an extraordinary moral victory which would result in magnificent and opportune repercussions throughout the Western Hemisphere.

Why Latin America Is Vital to Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very thought-provoking article which was published in yesterday's New York Times magazine section. The article is entitled "Why Latin America Is Vital to Us." Later today, in the course of my remarks, I shall refer again to the article.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY LATIN AMERICA IS VITAL TO US

(By Herbert L. Matthews)

When Secretary of State Frank B. Kellogg drew up his instructions to the American delegation to the Sixth International Conference of American States at Havana, Cuba, in January 1928, he began with a sentence that was then true:

"It is an established principle of our international policy," he wrote, "that among the foreign relations of the United States as they fall into categories, the pan-American policy takes first place in our diplomacy."

Came the Second World War, and times changed. Latin America took a back seat. Europe, Asia and the Middle East moved forward. The cold war was a struggle of East against West. The United States had put isolationism behind; its defense was global, not hemispheric, and so were its responsibilities.

In the late thirties and early forties, things had been different. First, preparations for the great war that everyone saw coming and then the war itself—with the knowledge that Latin America must play a vital, if largely passive, role in it—had kept that region in the forefront of American foreign policy.

When the war ended and the Latin American countries found themselves pushed into the background—their raw-material prices no longer supported, the things they bought from us skyrocketing in price, the Marshall plan devoted exclusively to Europe, American attention concentrated on the thrust of communism from Russia in Europe and China in Asia—they felt resentful. The charge of being neglected rose bitterly and persistently all over the region, through the Democratic regime of President Truman and—despite campaign promises to end the neglect—even more loudly in the Republican administration of President Eisenhower.

The pent-up feelings exploded with a tremendous shock when Vice President NIXON made his now famous trip to South America in April and May, 1958. Virtually all students of Latin American affairs agreed at the time that Mr. NIXON drew the right conclusion from his experience—that the hostility was not directed against him personally but against U.S. policies toward the region, especially economic policies, and the favoritism shown toward Latin American dictators.

An agonizing reappraisal of those policies was begun immediately in Washington, because it was realized that whether Latin America takes first place or not, it is still of supreme importance to us. The cold war cannot be won in Latin America, but it can be lost. If it be conceded that this struggle is a defense of the free and uncommitted countries and of the institutions that make life worth living for free men, then these principles must be defended on our doorstep and in our own hemisphere.

This was what Mr. NIXON must have had in mind in a recommendation which has been repeated so often that it will surely rank as a historic pronouncement. The United States, he said, should have nothing but a cool, correct handshake for dictators, but it should have a warm embrace—un abrazo—for democratic leaders.

The NIXON concept is based on a recognition of the fact that, without a spirit of cooperation, mutual respect and friendship, Latin America—or some countries in the area—could withdraw toward neutralism or an aggravated Yankee phobia. A negative attitude of that type is as much to be feared as a positive and favorable attitude is to be desired. In either case, one must start from the premise that Latin America is of enormous—perhaps even vital—importance to our continued existence as a free and prosperous Nation.

On its side, Latin America is an area in process of phenomenal growth. It has the highest rate of population increase in the world, averaging between 2.25 and 2.5 percent annually. At this moment, the United States has a population of about 175 million. The 20 Latin American countries total about 185 million. By the year 2000, it is estimated, Latin America will have a population of 593 million and the United States only half that.

The area is passing rapidly from an underdeveloped agrarian and mineral economy into an industrial revolution. The strongest feature of Latin American affairs today is social revolution, to which, in recent years, is linked the tidal wave of democracy that has swept most of the region's dictators away. It stands to reason that such an area is politically unstable, in a social ferment and emotionally sensitive. In other words, it is potentially a fertile field for communism.

While there is no threat in any Latin-American country of a Communist seizure of power, and while the Soviet Union is only beginning to show interest in the fields of trade and power politics, the long-range threat is formidable and inevitable. In several countries (Bolivia, where a right-wing revolt was crushed last week, is a clear example) a descent into economic and political chaos could be swift. A military-oligarchic reaction from the right would no longer be tenable in the nations that have thrown out their dictators. A reaction from the extreme left—which in our day means communism—or from a combination of military elements with Communists is more likely.

In considering this possibility, Washington, like any government, must give the first consideration to self defense. The hemispheric policy of the United States since the era of the War of Independence and the Monroe Doctrine has been based on the continental security of the United States.

Without bases in the Caribbean islands and without the Panama Canal, the United States would be wide open to invasion. If one could conceive of hostile missile bases in Mexico or Central America, the peril would be obvious.

Subtract the votes of the 20 Latin American nations from our side in the General Assembly of the United Nations and where would we be? The Afro-Arab-Asian bloc muster 30 to 40 votes on some issues. Add the Soviet block of 10 votes and one has a majority in a total of 82 members.

At every point it has to be said: "If we did not have Latin America on our side our situation would be desperate."

To be denied the products and the markets of Latin America would reduce the United States to being a second-rate power and cause a devastating reduction in our standard of living. A few of the basic economic facts of our national life are enough to prove this.

Of 77 articles listed as strategic materials for stockpiling in the Second World War, 30 are produced in large quantities in Latin America. We get more than 90 percent of our quartz crystals, two-thirds of our antimony, more than half of our bauxite, half of our beryl, a third of our lead, a quarter of our copper from the area.

Zinc, tin, tungsten, manganese, petroleum, and iron ore are some other important raw materials we get from Latin America. Some, like bauxite, iron ore, petroleum, and manganese, are becoming more important every year.

About one-quarter of all our exports go to Latin America and one-third of all our imports come from the area. U.S. private investments in Latin America now reach the amazing total of about $9.5 billion. The Export-Import Bank, an American institution, has authorized $3.5 billion in loans to Latin America since the war, $477 million in 1958 alone. This is just under 50 percent of its total world loans.

The trade between the United States and Latin America, both ways, now exceeds $8 billion a year. U.S. receipts for exports of goods and services and for net long-term investments were more than $6.8 billion in 1958. The figure for payments by the United States to Latin America for imports of goods and services, net donations, and investments in excess of liquidations or repayments was roughly the same.

It should be remembered, incidentally, that we get nearly all our coffee and most of our imported sugar from Latin America. These may not be strictly strategic materials, but one would hate to live without them.

What all this adds up to can be stated simply. Latin America is our most important trading and investment area. Latin American raw materials are essential to our existence as a world power. A friendly Latin America is necessary to our military security.

These are the facts of life, and yet we see the paradox of Latin America being taken for granted, neglected, and moved down in what Secretary Kellogg called the categories of our diplomacy. The axis of American foreign policy, one might say, is directed most emphatically east and west. Yet, the axis of our economic and financial interests is directed north to Canada and south to Latin America, which together outweigh the rest of the world.

If it were easy to formulate a policy toward Latin America that would correct this anomaly and eliminate the causes of anti-Yankeeism, it would have been done before now. The career Foreign Service officers working in the State Department and in the embassies around Latin America are, for the most part, of exceptionally high quality. The trouble is that their ability to make policy is limited and there are serious limitations, also, on what the United States can do.

The extent to which John Foster Dulles, as Secretary of State, kept policymaking under his individual control is well known; besides, his attention was turned elsewhere. There has been no Secretary of State since Cordell Hull who has made a close study of Latin American affairs. Moreover, the choice of ambassadorships rests largely in the White House, not the Department of State.

The Department knew perfectly well in the spring of 1957 that the Cuban situation desperately required an experienced career diplomat, and the first choice was such a man—H. Freeman Matthews. Unfortunately for the United States, and for Cuba, he felt obliged to turn down the transfer and, also unfortunately, the Republican National Committee wanted to reward a "good Republican" with an ambassadorship.

So the post went to a man with no diplomatic experience and no knowledge of Cuba—Earl E. T. Smith. There is no doubt that the present distressing degree of resentment toward thet United States on the part of Premier Fidel Castro and the Cuban people could have been avoided or greatly lessened by expert diplomacy in Havana.

This points to one of the obvious things that can be done to improve U.S. relations with Latin America. It is to choose ambassadors with more care and a greater sense of responsibility.

Another obvious limitation on the State Department, and hence on policy, is the division of power in our system of government. The State Department knew that to impose import quotas on lead and zinc would cause

hardship and a general sense of bitterness and resentment in Mexico and Peru, and criticism everywhere in Latin America. However, it was powerless to overcome the work of the strong mining lobbies in Washington backed by the Senators and Representatives from the mining States.

Again taking the case of Cuba (although the feature in question applies to other countries), we see that the State Department has not prevented the Pentagon from making crude blunders in Latin America. It is true that the belated decision to put an embargo on arms to President Fulgencio Batista in March, 1958, was a qualified triumph for State. However, the Department could not induce the Pentagon to withdraw three American military missions from Cuba, with the result that they were there when Fidel Castro's rebels took Havana.

Moreover, the State Department could not prevent high American military officers from decorating and entertaining Cuban generals hated by the Cuban people for their cruelty and corruption.

Better liaison between the Pentagon and the State Department and a closer and more enlightened control from the White House would obviate or reduce such blunders.

The particular case of Cuba has been much in our eyes—and in those of the whole hemisphere—thanks to the visit of Premier Castro, which is just ending. Cuba not only supplies 40 percent of the sugar we consume, she is the repository of something like $800 million worth of American investments. A glance at the map is enough to show the strategic importance of the island. It lies astride all the sea and air approaches to the United States from the south. Our naval base in Guantanamo Bay is the key base in the Caribbean area.

Fidel Castro himself is of great importance to us. The masses of Latin America see him as the outstanding champion of the social justice for which they are striving. As a friend of the United States he could be very helpful; as an enemy he could be very harmful. Taking Cuba as a whole, the same is true in magnified form. Taking Latin America as a whole, one gets into a field that comes close to deciding our national existence as a power greater than—or even comparable to—the Soviet Union.

The main complaints of the Latin Americans lie in the field of economics and finance. There are some basic differences of concept plus some exaggerated ideas on the part of Latin Americans of what the United States can do.

Although industrialization is taking place, the Latin region has essentially an agrarian and mineral economy. Too many of the countries are still overwhelmingly dependent on one commodity like coffee, sugar, copper or tin. The fluctuations in world prices of commodities can bring a temporary prosperity, as they did during the Korean war. But since then prices have been weak, especially in the past few years, and Latin America, taken as a whole, is in economic crisis.

Our neighbors to the South, therefore, have been asking us to help them to stabilize commodity prices. They have also asked for development loans from the U.S. Government to help them finance the production of their natural resources and public utilities. They wanted a hemispheric banking instituttion that would make such loans.

The U.S. Treasury, driven by the rigid orthodoxy of Secretary George M. Humphrey and later—until the shock of the Nixon experience—of Secretary Robert B. Anderson, would hear nothing of these measures. In fact, they were dismissed with little patience and some contempt.

Since the NIXON trip, we have discovered that we can try to help stabilize commodity prices, as we are doing with coffee, lead, and zinc, and that a development bank is, after all, feasible. One has just been agreed upon with a capital of $950 million—40 percent to be furnished by the United States.

The realization has been growing in Washington that inflexible financial orthodoxy demands too much of an under-developed Latin American country without enough experienced government officials, or managers and technicians in the industrial structure, or workers with a well-developed trade union movement and a philosophy of high productivity. Moreover, the political set-up is usually such that to demand strong measures of austerity would endanger or even destroy a government.

What this means is that American economic policies must be better adapted to the realities of Latin-American life and politics, to their weaknesses and possibilities. There has been a lack of understanding which lies at the root of much that is wrong with United States-Latin American relations.

Very few of our Senators and still fewer of our Representatives have any interest in or knowledge of Latin-American affairs. President Eisenhower has no one on the White House staff who is a specialist in Latin America. If he had, he might have avoided such outstanding errors as decorating the Venezuelan dictator, General Marcos Péres Jiménez with the Order of Merit, and sending American Marines to Caribbean posts when he thought Vice President NIXON's life was endangered.

Péron Jiménez, one of the most brutal and predatory dictators in Latin-American history, is a reminded of another great and bitter Latin-American complaint—U.S. favoritism toward dictators.

The last two American Ambassadors in Caracas, Fletcher Warren and Dempster McIntosh, were warm and publicly demonstrative friends of Pérez Jiménez and his Himmler-like police chief, Pedro Estrada. This fact undoubtedly contributed to the hostile reception that Mr. NIXON received, and he clearly indicated as much.

When American friendliness to dictators leads to Latin-American (and North American) complaints, State Department spokesmen, like Assistant Secretary of State Roy R. Rubottom, Jr., invariably counter by saying: "We are bound by the policy of nonintervention." The argument is beside the point, because no Latin American wants the United States to intervene to overthrow a dictator or even to use economic sanctions against him. Latin Americans would be the first to complain.

The error in policy is the unnecessary friendliness to dictators. That is why Mr. NIXON made his famous recommendation of a handshake for dictators and an embrace for democrats.

Moreover, to show favoritism to dictators is a form of intervention on their behalf. The power of the United States in the hemisphere is such that whatever we do or do not do influences the internal affairs of each Latin American country. The choice, therefore, is not between intervention and nonintervention but between objectionable and acceptable kinds of intervention.

This is a problem in U.S. diplomatic relations with Latin America that obviously has not yet been solved. Otherwise we would not have made the elementary mistake of favoring dictators at a time when an irresistible wave of democracy was sweeping over the hemisphere.

The problems are formidable and complex. Diplomacy, like politics, is an art, not a science. Every Latin American, for instance, stresses the fact that more understanding, sympathy and patience are required on the part of the United States. These qualities are in the realm of the spirit, not of dollars, goods or arms. The psychology, the character and temperament, the traditions and customs, the religion in most cases, the whole attitude toward life and government are different from our equivalents.

The efforts in every respect to improve relations between the United States and Latin America should be mutual. But we, being stronger, wealthier and one country, while it is weak, poor and divided into 20 parts, have the greater opportunities and responsibilities. We also have to adapt our policies more realistically to the basic fact that Latin America is of immense importance to us.

Statement of MacDonald Gallion, Attorney General of Alabama, Before the House Judiciary Committee on Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. GRANT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to insert in the RECORD a statement recently made by the Honorable MacDonald Gallion, attorney general of Alabama, before the House Judiciary Committee on Civil Rights. Attorney General Gallion, prior to his present office, was chief assistant attorney general of the State of Alabama. He is a deep student of law and one who is dedicated to public srevice:

STATEMENT OF MACDONALD GALLION, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF ALABAMA, BEFORE THE HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. Chairman, in making preparation to appear before this committee to testify on proposed civil rights bills and amendments to the present Civil Rights Act of 1957, I first requested that copies of these bills be forwarded me for study. I was frankly expecting to be the recipient of a mere handful of bills, assuming that the principal proponents of the bills would have first conferred among themselves as to the matters and things that they wished contained therein. Much to my amazement, I was supplied with a flood of bills introduced by quite a number of Congressmen, covering a wide variety of subject matter, and in many cases either duplicate in scope or basically the same with minor changes.

While I am sure that many of the Members of Congress are sincere in the legislation they advovate, I cannot help but feel, after reading a number of these bills, that there is a total lack of sincerity in many of them. The great majority of the bills have a preamble that has the suspicious tenor of a political speech directed toward the gaining of favor of minority groups in a particular Member's bailiwick.

In view of the large number of House bills presented, I do not intend to discuss in lengthy detail the contents of each of these so-called civil rights bills. I will make reference to some of these bills and my associate, Mr. Willard Livingston, chief assistant attorney general of Alabama, will perhaps go into more detail.

I wish to register strong opposition to all the bills inasmuch as I feel that they are all completely unnecessary and would constitute a further shocking encroachment of the cen-

tralization of Federal Government over State authority, and can only fan the flames of a situation that already exists.

I appeared before a similar committee in 1957 and expressed my concern, and, therefore, my opposition to various bills that were then being drafted, the total result of which came out as the Civil Rights Act of 1957. My concern was well founded as events have proven in my State. The previous harmonious relationship that existed between the colored and white races in my State has greatly deteriorated. The breach was beginning to widen at the time of the tragic school desegregation decision of the U.S. Supreme Court in 1954, and this has continuously widened with the persistent agitation of individuals and groups outside the South since that time to force integration upon the South. A definite barrier is being built up by the continuous pressure of the Federal Government to invade the sovereignty of the State on matters that have been traditionally handled at the local level. No longer is there proper communication between the two races, and a satisfactory working arrangement of mutual trust and respect, each for the other, has been replaced by suspicion and wariness.

Alabama, as has many of her sister States of the South, until recently been one of the poorer States, and has been used as a whipping boy. During Reconstruction days, after the War Between the States, the economic plight was most serious. Alabama and the other States of the South have had to literally pull themselves up by their own bootstraps to the level of prosperity they now enjoy. The greatest recipient of a higher standard of living in the South has been the Negro. Instead of being down-trodden and held back, as apparently pictured throughout the rest of the Nation, the gains of the Negro of the South in bettering himself have been nothing less than astonishing. The whites of the South have been the ones that have in the main footed the bill.

I would be hopeful that each of you could understand with clarity the tremendous impact that has resulted from the school desegregation decision of 1954 and the ensuing trend of events in the racial field since this day.

The State of Alabama has bled her poor economy in the past to eke out every available penny to improve her situation in the educational field, and this improvement has been for her citizens, both Negro and white. Relying on the separate but equal doctrine which through the years had been the prevailing law of the land, the people of Alabama invested hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars in school buildings from one border of the State to the other. The State has in recent years been spending approximately one-third of its total tax income on education, and local communities have supplemented this effort. It is true that there are many dilapidated and rundown Negro school buildings, but for each such school you find you will also find within a short radius of miles an equally dilapidated rundown white school building. On the other hand, we also have many fine school structures that we are proud of and this includes Negro schools as well as white schools. There are actually more white children going to schools in substandard school buildings than there are Negro children. Negro teachers are actually paid more on the average than white teachers.

Today Alabama and other States of the South are faced with chaos in education. The people have demonstrated time after time that they simply will not have integration in the public school systems forced down their throats. With racial tensions increased because of the 1954 decision, it is a tragic thing indeed that Federal pressure continues in the form of such approaches at the Civil Rights Commission and the ever sterner so-called civil rights bills that are sponsored.

If we ever needed concerted action of all of our people working together at such a time in world history, it is at the present time. If ever we needed a harmonious relationship of all the races, it is at the present time. If ever we needed a concentration of effort in the educational field to remain abreast of our common enemy, it is at the present time. However, it has appeared that while Russia was concentrating on a invasion of outer space our own Federal Government was concentrating on the invasion of Central High School in Little Rock. The people of Alabama bittery resent the continuous encroachment of the Federal Govment on State's affairs. They bitterly resent the sponsorship of the Civil Rights Commission and the various so-called civil rights bills, and view this action as not only punitive in nature but in direct conflict with the principles laid down by our Founding Fathers when this Nation first saw birth. They feel that is it contrary to the concepts of government—that concept of government recognizing the sovereignty of individuals States—as first laid down by the Founding Fathers.

The fear persists that in the creation of the Civil Rights Commission is the creation of a monster now directed at the South, that may well turn later to devour the East, West, and North also.

It would appear to me to be wise that Congress take full cognizance of the recent denunciation pronounced by the chief justices of the entire United States gathered together at Los Angeles last fall wherein they expressed their alarm for the trend of the decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court in its court interpretations that lean violently toward Federal centralization. This is no more than a protest against Federal encroachment in the field of the rights of the sovereign States. The same basic viewpoint was announced in scathing terms by the American Bar Association in convention at Chicago. The American Bar Association, of course, is composed of thousands and thousands of outstanding lawyers from every section and part of the Nation.

With these preliminary remarks, I voice my very strongest opposition to all of these bills.

H.R. 2538 extends the life of the Civil Rights Commission to January 2, 1961.

H.R. 619 provides for a permanent Civil Rights Commission.

To these and all other similar bills, I voice my opposition. For reasons hereinbefore enumerated, I state that these bills should be allowed to die a natural death. My position is that if this committee is sincerely interested in bettering the race relations of the white and colored people in Alabama at the present time they would recommend that not only the Civil Rights Commission now formed be allowed to expire, but that they curtail any further activities in the State at all.

H.R. 353, H.R. 914, and perhaps others advocate antilynching legislation. If I hadn't read some of these bills I actually wouldn't believe some of the contents. H.R. 353 heads section 4 with the caption "Right To Be Free of Lynching." Now, stop and think for just a moment of that caption. The "Right To Be Free of Lynching"—doesn't the caption itself reveal profound thinking ultimately leading to a revolutionary discovery in the field of human rights? So much has been said of the "unenlightened South" that I had assumed that other sections of our Nation are enlightened, at least to some basic degree. If the tragedy of ignorance wasn't woven into such a bill as this, any serious discussion would assume the proportions of a comic opera.

We haven't had a lynching in Alabama to the best of my knowledge in more than 20 years. If an isolated instance has occurred it has escaped my attention. Do the proponents of such a bill actually believe that we have daily or weekly lynchings as a matter of routine? I'm beginning to wonder just who needs enlightenment. Of course, we have State statutes making it a criminal offense to participate in or commit an act of lynching, and the penalties are more severe than that provided here. Section 6 of H.R. 353 says if you aid in or commit an act of lynching you can be fined $1,000 or imprisoned for a year, or both; provided, however—and this is a gem—if the lynching results in serious physical or mental injury the punishment might be as much as $10,000 and 20 years imprisonment. Now can you imagine a lynching that didn't result in serious physical or mental injury? It taxes my imagination to visualize otherwise.

Of course, we are against lynching, and I certainly would feel that I would be derelict in my duty as attorney general not to vigorously prosecute any such offenses if they should occur. However, we do say to Congress not to invade upon our State police powers and confine yourselves, if you please, to fields of legislation properly belonging to you.

If I was surprised at the lack of enlightenment outside the South regarding the antilynching bills, imagine my astonishment to see this in title V of H.R. 619:

"Whoever holds or kidnaps or carries away any other person, or attempts to hold, kidnap, or carry away any other person, with the intent that such other person be held in or sold into involuntary servitude, or held as a slave; or

"Whoever entices, persuades, or induces, or attempts to entice, persuade, or induce, any other person to go on board any vessel or other means of transportation or to any other place within or beyond the United States with the intent that he be made a slave or held in involuntary servitude, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both."

Now, does a Congress of these United States in the year 1959 actually thing it necessary to pass legislation preventing slave traffic in the South today and the calling to a halt of slave running vessels to the coast of Africa? Gentlemen, I simply will pass on from here without further comment.

H.R. 617 relates to public accommodations, entertainment, and the like. The substance of it is to integrate or be punished up to $1,000 fine and go to jail for a year, and this is made a felony. For such an offense to stamp a person as a felon is abhorrent.

The so-called Civil Rights Act of 1959.

H.R. 430, H.R. 913, H.R. 3212, H.R. 461, and H.R. 3147 are all substantially the same. H.R. 300 and H.R. 2786 are also substantially the same except that they upped the amount of money to be wasted. The one thing the Congressmen do have in common is that they all condescend to have their particular bill credited to them as the Civil Rights Act of 1959.

Following preambles that shame the preambles of the Articles of Confederation, the Constitution of the United States, and the verbiage of the Magna Carta all thrown together, title II provides in each instance for the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to render technical assistance to local governmental units from States all the way down to school districts to enter into com-

pliance with the Supreme Court desegregation decision.

The Secretary will distribute information, make surveys, meet with various officials in discussion groups, set up advisory councils, and report frequently to Congress. Just how one man was going to do all this worried me at first until I came to section 202 where I found out he can employ an untold number of specialists who can mill all about the South doing this for him. Perhaps to keep the traffic clear they in turn can have private individuals or groups meet them at given places and these people in turn will have their expenses paid for getting to talk to each other.

Then we come to title III, and here I will get most serious for here we come to a most solemn and diabolical offer. For implementing integration in any governmental unit that unit will become qualified for grants of money. How despicable is such an offer. It is no more than a bribe to purchase for cold cash the principles and convictions of an honorable section of our Nation. This is repugnant to good conscience and our past American standards. It is a force bill that would bring tears to the eyes of George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, and all of our Founding Fathers were they here to witness it. No, gentlemen, certainly our honored Congress of the United States of America would not stoop so low. Certainly, Members of Congress from all sections of our Nation will join hands to defeat the substance of these bills.

Time does not permit me to elaborate on other proposals offered. I do want to conclude by saying this:

There is no real reason for the Civil Rights Commission to exist or for any such acts to be passed. I opposed the Civil Rights Act of 1957 and my reasons for doing so have been justified. Apparently first aimed at securing voting rights for the Negroes of the South, the results have not been forthcoming because the results were not there initially to obtain. The propaganda swallowed just simply did not prove true. Of course, we may have isolated instances of improper voter registration denials, and this is for both white and Negro, but generally speaking, you will find applicants in Alabama allowed the voting franchise when properly qualified.

The Birmingham News, a respectable news media, just recently conducted a thorough statewide survey and found this without question to be true. Negro voter registration in Alabama, as well as economic and educational advances, has been astounding. The great majority of the Negro masses realize this. It is only the handful of agitators that you apparently listen to. Today the number of Negro registered voters is estimated at sixty to seventy thousand, an amazing increase, especially in the last few years.

We have adequate laws in this field and they are fairly administered. Do you think we are all out in our opposition to the Federal suit in the Macon County case solely because 20 Negro complainants are involved? What do 20 voters amount to in a mass of 70,000 voters, as far as we are concerned?

No, gentlemen, ours is the cause of States rights. Ours is the fight to maintain constitutional government; to maintain that concept of government that recognizes the sovereign rights of the States as was originally contemplated by our Founding Fathers; to maintain that concept of government that recognizes a separation of powers and jurisdictions between the Federal Government and each individual State. It is this that has made this Nation the greatest Nation ever to rise on the face of the earth. Let us not destroy this.

Victor Herbert Centennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, it is ironic, is it not, for me, a legislator, to rise in praise of a maker of songs? For, has it not been said, "Let me make the songs of a nation, and I care not who makes its laws?" Moreover, if I had any spirit I should be up before you singing the songs of Victor Herbert rather than using the flatness of prose to talk about him. But I do remember how many hours I spent playing his songs on the piano and the violin. The gay and sentimental songs, the marching songs, the heart lifting to the melodies and the rhythms. For, surely, he was, and is, a beloved composer. When I think of all the Victor Herbert melodies we played and sang at home, I grow nostalgic. I tell my grandchildren that they are missing a good bet in not knowing the songs of Mr. Herbert, cellist, conductor, composer. For, it seems to me, and I hope I am sadly mistaken, that the younger generations, not knowing him, are a bit prone to condescend toward his music; are more apt to dismiss the songs we loved as sentimental effusions. But I maintain that they are the losers.

The younger generation has been so busy educating us that it is time we turned the tables and educated them. I propose that the theater, television, and radio combine in one huge conspiracy to bring them the music of Victor Herbert. Once again, we would hear a lot of "Toys," from "Babes in Toyland"; "Kiss Me Again," from "Mademoiselle Modiste"; "Ah, Sweet Mystery of Life"; "I'm Falling in Love With Someone," from "Naughty Marietta"; "Gypsy Love Song," from the "Fortune Teller"; "Moonbeams," from "The Red Mill"; "Sweethearts," from "Sweethearts." And that is at least one small contribution we could make to bring a spot of joy to this world of atom bombs and everyday crises. There are few enough as is.

Herbert's music is universal. It needs no interpreter. Herbert illustrates what Confucius said so many years ago:

Music produces a kind of pleasure which human nature cannot do without.

It is music like Herbert's that washes away the dust of everyday life. He recalls a compelling statement of Disraeli:

Music is miraculous. A blast from a trumpet and millions of soldiers rush forward to die. A peal of the organ and uncounted nations sink down to pray.

Let us remind these know-it-all youngsters that Mr. Herbert was an accomplished musician, a cellist of the highest rank, who played with the Metropolitan Opera; that he was the most famed conductor of his day of the Pittsburgh Symphony. That, born in Dublin, he had the joyous flair of the Irish; educated in Germany, he had the meticulous workmanship of the Germans; and living in America, he had the largeness of heart, the generosity, and the friendliness of the Americans. With these traits he made good music, fresh music, music to be loved, and music to be sung. That we here tonight pay tribute to Victor Herbert is no small wonder. There is no mind too sophisticated nor heart too simple that cannot embrace him. Perhaps this evening can initiate a national revival of Victor Herbert's music. For my grandchildren's sake, I hope so.

Members of Congress and Their Families Will Visit New York City May 22, 23, and 24

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the annual congressional tour of New York City on May 22, 23, and 24 for Members of Congress and their families has been perfected. The tour includes an evening in Chinatown, a visit to the United Nations, New York Stock Exchange, city hall, Empire State Building, Broadway theaters, a visit to the French transatlantic liner, steamship *Flandre*, New York's planetarium, as well as several prominent restaurants in the New York area.

A copy of the official announcement which recently was sent to Members of both branches of Congress is as follows:

ALL EXPENSE 3-DAY CONGRESSIONAL TOUR, MAY 22, 23, 24, $39.50; CHILDREN 5–12, $34.50

SCHEDULE OF EVENTS

Friday, May 22, 9:45 a.m., daylight time, party will leave Washington via Pennsylvania Railroad; luncheon in dining car; 1:45 p.m., arrive Penn Station; motor coach will take party direct to stock exchange to observe trading on the floor and look over exhibits; 4 p.m., leave stock exchange for visit to United Nations tour and welcome by Ambassador Lodge; 6 p.m., leave U.N. by motor coach for Paramount Hotel; 7 p.m., leave hotel for reception and dinner at the Town and Country Club.

Saturday, May 23, 8:30 a.m., motor coach will leave for breakfast and visit to Empire State Building; 10:30 a.m., leave Empire State Building for city hall for official reception by Mayor Wagner; 11:30 a.m., leave city hall by motor coach to Chinatown for reception and luncheon after which we will return to hotel; 6:30 p.m., leave hotel by motor coach for reception and dinner at Oscar's Delmonico's and back to hotel at 10:30 p.m.

Sunday, May 24, 9:30 a.m., motor coach to pier 88, to board steamship *Flandre* for reception, breakfast, and inspection of ship; 12:30 p.m., motor coach back to hotel for reception and luncheon; 3 p.m., leave hotel for visit to the American Museum-Hayden Planetarium for sky show "Unseen Worlds"; motor coach will return us direct to Penn Station; 5:20 p.m., daylight time, our train

will leave for Washington. Members will meet at Penn Station, west gate, track 13, at least 10 minutes before departure time. Dinner will be served in dining car enroute home.

Make your reservations today. Dial Extension 4576, room 1104, House Office Building.

Appropriation for National Board for Promotion of Rifle Practice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, on last Friday, April 24, 1959, an outstanding constituent of my district, Mr. Irvine C. Porter, president of the National Rifle Association of America and a member of the National Board for Promotion of Rifle Practice, appeared before the Department of Defense Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations in behalf of the appropriation of $300,000 to the National Board for Promotion of Rifle Practice for fiscal year 1960. Because of the thoughtful and informative nature of Mr. Porter's statement, I am happy to insert same herewith in the RECORD. The Members of Congress are urged to give the statement their close and careful study and attention:

STATEMENT OF MR. IRVINE C. PORTER BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE SUBCOMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C., APRIL 24, 1959

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, my name is Irvine C. Porter. I appear today as the president of the National Rifle Association of America, which, as its executive director, Mr. Louis Lucas has just stated is composed of more than 300,000 individual members and almost 9,000 affiliated membership groups. I, also, appear as a civilian member of the National Board for Promotion of Rifle Practice, representing the country at large, this being the Board whose appropriation is being considered by your committee today.

Please accept my thanks and appreciation for affording both Mr. Lucas and myself an opportunity to appear before your committee in support of this Board's appropriation, which is in the sum of $300,000, as recommended by the President in his budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, under the title, "National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice, Army." I have been privileged to appear before this subcommittee and similar subcommittees in the Senate in support of this Board and its appropriation on a number of occasions in the past, and I have come to Washington, again, from Birmingham, Ala., where I practice law, specifically for the purpose of urging this committee to fully support and approve that portion of the budget for the Defense Department for fiscal year 1960 which relates to, and supports, the activities of this Board.

I am informed that this committee has previously been furnished a very detailed statement of the activities of the Board during the last year by its executive officer, Col. Hugh W. Stevenson, who also fills the the position of Director of Civilian Marksmanship, Department of the Army. This statement covered in detail the number of rifle clubs and schools enrolled under the Board's program; the number of individual's involved; the attendances at the various smallarms firing schools conducted by the Board; the number of civilian teams attending the national competitions from the respective States and Territories, and the ammunition requirements of this program. I will not attempt to go into detail concerning those figures and statistics, but I do desire to suggest that a careful analysis of them justifies the conclusion that there has been a steady and healthy growth of the activities supported by the National Board during the last several years, and is, again, definitely expected and forecasted for fiscal year 1960.

Participation of civilians in this program is definitely on the increase, and as I have heretofore suggested to this committee, is directly related to the fact that Congress has seen fit to provide travel funds for State civilian teams, both rifle and pistol, to attend the national training schools set up at Camp Perry, Ohio, and has furnished sufficient ammunition to meet the growing needs and demands of Board-sponsored activities throughout the country.

I cannot urge you too strongly to approve this budgetary amount of $300,000, as recommended by the President in his budget for the support of the National Board during fiscal year 1960, in its entirety. I especially urge that you continue to approve the manner of handling the ammunition requirements of the Board by authorizing the Secretary of Defense, under General Provision 630 of the President's budget, during fiscal year 1960, to transfer from agencies of the Department of Defense to the Board ammunition from stock, or which has been procured for that purpose in such amounts as the Secretary may determine upon the requisition of the National Board and without the necessity for reimbursement. In my opinion, this is the most important single requirement of this Board. There are thousands of range facilities available throughout the United States, and hundreds of thousands of weapons which might be otherwise available for use by interested civilians, but without a sufficient quantity of ammunition, both .22 caliber and .30 caliber, being made available, it is impossible for this Board to fulfill its primary function of promoting markmanship training among able-bodied citizens of this country who might hereafter be called upon in the adequate and proper defense of it.

While the Board's program of activities are and have been expanding at the rate of approximately 15 percent per year, it is still my feeling, not only as president of the National Rifle Association, but, also, as a civilian member of this Board, that the Board's program is not as extensive as it should be for the best interest of this country. It is my opinion that it would be highly desirable and in the best interest of the proper defense of this country that every person now or hereafter eligible for military service should have a reasonable and adequate opportunity to fully familiarize himself with and become accustomed to the use of the basic weapon of the Armed Forces of this country, the rifle, under proper supervision and competent guidance. The National Board for Promotion of Rifle Practice is the agency which Congress created for this purpose, and I am certain that the gentlemen of this committee are reasonably familiar with that fact. I am certain, also, that there will not be a time in the foreseeable future when the necessity for the use of the rifle as a basic weapon in the defense of our country will not be of paramount importance. I quote Maj. Gen. J. H. Hinrichs, Chief of Ordnance, on this point. He said in an article published in the May-June 1957 issue of Ordnance, page 961, that:

"Even in an atomic war in which the Army could employ a wide spectrum of nuclear weapons, I can visualize many tactical situations in which an atomic blast would not satisfy the requirement; for example, destroying or capturing an enemy platoon. Bringing down an atomic blast on such a target would be like cracking nuts with a piledriver. In any case, there would be many occasions around the periphery of an atomic blast, and in other operations like exploiting breakthroughs and mopping up, in which small arms would be absolutely vital. I can visualize no war in which our soldiers will not need a personal weapon for attack or defense.

"In the widely dispersed units that will be necessitated by the threat of atomics, it will be mightly lonely out thar without Old Betsy resting in the crook of your arm."

While we have before us today the main issue of the approval of the $300,000 appropriation for the support of the National Board for fiscal year 1960, I should like to pass on to the members of the committee the thought that not only myself but many of my colleagues on this Board, particularly those who are civilians, feel that Congress could well afford to expand the activities of this Board many times, and that such an expansion could be accomplished in an orderly fashion without any waste of Government funds and at a very low per capita cost. We feel that such an expansion would be in the best interest of the proper defense of this country and that the results would be apparent in the vigorous undergirding of the character of our people. Furthermore, we are convinced that there is a tremendous interest in the activities of this Board in the preinduction age group (which has jumped from about 40,000 participants in 1949 to over 132,000 participants as of the first of this year in the activities of the National Board, alone) which is not being met at all throughout the country. I feel confident in saying that, if this committee and that of the Senate were to so direct and provide the necessary budgetary support, the figure which I have last mentioned of 132,000 preinduction youngsters could be increased almost tenfold in 3 or 4 years.

With reference to the funds provided in this budget for civilian team travel for fiscal year 1960, there has been provided the sum of $56,000, which compares favorably with the sum of $57,000 in the budget for fiscal year 1959. In the year prior to 1959 only the approximate sum of $25,000 for this purpose was provided. This increase last year caused the total number of teams, both rifle and pistol, attending the national training schools set up by the Board at Camp Perry, to jump from 174 to a total of 229. As both Colonel Stevenson and Mr. Lucas have indicated, these teams constitute a vital source of competent instructors for the expanding of the Board's program throughout the country. Looking ahead, I believe that it can be safely said that, should this committee provide the funds, this aspect of the Board's program could be increased in rapid order in the same degree that took place between the budget years 1958 and 1959.

In conclusion, permit me to say that I wish to thank the chairman of this committee and those members present for permitting me to attend this hearing and for the patient attention given during this presentation. I wish to state further that if there are any questions which any member of this committee desires to have answered, both Mr. Lucas and I are ready now to undertake to answer or discuss them to your satisfaction. If we do not now know, or have, the necessary information or answer, we will endeavor to get it and furnish it to the committee as part of the record of this hearing.

The Big Dilemma: Conscience or Votes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a most interesting and thought-provoking article entitled "The Big Dilemma: Conscience or Votes." The article was written by former Senator William Benton, who, in my opinion, is one of the most able and courageous men to sit in the Senate during the last 25 years. His article, which was published in the New York Times magazine section of yesterday, deals with the whole philosophical problem which faces every politician—namely, whether he ever has a right to compromise his conscience by compromising what he knows is a matter of principle.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BIG DILEMMA: CONSCIENCE OR VOTES
(By William Benton)

Should a legislator compromise his principles in order to be a successful politician? How far should he go in order to be elected? Is it enough to be right most of the time, but to yield, on occasion, to the predilections or even the prejudices of his constituents?

Many people have asked me about the dilemma implicit in these questions which has puzzled students of politics since representative government began. But, paradoxically, I have found that legislators themselves are much less puzzled—and not because they are morally insensitive. The problems they actually confront, either as candidates or as lawmakers, are rarely black-and-white issues of conscience. Almost always they are questions of prudence and judgment—the height of a tariff or a subsidy, the size of a budget item, or, more particularly, the best tactics for advancing a particular cause in the face of opposition from colleagues or from constituents at home.

Nevertheless, the classic dilemma has a new relevance. Issues of civil and human rights—for example, segregation—tend to fall in the category of conscience, and these are critically important today. We had a dramatic example last November in the write-in, paste-in blitz that unseated Representative Brooks Hayes in the Little Rock district because his record, his campaign and his conscience had classified him as a moderate on race issues.

It has been said that I was myself defeated in 1952 on an issue of conscience because I had insisted on denouncing Senator McCarthy and on demanding his expulsion from the Senate. The parallel is valid only in that I was willing, on principle, to take publicly a position that seemed politically dangerous at the time. As it turned out, I lost because 1952 was an Eisenhower year, not on the McCarthy issue, and I ran well ahead of the national ticket.

In the corridors of the Capitol in Washington one hears it said occasionally that if a Congressman votes right 95 percent of the time—that is, in accordance with his own best judgment—he can afford to be "wrong" on 5 percent of his votes—that is, against his own judgment or conscience—in seeking to serve some particular end, including his reelection. (He is supposed to console himself that his defeated opponent would doubtless have done worse.) The same formula has been said to apply to a campaign in which the candidate is forced to take controversial stands.

Is this attitude justifiable? Can such wrong votes be defended?

I invited some of my former colleagues to share in this discussion. They tend to focus on the question, Should a legislator, once elected, compromise as a matter of practical politics in order to push necessary legislation through? They see this as closely intertwined with the question, Should a legislator compromise his principles in order to be elected?

None of these colleagues will openly admit that a principle should ever be abandoned, under any circumstances. Almost all would agree with the formulation of Prof. T. V. Smith, the philosopher-politician, who wrote: "A politician is a man who can compromise an issue without compromising himself, and who can in a pinch give an issue away without himself away."

Two thoughtful Republicans who have just retired—voluntarily—after distinguished careers in Congress come to different conclusions about the issue of conscience and compromise as applied to segregation. I have worked intimately with both. They are men of high principle. Senator Ralph Flanders of Vermont, who seemingly does not want to see Governor Faubus in the Senate, writes me:

"There is a saying to the effect that 'a Senator's first duty is to get reelected.' This sounds a bit cynical, but there is a real vein of truth in it.

"If I were a southern Senator and were facing the Little Rock situation, I would be strongly moved to avoid the extreme segregationist position, but would also avoid crusading for antisegregation. I would join the moderates so far as seemed safe and hope for reelection, knowing that if I were defeated in the primaries my place would be taken by a rabid segregationist."

Representative John Vorys, of Ohio, who was the intellectual leader of the Republican minority interested in foreign policy in the House, says:

"I am extremely cautious about calling political decisions moral issues. On the other hand, I think that Congressmen and Senators are expendable rather than indispensable, and no Congressman or Senator should cast a vote he knows is wrong in order to be reelected. It makes no difference whether the wrongness is on a moral, legal, economic, or other issue.

"As Edmund Burke said: 'Your representative owes you, not his industry only, but his judgment; and he betrays instead of serving you, if he sacrifices it to your opinion.'

"Taking the example you mention, I think that if a southern Senator is opposed morally to segregation he should vote his convictions and take his medicine. For one thing, he might be surprised to find how many people admire that kind of courage."

Two of my correspondents cited the vote on the 1957 civil rights bill and reached opposite conclusions. Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, never one to shirk an unpopular cause and one of the most courageous men in the history of the Senate, argues that the politician's dilemma can usually be resolved if he works hard enough at informing his constituents. He writes:

"Too often and too readily politicians—when they vote against something they know is in the public interest—fall back upon the excuse that 'I know it is right, but people don't understand it.'

"What these politicians don't understand themselves is that it is part of their function in representative government to get the facts across to the people so they will understand. Instead, they become panhandlers for votes. We have many in public life who are afraid or unwilling to be defeated. Winning is their only goal, not true public service."

Senator MORSE is certain he could not have been reelected to the Senate in 1956, in the face of the Eisenhower landslide, if public opinion, which had opposed some of his votes when he cast them, had not later swung over to his view.

Having battled for civil rights throughout his career, he was nevertheless the only Senator outside the South who voted against the 1957 civil rights bill. Here is an example of his individuality and his spirit. He says:

"Of course, I recognize the need for compromise in legislation. But the civil rights bill of 1957 was passed because Members of Congress wanted to be on record as having voted for something with that title; their bill actually compromised the civil rights guarantee of the 14th amendment. I do not accept the view that such a compromise of principle is ever justified. When a principle is compromised it is destroyed and all that is left is a statement of expediency.

"'But,' says the doubter, 'when does the legislator know when he is dealing with a matter of principle?' The answer is that his brains and conscience always tell him so, and he always knows when he has compromised a principle."

Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, of New Mexico, one of the most able, experienced and humble men in public life, reached a different conclusion about the same measure:

"The House had passed a civil rights bill. It came to the Senate. The Judiciary Committee was bypassed and the bill came at once to the Senate floor. Some Senators were determined to try to pass a civil rights bill with the strongest possible language and the most drastic provisions. They could have adopted all their amendments, perhaps, but could never have passed the bill * * *.

"I became disturbed at the situation because I wanted a civil rights bill passed. * * * I talked it over with Senator LYNDON JOHNSON and out of our conference came my approach to Senator GEORGE AIKEN, of Vermont, whom I greatly admire. We developed an amendment and were subsequently joined in it by a third cosponsor, Senator FRANCIS CASE, of South Dakota. That amendment to section III was not pleasing to those who preferred defeat of the bill to any compromise, but it was adopted by the Senate and paved the way for adoption of another amendment previously offered by Senator O'MAHONEY and others. When the amending process was finished the southerners realized they could not successfully filibuster against the revised bill * * *.

"Maybe the civil rights bill was not everything it ought to be; maybe it will need to be amended in view of Little Rock and other spots. That will, however, come easier because of abuses which followed the passage of civil rights legislation by the 85th Congress and will be much easier than would have been the case had the no-compromise faction had its way and no bill resulted."

Senator JOHNSON of Texas, widely admired as majority leader of the Senate, writes me:

"The real issue is not whether a man should compromise—because I do not believe in compromising a principle—but whether he should insist on asserting his position aggressively on every single issue that comes along.

"Everybody is fond of quoting Clausewitz' dictum, 'War is politics carried on by other means'. The reverse is also true that politics is war carried on by other means. When it is viewed in that perspective the answer becomes somewhat more readily apparent. It would be ridiculous to say that a captain of infantry out on a scouting expedition should charge into a regiment that he meets unexpectedly.

"Nobody would expect him to do so. In fact, he would be court-martialed if he did anything other than the sensible thing, which is to fall back to the main body of troops and gather his forces so he can be ready for action when action is feasible.

"The captain of infantry has not compromised his position because he refused to sacrifice his men or his followers by fighting under impossible circumstances. Similarly, I do not think that the political leader should be accused of compromising his position because he too refused to fight on impossible terrain. It is essential for a political leader to be able to pick the terrain and the time upon which he will give battle."

Representative JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, majority leader of the House of Representatives, whose job requires him to steer legislation through the House, seems to agree with Senator JOHNSON. He writes:

"As between partial progress and no progress, it seems to me that the constructive mind takes the road of progress.

"I never place myself mentally in the position of compromising principle and conscience. But there are times when I might harmonize differences in order to make progress, or maintain unity, and then start the journey from there.

"The extent of 'compromise' or 'harmonization' depends upon the circumstances of each case, the atmosphere, the strength of the opposition, as well as the support for a measure, and other factors. But sometimes there can be no 'compromise' or 'harmonization,' such as the extension of the Selective Service Act in 1941, 3 months before Pearl Harbor."

Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY's book, "Profiles in Courage," written in 1955, consists of case studies of political courage in the Senate going back to 1803. He finds that it sometimes takes courage to compromise. He writes in his book:

"We shall need compromises in the days ahead, to be sure. But these will, or should be, compromises of issues, not of principles. We can resolve the clash of interests without conceding our ideals * * *. Compromise need not mean cowardice. Indeed, it is frequently the compromisers and conciliators who are faced with the severest tests of political courage as they oppose the extremist views of their constituents. It was because Daniel Webster conscientiously favored compromise in 1850 that he earned a condemnation unsurpassed in the annals of political history."

Senator KENNEDY now writes me:

"I think even more now than I did in 1955 that the politician faces this dilemma more than the member of any other professional or occupational group. Others face different moral choices perhaps, wondering when a compromise is one of accommodation or one of principle—but no one else has to do it in such a glare of publicity, or in such an irretrievable manner, on a permanent record, and with only the answer of an 'aye' or 'nay' to choose between."

This last point is of high importance. There are no footnotes in the voting record; each vote is the monosyllable "aye" or "nay." The business executive seldom faces such dilemmas. His mistakes tend to be buried in the overall record of profit and loss—or at least they can be explained in his annual report.

In my opinion, these statements by Senators and Congressmen (and others like them I have not quoted) deserve the highest respect, even from those who may disagree.

Further, my own experience as a legislator persuades me that Congressmen are fully justified in intermingling the question of campaign policies and tactics with the question of legislative policies and tactics. These two are inseparable. The great majority of legislators who are elected in a given year in the United States—Federal, State, and local—have been reelected. From the moment they were first sworn in as legislators they were running for reelection and this is seldom out of their thoughts. Each must run on his legislative record; he knows his next opponent will scrutinize that record with a magnifying glass.

Finally, the issues that actually confront a legislator are rarely simple. When a major bill reaches the floor it is a long, complex document. If a Congressman or Senator disagrees with some aspect of it, he may seek to amend that aspect from the floor—but it is usually an exercise in futility. Generally he must cast his "aye" or "nay" on its net value.

In my judgment it is often impossible for a legislator clearly to separate considerations of prudence from moral principles. Indeed, he must frequently fall back on prudence if he is to advance his moral principles.

One of America's greatest social thinkers, the late Prof. Robert Redfield, discussing progress toward race equality, pointed out that a right and moral action may in some circumstances defeat or postpone the social end it is intended to serve.

Abraham Lincoln never doubted that slavery was wrong. Yet in December 1860, a month after his election as President, he offered to guarantee to the Southern States, in perpetuity, their right to a slave system, providing they agreed there should be no extension of slavery in the territories. Lincoln hoped that this offer might avert civil war; and undoubtedly he hoped also that the slave system would in time dissolve and disappear.

The danger in the argument for prudence is that, for those of us who are less than Lincolns, it can be an excuse for weakness. Like most other men, politicians too often underestimate the long-range values of boldness and stubbornness in defense of an ideal. Gandhi can be an example as well as Lincoln. Gandhi won because he was bold and stubborn and preferred jail to compromise.

I am so impressed with this danger that I cannot personally agree with any argument to the effect that a legislator need be morally right only 95 percent of the time—and can thus give away the other 5 percent even if it involves an affront to his conscience.

Ultimately, each Member of Congress must make his own decision each time a matter of principle arises—to compromise or not to compromise, to stand fast or to yield ground in the belief that his action will help achieve the desired final goal. His burden is that he must make the decision again and again and again—and not just once in a moment of emotional intensity—for there may be some 200 aye or no rollcall votes each year plus hundreds of votes in committee or elsewhere, any one of which may involve a moral choice.

A whole nation will be watching. But for each Member of Congress the decisions, whatever they may be, must be taken in the solitude of heart and mind and conscience.

The Brigantine "Yankee"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HASTINGS KEITH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill on behalf of the brigantine *Yankee* which will, I believe, do much to keep alive for American boys and girls the seafaring tradition of New England—and especially of the salt-of-the earth section I am proud to represent—an area that includes Cape Cod, the islands of Nantucket and Martha's Vineyard, and the famous onetime whaling town of New Bedford.

In recent years, training youthful mariners in sailing and seamanship has been carried on aboard the famous brigantine *Yankee*. Voyages in coastal waters as well as around the world have helped to develop in these youths self-reliance, and the ability to assume leadership.

The *Yankee* has changed hands, but her new owners wish to carry forward the same program of training our youth.

The bill I wish to introduce will, I am advised, permit this training to be resumed, as it grants the *Yankee* registration as yacht under specific restrictions.

The Pitfalls of Negotiation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by Christopher Emmet, executive vice president of the American Council on Germany, which appeared in the April 20 issue of the New Leader. I believe that this article, which concerns the British Government's recent attitude and proposals, as symbolized in their reservations about our high flights to Berlin, will be of interest to all Members of the House:

THE PITFALLS OF NEGOTIATION
(By Christopher Emmet)

The danger of Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev's Berlin ultimatum was always indirect as well as direct. From the beginning, it was hardly conceivable that the Western allies would yield on Berlin itself, except to the extent of tolerating an East German takeover under protest and treating the East Germans as Soviet agents, as long as they do not interfere with Western traffic into the city. However, a camouflaged surrender always appeared to be a greater danger—in other words, that we would buy tacit and probably temporary Soviet acceptance of the status quo in Berlin by making other concessions. Such concessions might include a beginning of disengagement; an atomic test ban without adequate inspection; a relaxation of East-West trade restrictions; an extension of credits to the Soviet bloc; a so-called European security pact; and a summit conference at which these concessions would be formalized.

Such Western concessions would represent a whittling away of an already gravely weakened Western position, unless matched by Soviet moves toward German unification in freedom. All these demands have been included in Khrushchev's recent speeches and in the Soviet statement of March 29 on the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Conference. More ominous still, the acceptance of all of them has been urged by British Prime

Minister Harold Macmillan, in one form or another. Under his influence, there are now indications of a drift toward some form of retreat from present allied positions, such as those listed above, without any comparable Soviet quid pro quo. If so, the Soviet blackmail on Berlin will have paid off.

It is true that no concessions seem as yet to have been definitely agreed upon by President Eisenhower and Macmillan, except the decision to hold a summit conference even if the foreign ministers' conference does not succeed; and even this change has not been definitely announced. Nevertheless, the whole trend of well informed press speculation, and the trend of nearly everything Macmillan has said since his return from Moscow, has been in the direction of some retreat. Although Macmillan has advocated firmness against a Soviet take-over of Berlin, he has urged a willingness to make changes in the direction of neutralization, and even Khrushchev himself never demanded Communist occupation of West Berlin. A troop and arms freeze in all Germany, which Macmillan tentatively discussed with Khrushchev, would mean surrendering the whole western program for German rearmament—and all this without even demanding German unification, let alone raising the issue of Soviet treaty violations in Hungary or the other countries of Eastern Europe. No wonder the British report that Khrushchev called a military freeze for Germany an interesting suggestion.

By leaving the initiative to Macmillan, the West has been leading from weakness in its negotiations with the Soviets. Britain is now the weakest link in the alliance, not only because of Macmillan's grave domestic political problems and the overhanging elections, but because of Britain's economic fear of German competition and of the Common Market. The motive of Macmillan's pro-summit policy s probably mainly political, but it may also be an effort to pressure France and Germany on the Common Market issue.

Another factor may well be the increasing Soviet domination of Iraq and the consequent threat to the great British oil interests there and to the British Protectorate of Kuwait, which by itself contains one-quarter of the world's oil reserves. No doubt this soft policy also expresses, at least in part, his sincere and objective judgment. However, Macmillan's motives are less important than the fact that he has initiated this policy to a chorus of praise from the British press, and he tends to be increasingly committed to it as it gathers momentum.

The Conservative papers in Britain naturally made a virtue of necessity and built Macmillan's humiliating and discouraging experience in Russia into a great triumph, with Macmillan assuming the leadership of the free world in British eyes. This, of course, was routine party politics; but even the independent and pro-Labor British press has joined the praise, partly from national pride over his assumption of international leadership, and party because they really approve his proposals.

The U.S. press met the British praise of Macmillan at least halfway, first, because his proposals were news (in the sense that they represent a new line), and second, because of the general sympathy for Macmillan's domestic political difficulties and a proper desire to preserve and strengthen the Anglo-American alliance. All this is understandable, but it has obscured the American people's comprehension of the real implications of Macmillan's policies.

Because of its popularity in Britain, only some new Khrushchev blunder or the united pressure of all of Britain's allies can now force a shift in the general Macmillan line. This issue was not fought out in the Eisenhower-Macmillan meeting, which, aside from settling the terms for a summit conference subject to French and German consent, involved an exchange of views rather than definite agreements. The issues remain to be hammered out between now and the foreign ministers' conference. For even if Macmillan only succeeded in putting over his plan to end atomic tests without adequate inspection, that alone could be disastrous in its psychological and military implications.

British press reports have probably exaggerated the degree of disengagement which Macmillan favors, but the whole trend and philosophy is wrong. He is bent on preventing a showdown on Berlin, whereas the hope for the West lies in a showdown from which Khrushchev would have to retreat. A Soviet setback in Berlin offers the best chance in a long while for the West to regain the initiative and launch a diplomatic offensive.

The whole risky Berlin maneuver indicates Khrushchev's fear of the captive peoples, especially, of course, the East Germans. This was stressed by Gen. Maxwell Taylor, Army Chief of Staff, in his recent Senate testimony. The Soviet fear of the satellite peoples, he noted, is one of the main reasons that it would be folly for Moscow to go to war. What is the West doing to exploit and reinforce those Soviet fears in bargaining with the Kremlin?

The Berlin ultimatum must be made the occasion for negotiations not on Berlin, nor even on Germany alone, but on the whole problem of Germany and East Europe. All this is now being lost sight of. The East European captive nations are not even mentioned except in connection with a proposed overall security pact. Such a pact would only serve to prevent Western aid to any future satellite revolution, and so stabilize the Soviet tyranny.

The demand for German unification is even being watered down to the point where, under the guise of a step toward unification, Macmillan is really promoting the beginnings of Khrushchev's plan for a German confederation, which means increased recognition for the East German puppets. Thus any steps toward unification by confederation rather than by free elections would help Khrushchev's Trojan horse tactics, and relieve his fears about East Germany by increasing the recognition and stability of the puppet regime.

The reunification of Germany would be of little advantage to the West unless it is made part of a general European settlement which restores some real measure of freedom to Eastern Europe. That is the only goal which could justify the risks to the West of any large measure of disengagement. But in any case, because of our promises to the German people and Khrushchev's own promise at Geneva in 1955, Western acceptance of any kind of disengagement or other concessions, without insisting on at least German unification, would clearly be an indirect surrender to the Soviet ultimatum.

Moreover, the Macmillan formula of first steps toward unification, in which improved relations between East and West Germany are made the beginning of confederation, would be the worst thing the West could do, for two reasons:

1. By raising false hopes of unification in freedom, it would help fix German political attention mainly on the unification goal, rather than on the integration and security of Western Europe and the liberation of Eastern Europe, including East Germany. This would help German neutralists and nationalists and weaken pro-Western policies.

2. It would increase the prestige of the East German Communists and so help Khrushchev control unrest in the East Zone. This would be appeasement in the name of unification. It would be far better for the West to return to its insistence on the free election formula, which is the only safe, honest and democratic method of upholding the ideal of unification in freedom. In the meantime, until the Soviets accept the formula, it would ensure the maintenance of the status quo, which Khrushchev is trying to change. The free elections formula is the symbol of the liberation of East Germany and of all Eastern Europe. It is the one goal for which the West could afford to pay something in the way of disengagement or atomic tests concessions.

But by the terms of the Macmillan policy, we will pay dearly to get something far worse than the present status quo which worries Khrushchev so much. Like George Kennan a few years ago, Macmillan would have us accept the finality of the Soviet satellite empire. He would relieve the Soviet fears, stressed by General Taylor, and would repudiate our pledges to press for free elections in those countries, without getting anything in return.

Beyond all this, Macmillan at Moscow apparently went far in promising to eliminate the last vestiges of restrictions on trade with the Communist bloc. Yet since the West has so little to negotiate with—we cannot threaten war—it would be suicidal folly to grant economic concessions without obtaining Soviet political concessions in return. But instead of demanding such concessions, Macmillan is adding increased trade to the other offers he wants us to make—on the summit conference, on German unification, on disengagement, on the issue of atomic tests, and on a security pact. It is even reported that Macmillan wants to draw the United Nations into West Berlin; this would be a step toward the city's neutralization, a loss of its present status as a Western outpost guaranteed under the Potsdam Agreement.

Possibly the most dangerous of all the proposed Macmillan giveaways is his reported tentative agreement with Khrushchev to accept the end of atomic testing without adequate inspection, if the United States could be persuaded to agree. Such an agreement would be all the more idiotic coming after the revolutionary new U.S. space tests, with their possible effects on missile warfare; and especially after the recent statement by General Taylor that to end testing now would seriously injure the relative military position of the United States. Once having created the Frankenstein monster of nuclear weapons, we would be foolish to end testing at this point, just when the bombs are at their most destructive, most poisonous, and least flexible phase.

But aside from the military disadvantage to the West of halting tests without making the ban part of a more general disarmament agreement, to accept the kind of token inspection which Macmillan reportedly discussed with Khrushchev would set a highly dangerous precedent. It would imply an element of trust in Soviet promises that would violate the fundamental Western principle President Eisenhower has repeatedly stated: Since Soviet promises cannot be relied upon, all agreements with them must be self-enforcing.

Macmillan's thesis is that we must make these concessions in order to get Khrushchev to negotiate, that he will not negotiate except at the summit and that there is no one else in Russia to negotiate with. We are told that a summit conference is the price we must pay to avoid a dangerous showdown in Berlin. But it was generally agreed from the start that it would be fatal to yield to that Soviet blackmail. In other words, it was agreed that we must face the Berlin showdown, for until it has been faced the threat will always be hanging over our heads like a sword of Damocles.

The series of indirect concessions which Macmillan proposes, however moderate in degree they may be, will be interpreted by the world as at least a partial Western surrender to the war threat. Instead of calling Khrushchev's bluff in Berlin and ending the effectiveness of new Soviet threats, at least for a long period to come, we will have made it easier for him to blackmail us again later. The parallel with Hitler's Rhineland is obvious.

As a matter of fact, the series of endless summit conferences which Macmillan proposed to Eisenhower would facilitate future Soviet threats like the present one on Berlin. According to Macmillan's formula, all such threats would be negotiated at summit conferences, on the principle of mutual concessions from both sides—the Soviets' concessions amounting merely to willingness to give up most of what they demanded in their threat. So the compromise starts from the new situation which Khrushchev's threat has created. This is the precedent which Macmillan's plan for dealing with the Berlin crisis would establish.

Another dangerous aspect of negotiating a new and more neutral status for West Berlin, thinning out military forces in a zone of central Europe, etc., could be its effect on Congress and the Democratic Party opposition in the United States. The Democratic leadership has been playing a constructive role in urging a greater defense effort and in backing the policy of not yielding an inch on Berlin. But if the administration avoids a Berlin showdown by making such concessions as Macmillan desires, the Democratic opposition will naturally shift its emphasis to the party's proposals for more domestic spending and for welfare measures which promise benefits to groups of voters. Thus the opportunity to use the Berlin crisis to get the American people and Congress committed to a greater defense and foreign aid effort will be lost, and the trend toward the disintegration of NATO through the unwillingness of its members to make the necessary sacrifices would be resumed.

The favorable press which Macmillan has received all over the world makes it more difficult, but also more necessary, to clarify these facts. It is in the interest of the United States to help Macmillan with his political difficulties. It is in our interest to do what we can to conciliate the British, who are our most important allies. But if we go nearly as far as the British press indicates Macmillan wishes us to go, we will risk abandoning the main purpose of the alliance in order to preserve the alliance.

If we are as firm as Secretary Dulles would have been and as German Chancellor Konrad Adenauer and French President Charles de-Gaulle still wish to be, Macmillan will have no choice, committed as he is to the alliance, but to stand with us. An when it comes to the election showdown, the British people can probably be counted on to back him, even if we do not go along with the policies he proposes. For if we stand firm, the British voters will have to choose between Macmillan and the NATO alliance, on the one hand, and the breakup of the alliance, on the other. It is unlikely that they have already forgotten the meaning of Munich.

Poison in Your Water—No. 65

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Daveport (Iowa) Democrat on April 23, 1958, entitled "Hepatitis Outbreak Emergency":

HEPATITIS OUTBREAK EMERGENCY

An emergency hepatitis situation in Silvis was declared Monday night by Mayor Peter J. Dreier.

At the same time, the city council approved Dreier's appointment of Dr. Harry DeBourcy as temporary health inspector during the hepatitis epidemic.

DeBourcy will direct an innoculation program expected to affect the 900 elementary school students in Silvis, Dreier explained.

Fifty-four students are now ill with the disease, which began with two cases in January. Dreier said cause of the disease is still not definitely known, but he declared State tests have again found city water uncontaminated.

A Silvis father last week contended that a Moline physician attributed "dirty" city water as the cause of hepatitis in his son.

It is now believed that improper hygiene in some homes is the cause of the hepatitis outbreak.

Statement of Willard W. Livingston, Chief Attorney General of Alabama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. GRANT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include for the RECORD a statement made by Hon. Willard W. Livingston, chief assistant attorney general of Alabama. Mr. Livingston, while a learned attorney in his own right, is the son of the distinguished chief justice of the Supreme Court of Alabama.

I have known the Livingston family for many years; in fact, the brother of the chief justice, the late Frank Livingston of Tuscaloosa, and I were classmates and friends at the old Southern University in Greensboro.

STATEMENT OF WILLARD W. LIVINGSTON, CHIEF ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL OF ALABAMA, BEFORE THE HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Willard W. Livingston and I am chief assistant attorney general of the State of Alabama. I have been an assistant attorney general for approximately 11 years with a majority of that time devoted to handling tax matters and tax litigation for the State of Alabama. However, I am very much interested and concerned with respect to the proposed civil rights bills which are now under consideration.

I am opposed to this legislation because I do not think that it is needed. In my judgment, such legislation is aimed at the destruction of many of the basic principles which have caused this Nation to become the greatest nation of the world. I am a firm believer in States rights and had it not been for such belief by our forefathers, this country might never have been established and organized on the basis that it was. The war for independence was fought long and hard and the new country not yet a nation because of the weakness of the compact that bound the 13 Original Colonies together, struggled for her existence. We had won our independence, but we now found it necessary to pay for it. The Articles of Confederation were not adequate for this need and were insufficient to meet a common desire among the 13 Colonies. Eleven years after the Declaration of Independence, in 1787, the Constitution of the United States was drafted, signed, and submitted to the people of the several States.

The need for some form of national government, made necessary for the common defense, was desirable and yet the 13 independent colonies were reluctant to surrender their independence, so recently acquired from England, to a Federal Government which might in time prove as dictatorial and oppressive as England had been. So fundamentally, our Constitution was an attempt to reconcile the conflicting desires of those who believed in a strong central government and those who wished to keep their government on a State and local level.

Many of the drafters of the Constitution were doubtful that the States would accept it. Leadership, tact and even salesmanship were needed to foster this new document on to a new and troubled people. However, once the States were guaranteed the first 10 amendments, commonly called our bill of rights, the Constitution was adopted and the embryo of today's National Government received life.

The 10th amendment to our Constitution is a part of the people's bill of rights and it is so short, yet so clear and meaningful, I would like to read it to you with a reverence that has not found expression here in Washington for many many long years. It provides:

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

To me, this means exactly what it says. It says to Congress, the President, and even to the Supreme Court of the United States that you must look to the Constitution for any power you attempt to exercise over the people of the respective States. If you cannot find it granted to you, expressly or by necessary implicaiton, in one of the provisions of the Constitution, then you have no power to act, because that power belongs to the States or to the people.

We in Alabama have exercised that power and have constitutional provisions and statutes relating to the very things which the proposed civil rights measures under consideration attempt to regulate. We say these are matters, the regulation of which should be by the respective States and not by the Federal Government.

I would like to call the committee's attention to certain Alabama constitutional provisions and statutes relating to electors and the registration of voters, statutes relating to lynching, dynamiting, and a constitutional provision relating to slavery.

We already have on the statute books in the State of Alabama the necessary laws and we certainly can enforce our own criminal statutes. We have done so in the past and it is our intention to do so in the future. Federal assistance is not needed and will be more of a hindrance to the States and will cause a wider breach between the races, particularly in the South, than already exist. It is beyond question that the actions of the Civil Rights Commission in Alabama the latter part of last year did more to further strain the relations between the races in Alabama than any one thing. It is my understanding that one member of the Civil Rights Commission stated in substance that he saw no solution to the race question insofar as legislating against segregation and it is also my understanding that several members of the Civil Rights Commission have indicated that it was their desire to resign from the Commission.

I would like to close with a quote from the case of *People Ex Rel. King, etc.* v. *John Gallagher*, 93 New York 438 (1883): "In the nature of things there must be many social

distinctions and privileges remaining unregulated by law and left within the control of the individual citizens, as being beyond the reach of the legislative functions of government to organize or control. The attempt to enforce social intimacy and intercourse between the races by legal enactments would probably tend to only embitter the prejudices, if any such there are, which exist between them, and produce an evil instead of a good result." (*Roberts* v. *City of Boston*, 5 Cush. 198.)

The above statement is most appropriate in view of recent developments during the last 2 or 3 years with respect to the segregation issue. Any further attempt by the Federal Government to interfere with matters, the regulation of which belongs to the States under the 10th amendment to the Constitution of the United States, can only lead to chaos and ultimate destruction of this country which has become great on the democratic principle that it is a "Government of laws and not of men."

"Uncle Sam" Wilson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO W. O'BRIEN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, a movement, unfortunately too typical of our times, has been launched to eliminate Uncle Sam as a symbol of our Nation. He is outdated, say those who seem to think a crew-cut or Elvis Presley sideburns would be better.

"Uncle Sam" Wilson, the inspiration for the Uncle Sam character, lived and died in Troy, N.Y.

It is fitting to place in the RECORD the views of a distinguished Troy journalist on this "scrap Uncle Sam" effort. Here, as they appeared in the New York Times of April 12, are those views:

"UNCLE SAM" WILSON

(Many readers have asserted, as does the writer of the following letter, that "Uncle Sam" derives from a Samuel Wilson who lived in Troy, N.Y., in the late 18th and early 10th centuries. A formal declaration to that effect was issued recently by the New York State Legislature. The theory is accepted by some specialists in American history and folklore, but not by others.)

If "Uncle Sam" is an out-of-date stereotype, as Mr. Nevins says, then "The Star-Spangled Banner" is totally archaic, for both were born in the crucible of the War of 1812.

The symbol of "Uncle Sam" is not the creature of a cartoonist's pen, but the result of the evolution of the American dream—as expressed in the life story of one of the most representative of all Americans, "Uncle Sam" Wilson, who was born in Menotomy (now Arlington), Mass., on September 13, 1766, and who died in Troy, N.Y., July 31, 1854.

The story of Sam Wilson's life is an abridged story of America. As a boy, Sam helped his brothers and sisters run the Wilson farm at Menotomy when their father, Edward Wilson, answered Paul Revere's dramatic call on April 18–19, 1775, and took part in the battle of Lexington. And Sam himself ran away from home at the age of 14½ to enlist as a service boy in the American Army, and served until the end of the war.

Almost penniless, Samuel Wilson at 23 migrated to Troy, where by dint of hard work he took root in the community and became known for his honesty and commonsense, wielding great influence for good. Just as he had spoken out against those defeatists who believed the Colonies could not win independence, he now opposed those pessimists who said the new Nation could not survive as a weak and debt-burdened country.

By the beginning of the War of 1812 Samuel had become prominent in the State. A tall, slender man with a "nutcracker" face, he was especially liked by children, who called him Uncle Sam. People came from miles around for his counsel.

In October 1812 Sam Wilson, who had begun a meatpacking business, was made inspector of provisions for the Army in New York. A group of visitors to his plant in Troy asked what the initials "EA-US" on the barrels of meat stood for. A workman replied that the "EA" stood for Elbert Anderson, a contractor, and added jokingly that the "US" (actually an abbreviation for "United States") stood for "Uncle Sam" Wilson.

The allusion caught on and spread rapidly, for Sam Wilson was popular. He epitomized the plain American, with a devotion to honesty, self-reliance, and a passion for justice for himself and all men. The step from this to an impersonation of our country by an ideal Uncle Sam was a logical sequence. Suddenly America had a flesh-and-blood symbol to give it courage, at a time when the was war going badly.

By 1814 British ships had taken over the Atlantic coast and British marines raided towns in seacoast States. "Uncle Sam," tall and resplendent in his red, white, and blue attire, came to life when the Nation needed him most. The widespread use of "Uncle Sam" in lithographs and cartoons helped to arouse and inspire the country.

Today, "Uncle Sam" lives on as a spokesman for all that went before him in the building of America, and all that is yet to come. We must interpret the true Uncle Sam to the rest of the world For the solution to the life-or-death riddle of the atomic race with Soviet Russia lies in showing other nations that our way of life, which "Uncle Sam" Wilson symbolizes, holds the greatest promise for struggling mankind.

THOMAS I. GERSON.

SCHENECTADY, N.Y.

Cheaper To Pay Off Our Debt Than Owe It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JIM WRIGHT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, as evidence of the continuing and growing editorial interest throughout the country in the necessity for a systematic program of national debt reduction and eventual retirement, I am taking the liberty of including here for the reading of those Members who are interested, a very fine editorial which appeared in the Abilene Reporter-News on Saturday, April 18:

CHEAPER TO PAY OFF OUR DEBT THAN OWE IT

Year after year, Congress after Congress, administration after administration, lipservice has been paid to the thesis that we must begin to pay off the national debt and start to get out from under the crushing burden of interest payment, which will amount in the new fiscal year to more than $8 billion, a sum equal to one-third of all that we owed at the end of the First World War.

We were well on the way to paying off the World War I debt—it had been cut down from around $24 billion to around $16 billion by the mid-1920's—when an era of high tariffs, tax reductions and income tax refunds reversed the trend and brought on the big boom followed by the big bust.

The national debt stands today at $283 billion. Time after time the debt ceiling has had to be raised so all the camels could get under the tent.

Why? For want of a fiscal program aimed peculiarly at debt reduction.

Congressman JIM WRIGHT of the Fort Worth district introduced early in the first session of the 86th Congress a resolution which, if adopted and carried out with singleness of purpose, would eventually whittle the national debt to manageable size.

It expresses "the sense of Congress that the national debt should be reduced annually by an amount not less than 1 percent of the total" now outstanding, and that the Secretary of the Treasury should include such an amount in any request for funds to pay any obligatory interest payments which become due and payable.

He suggested that the plan be implemented beginning with fiscal 1961 and continued "without interruption until the total national debt now outstanding is retired." Estimated cost allocated to principal and interest, about $2.8 billion per annum.

Congressman WRIGHT sees in the trend to higher interest that the Government will soon be paying at the rate of $9.8 billion a year, assuming the total debt remains unchanged.

It is, he declares, cheaper to pay than to owe.

"In profound but simple terms," he said in submitting his plan, "these figures reveal the amazing and yet inescapable fact that it is more than $485 billion cheaper to pay off the debt in 100 years than it would be simply to continue paying the interest for that period of time."

We don't know what chance Congressman WRIGHT's resolution has at this session, but we imagine very little chance. "Balancing the budget," which is meaningless in the long haul, a mere matter of bookkeeping, should give way to a new slogan: "Start paying off the national debt; it's cheaper that way."

Missouri River Diversion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. QUENTIN BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I should like to advise my colleagues again that the "no new starts" policy of this administration has brought new water resource development to a halt. North Dakota has cooperated fully with the Flood Control Act of 1944 and has not only given up 566,000 acres of its finest land for reservoir purposes but has taken them from the tax rolls of our State.

Now, after 15 long years, no construction of the Garrison unit has been commenced, although authorized as a part of

the development under the 1944 act. The reauthorization bill has been locked up in the Bureau of the Budget as are many other projects. The responsibility for this situation rests upon the executive branch of this Government. It is little wonder that the Minot Daily News, a pioneer in water resource development in North Dakota, is running low on patience. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am happy to place its just complaints before the Congress in an article published April 11, 1959, entitled "Virtue of Patience Is Tested":

VIRTUE OF PATIENCE IS TESTED

Up to this time North Dakota has done all of the giving in connection with development of the Pick-Sloan plan and has received none of the benefits that were promised.

This fact was brought out by Milo Hoisveen, State engineer, in an address at Grand Forks this week.

The original compact was just as clear as any agreement could possibly be. North Dakota was to give up a half million fertile acres of Missouri River bottomlands that produced abundant feed and winter shelter for great herds of beef cattle, in exchange for a million acres of irrigation.

The area to be flooded—and much of it is already flooded—has been removed from the tax rolls, depleting the income of counties and the State, as well as some townships where only a portion of the area has been taken.

The plan report has long since been completed and worked through channels into the Interior Department which it finally cleared to run into what looks to many like a stone wall in the Bureau of the Budget. This all-powerful Department seems to be held in great awe in Washington.

Every question of the Bureau has been answered. Technical points have been cleared up and still the report continues to develop a moss coat.

From the time the report was completed there has been every evidence of a studied campaign of delay from Washington, seeking to keep the report from Congress. Because there has been a change in plans that call for taking water from Garrison Reservoir in place of near Fort Peck, technical legal minds in Washington called for a reauthorization of the project which had once cleared Congress.

North Dakota is today solidly behind the Missouri River diversion project. In the pioneer days there were not too many willing to carry the torch. Minot has the distinction of furnishing leadership and sizable funds. It was a rough road but gradually opponents were converted.

The time has now arrived when North Dakota, with the support of many other Missouri Valley States, is demanding that Washington keep faith. We have just about reached the point where patience ceases to be a virtue.

North Dakota has every right to demand that the benefit chapter of the Pick-Sloan compact be approved and a start made on a project that will take several decades to accomplish.

We are entitled to nothing less.

Effect of the Railroad Relief Act of 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I would again like to respectfully call to the attention of my distinguished colleagues the continuing urgency of the railroad-commuter problem in New Jersey. And what is happening in my State is rapidly developing into a pattern across the Nation.

In connection with my remarks asking for rapid action on S. 1450 which I believe would close some of the gaps in the Transportation Act of 1958, I think it would be of interest to review once more the background which led to the enactment of the Transportation Act of 1958, commonly referred to as the Railroad Relief Act.

I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that the following article from the New Jersey Municipalities, February 1959, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EFFECT OF THE RAILROAD RELIEF ACT OF 1958

(By Toward T. Rosen, deputy attorney general, board of public utilities commissioners)

As you know, when a railroad today desires to curtail or discontinue the passenger service it furnishes by train or ferry to your towns it is required first to obtain the permission of the regulatory agency. That regulatory agency in New Jersey will be either the New Jersey Board of Public Utility Commissions or the Interstate Commerce Commission. The one agency is an integral part of the State government of New Jersey; the other is an administrative agency of the U.S. Government.

I would like to tell you a little about the pattern of regulation that existed before the recent Railroad Relief Act was passed. The situation then was fairly clear. A railroad that wanted to discontinue passenger service within the State of New Jersey took its case to the New Jersey Utility Commission. This commission weighed the financial losses that the railroad suffered from the service along with the need of the community for the service and came up with an answer which sometimes made one side happy; more often it wasn't completely acceptable to any side, but it was the best that could be done in a situation where there is no yardstick for what is absolutely right or absolutely wrong.

In considering these services, it has been the policy, the philosophy of the State public utility commission, that the primary emphasis must be given to the need of the local community for service. A study of the opinions and decisions of the New Jersey board will reveal that that need has been given emphasis over and above the loss that the railroad claimed or the loss that the railroad actually did suffer in individual service problems.

However, you have the situation where the board has been sensitive to the financial difficulties of the railroads, particularly the financial difficulties that followed passenger commutation service since the second World War. In a case where a municipality was using its local train service but where the people had other means of transportation to get to their destination, the board would permit the railroads to curtail or discontinue entirely the service to the communities. As you know, those other alternate means would most often take the form of bus transportation.

But in those communities where the railroad was the only public means of transportation available or, if the other public transportation, if the bus systems, were inadequate, then even despite an acknowledged heavy loss on service, the New Jersey board would require the service to continue. It, however, took into account or took under advisement the impact of the loss on the overall operations of the railroad—the amount, for example, that the railroad might be earning from its freight operations in the area or the State as a whole. Considering all of these things, the board come up with an answer, remembering, however, that it felt a primary obligation to preserve the transportation system of the State of New Jersey.

NEW FEDERAL LAW

What happened in the spring of 1958 was that the financial troubles of the railroads became acute. I won't try to analyze the reasons here. That particular situation was certainly accentuated by the recession that the economy faced. The railroads went down to Washington, told their story, in many respects a legitimate story, and the Federal Transportation Act of 1958 resulted, popularly known as the Railroad Relief Act.

This act contains many things, but the ones we are interested in today are the provisions with respect to the passenger service of the carriers. Changes were made by that law. Briefly, the changes were these: The railroads now were told to take their passenger service cases to the Interstate Commerce Commission if the train involved ran from one State to a point in another State. Thus, hypothetically, a railroad running a train between Elizabeth and New York City—Trenton and New York City—which, previous to the new legislation, had submitted its case to the New Jersey board insofar as any changes taking place within New Jersey, now, without delay, can submit its case to the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Prior to this act, the Interstate Commerce Commission did not have jurisdiction over that kind of service. The only service on which it could hear cases concerned those where the railroad proposed to abandon an entire line of railroad, not just cut down the service, not just eliminate passenger service and keep freight service, but abandon an entire line of railroad. That is how some of the ferry cases, which you may have read about some time ago, came to the Interstate Commerce Commission on the claim that the railroad was abandoning its entire ferry line.

Those cases now, of course, have been litigated by the State. The State of New Jersey has taken the position that those weren't abandonments at all but merely curtailments of service, since the railroad expected to continue its freight service across the river by means of other carriers—that is, the barge and lighter service.

The main point to be remembered is that the Interstate Commerce Commission's jurisdiction over passenger service prior to this new law was a most limited one but it was significant for this reason: In the area where the ICC did have jurisdiction, it pretty plainly pointed out its philosophy, the direction it could be expected to take if its jurisdiction over the service were to be lost.

IMPACT OF LAW

That philosophy, or policy, is a very different one from that administered by the New Jersey board. It is different in this respect: The Interstate Commerce Commission conceives of itself as having a mission primarily to preserve and protect and nourish the railroad system. If the Commission (a) receives a case where there seems to be a choice between the losses of a railroad and the service rendered to a community or a region, by and large, the Commission will generally take the financial picture of the railroad in preference to the needs of the local people. This is where there has been a difference in approach between the attitude of the ICC and the New Jersey Board of Public Utility Commissioners.

This new act was motivated in very large part by the campaigns of the railroads that the State commissioners, New Jersey among them, had been too parochial in their respect for local interests, too narrow in not taking

into account the impact of these passenger losses on the financial health of the national transportation system. I cannot say whether it is right or it is wrong, but that is the complaint which the railroads took down to Congress and that is the complaint which Congress pretty much accepted when they drafted this new legislation.

But the Congress didn't buy the railroad story completely. The new legislation that was submitted to the Congress originally provided that any railroad company could discontinue any passenger service on which it could demonstrate a financial loss. Now, of course, there was dynamite in the bill as originally written. Implicit in it was the power of the railroads to discontinue overnight, virtually all commuter service in our suburban and urban centers.

The law didn't get through Congress in that form. It was modified very substantially. The law as it came out gave the Interstate Commerce Commission jurisdiction over interstate rail service. You will remember my illustration of the train running from Elizabeth to New York City. In those cases the railroads were given an option of taking their case either to the State board—in the Elizabeth-New York case it would have been the New Jersey board, by and large—or to the Interstate Commerce Commission. It was fairly predictable that the railroads would prefer to take their case down to the Interstate Commerce Commission for the reasons that I have attempted to outline to you.

On the local service cases, that is, the train running between points within one State, that which we call intrastate service, the railroads were still required to take their case to the State public utility commissions, with this little twist, however: If the Public Utility Commission wouldn't give them relief, the railroads were permitted to appeal to the Interstate Commerce Commission. So that under this new legislation as drafted, you can expect a shift in regulatory emphasis to take place from the State-local level to the Washington-Interstate Commerce Commission level, and that shift has already started.

IMMEDIATE ACTION

The day after the President signed the new bill, one of the major local carriers in northern New Jersey filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission to discontinue a ferry service. The next day, that is, two days after the new bill was signed, another major local carrier filed to discontinue its ferry service. The Interstate Commerce Commission, not unexpectedly, refused even to hold a hearing and as things stood, the ferries were to be discontinued within 30 days from the filing.

This case has been taken by the State to the Federal district court and since it is now pending in the Federal district court[1] I am not at liberty to discuss it at length. It is up to the court to decide that case but, fundamentally, I will say this to you: The case raises the issue of whether it is fair procedure in a due process, in a constitutional sense, for a railroad to be permitted to discontinue service by a Federal agency without first affording a hearing on the claims of the riders of the municipalities which are served. The issue raised is not whether the Federal Government has the power over the service—it is pretty clear that it does—but whether the Federal Government is required to give a hearing and afford due process to the users of the service and to the regions which may require the service.

As matters now stand, the constitutionality of the major provision of that new Railroad Relief Act is in issue. The answer, we won't attempt to predict. The chances are we will get an answer from the Federal court soon, and the chances are also most likely that no matter how the answer comes out from there, it won't be resolved finally until the case reaches the U.S. Supreme Court.

Today, the regulatory pattern is a little foggy. You can't lay it out and say, "This is just how things are." There have been changes. The extent of the changes, we can't know until we get the answers from the litigation now pending. It does seem clear, however, that the changes herald a shift in emphasis from the local level to the Federal level; that this will most likely result in train service being curtailed at an even greater rate than you have seen in the last few years.

The Illusion of Nuclear Plenty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New Leader of April 27, 1959, written by Mr. Morton A. Kaplan, professor of political science at Chicago University and a fellow of the center of international studies at Princeton University:

THE ILLUSION OF NUCLEAR PLENTY

(By Morton A. Kaplan)

In a recent scientific meeting at the California Institute of Technology, the missile policy of the U.S. Government was denounced. It was asserted that the United States already has the power to destroy the Soviet Union, that additional missiles are useless or even part of a policy to deliberate waste designed to keep the economy going, just like some of the planned obsolescence in civilian industry.

The belief that armaments are necessary to the economy seems to be a widespread hangover from the economic determinism that prevailed during the 1930's. The strikingly favorable reception of Soviet Deputy Premier Anastas Mikoyan by American businessmen led him to assert after his return, that American policy does not reflect the views of the business and industrial elite. This might indicate that even the Soviet high command rejects the myth that armaments are necessary to prosperity in capitalist economies. In any event, the best economic studies, such as those of the National Planning Association, support the view that, although the economy can support the present military budget without harm, or even a much larger military budget without serious economic costs, there is no evidence that the economy is best supported by armaments expenditures and much evidence to the contrary.

Nevertheless the charge has been made. If the charge is false, it is dangerous to leave it unrebutted. If scientists believe it, the various Government and private research organizations working on military policy will find it difficult to recruit the staff necessary to carry on vital programs or to maintain the kind of morale and sense of urgency necessary for effective work.

In fact, the charge is false, although it represents a widespread and dangerous illusion. The policy of the Government is subject to legitimate indictment, but for precisely the opposite reason. The safety of the United States and of the American way of life is being endangered because of an inadequate defense program that is based upon a misunderstanding of the problem of the nuclear missile age.

The United States does have the power to destroy the Soviet Union provided the Strategic Air Command can deliver its nuclear payload unhindered by the Soviets. Unfortunately, this kind of successful strike cannot be assumed, for the U.S.S.R. may destroy most SAC planes on the ground; others may be halted by the active Soviet air defense; and the planes that get through, if any, may do little damage because of the civil defense precautions that the Soviet Union has taken. In brief, the time may soon come when the Soviet Union can afford to attack the United States at relatively little expected cost.

Assume that SAC has some 43 bases in the United States. If the Soviet Union had about 250 ICBM's with a payload of 5 megatons, and a circular error probability (CEP—the radius of the circle within which one-half of the missiles aimed at the center of a target may be expected to fall) of 5 miles, and a reliability of 0.5, it could take out every SAC base with a very high probability. (Overseas bases could be taken out easily by Soviet IRBM's). Now it might be that the Soviet Union does not have ICBM's with 5 megaton warheads, although some of Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev's remarks to Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, Minnesota, in December might be interpreted to include such a claim. (Incidentally, I cannot remember, in the postwar period, a single official Soviet claim about their weapons system that was not later verified.)

The Soviet moonshot, according to expert testimony at recent congressional hearings, would indicate a guidance system with a 15-mile CEP, although the Soviet Union might not have used its best guidance system, or that particular shot might not have been a good shot. And the Soviet Union might not have 250 ICBM's, although cutbacks in other military areas would seem to indicate a massive production program in that field.

Even if the Soviet Union cannot risk a sneak attack today, it is difficult to feel confident that it will not be in a position to risk such an attempt in a year or two, when it possesses a large number of improved missiles.

Meanwhile, developments in active air defense, particularly in the missile field, make it more and more difficult for planes to penetrate an elaborate active defense system, even if they survive a sneak attack. SAC commitment to the manned plane at the present time can be understood because of the heavy payload that planes can carry and because active defense cannot be expected to halt a massive attack carried out by an undamaged SAC.

Moreover, planes will continue to be useful, after missiles have knocked out the enemy striking forces and air defense, to pose the threat of massive destruction and thereby to force surrender. Unfortunately, it may be the Soviet Union and not the United States which is able to make this threat effective if the present U.S. defense policy is continued.

The United States has no effective missile program. The projected IRBM bases in Europe will be highly vulnerable. As part of a much larger system, they would nonetheless be useful. But there is no operational ICBM and the projected production schedule is pitifully small. The administration argument is that it does not want to waste money on first-generation missiles, when there is no current urgency, and when the United States will soon be able to make use of second-generation missiles like Polaris and Minuteman. Unfortunately, we cannot be

[1] (EDITOR'S NOTE.—After this address, the Federal district court sustained the constitutionality of the new legislation. The State of New Jersey has taken an appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court, but a final rule is not expected until the fall.)

very confident that the situation will not be urgent before the second-generation missiles are available. In addition, it is highly doubtful that the second-generation missiles are adequate to do the job they are supposed to do.

The Polaris and Minuteman carry small payloads; some public estimates have been in the range of 200 kilotons. This is sufficient to do heavy damage to a large city. But, if there is an effective civil defense program, the damage they can inflict might not be sufficiently worse than some German and Japanese cities received during World War II; they are unlikely to incapacitate an enemy. Polaris and Minuteman do not carry a big enough warhead to be useful against hardened Russian launching sites.

On the other hand, the Soviet Union's ICBM's probably will carry a big enough warhead to knock out American missile-launching sites. And the very large numbers of missile sites or the hardness of bases necessary for minimal safety in the next few years are not being designed into present production plans.

Less than 10 Polaris submarines are planned, and even the Navy apparently is not asking for more than 50. These could be hunted down at sea and destroyed in peacetime. The United States could do nothing except watch helplessly as its striking forces were destroyed; or it could launch a suicidal attack—suicidal since the Soviet Union could strike back with undamaged forces. In addition, the planned range of the Polaris is 1,200 miles.

It so happens that even if Polaris were not hunted down in peacetime, it could not be used against the Soviet Union except in a narrow range off the Eurasian continent. The Polaris submarines could be destroyed as they surfaced to fire, since the area is patrollable (although this would not be the case if the Polaris range were increased to the original plan of 1,500 miles).

Thus, present administration plans call for creating a highly vulnerable missile force that is not useful against Soviet launching sites. This force could not be used in a first strike unless the United States were in a suicidal mood. The Soviet forces could be used in a first strike. A dangerous asymmetry is in process of creation. In consequence, a good situation for nuclear blackmail by the Soviet Union is likely to develop.

Indeed, the Soviet Union would have to be either unsure of its advantage or stupid not to blackmail the United States in such a case. The world would be a very uncomfortable place to live in. The Soviet Union would hardly feel safe if the United States were to adopt an intelligent defense program. What better time to insure its safety than when it possessed an effective preponderance of military force.

True, there would still be many uncertainties in the situation. Even the best laid military plans often go wrong through miscalculations, mistakes or inefficiency. Accident may not play the role in modern war that Tolstoy thought it did in 19th-century war, yet its possible consequences could hardly be neglected by any sensible government. However, when this is admitted, the Soviet Union would run only slight risks with a policy of blackmail. The United States might accede.

The United States might prove stubborn, but it could hardly adopt the suicidal strategy of striking first, particularly since a Soviet first strike would be directed against American military bases rather than against the centers of population. And if the Soviet Union struck first, the attack might succeed in destroying the effective American military power. If it did not succeed, the United States could hardly afford to hit back at Soviet cities, since it could not hope to knock out the Soviet launching sites aimed at American cities. Therefore, except for the few attacking planes or missiles that responded immediately and automatically to the Soviet strike, the best the United States could do would be to threaten to bomb Soviet cities unless the Soviets called their attack off, and to alert the remaining American striking forces as a protection against a second sneak attack.

The American situation is made worse by the fact that no effective civil defense program has been established. Having given up on the possibility of defense, the entire American population becomes a hostage to Soviet benignness, on the assumption that the population could not be saved in any event. This is a very dubious assumption. Moreover, the Soviet Union is operating on the assumption that civil defense can make a difference.

The entire American defense program is shot through with false assumptions. The administration does not recognize that even hard bases can be destroyed by sufficiently large and accurate ICBM's, that mobile targets can be located and knocked out, that enough cities can be defended to make a large difference in potential recuperation (particularly if provocative acts provide warning during which evaluation can be carried out), that planes can be destroyed on the ground, that numbers and dispersion of bases might prove crucial, that signaling systems can be fooled, that communications can be knocked out. In short, that blackmail can be employed successfully against an inferior military establishment. Everything hinges on the relative rate of technological development in the Soviet Union and the United States.

It is ironic that a program as faulty as the present American military program should be regarded as a needless luxury. At a time when the values of Western civilization rest upon the defensibility of the United States, it is important for sicentists to recognize the supreme importance of the tasks they are performing in defending the physical security of the United States. Not a day passes that some technological innovation or discovery may not change the entire balance of military power.

Unless American scientists remain dedicated—not merely on the job—the United States is in desperate trouble. It is necessary for scientists to tell the Government that its complacency is without foundation, that any defense can be penetrated, and that any offense may be nullified by technological innovation—unless we possess considerably more powerful weapons than those on the planning boards. The Government's complacency is not justified, and scientists have an obligation to say so.

There are undoubted dangers in a long-continued arms race. It might bring technological innovations giving such an advantage to the first strike that any responsible government would strike first. These innovations are not likely in the next few years; in any event, unilateral withdrawal from the technological race will not remove the danger. Indeed, such unilateral action can only increase the danger by insuring a Russian first strike advantage and by reducing the Soviet incentive to agree to reasonable arms control.

This is the time for the most responsible individuals in the scientific community to make a dispassionate analysis of the problem. They must inform their colleagues and the public at large of the nature of the situation, and of the responsibilities of the scientist and the humanist in the light of the fundamental values to which this Nation has been dedicated from its birth. If these values are forfeited now, the loss may be permanent.

A revolution in biology may one day permit us to control the gene structure and the environment in general. But it would be an awful thing if future generations were to be deprived of the right to live as free men in the way their consciences dictate.

He Will Be Sorely Missed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROSS BASS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include an editorial which appeared in the Clarksville Leaf-Chronicle, one of the most outstanding newspapers in my congressional district. In my opinion, this article well expresses the general feeling and sentiment in regard to the resignation of Secretary of States Dulles; and, I would like, therefore, to share it with my colleagues in the Congress.

The editorial, "He Will Be Sorely Missed," follows herewith:

HE WILL BE SORELY MISSED

Cancer-ravaged John Foster Dulles has finally decided to do the inevitable. He has resigned his duties as Secretary of State.

Announcement of Mr. Dulles' decision was made Wednesday by President Eisenhower, who has described Mr. Dulles as the greatest Secretary in U.S. history. The President was visibly moved by the decision of his old friend in whom he has placed the utmost faith.

It took unselfish courage on the part of Mr. Dulles to relinquish the post for which he had been trained for years and to which he was completely devoted. But cancer has taken its deadly toll and regardless of the physical stamina of John Foster Dulles, he could not bounce back and give full time to the office of Secretary.

Mr. Dulles has been one of the most controversial personalities in an office that is familiar to controversy and criticism. Perhaps no other post other than that of the Presidency is so open to both praise and abuse.

While Mr. Dulles steps down, his record remains and only history can be the fair judge. Extravagant praise at the moment ranges from a thoroughly dedicated man to the greatest Secretary in U.S. history. Extravagant criticism pictures Mr. Dulles as a "brink dancer," and a stubborn statesman without imagination and vision. He was neither. But he will be known for one outstanding characteristic—his unbending purpose to steer U.S. foreign policy on a straight course and without yielding to compromises.

Regardless of Mr. Dulles' place in history, at this particular moment he is sorely missed. Cancer incapacitated him almost on the eve of the important Foreign Ministers' Conference. Much of the free world's stand against communism was anchored on Mr. Dulles' policy. And while U.S. policy is not expected to change, the bulldogged determination of John Foster Dulles will be missed.

Democrats and Republicans alike deplore the grievous illness of Mr. Dulles and the necessity for his resignation. The man who succeeds him must assume tremendous responsibilities that can affect this Nation and the whole free world.

Freedom for Bulgaria and Opposition to Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, at the third congress of the Bulgarian National Front of the United States of America and Canada, held in New York City on March 7 and 8, several important resolutions were adopted. In these resolutions this fine organization reaffirmed its opposition to atheistic communism and rededicated itself to the freeing of noble Bulgaria.

Because this group has established an enviable record of service to America and to the cause of the liberation of Bulgaria, and because these people know at first hand the treachery and dangers of communism, their views deserve wide dissemination. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions recently adopted by the Bulgarian National Front be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS OF THE THIRD CONGRESS OF THE BULGARIAN NATIONAL FRONT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND CANADA

The delegates at the third congress of the Bulgarian National Front of America and Canada, Inc., convened at the Biltmore Hotel in New York City on March 7 and 8, after having heard the reports of the president of the central executive board and the other officers and after having discussed the issues raised in those reports, adopted the following resolutions:

"RESOLUTION I, ON CURRENT INTERNATIONAL ISSUES

"Whereas the international situation during the last year has fundamentally changed in favor of the free nations, as the result of the resolute resistance demonstrated by the free world under the leadership of the United States against Communist aggression in the Far East, in the Middle East, and lately in Germany; and

"Whereas the leaders of the free nations recently are acting in a way which implies that they no longer entertain any illusions as to the ultimate aims of the Communist bloc of nations and in their diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union manifest more realism and sense of responsibility than in earlier times so as to leave the Communist aggressors to choose between the alternatives of war or peace; and on the other hand

"Whereas the free nations have reconciled with the status-quo created after the Second World War in Eastern Europe and their opposition to communism do not go beyond defending this status-quo, thus leaving the enslaved nations to Communist tyranny, though, from time to time, responsible statesmen come out with platonic declarations promising them support for their liberation; be it

"Resolved, That the third congress of the Bulgarian National Front of America and Canada expresses its feelings of admiration to the President of the United States Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, and to the leaders of the other free nations for their courageous policy of resistance to Communist aggression in the Far East, in the Middle East, and in Germany and urges them to stand firm in defense of the free city of Berlin where the Soviet Union is lately trying to destroy the moral and the political prestige of the Western Powers; and be it further

"Resolved, That the third congress of the Bulgarian National Front extends its heartfelt wishes for a fast recovery to Secretary of State John Foster Dulles and congratulations for his tireless efforts and sacrificial dedication to the cause of democracy in the world; and be it further

"Resolved, That the third congress of the Bulgarian National Front warns the leaders of the free nations not to atone the peace of the world with the slavery of the nations in Eastern Europe, and to reject the formula 'Peace at any price' as immoral; and be it further

"Resolved, That the third congress of the Bulgarian National Front wishes to assure the leaders of the Great Powers that the Bulgarian people, at the present engaged in an uneven struggle against the Red tyranny, imposed upon him by the Soviet troops in September 1944, is ready to join the free nations after its liberation for the establishment of a world order of justice, peace, and cooperation among all nations on the basis of free covenants freely arrived at; and be it further

"Resolved, That the third congress of the Bulgarian National Front expresses its firm belief in the imminent liberation of all enslaved by Communist nations.

"RESOLUTION II. THE BULGARIAN NATIONAL FRONT AND THE STRUGGLE OF THE BULGARIAN AGAINST COMMUNISM

"Whereas as the result of tragic developments and against the will of her people, 15 years ago, Bulgaria was occupied by the Soviet troops, her independence reduced to trivial formality and the Bulgarian people forced to accept a regime of cruel tyranny, terror, and political distatorship; and

"Whereas in the very day of Bulgaria's fall under communism the entire Bulgarian nation joined in a desperate struggle for liberation, sacrificing the flower of a generation, and despite the tremendous odds against her cause and without sufficient moral and material support from the free nations she continues this struggle with unwavering spirit and determination; and

"Whereas in the course of this struggle the Bulgarian people realized how misunderstood and misinterpreted their national internal political problems have been abroad, due to a concerted foreign and domestic propaganda, and how the specialists and the specialists and the representatives of the Great Powers have manifested, and continue to manifest, a complete ignorance as to the substance of the Bulgarian national politics, and continue to pay tribute to outdated prejudices and, by doing that, willingly or unwillingly, weaken the spirit of resistance in Bulgaria, as well as the sacrificial enthusiasm of the Bulgarian people; and

"Whereas in spite of the enormous difficulties and disappointments, caused by the aforesaid facts of official and unofficial foreign and Bulgarian agencies, who have shown interest in the struggle of the Bulgarian people against communism with the explicite of the implicite desire to impose on this struggle personalities, ideas, methods, tactics and aims irrelevant, incompatible, false or detrimental to this struggle, the people of Bulgaria, led by its unmistakable instinct and by its patriotic leaders, have never ceased to carry this struggle for life or death, being determined to hold its destiny in their own hands and to organize the future of liberated Bulgaria according to the best interests of the Bulgarian people; be it

"Resolved, That the Bulgarian National Front bestows the greatest honor upon the memory of those who have fallen in the struggle for freedom in Bulgaria and pay them the deepest respect of its members; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Bulgarian National Front extends greetings.—

"To his Majesty King Simeon II, the Constitutional Representatives of the enslaved people of Bulgaria abroad and its legal leader in the struggle for freedom, to whom, all delegates at the congress and all members of the organization pledge their loyalty and promise their support in fulfillment of his mission, imposed on him by the providence—to be the King liberator of Bulgaria.

"To the Bulgarian fighters for freedom: those who are fighting communism in the mountains, those who are in prison and concentration camps, those who are at large and day after day escape the vigilant eye of the Communist secret police, those who have escaped out of Bulgaria and carry the struggle against communism abroad; and

"To the Bulgarian patriotic officers and soldiers in the Communist army of Bulgaria and to recall them that the Bulgarian soldiers have many a time glorified the name and have defended the honor of Bulgaria and that, at the present, the fatherland looks them as the future saviors of the nations who, at the decisive moment of the national struggle for freedom, will turn their weapons against the enslavers of our country and will take over the destinies of Bulgaria until the Bulgarian people are given the opportunity to choose freely their government;

"To the Bulgarian youth serving in the labor troops as a punishment for their democratic convictions and for their part and sympathy with the struggle against communism;

"To the Bulgarian youth, who have grown up and have been educated in the Communist schools but which have been nourished by the covenants and the ideals of the glorious Bulgarian past and its struggles for freedom and independence and which, with self-sacrifices and determination worthy for admiration, follows the traditions of the youth of the Bulgarian renaissance as the vanguard in the fight for freedom;

"To the patriotic Bulgarian workers and peasants who were called to perform the greatest acts of resistance against communism and who made the heaviest sacrifices in the struggle against the slavery, being the prime object of Communist political and economic exploitation and pressure;

"To the patriotic Bulgarian intelligentsia: clergy, writers, artists, scientists, professors, teachers, students, lawyers, doctors, civil servants and businessmen who succeed in escaping the vigilant eye of the Communist police and support, by all means, the national struggle for liberation;

"To the thousands of Bulgarian mothers in whose hands is the future of Bulgaria, the youth, to encourage them to follow the example of the national heroine, Baba Tonka, educating a generation worthy to wear the wreath of liberation of the fatherland;

"To the entire Bulgarian people for their courageous and uncompromising struggle for freedom and to assure them that the members of the Bulgarian National Front abroad will not give sleep to their eyes and rest to their feet until they see the down of freedom over the long suffering Bulgarian land.

"RESOLUTION III

"Whereas the organization of the Bulgarian National Front abroad was set up by proven in the past anti-Communists, belonging to various political groups, with the sole purpose of organizing a strong anti-Communist liberation movement among the Bulgarian exiles abroad, for the restoration

of the Tirnovo constitution in Bulgaria and the rights and the liberties of the Bulgarian people guaranteed thereby; and

"Whereas the Bulgarian National Front came to existence on the Bulgarian political scene abroad in times and circumstances which had forced many a Bulgarian political leader to renounce ungloriously the cause which they had served for decades and either to disappear in oblivion or to accept shameful collaboration with the enslavers of Bulgaria; and

"Whereas in spite of the extraordinary hardships, as the result of the self-sacrificing dedication of the members of the Bulgarian National Front, the cause of the Bulgarian people, buried in prejudices, slandered and denounced was resurrected and was imposed as a leading force among the Bulgarian political exiles; and

"Whereas the growth of the Bulgarian National Front as the strongest political movement among the Bulgarian national emigration abroad disturbed the schemes of the Communist tyrant of Bulgaria and they began, with all the available means, to work for the destruction of the organization; be it

"Resolved, That the struggle of the Bulgarian National Front for the overthrow of the Communist regime in Bulgaria and the restoration of the Tirnovo constitution remains the most important motive for the existence of the organization; and be it further

"Resolved, That the third congress of the Bulgarian National Front declare to the entire Bulgarian community abroad that the realization of the cause of the liberation of Bulgaria depends exclusively on the cooperation and the unity of all national democratic forces in exile and in the fatherland; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Bulgarian National Front has always been in favor of a Bulgarian representation abroad which should unite all Bulgarian immigrants in the national struggle for the liberation constituted by the representatives of the Bulgarian democratic parties, organizations and institutions abroad, having a representative character; and be it further

"Resolved, That the third congress of the Bulgarian National Front appeal to all members of the organization to join with the central executive board to endorse it with their confidence and give it their support for carrying the anti-Communist struggle and, at the same time, to denounce the attempts of the Communists to sow disturbance and divisions in the ranks of the organization.

"RESOLUTION IV

"Whereas the relations between the United States and Canada on the one hand and Bulgaria on the other had always been based on mutual recognition of their respective interests and the Bulgarian people have always been well disposed for a complete understanding and coordination of the policy of Bulgaria with the policies of America and Canada, in view of the best interpreted interests of the three countries; and

"Whereas the fall of Bulgaria under Communist slavery placed the people of Bulgaria against its will, within the camp of the enemies of America and Canada; and

"Whereas the entire Bulgarian people have put their confidence and their hopes for their liberation on America; and

"Whereas the severance of diplomatic relations between Bulgaria and the United States in February 1949 and the continuation of this situation is considered by the Bulgarian people as an act of moral support on the behalf of the American Government for the struggling-for-freedom Bulgarian nation; and

"Whereas the Bulgarian Communist Government makes desperate efforts to restore the diplomatic relations between Bulgaria and the United States and, by doing that, to inflict a new blow on the Bulgarian liberation movement, presenting it to the Bulgarian people as a recognition of the existing regime of tyranny by the American Government; be it

"Resolved, That the third congress of the Bulgarian National Front urges the President of the United States, in the interest of the national struggle for the liberation involving the entire Bulgarian people, not to allow the restoration of the diplomatic relations between Bulgaria and the United States; and be it further

"Resolved, That the third congress of the Bulgarian National Front assure the American and the Canadian peoples that the Bulgarian people have not ceased to nourish warm friendly feelings toward them and that the support which they give him now or will give him in the future, in the decisive hour of the national struggle for freedom, is welcome with a feeling of profound gratitude; and be it further

"Resolved, That the third congress of the Bulgarian National Front expresses deep gratitude on the behalf of the Bulgarian immigrants who were allowed to resettle in the United States and Canada, for the hospitality shown to them, and urges the respective Governments to take the necessary steps and assure the admission to the United States and Canada of those Bulgarian political refugees who are still in the refugee camps or who would escape from Bulgaria in the future."

Now or Never

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the Nation may not be in serious danger, but it is in greater danger than ever before.

Russia has more submarines, more planes, and more divisions than we have—and is adding to them faster.

Every year we have more enemies and fewer friends. The last to go is oil-rich Iraq.

Every year Khrushchev is more aggressive and more insulting.

Every year we have a larger national debt. Interest alone is $7½ billion dollars. Next fiscal year it will be over $8.1 billion.

Every year Congress spends more than our income, the larger part for nondefense spending, things we have been doing without and can continue to get along without.

Every year we vote to increase the number of civil employees. They now number more than 2,300,000 at an annual payroll in excess of $13 billion.

Every year it is harder for the U.S. Treasury to sell Government bonds; harder to borrow the money Congress spends above the budget—and interest rates go up.

Mr. Speaker, when Congress votes to spend more than the budget the Government must gobble up more money to finance the big spending:

First. When Congress votes to spend more than we take in the dollar depreciates. Your money buys less.

Second. When Congress votes more money than the budget, the cost of living goes up for every family in America. Prices increase in every store.

Third. When Congress votes more money it is harder to get a loan. And interest is higher.

Fourth. When Congress votes to spend above the budget your savings are worth less. Your old age will be harder than you expected.

Fifth. When Congress votes to spend for things we have been doing without and can continue to do without, your life insurance will do less for your family and your fire insurance will not build your house back.

Sixth. When Congress keeps on voting to spend past the budget your pension will not support you as well, and your social security will not provide as much security.

Seventh. When Congress votes to issue more bonds and borrow more money, gambling on Wall Street grows more frenzied and the crash is that much nearer.

Eighth. When Congress keeps on spending after we have used up all our income, inflation burns higher and you have less confidence in Congress and the Government.

Ninth. When Congress keeps on spending, taxes must go up instead of down.

Tenth. When Congress spends and spends our allies lose faith and want to compromise with the enemy. Our enemies gain confidence and refuse to disarm.

Eleventh. When Congress spends for nondefense pressure groups, war is nearer. Khrushchev is just waiting until Congress spends us into bankruptcy.

Every time Congress votes to spend a dollar we do not have for things we can get along without, they are voting you and your family and your Nation into greater danger and shorter rations.

Here is what the Reader's Digest says about it:

THE OMINOUS DISTRUST OF THE DOLLAR

The flight from Government bonds is more ominous than most Washington officials care to admit publicly. Several recent Treasury financing operations have failed badly. As a result, the Treasury is being forced to run faster and faster merely to keep up with its maturities. The fact is that the richest nation in the world is now operating on a hand-to-mouth basis.

The effect of all this seems utterly lost on advocates of dynamic new spending programs to speed business expansion, eliminate unemployment.

The Treasury cannot spend more money than it gets through taxes and Government security issues. Yet professional and naive investors both now distrust the latter. This means recourse to financing through the banks, which increases the money supply and is directly inflationary.

The classic sources of savings upon which the Treasury must draw if it is to manage the public debt in orderly fashion are being diverted. Institutions and individuals alike are investing their funds elsewhere. This clearly reflects basic distrust of the Govern-

ment's fiscal responsibility. As Federal Reserve Chairman William McC. Martin puts it, "Investors cannot be induced to purchase fixed-income securities if they fear a steady erosion in the purchasing power of the dollar." Yet this is precisely what they do fear.

Official Treasury figures tell the story. During the past 6 years the assets of insurance companies, mutual savings banks, savings and loan associations and pension funds rose by about $100 billion—but not a penny of this additional money went into Government issues.

During this same period, private citizens had new savings on the order of $137 billion available for investment either through savings institutions or directly in securities and mortgages. None of this flow of capital went into Government obligations, on balance.

Refusal of the investing public to put new funds into Federal issues forces the Treasury to finance by devious means. For example, it sells tax anticipation notes to corporations at whatever price the market offers. This is, in effect, a method of collecting taxes before they are due. And it sells other short-term issues to banks, which treat them as cash, since they can be turned into dollars by rediscounting—thus creating more money.

Unless hopes for balancing the budget can be revived, the Treasury will have no alternative but to continue this course. That creates still further problems: (1) It will push up its interest cost even higher; (2) it will necessitate new offerings at more frequent intervals.

Restoration of faith in the dollar requires facing up to the Treasury's dilemma. But that is something Congress still seems unprepared to do. The testimony of Treasury officials has brought out clearly the need for fiscal sanity. But such pleas for a balanced budget mean comparatively little to a Congress which is being pressured from all sides to approve vital new Federal spending programs.

These pressures are direct, and every Member of Congress is subject to them. The sad truth is that they do not come solely, or even primarily, from labor-liberal groups. Conservatives are just as active in sponsoring spending programs when their own interests are involved.

Congress lacks any real machinery, moreover, with which to keep the budget under control. Its dual system of appropriating directly for some programs and authorizing agencies to borrow from the Treasury, with no time limit on either type of spending, skirts the whole problem. There is no close tie between the voting of expenditures and the voting of revenues to provide the necessary funds. This makes a hold-the-line policy difficult under any conditions.

Spot checks of congressional mail fail to reveal any strong national demand for a balanced budget. Many people are writing, but most also want local needs considered.

Federal debt-management problems not only arouse concern on the part of Treasury officials but also affect the taxpayer's pocketbook. Interest cost on the money the Government has hired now runs to $8.1 billion yearly. This is second only to defense in the fiscal 1960 budget of $77 billion, and represents almost a 30-percent increase within the past 5 years alone.

The continuing shift in Treasury debt to shorter and shorter issues is creating other worries. With buyers backing away from issues having a longer term than a year, refunding operations become larger and more frequent. Financing exclusively in the 1-year area means that within 4 years 75 percent of the total debt would have to be refunded each year.

The upward trend of interest rates has, moreover, still some way to go. Not only does the Treasury face further maturities this half-year which must be refunded; it will also have to raise some $6 billion to $7 billion of new money in the second half. If business recovery continues as expected, the Treasury will be competing with heavy business loan requirements.

Eisenhower's impossible position on spending versus economy is illustrated in his effort to boost rural electrical cooperative interest rates. He wants co-ops to pay the same rate (about 4 percent) that the Treasury must bear when it borrows in the open market—just enough to cover basic costs. Yet the President is stymied by the congressional farm bloc. Democratic leaders assured the cooperatives that the 2-percent rate will go untouched.

At the heart of the Treasury's problem is a simple fact, easily grasped by anyone. This is that governments, like individuals, cannot spend more than they take in, without being hurt. In the case of governments, continuing deficit spending debases the currency. This is the essence of today's distrust of the dollar.

It may be added, Mr. Speaker, that the next world war will be different in many respects from any previous world war in history. We will not be fighting for victory; we will be fighting for survival.

The decisive phase of the war will be fought in America. And if America loses it will be a war of extermination. The Russian firing squads will leave only the uneducated and the unskilled, and our form of government, our way of life, and our people as we know them today will cease to exist. It is a familiar program followed in every satellite government Russia has liberated.

With that in prospect, however remote, can we not for the present tighten our belts a little and deny ourselves some of the nondefense "knicknacks" the pressure groups are urging?

He Gave His Life for His Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROSS BASS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Daily Herald, of Columbia, Tenn., recently carried an excellent editorial in regard to the career and service of John Foster Dulles. I would like to call this outstanding article to my colleagues' attention; and, I am, therefore, under leave to extend my remarks, including it herewith.

The editorial, "He Gave His Life for His Country," follows:

HE GAVE HIS LIFE FOR HIS COUNTRY

"A life dedicated to the service of his country."

If ever these words have been appropriate about a man still living, whose tasks are ended, they are true of John Foster Dulles.

His work as Secretary of State has been roundly criticized by many. Seldom has his work been the subject of unbounded praise. For John Foster Dulles was not a man who sought praise, nor one who did the spectacular in order to achieve praise.

And there are honest differences of opinion as to whether he has guided this Nation along the best course during the past 6 years.

But there is no difference of opinion about his honesty, or his dedication to his country.

His patriotism, and his sincerity have never been questioned by ayone in their right mind.

Nor has his courage.

He worked quietly. He worked long hours. He worked sometimes alone. But always he worked not for John Foster Dulles, not for the Republican Party, but for this Nation. And for world peace.

Long before he was Secretary of State he was adviser to the Democratic heads of state on foreign affairs. And long after men of less dedicated service would have been enjoying a respite from difficult and unrewarding duties, he was on the job, working toward one goal and one alone—the best interests of his fellow men.

Now his task is ended. He is the victim of disease. He is no longer at the helm of the ship of state. Today the entire free world sorrows and suffers.

During his active career he met gibes and sneers, praise and cheers, and let none of these deter him from his chosen course.

In his illness and old age, he has the comfort of a life well spent, a life of dedicated service, a life which has been, and is, an inspiration to literally millions of free people. Of him it can be as truly said as of any man who ever wore the uniform of the United States: "He gave his life for his country."

Let's Not Be Silly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO W. O'BRIEN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I submit an excellent editorial from one of the great newspapers of our Nation, the Buffalo Evening News. I concur in its views. The editorial follows:

A RIDICULOUS RULING

A recent ruling of the Federal Communications Commission in reference to political broadcasts requires amendment, clarification or, better still, outright repeal.

As the matter now stands, no matter how fair or honest a radio or television station may be, or tries to be, in respect to political broadcasts or news reports of political events, the February 19 ruling of the Commission practically makes it impossible to conform without opening the door to all sorts of weird and wild requests for equal time to reply.

The ruling appears to be a new concept of section 315 of the Communications Act. Whether this is valid, or straining to stretch a point, isn't clear. It is clear, however, that it will require prompt action either by Congress or the Commission itself if freedom is to be restored to the airways.

On the one hand the Commission urges radio stations to editorialize on the air, and on the other it puts into effect this new requirement which would suggest that any responsible broadcaster would be out of his mind if he did so.

The ruling is so far-fetched that President Eisenhower has taken the almost unprecedented action of asking the Attorney General of the United States to see what can be done about it whether the remedy lies in legislative action by Congress or otherwise.

Speaking for the President, and with his authority, White House Press Secretary James C. Hagerty said:

"The emphasis here is that it is ridiculous to have the law tell radio stations they have to give equal time in the coverage of news."

Dr. Frank Stanton, president of CBS, has pointed out in connection with the ruling that had the FCC ruling been in effect in 1956, that network would have been required to give equal time on regular newscasts to 24 presidential and vice presidential candidates of 12 parties, most of which wouldn't be recognized by the general public. The same requirement would have been imposed upon the News stations, which always have prided themselves in giving fair political coverage, or to any other station which carried these network programs. It imposes an impossible condition.

Chairman John C. Doerfer, of the FCC, speaking in Chicago this week, said that strict interpretation of section 315 would emasculate radio and television news coverage during campaign periods, and, he might well have added, at other times. He said if the section is not repealed or amended by Congress before the 1960 presidential campaign the public inevitably will be denied the opportunity to see and hear candidates. We don't know why he limited his remarks to 1960; a local election campaign is coming, and the ruling of the Commission could have the same effect on local campaign coverage here and elsewhere.

The courts, of course, might take a hand in the matter, but that would ential much delay, without certainty of relief. Wouldn't it, perhaps, be better for the FCC to take another look at the law, the many and long-standing previous rulings based upon it and determine whether this new and strained interpretation is in fact what Congress intended? If it had, we are inclined to think that fact would have been discovered long ere now.

The Immorality of Evading the U.S. Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JIM WRIGHT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of the Treasury, Robert B. Anderson, in addressing the annual meeting of the Associated Press in New York last week, made a telling point as to the imperative desirability of our making payments to retire the national debt.

What the Secretary of the Treasury said on that occasion is so much in harmony with what some of us in the House have been advocating, that I feel his remarks should have special attention.

I am taking the liberty of including herewith for printing in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent editorial which apeared in the Fort Worth Star-Telegram on Thursday, April 23, concerning this speech by Secretary Anderson:

THE IMMORALITY OF EVADING THE U.S. DEBT

Failure to make payment on the national debt in prosperous times was branded by Secretary of the Treasury Anderson, in his speech to the annual meeting of the Associated Press in New York, as immoral.

Neglect in meeting our obligations incurred by the Federal Government in war and peace is sheer evasion of responsibility since every dollar borrowed carries a pledge of repayment with interest, but, instead, further borrowings are pyramided on the colossal debt. This improvident expediency, increasing each day the obligation for posterity, amounts to national capital depletion which results from inflation.

The necessity for constant refinancing portions of the Federal debt does not signify official condonation of moral irresponsibility toward that record obligation, but is only an enforced course consequent to continued default in debt reduction. No manner of fiscal rationalization or economic sophistry can hide the unethical nature of debt evasion.

What, indeed, can happen to a nation of free people which runs from its financial responsibilities in that way? The long chain of cause and effect should not conceal the true nature of this evasion. Deficit financing year upon year is due to the pressure groups which force unwise spending on a pliant government, to officials and legislators who play politics by being subservient to such influences, and to both government and the people who fail to provide enough margin between income and outgo to permit payment on the debt in prosperous years.

The debt is a colossal monument to our cowardly evasion that is nothing less than dishonesty, as Mr. Anderson declared. Deficit financing and its effect of inflation amount to robbery of millions with fixed incomes, including those small investors in Government bonds. To fail to see that our debt policy is undermining the strength and fiber of our Government and our freedoms is only the blindness that destroys. This moral decay from within is all that Communist Russia could hope for. It is toward fulfillment of the Communist belief that our own excesscs will spell our doom.

Due Credit to "American Forum of the Air" and "Youth Wants To Know"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the "American Forum of the Air," America's oldest discussion program, and "Youth Wants To Know" are time honored programs. The radio and television industry has presented these programs to the American public for many years. It has long been recognized that there is a need for programs of this nature. Unfortunately, they have been the victims of poor scheduling, that is to say, they have been presented usually early Sunday afternoon, along with other educational and informative programs.

This year, the Westinghouse Broadcasting Co., in cooperation with my friend, Theodore Granik, has pioneered in making these two fine programs available to the American public during regularly scheduled evening hours on weekday nights, when the largest potential viewing and listening audience is available. This move is to be highly commended. This innovation provides the opportunity to present the important issues by leading authorities in their fields. Never before has such a large potential audience been made available by the network for this type of programming.

Both the "American Forum of the Air" and "Youth Wants To Know" are telecast once each month. The programs are recorded by video tape facilities and are distributed by the Westinghouse Broadcasting Co. to television stations throughout the Nation. Many of my distinguished colleagues in the House have had the opportunity of appearing on either one or both of these fine programs and it is most gratifying to know that they will have the opportunity to continue to bring to the attention of the American people the crucial issues facing Congress.

Several of the Members of the U.S. Senate have already appeared in this new series. Senator WAYNE MORSE and Senator BARRY GOLDWATER opened the new series, discussing the need for labor legislation and recently Senator JAVITS and Senator TALMADGE discussed the controversial civil rights proposals pending before the U.S. Senate. On "Youth Wants To Know" the guest was Senator HUMPHREY, who was questioned by high school students regarding his recent trip to the Soviet Union.

Great tribute should be paid to Mr. Donald McGannon, president of the Westinghouse Broadcasting Co., and Theodore Granik, founder and producer of the "American Forum of the Air" and "Youth Wants To Know" for pioneering this new concept in programing. This opportunity for leaders in the field of government, education, science, business, labor and others to debate openly the issues affecting all the citizens of this great Nation, attests to the public service performed by the radio and television industry. The continued success of the "American Forum of the Air" and "Youth Wants To Know," the first to be presented during prime evening time, demonstrates that at last the broadcasting industry has recognized the need for informative educational programing in the most advantageous time periods.

I would like to add a personal note here. Theodore Granik, who produces both of these shows with the Westinghouse Broadcasting Co., is, I repeat, an old dear friend of mine. I was the first guest on the "American Forum" 31 years ago, the progenitor of this program and "Youth Wants To Know." On many a night Ted and I struggled to bring these programs into being and my colleagues in the House and Senate have joined me in recognizing the proud record created by both these programs. From my vantage point of 37 years in Congress, I say to Ted and the Westinghouse Broadcasting Co. well done.

Governors of 10 Midwestern States Urge New Starts for Flood Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NEWELL A. GEORGE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, each of the 10 Governors of the States compris-

ing the Missouri River States Committee joined in adopting a resolution on April 15, 1959, which emphasizes the great injury to the development of our natural resources and the deteriorative effect upon the economic strength of this country should the Congress accept the shortsighted no-new-starts policy of the administration in connection with flood control, reclamation and water conservation projects.

In 1951, Mr. Speaker, a tragic flood occurred which caused over a billion-dollar loss in the Greater Kansas City area alone. Many cities in Kansas and Missouri also suffered huge losses. This flood, which brought suffering and despair to so many of our citizens, could be repeated at any time. The total cost to complete the entire flood control program in this region would not nearly match the overall loss in revenue to the United States government if such a disastrous flood should again wreak havoc and destruction upon the people, their homes and their businesses.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress is here given another opportunity to correct a grievous error on the part of the administration and to add momentum to the effort to relieve many of our citizens from the fear, the terror, and the horror of another catastrophic flood and the constant threat of such a disaster.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the resolution adopted by the 10 distinguished Governors in the extension of my remarks:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED APRIL 15, 1959, BY MISSOURI RIVER STATES COMMITTEE AT COUNCIL BLUFFS, IOWA

We, the Missouri River States Committee, consisting of the Governors of the States of Iowa, Colorado, Kansas, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, and Wyoming, comprising one-sixth of the area of the United States of America, in meeting assembled, do hereby adopt the following resolution:

"Whereas the Missouri River States Committee, created in December of 1941, was organized for the express purpose of securing flood control, irrigation, navigation, power development, and related improvements of the entire Missouri River Basin; and

"Whereas through the efforts of the Missouri River States Committee and other groups, the Missouri Basin Project was authorized by Congress in the year 1944; and

"Whereas during the 15 years since that time substantial progress has been made in meeting the objectives of flood control, navigation, water supply, and power development and, to a lesser degree, irrigation and other improvements; and

"Whereas the orderly development of natural and human resources of the Missouri River Basin is impeded and severely handicapped by the no new starts policy; and

"Whereas said no new starts policy impairs the economic strength of the entire country by preventing the development of natural resources in the basin as an investment in the future welfare and security of the United States as a whole; and

"Whereas the construction of planned projects would strengthen the economic base of this region and of our whole country at a time when full development and use of our national resources are urgently needed in the struggle between the free world and the areas of the earth dominated by communists: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That this committee urge the Congress of the United States to implement its authorizations of reclamation and flood control and other projects by appropriating the necessary money for the initiation of said projects; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That this resolution be forwarded by the chairman of the Missouri River States Committee to the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON, chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States, and the Honorable CARL HAYDEN, chairman of Appropriations Committee of the Senate of the United States."

Guiding Impressions of the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, there are a number of political analysts in this country who presently warn us that the next major crisis will again be in the Middle East. In fact, according to these observers, while the world's attention is focused on Berlin, feverish preparations are being made by Moscow for another eruption in the Middle East. These analysts are of the opinion that even the firmest position taken by the West on the Berlin issue would not lead to war. On the basis of their knowledge of the captive countries in Eastern Europe and Central Asia, they are convinced that Moscow couldn't possibly afford a hot war now or in the foreseeable future unless it is bent upon Russian national suicide, and this is most unlikely.

One such observer is Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor in Soviet economics at Georgetown University and also national chairman of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America. Aware of the possibility of historical accidents, Dr. Dobriansky nevertheless strongly believes that in the present situation Moscow will behave according to traditional Russian imperialist pattern. In line with Lenin's dictum and that of his Czarist predecessors, it will take one step backward on Berlin if for no other reason than to have its current preparations and involvements in the Middle East fructify in the next stage of the incessant cold war. Operating on the peripheries of its empire and true to its centuries-old borderland policy, Moscow has nothing to lose by precipitating these successive crises and it has everything to gain. It has much to gain not only by achieving fresh inroads in the areas of the free world but also by continually deflecting our attention from the crucial captive nations to the separate issues created or aggravated by it in these different areas of Russian colonial opportunity. So long as we have no active and imaginative policy toward the captive nations—and this means not only the "external satellites" in Central Europe but also the "internal satellites" within the U.S.S.R.—we insure Moscow's power to initiate such crises at will.

The logic of Dr. Dobriansky's position is developed in some degree in an interesting article which appeared in a recent issue of the Ukrainian Quarterly. The article itself is based on a trip taken through the Middle East. The manner in which it relates the problems of this area to the primary problem of the captive nations can be applied to Berlin or the Far East. As a contribution to a more integral understanding of these problems, I ask that this article on "Guiding Impressions of the Middle East" be printed in the RECORD:

GUIDING IMPRESSIONS OF THE MIDDLE EAST

(By Lev E. Dobriansky)

A few months ago this writer had the honor and real privilege of joining an official group on a visit to the Middle East. In every sense of the word the trip was incomparable. The people we met, the discussions we engaged in, and the many vital things we observed, all contributed to the richness and the depth of our experience. The trip could not literally be purchased by a private citizen for even a million dollars. Covering over 23,000 miles by air, land, and water, it included not only several of the Middle Eastern States but also a number of countries which are, strictly speaking, not in the Middle East area. However, the interests of these bordering countries are perhaps more immediately related to turns and changes of development in the Middle East than those of our own country.

The fact that one was fortunate to make a trip of this sort does not, of course, qualify him as an expert on the subject. Ineed, the writer is far from being a specialist on the Middle East. Yet, judging by the insular views and even unbalanced perspectives of some of our acknowledged Middle East experts, particularly where they concern U.S. foreign policy, it seems quite advantageous not to become too engrossed in the details of data flowing out of the Middle East. This does not mean that thinking Americans should not be interested in a variety of ways with the problems and tasks of the peoples of the Middle East in like manner that we are with those of peoples and nations elsewhere. On the contrary, in behalf of our own interests we have definite objectives in the Middle East and the fulfilment of them requires the support of the nations involved. But the observation does mean that we should constantly maintain a clear perspective of the Middle East and its hosts of problems and difficulties in terms of the global struggle between national freedom and Russian Communist imperialism and colonialism. This primary perspective, based on a rational scale of priority of problems, is frequently lost in the writings of those experts who in their rapturous attachments picture the solutions of Middle East problems as ends in themselves.

As one would expect, each of us on the trip approached the area with an individual set of preconceptions. Actually, to have done otherwise would have meant entering it blindly. These necessary preconceptions were developed in the course of a year's intensive study aided by some of the best minds on the subject. In a thoroughly scientific manner we entered the area with general views that served a number of purposes. One, they enabled us to seek out essentials with minimum of time and effort. In contrast to many American visitors to the Soviet Union, for example, we knew beforehand what to look for. Second, they facilitated a process of question-raising which quickly focussed the issues of any problem. And thirdly, these preconceived views were in essence hypotheses which demanded empirical proofs by direct observation.

In my case the most important preconceptions were as follows: (1) from the viewpoint of U.S. national interest, the Middle East is and will continue to be a secondary area on the field of the current global conflict; (2) the Middle East is nevertheless a crucial and significant area, even more so than the Far East, from which to wage a successful offensive against the imperialist Russian threat to all independent nations; (3) the United States can and should assist in the solution of certain problems in the Middle East, but it would be futile and naive to hope for a moderately longrun solution of every major problem in the area; and (4) the paramount goal of U.S. policy in the area is to prevent at whatever cost the entrenchment of colonial Russian power in any part of it. It was with these preconceived views that the writer embarked upon an empirical study of close observation at a time immediately prior to the Lebanese crisis and the subsequent Iraqi revolution.

TUNISIA AND NORTH AFRICA

Our first important stop was Tunisia. The country, with its 48,000 square miles, is much like Louisiana in size. Its population of approximately 4 million people consists of over 3 million Moslemic Tunisians, about 180,000 French, and the rest made up predominantly of Italians, Algerians, and Jews. This newly independent country is chiefly agricultural in character, the main crops being wheat, barley, olives, and grapes. It possesses a number of major mining industries in iron, lead, zinc, and natural gas, but its greater potentialities in these and related enterprises await further economic development. To realize such development in more rapid course, Tunisia unquestionably requires foreign aid, the largest contribution to which can come only from the United States.

There are many general and specific factors that enter into the consideration of granting aid to foreign governments for economic development. One paramount factor is that the absorptive powers of an economy must be carefully considered if sound and balanced development is to be sustained. In Tunisia, as almost everywhere else in North Africa, the Middle East, and South Asia, illiteracy is high, poverty is widespread, and capital in the form of national experience and skilled resources is in short supply. In varying degree this is the characteristic pattern one encounters throughout these areas. The pattern sets limits to the amounts of capital that can be prudently injected into most of these economies. In fact, for all these areas the prime element of capital is time—time for training, time for education, time for cumulating experience.

Those politicians and columnists who clamor for the United States to adopt as its prime objective a broad economic and social development program in these areas, are not only unthinking and unrealistic politically but also economically. Such an international New Deal program would lead to inevitable wastes and would hardly contribute to stave off the encroachments of Russian colonialism. As a matter of pointed fact, if the history of 40 years of Russian Communist aggression demonstrates anything, it is the truth that healthy and growing economies are in themselves insufficient deterrents against Russian colonial expansion. Historical accidents, political strategy and tactics, and the threat of unleashed military power weigh far more heavily. This observation applies to these areas just as much as it did to Eastern Europe, the Caucasus, and Central Asia. Looked at more critically, there is a certain unrealistic amount of economic determinism in the position taken by those politicians and columnists who argue that economic and social betterment is a sure guarantee against the inroads of Russian imperialist expansionism. They fail to ask themselves the question that if this were so, then why does Moscow offer its material contributions to many of these countries which, in some instances, have for centuries been prime goals of Russian conquest? The answer to this should be obvious.

To avoid the economic and also political wastes of any international New Deal program, sound foreign aid measures should carefully examine each national economy on its own merits, and in every case a priority of evaluation should be given to political considerations. In the case of Tunisia the situation is really not as involved as some picture it to be. Led by its dynamic and colorful President Habib Bourguiba, the Republic of Tunisia is undoubtedly a focal point in North Africa. With proportioned aid for its internal development, Tunisia can play a leading role in the solution of the Algerian problem and in the practical realization of a North African federation of Arab states. Even recent rifts between the Bourguiba government and both the Algerian F.L.N. and Morocco would not seriously hamper this.

These broad directions for U.S. foreign policy in the area would satisfy many ends. Contrary to some opinion, such developments would actually contribute to the gainful interests of our French ally in view of the organic economic ties that would persist between such a federation and France. They would also meet the natural urges of Arab nationalism and present another form or stage in the evolution of Arab unity. Moreover, they would create a tremendous impact on the rest of the Arab world and would virtually eliminate some of the existing vulnerabilities in North Africa to indirect Russian penetration. The resulting dynamic stability would provide untold advantages in oil, defensive military posture, and psycho-political strength against the common enemy. It should not be difficult to discern what the alternative to such policy directions, and all its negative consequences, would be.

Before proceeding on to Iraq and other states in the Middle East, a point of considerable value deserves emphasis here. Conversations with Tunisians and other Moslems disclosed a keen awareness of the oppressions to which their brother Moslems in the Soviet Union are being subjected. These expressions of knowledge and sympathetic affinity were, however, of an individual and isolated tenor rather than an organized one. Moreover, they were on a religious plane rather than on the more important level of mutual nationalism. Despite these shortcomings, the Tunisians displayed a greater familiarity with this vital subject in the Soviet Union than our own people assigned to Tunis. There is virtually no effort exerted by the U.S. Information Service to inform Moslems in North Africa about Russian colonial domination over Moslemic Turkestanians and others in the U.S.S.R. This is a serious defect, largely born of ignorance, which one meets with throughout these Moslem areas. Yet concentrated effort on such information, disseminated with meaningful conceptual forms, is one of our most powerful weapons against Russian duplicity and infiltration.

IRAQ AND THE MIDDLE EAST

The Middle East is undoubtedly a maze of problems, conflicts, and entanglements. It is worthwhile for us Americans to continually bear in mind that this maze has roots dating back decades and even centuries. Most of the issues in the area well antedate the current global struggle in which we are engaged. To plunge deeply into this mire of problems and unavoidably lose progressive sight of our primary objective in the region would spell disaster. For an anti-imperialist nation with responsibilities of free world leadership thrown upon it a certain transcendence of thought and attitude is necessary to avert deep sectional involvements and vacillating positions in this environment of flux and change. This is not an easy task, to be sure, but it is the only peaceable course by which the major forces now at work in the region can be channeled in favor of our primary objective.

We landed in Iraq many weeks before the startling revolt. From there it was Saudi Arabia and, later on, Israel. At these three vantage points we felt the pulse of movements emanating from other quarters in the area. Each of these points tells a story in itself to correct some of the unsafe notions harbored by experts with biases in one direction or another. To be pro-Arab or pro-Israel, prolegitimacy or prorepublican, or promilitary defense or proeconomic development—and we met spokesmen for each grouping with, of course, some cross-sectional ties—usually distorts the picture in some degree of emotional heat. Keeping in mind the chief threat to the area, i.e., the Russian bear to the north, one can view the forces represented by each of these groupings with some objective detactment and prepare tactically for their canalization toward our primary goal. It must be remembered that regardless of rifts between governments and the mistakes that we have made in the past, we still have countless Arab and Israeli friends in all strata of their societies. Difficulties and even dilemmas will constantly haunt us, of course, but if we steadfastly maintain our valid objectives with principle and firm determination and within these broad limits adapt ourselves flexibly to swift changes which should be anticipated in the form of real possibilities, there is no reason why our paramount objective could not be successfully realized.

No; in Iraq, at the time, there wasn't the faintest concrete indication that a revolt was brewing. The country, with its 6.5 million population in an area 168,039 square miles, like that of California, was bubbling with intense economic activity. According to the premises of our economic determinists, this condition should have conduced to maximum political stability. Much was done economically and socially for general development. Substantial oil revenues were invested in irrigation projects, redistributed land, hospitals, education, and the like. The financial condition of the country was excellent and the 60 percent of the population in agriculture was prospering in staples of barley, wheat, rice, and cotton. A political overturn nevertheless did take place. The The nationalist urge for Arab unity did successfully express itself.

Saudi Arabia, the birthplace of Islam, is another example of wealth, social and economic development, and attempted reform. This hereditary monarchy under King Saud ibn Abdul Aziz has a population of 7 million in an area of 618,000 square miles which contains tremendous oil reserves. It is a country of sharp contrasts between the ancient and the modern. Significant development projects have been undertaken; but, as elsewhere, illiteracy is rife. The most modern schools and hospitals have been built, but there is a marked dearth of trained personnel to run them. Politically, the situation is a shaky one, and even with an expected shift to a constitutional monarchy the forces of Arab unity will continue to make deep inroads among the Saudis.

For our purposes these two examples stand well above Egypt, Lebanon, Jordan, Syria, or any other section in the Arab States area of 1,675,234 square miles to demonstrate the foolhardiness of subordinating political objectives to the economic. The driving force for Arab unity among the approximately 48 million Arabs in the Middle East should have been long ago properly weighed and appreciated. It is truly a cause for wonderment

that following the Lebanese call for American intervention several U.S. Senators finally realized that nationalism is a basic force in the Middle East and urged that we support it. Those, including this writer, who have for years advocated this, continue to emphasize that our support of the forces of nationalism be founded on a single standard of morality. Such a view serves multiple purposes, especially in the general area of the Middle East. By clearly supporting both Arab and Israeli nationalism and working toward their harmonious coexistence we would undoubtedly weaken the false Russian appeal which thrives only on division. Concurrent with this, our plain and astute support of the forces of nationalism within the Soviet Union itself—particularly the Moslemic Turkestani, Azerbaijani, and others in reference to this area of free Islam—would completely nullify Russian colonial objectives. This operational view demands that we perceive things in their interrelated totality, but this writer scarcely witnessed such an orientation among our own people in these regions.

In setting these guidelines it should be realized that what is called Nasserism is not conceptually identical with Arab nationalism. It is one of its expressions and Nasser himself is one of its leading symbols. Many Americans share the thought that we have made several grave mistakes in relation to Nasser. These mistakes have forced him to look elsewhere for aid. However, the situation is not beyond repair. The appeal and popularity of Nasser is far and wide. The dynamism represented by this symbol will bring further changes in the Middle East. But these changes will certainly not take place along linear routes. Even Nasser is subject to the desires and opinions of his own Egyptians, not to mention other Arab pressures in Iraq, Lebanon, and Saudi Arabia. Necessarily playing it by ear but always cognizant of our own primary objective, we must be prepared to accommodate ourselves to the inevitable changes toward more integrated Arab unity, one that will be achieved in stages and very likely in different forms. What is of essence is the increasing friendship of the Arab world, including the present United Arab Republic, and the consequent reduction of any possibility of a Russian colony emerging in this region.

A harmonious coexistence between Arab nationalism and Israeli nationalism is by no means an impractical goal. Indeed, it is a necessity. Israel is here to stay, and intelligent Arab spokesmen privately admit it. With proper gestures and mutual accord it won't be long before public Arab acceptance of this fact will be noticed. Of the size of New Jersey and populated by over 2 million people, including some 180,000 Arabs, Israel is one of the most progressive and prosperous countries in the Middle East. Its economy is fairly well balanced and its leadership is highly enlightened. The spirit of its people is vibrant and confident. There can be no doubt that if the independence of Israel were seriously threatened, the people would fight to the last soul. Actually, it would take years for any such Arab threat to materialize, and during this time a peaceful development would serve to obviate the possibility of an outbreak of hostilities. Again with an eye on our primary objective, it is definitely in our interest and in the mutual interest of Arab and Israeli alike that such a development be furthered. The Arab world would gain immensely from a respected, prosperous, and cultured Israel. Israel would gain reciprocally from the cultural and material advancements now in being throughout the Arab world. The party that would be sure to lose is imperialist Moscow.

THE NORTHERN TIER AND INDIA

One of the most significant features of Israeli thinking is its full understanding of the nature of the global struggle. The writer was impressed by ideas along these lines in Iraq, too. He would go so far as to suggest that many American officials and wandering students might learn a great deal about the subject in certain sectors of this part of the world. The brute menace of Russian imperialism and colonialism is clearly understood for what it is. The facade of "international communism" is realistically discounted and the centuries-old Russian problem is freely and frankly discussed. None of the misleading vagaries about Marxism, "the Soviet peoples," "Soviet communism" and the like is permitted to becloud their perception of the real problem and threat.

As one travels in the Muslim countries of the vital "northern tier"—Pakistan, Iran, and Turkey—the realism of both official and private leaders, concerning the Russian problem, is refreshing and encouraging. It is ultimately this firm knowledge about the problem and what to expect from the Russian imperialists that provides us with sturdy and loyal allies in these countries. To frustrate the traditional borderlands policy of Russia, which for centuries has used it as a weapon of conquest and empire building, the independence and internal strength of these nations are indispensable to the United States in realizing its primary objective. In terms of our interest there is a vast difference between some Arab State joining a larger Arab unity and one of these METO partners leaving the pact or being undermined by Russian subversion. Of course, the former must be watched because of outflanking possibilities. The latter must be prevented at all costs because it would unquestionably open a dike for the Russian inundation. The basic distinction between the two cases is that a solidification of nationalism is involved in one and an endangerment to nationalism emerges in the other.

Each of these Muslim countries has its set of problems. The Kashmir issue, the problem of the five rivers, border disputes, and internal economic difficulties beset Pakistan. The illiteracy rate is high in this Muslim democracy, split between West Pakistan and its 33.8 million and East Pakistan with its 42 million. However, notable economic progress has been achieved, although much remains to be done. The United States is assisting this valuable ally in a proper way and the interests of the two are mutually served. The Pakistani are sturdy fighters. Some of the specimens seen up north and in the Khyber Pass are models for any nation. A close affinity exists between the Pakistani and the enslaved Turkestani just up north in the Soviet Union. With additional resources the Pakistani would have no fear in seeking the liberation of their brothers in the Russian prison of nations. As one high level official told this writer, "You don't have to impress us with this goal. You should sell this to your own government." The bold fact here, as elsewhere, is that sheer ignorance blinds us to the opportunity of reversing for freedom the old Russian borderlands policy.

In the basically agricultural countries of Turkey and Iran similar economic and political problems exist. Cyprus, internal development, the Syrian neighbor, and the existence of Kurd and other minorities present Turkey with actual or potential difficulties. Economic problems characteristic of the area contribute to a political instability in Iran which the Russian influence in the country does not hesitate to promote. The solution of some of these problems naturally requires our proportionate assistance; and both countries are receiving it. However, our guidelines of interest in the area would require more than just ancillary help if, for example, the present regime in Iraq or Moscow itself should show signs of stirring up the Kurds for the creation of a satellite Kurdish state, extending from portions of Iraq through northwestern Iran and eastern Turkey into the Soviet Union. There are about 10 million Kurds, mostly Sunnite Mohammedans, whom Moscow sought to arouse as late as 1945. Approximately 1 million are in Iraq alone. A venture of this sort would unmistakably be indirect aggression deserving of our firmest direct action. The possibility of such a venture is real and would be in tune with traditional Russian policy. It can be best offset by a policy of freedom directed at the submerged nations to the north of the "northern tier." The writer feels quite certain that, as in the case of Pakistan, both Turkey and elements in Iran are prepared to launch in coordinated action a policy of this nature.

The visits to India and later to Greece and Portugal were somewhat marginal concerning the problems of the Middle East. It was, of course, instructive to learn from high sources the problems peculiar to their nations and their views in relation to the Soviet Union and the rumblings in the Middle East. In India it appears that Russian agents are doing a far more effective disinformational job than our own USIA is doing an informational one. The impressions certain Indian leaders have of the Soviet Union are hardly worthy of a nation which successfully overcame a foreign colonialism. India is doubtlessly an important and integral part of the free world, but in addition to wheat, credits, and other forms of aid, it is in dire need of a comprehension of Russian colonialism and imperialism within the U.S.S.R. itself. In Greece and Portugal the writer sensed a deep interest in this fundamental subject. As elsewhere, the two countries have their respective interests and difficulties. However, as to the primary importance of the Russian menace, there is no question of their dedication to its eventual defeat.

The preconceptions stated earlier were more than confirmed by the direct observations of this unique trip. The writer is more than ever convinced as to their validity. He is more impressed than ever by the necessity for American officialdom to assume an integral view of these situations and developments and to take advantage of the great opportunities afforded by both Africa and Asia. On a scale of priority, the most essential areas of concern and policy for the United States and Eastern Europe and Central Asia. These are the basic sources of insecurity and danger to imperialist Russia. We must never allow ourselves to guarantee these two areas to Moscow so that it would be free to concentrate its weight in any of the essentially secondary areas. On the contrary, girded to the support of nationalism, our policy should be aimed at a combined effort of nationalist forces within and immediately outside the Russian Communist Empire to overwhelm through peaceable means, as concerns any global war, the tentacles of colonial Russian domination. In pursuing such a policy we and our allies need have little fear of the forces of the Soviet Union. With half of them being non-Russian, these forces have always been feared for their unreliability in the act of war by Russia itself. To view these situations clearly and to see them as a whole are our prime requisities.

National Parks Facilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, a recent news release by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] follows:

NEWS RELEASE BY CONGRESSMAN DON MAGNUSON, SEVENTH DISTRICT, WASHINGTON

WASHINGTON, April 8.—Recent hearings held by the House Interior Appropriations Subcommittee brought out the alarming fact that we are falling behind on our Mission 66 plan for developing our national parks while use of these facilities continues to increase by leaps and bounds.

The Mission 66 program, initiated in 1956, was designed to develop adequate facilities for an estimated 65 million people who are expected to visit our national parks in 1966.

As a member of the subcommittee which approved the initial money to get this program underway, I am concerned over the way the administration has permitted Mission 66 to fall so far behind schedule.

Part of this slowdown must be blamed on inflation. When Mission 66 first was approved in 1955 it was estimated that the 10-year program would cost $459 million. Since then, rises in construction costs have increased this by $61 million. Additional projects have upped the anticipated cost another $125 million.

The National Park Service, adhering faithfully to the administration's balanced-budget-at-all-costs policy, has asked for only $47 million for fiscal 1960 while we originally planned to spend nearly twice that amount.

Conrad L. Wirth, Director of the National Park Service, shed little light on how the Service expects to get back on schedule. He admitted that the program was lagging badly and suggested that $80 million a year should be spent during the next 2 or 3 years to get back on schedule. But he did not ask for that amount or say where he expected it to come from.

These neglected resources mean a great deal to a large segment of our population. Last year 59 million people visited national parks and an additional 68 million went to national forests for their recreation.

With park development falling behind our burgeoning population, we face the grim prospect of having to reserve cabins that we used to be able to drive to on the spur of the moment; pulling into crowded, smoky camp sites that used to be quiet and out of the way; fishing in streams with more fishermen than fish and even being turned away from full campsites.

In this morning's mail was the following press release on the same subject from the National Park Service:

FIRST-QUARTER TRAVEL TO NATIONAL PARK: BREAKS ALL RECORDS

The number of visitors to national parks and other areas in the National Park System for the first 3 months of 1959 has set a new record for first-quarter travel, Director Conrad L. Wirth of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior, announced today.

Total for the first 3 months of 1959 was 7,119,000, Wirth announced. This represents an increase of 24.5 percent over the total of 5,717,300 for the same period in 1958. The previous high for the period was 6,345,000, set in 1957.

Travel in March of 1959 totaled 3,152,200, a gain of 36.9 percent over the 2,302,000 visits recorded in March 1958.

Among nearby areas, the Blue Ridge Parkway recorded a 39 percent increase in visitors in the 3-month period. Other increases in individual park areas ranged as high as 204 percent. The National Historical Areas of the System were highest among category increases with a gain of 48 percent, followed by the 29 national parks with an increase of 42 percent.

"These heavy increases in visitation," Wirth said, "clearly justify the Mission 66 program to provide adequate facilities and services for the many millions of Americans who visit and use the approximately 180 areas administered by the National Park Service.

"Our original mission 66 planning took into consideration a probable total of 80 million visitors a year by 1966, the year the mission 66 program is scheduled for completion. These travel figures for the first quarter of 1959 cause no dampening of our previous estimates that the total by 1966 may be well above 80 million."

Mr. Speaker, I note that Mr. Wirth says mission 66 "is scheduled" for completion in 1966. But, as the gentleman from Washington points out, Mr. Wirth admitted that the program is way off schedule and does not know how it is going to get back on.

Editor Mel Ruder of the weekly Hungry Horse News, published at Columbia Falls, Mont., near Glacier National Park, has suggested that the program be renamed mission 76. That apparently is the only way this program is going to get back on schedule.

British Policy Starts U.S. Diplomats Wondering

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Edgar Ansel Mowrer:

BRITISH POLICY STARTS U.S. DIPLOMATS WONDERING

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

The Berlin crisis, the advance of communism into the Middle East, the Arab countries' gang-up against foreign oil companies—all these would seem to indicate a crying need for Western solidarity. With a single resolute policy in Berlin, on disarmament, on the cessation of nuclear tests and with a common attitude toward Nasser, of Egypt, and Kassem, of Iraq, the harrassed Western countries would be a rock. Divided they give an impression of weakness and vulnerability even when they are basically strong and in good position.

Yet instead of seeking such a united policy through appropriate organs to which the power of decision has been delegated, they publicly argue and bicker among themselves, with the press of various countries sniping at allies as though they were enemies.

No NATO country is free from this. American organs have never shown any particular regard for the sensibilities of even our closest allies. The French press has somewhat overemphatically supported the French Government's claim to become one of a three-power NATO directory. The British are the latest offenders.

Why, Washington officials are asking, have the indomitable British suddenly begun to insist on a soft line towards the U.S.S.R.? Why has the British Government gone flexible in and out of season and the British press gone sour on allied peoples that will not tamely submit to Britain's latest whim? These officials make allowance for the British Tories' need to compete with pacifist labor in an effort to win the coming election. They realize how fresh are Britain's scars incurred in the last war—and how eager the British masses are to disarm and spend the money that now goes into armament on living. But they suspect that this is not the whole story.

Hardly anyone in Washington, Paris or Bonn shares Prime Minister Macmillan's apparent belief that the U.S.S.R. will make war for Berlin or his desire to accept Russia's conditions about the height at which allied planes may fly to Berlin. Anyhow, these Americans insist, the danger, if any, is no greater for Britain than for West Germany, France or Italy, none of which shares Britain's apprehension.

What then is ailing the British? For a possible answer, allied diplomats go back into Britain's history and come up with some disquieting examples.

For instance: Britain's chief policy has been to keep the continent of Europe divided. But recently, six continental countries have set up a Common Market (customs union) which promises to develop into a single state. British spokesmen, after some hesitancy, insist that Britain does not want to break up this market but merely to enjoy its benefits without joining. Since the French particularly have refused to extend what one could call a guest membership, is the British Foreign Office trying to enlist American support and use Soviet pressure against the Common Market countries? If so, what about NATO?

Drew Middleton recently wired the New York Times that the British do not really feel themselves allies of the continental countries: the United States is the only country they recognize as an ally. Where does this leave NATO? Is there a British belief that by accepting certain Russian desires Britain may pressure the Common Market countries?

One of these Russian desires is European disengagement, which would imply West Germany's withdrawal from NATO. Another is to prevent West Germany from obtaining nuclear weapons. Do the British wish to get West Germany out of NATO? Do they really believe that Germany will for long accept essential disarmament so long as the U.S.S.R., the United States and even Britain possess nuclear monsters?

In the past, after each major war Britain has turned against its allies and built up its former enemy. That is how World War II came about. Now, embittered by its failing influence and the obduracy of the Common Market countries, is Britain ready to sacrifice German unity and equality to its own fear of another war?

British statesmen say no and they are honorable men. But American diplomats can sometimes see no other motive for Macmillan's apparent desire for an understanding with the Soviets even at the cost of Germany and NATO and the Common Market. So they wonder.

One Hundredth Anniversary of Birth of Paul Dresser

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED WAMPLER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker, last week, on April 22, 1959, the State of Indiana, and particularly the city of Terre Haute, marked the 100th anniversary of the birth of Paul Dresser, the author of the State Song of Indiana, "On the Banks of the Wabash, Far Away."

In memory of and as a salute to that gentleman whose prodigious musical talent brought, and still brings, melodious pleasure to hundreds of thousands, I should like to set forth an article titled, "Mark 100th Birth Anniversary of Paul Dresser," which appeared in the April 22, 1959, issue of the Terre Haute (Ind.) Tribune.

Paul Dresser was born April 22, 1859, at 318 South Second Street, here in Terre Haute. His parents were Paul Dreiser and Sarah Marie Schanestp (the mother's maiden name was very blurred in the church record). Paul was baptized May 24 at St. Joseph Church and his godparents were Dr. James Bell and Mrs. Margaret Breen.

Terre Haute's first city directory of 1858 lists the father as living on South First Street, between Walnut and Poplar Streets. In 1863 the family was living at 56 North Second Street. In 1872 they lived at the southwest corner of 12th and Walnut Streets. Three years later their address was 203 South 12th Street.

By 1879, Paul, Jr., was listed as a laborer at 209 South 12th Street; then as a musician boarding at the National House and at 533 North 7th Street. In 1880, 1881, and 1883 he was residing at 205 North 13th Street, and his occupation was listed as lightning rod agent. Another source says he left Terre Haute with the Lightning Liniment Co. as an entertainer in their medicine show. What are we to believe all these years later?

Paul Dresser worked at many jobs in his younger days. He sold newspapers in the old post office and worked in a bakery on North Fourth Street.

Research concerning his birthplace became very complicated. The abstract for the property at 318 South Second Street shows the initial payment for the "North one-half of lot 155 in original town" was made by George F. Ellis, proprietor of the Riverside Woolen Mill where Paul's father was employed. The mother sewed for Wabash Avenue tailors for 50 cents a day to help pay for the house. The deed shows the last installment of the $300 note on the property was paid by Paul's father on January 18, 1859. With some help his father made the little one-story brick into a two-story house as it is today.

HISTORY CONFUSED

On October 7, 1863, he sold the house for $875. I don't believe anyone will ever know the true and complete story of the Dreiser (or Dresser) family. Certainly Theodore Drieser did everything he could to cloud the true picture and add to the confusion of facts.

Of Paul's bothers and sisters we know Romance Marcus was born February 12, 1860; Mary Frances was born July 7, 1861; Emma Wilhelmina was born January 29, 1863 (it was at her home that Paul died); and Theodore born August 27, 1871.

After Paul left Terre Haute and became a full-fledged entertainer, he returned to town on several occasions in various theatrical presentations. On one occasion he led the noontime parade down Wabash Avenue of the Haverley Minstrel Show. Dressed in a buff-colored morning suit and plug hat, he looked every inch the great showman he later became.

In 1923 "Dresser Day" was observed in Terre Haute on April 23. In honor of the celebration a valuable enlarged photograph of Paul Dresser was presented to the Terre Haute Elks Lodge No. 86. This large framed three-quarter study of Paul Dresser was in the possession of the "White Rats," a famous New York theatrical association which was disbanding, and they gave the valuable picture to Paul's brother, Theodore Dreiser, who in turn gave it to the Elks. It was stipulated that should the Elks not be able to care for the picture, it was to pass into the possession of the Vigo County Historical Society, where it is now at their museum, 1411 South Sixth Street.

Paul Dresser is best remembered for our State song, "On the Banks of the Wabash, Far Away." The story is told that one time Ed Wynn, known in entertainment circles as the perfect fool, once introduced this famous song on a radio show by announcing "now comes the song so popular with commercial trust companies of Indiana—'On the Banks of the Wabash.'"

COMPOSER'S GODCHILD

Eighty-two-year-old Mrs. Amelia Schultz, of 227 South Ninth Street, tells me that Paul Dresser was her godfather. Her godmother was Miss Amelia Zoble, a pretty young woman whom Paul admired very much at that time in 1877.

Mrs. Schultz' parents, Frederick and Catherine Miller, were good friends of the Dresser family, particularly of Paul's father. By this time, Paul's mother had left his father who was employed in a woolen mill at 10th and Wabash. Paul's father, a former schoolteacher at St. Benedict's School, was a very devout man and attended vespers every Sunday, after which he would come to the Miller home for Sunday dinner.

Mrs. Schultz was only a small child at that time but she clearly remembers the elder Mr. Dresser and his Sunday visits. There were 12 children in her family and her childhood memories are happy ones. Her brother played the guitar and they would all sing.

Sometimes the 10 children of the Breinig family would be there. Whenever Paul Dresser came to the house, she remembers that he was such a large man and so heavy that the family feared for the safety of their sofa.

Everyone remembers Paul's voice differently. Some say he only "talked" his songs; others tell that he had a "nice voice." Mrs. Schultz remembers particularly how good natured and jolly he was.

At the museum is an autographed album of Paul Dresser's sheet music of 1898 which contains 25 of his early hits. Included are: "On the Banks of the Wabash" which is "respectfully inscribed to Miss Mary E. South, Terre Haute, Ind." "Just Tell Them That You Saw Me," "Don't Tell Her That You Love Her," "I Wonder If She'll Ever Come Back to Me," "In the Sweet Summer Time," "Sweet Savannah," "Come Tell Me What's Your Answer, Yes or No," "A Dream of My Boyhood Days," "I Wish That You Were Here Tonight," "Our Country May She Always Be Right, But Our Country Right or Wrong," "He Brought Home Another," "Your God Comes First, Your Country Next, Then Mother Dear," "A Sailor's Grave by the Sea," "The Old Flame Flickers and I Wonder Why," "If You See My Sweetheart," "I Was Looking for My Boy, She Said on Decoration Day," "You're Going Far Away, Lad, or I'm Still Your Mother Dear," "Take a Seat Old Lady," "Every Night There's A Light," "We Fight Tomorrow Mother," "He Fought for the Cause He Thought Was Right," "Show Me the Way—Sacred Song," "We Are Coming Cuba, Coming," "You's Just a Little Nigger, Still You'se Mine, All Mine," and "Say Yes, Love."

Paul Dresser died in New York City, January 24, 1906, but was buried beside his mother in St. Boniface Cemetery, in Chicago, Ill. While Ora Davis was mayor here, there was much talk of bringing Dresser's body back to Terre Haute for burial, but nothing ever came of the plans.

Fair Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am inserting into the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the Home Furnishings Daily of Friday, April 10, 1959, under the headline "Rambling With Ray," by Mr. Raymond S. Reed.

Mr. Reed chronicles still other weaknesses in State and Federal fair trade legislation.

I hope all Members will read this and other articles which I have been inserting in the RECORD on the subject of fair trade and will join me in defeating H.R. 1253 and other vicious price-rigging legislation. Fair trade will not help the little man, but on the contrary, will help destroy him. It must not become law.

RAMBLING WITH RAY

(By Raymond S. Reed)

Is the flaming fervor for the floor price sagging a wee bit? Is the zeal to create a fire break to check deterioration of the list price a little less zippy? Are some electric housewares makers awakening to a horrible realization? Is their pet floor formula just a junior tintype of the Fair Trade Act which is presently (and I'm afraid permanently) kaput? There are some indications.

In a report from Chicago it was stated that "Sunbeam Corp. contracts with west coast dealers, franchised under the firm's test consignment plan, make no reference to an ad program or minimum pricing. In separate statements which refer to separate printed bulletins, Sunbeam fills in a few fundamentals on the matter of violating printed principles, as well as the basics of selective selling, particularly on the consignment plan of distribution. It's a strong, straightforward statement of policy consistent with Sunbeam's long and sincere effort to protect its product leadership and preserve its retailers' profit.

Frankly and realistically, Sunbeam recognizes a vulnerability which it can't forestall under present ground rules. That's the deliberate and deceptive undercutting of the 15 percent established minimum. In such instances Sunbeam has to wait until the undercut is a fait accompli and to review the deed in newspapers of the area. Then Sunbeam can select the offender out.

The important aspect of the Sunbeam plan is its sincerity of purpose. The determined intention to preserve some profit for the retailer is crystal clear. And we must admit that no policy, no matter how legal or lofty, is worth a hill of beans unless it is sincerely backed with right, determined intention.

On that score, Sunbeam rates an "A" for effort and a helping hand in its objective from many retailers.

You can't legislate the ruthless price-cutter out of business. And, let's be fair with the facts, you can't expect the FTC or any other Government agency to decree that any retailer has to get a specified amount of gross margin over his cost. It's a situation that may be hell to suffer through, but it is also, and in all ways, a restraint of trade.

That was the Achilles heel of the defunct Fair Trade Act. I know and agree that there was much to be said in favor of fair trade. In fact, its diehard loyalists are currently repeating and rehashing all these virtues in Washington today in their wishful campaign to revive the dead horse.

Fair trade, per se, had its disadvantages too, which harmed the retailer, even though designed to protect him. It provided a beautiful, broad umbrella of pegged list prices under which the price wrecker could duck with comparative ease and safety.

We can have a smorgasbord of floor, ceiling, list, established, suggested or even intimated prices. They can be served up and dished out any way you want. They won't amount to a tinker's unless backed by the purposeful intention of manufacturers with a case history of high integrity of distribution. That's the net of any plan for retail profit preservation.

Address by Hon. Solomon Blatt, Speaker of the South Carolina House of Representatives, to the Hebrew Benevolent Society, Charleston, S.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. FORRESTER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, Hon. Solomon Blatt, speaker of the house of representatives of the great State of South Carolina, addressed the Hebrew Benevolent Society, of Charleston, on April 6, 1959.

Mr. Blatt is a Hebrew and his address was made to Hebrews in the city of Charleston. Mr. Blatt is and has been proud, indeed, of the people of his State and of the South. Mr. Blatt feels that praise should be accorded the South instead of condemnation. Mr. Blatt believes that any person discriminated against in the South causes that discrimination. Mr. Blatt's address is so genuine, so logical, and so true that every person of every race should have the opportunity of reading it. Not only should all races read it, they should follow his sound advice. It is high time that agitation cease and commonsense be practiced.

Mr. Blatt's address is as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. SOLOMON BLATT, SPEAKER OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, TO THE HEBREW BENEVOLENT SOCIETY, CHARLESTON, S.C.

No occasion could give me greater pleasure than to participate in this, the 175th anniversary celebration of the Hebrew Benevolent Society.

The distinguished record of this organization, coupled with the whole history of the Jewish race in America's most historic city, makes me proud to be included among you.

Not the least of the pleasures I have experienced as a result of your kind invitation has been the delving back into history—the studies I have made of the records in Charleston, dating back to 1695 when the first Jews settled here.

Those were the days of the lord proprietors, Joseph Blake was Governor through one-half of 1695, being succeeded by John Archdale in August of that year. The culture of rice had just been started in the Province, and the State was just beginning to be called South Carolina, instead of the southwest portion of the Province of Carolina.

Many Indian tribes inhabited the State—some friendly, some hostile.

The last years of that century tested the courage of all inhabitants. There was an epidemic of smallpox, killing many settlers and Indians. The epidemic was followed by a great fire that destroyed about one-third of Charles Town, as the city was then called. There was an earthquake, a siege of yellow fever, and during the yellow fever plague a violent hurricane struck Charleston. The sea came in with a tidal wave which forced the people to take refuge in the second stories of their homes.

South Carolinians began to talk about leaving a country that seemed marked for ill fortune, but few actually left and the development of the Province really took root about that time, with Jewish people as part of the pioneering inhabitants.

I have been impressed by reading Thomas J. Tobias' booklet on "Tombstones That Tell a Story," a history of the Coming Street Cemetery, the first burial place of Jews in Charleston.

I have read with great interest and enlightenment the book on the bicentennial celebration published by the Charleston Jewish Community in 1950, under the brilliant editorship of Mrs. Jeanette Pearlstine.

The preface in this book by Rabbi Allen Tarshish cited the fact that Francis Salvador, of Charleston, was the first Jew to hold an important elective office in the United States. He was a member of the first and second Congresses of South Carolina in 1775 and 1776, and on August 1, 1776, he was the first Jew to die in the war for American independence.

Having been somewhat of an officeholder myself, it was particularly interesting to recall that a Jew had served in the legislative halls in South Carolina nearly 200 years ago.

During the intervening years many more of our race have served with honor. At the present time, the Senator from Marlboro, the Honorable William C. Goldberg, is a highly respected man. One of the oldtimers in the house, Matthew Poliakoff, of Spartanburg, is one of our most popular members.

I recall during my time in the legislature others of our faith including Julius B. Ness of Bamberg, and Isadore Bogoslow, of Colleton, have served with us.

Mr. Ness is now a circuit judge, and making an outstanding record as a South Carolina jurist.

We all know that many, many members of our faith have attained national acclaim for their talents in many fields of endeavor.

In the judiciary, we look with justifiable pride upon the records of Associate Justices Benjamin Nathan Cordozo and Louis Brandeis.

We are proud of such great figures in medicine as Jonas Edward Salk.

In business and finance, we in South Carolina revere the name of a native son, Bernard Baruch.

An outstanding figure in the development of atomic energy and now the Secretary of Commerce, we pay our respects to Adm. Lewis L. Strauss, who previously had distinguished himself in the Navy.

Another great naval man, Adm. Hyman Rickover, is recognized as the father of the atomic submarine, and is a national inspiration to those who see the imperative need for constructive changes in public education, especially on scientific subjects.

In music, no other man today stands above the distinguished Conductor-Composer Leonard Bernstein, whom many of us have enjoyed recently in national TV broadcasts.

In opera, Richard Tucker is one of the foremost contemporary singers.

In the lighter forms of entertainment, we point with pride to veteran performers Eddie Cantor, Jack Benny, George Jessel, and many others.

We have read of the contributions made by Solomon to President Washington in the American Revolution.

Down South, we remember that Judah E. Benjamin was widely recognized as the brains of the Confederacy serving as both attorney general and secretary of state in the Confederate States.

We could go on and on calling the names of distinguished members of our faith, both in the past and in the present American scheme of things.

The Jewish citizens of Charleston have contributed much to the progress of this fine city and county. I could, if time permitted, call the names of many of our faith in Charleston who are good citizens and who have had a part in this progress. I want to pay public tribute tonight to one of South Carolina's most outstanding citizens. He is a gentleman of the highest character, a man of integrity and outstanding business ability. He is always thinking of how he can help his fellowman whatever his faith. He is charitable and civic minded. I know of no finer citizen anywhere than Ed Kronsberg and I am happy to call him my friend and publicly pay him this well deserved tribute.

It is right and proper that we should take personal pride in the accomplishments of Jews throughout the history of this wonderful Nation. We should sing their praises at all times, but we must also be careful to remember that their greatness came, not because they were members of any particular faith, but from their merits as individuals. That is true of all outstanding men and women, no matter what their origin.

People become great because they are endowed by God, born with certain sparks, and because they take advantage of their talents, working against any and all odds to perfect and apply the good that is in them to the welfare of human beings everywhere.

Not all of us, of course, can be great and distinguished doctors, scientists, composers, or writers. Many of us simply do not have the mental and physical attributes; others simply fail, often due to unfortunate circumstances, to develop themselves to the fullest extent.

The important thing, however, is that all of us in this great free country have the fullest opportunity to become whatever we can make of ourselves, not because of any particular national or racial origin, but because of the dedicated contributions we are able to make to a freer, happier, healthier and more prosperous Nation.

I dwell upon this particular theme for a definite reason. I have endeavored to show that from the early times in South Carolina and in the Nation the Jewish race has enjoyed the rights and privileges which come from living in a free country.

I have singled out a few of the Jews who have become great national figures, and a few who have especially earned and received the honor and respect of the people of our own State. I did not pretend to call the whole roll, but simply wanted to illustrate, through the use of some names, the fact that, like members of all other races, we are

recognized as individuals according to our worth and our performance.

There are dangerous inclinations among some of the Jewish people in America today, out of the goodness of their hearts, to establish themselves as a minority force in the tragically exaggerated storm of political propaganda which surrounds and confuses the Negro question in the South.

Let it be clearly understood that if there were indeed conditions anything similar to those which prevailed during the Hitler persecutions of Jews in Germany—if there were any such persecutions against any particular race in America, I think that all good Americans should and would rally to defend the oppressed, whomever they might be.

But let us examine the status of the Negro race in South Carolina. We all know about our own problems better than we do about the problems elsewhere in the Nation, and, by the same token, we know better about our own problems than do people who live elsewhere in the Nation.

The fact is that nowhere else on the face of the earth are Negroes happier, more prosperous, more contented, more a part of the general way of life than in South Carolina.

During the last 25 years especially the Negroes have made tremendous strides in this State politically, economically, professionally, and otherwise.

Never before in any other part of the world has so much relative progress been made by the Negro race as has been enjoyed in the South during the present generation.

Where else in America are such a large proportion of Negroes actively participating as respected ministers, teachers, lawyers, doctors, businessmen, and citizens in general?

About 40 percent of the schoolteachers in South Carolina are Negroes, teaching school in the most modern buildings, receiving the same State aid salaries as white teachers in their classifications, and otherwise becoming more and more a large and constructive force in our way of life.

Where else in America, outside of the South, are Negroes able to afford to become such extensive and prosperous participants in all phases of life?

There are more Negro teachers in the schools of South Carolina today than there are in any five or six States combined, outside of the South—and in that respect this includes such States as New York, Michigan, California, and others where political propaganda is rampant, where the South is being used as a whipping boy for ambitious propagandists who have no genuine interest in the real progress of the Negro.

We know that in South Carolina the already excellent relations between the races have been so sound and friendly that all of the misrepresentations in national newspapers, magazines, and over television and radio have not so much as dented the good will existing down here.

That, to me, is the finest evidence available that our good relationships are based on proper understanding, proper treatment, a proper and rapid rate of progress, and a proper perspective for the future.

If our relationships were not based on strong and deep-rooted goodwill, we would be in a state of utter chaos because of the unwise, unfriendly and generally deplorable and deliberate misrepresentations which have been heaped upon us.

Make no mistake about it—our racial relationships in the South have been put to the acid test, and we have not been found wanting.

Still another strong evidence is the fact that, as we have good reason to believe, the truly thoughtful and sincere people over the rest of the Nation are beginning to understand, despite the false and tragic curtain of propaganda, that the South does indeed live in a much more healthy and promising atmosphere of racial goodwill than any other section of the country.

We do not have in South Carolina the kind of gangs, and mobs, and misunderstanding, and social conflict, and teen-age terrorism which prevails in States like New York, Pennsylvania, Michigan, and California—the very States from which have come the most abuse against the South.

So I say, that every race living in South Carolina has equal opportunity for happiness and progress—that the members of every race living in South Carolina have the wide open opportunity, as individuals, to prove themselves for what they are worth.

No group of people is entitled, as a group, to be given special treatment.

If I had to select the one outstanding element in this Nation's rise to becoming the greatest nation in all the history of the world, I would say that the freedom of the individual to express himself and to gain recognition according to his worth ranks ahead of all other blessings and attributes.

No, my friends, the Negro race, nor any other race is oppressed in the South Carolina way of life today, and I am a living example of the tolerance of the people of this great State.

People of all races in South Carolina can look forward with confidence to the future, knowing full well that if they have character, talents, and abilities, and if they exert themselves intelligently and constructively they will be recognized and appreciated.

The Jewish people who moved into the Carolina Colony in 1695, moved wisely into an area where their descendants have become respected and responsible parts of the communities and States in which they live.

Members of the Jewish race have fought in all of the wars in which our people have been engaged.

Seven Charleston Jews who served in the American Revolution are buried in the Coming Street Cemetery.

Four veterans of the War of 1812 are to be found buried in this same cemetery.

More than 180 Charleston Jews served in the Confederate forces, of whom some 25 were killed.

Thousands of our faith served in World War I, World War II, and the Korean war.

Many of them died on the fields of battle, but their sacrifice was not in vain.

Quoting Mr. Tobias: "During the century prior to the fatal firing on Fort Sumter, Charleston prospered from the thriving plantation economy it served—with a heritage of religious freedom from its founding. Charleston's Jews participated in their city's prosperity and shared in its culture, developing men who contributed to the community and left their mark in all walks of life.

"Such a man was Mordecai Cohen, who died in 1848, but who had risen from a peddler to the second wealthiest man in South Carolina. He was noted for his civic leadership. His tombstone best summarizes the kind of man he was: 'He was a good citizen, an enterprising merchant and one of the largest contributors to the improvement and revenue of this city. By his strict integrity, his just and charitable disposition, he won the confidence and esteem of the community.' "

Now, not all Jews have risen to become the second wealthiest man in South Carolina, but to me the story of Mordecai Cohen, on a lesser but equally as commendable basis, applies to literally thousands of Jews who have lived in Charleston and the rest of South Carolina since 1695.

My personal feelings toward Mr. Cohen are doubly sympathetic, because my own father, came to South Carolina from Russia many years ago. Like Mr. Cohen, my father was a peddler, but because South Carolina is a wonderful State of opportunity, my father was able to overcome all handicaps and to become a substantial merchant in the town of Blackville in Barnwell County.

Many, many times, especially in recent years, I have thanked God that my parents did come to this country, and to South Carolina, escaping what was then a tragic plight in Russia, and what now—in a godless nation—would be far worse than any plight I can imagine.

Now let's talk about the subject I happen, through experience, to know best—the government of South Carolina.

Though, at times, public service seems to be a thankless job—especially when as at present we are faced with imposing new taxes for desirable public services, public service nonetheless is one of the most compensating experiences to which men and women can devote themselves.

Twenty-seven years ago, in 1932, I was elected to the house of representatives from Barnwell County. Two years later I was elected speaker pro tempore of the house without opposition, and then in January 1937, I was elected speaker of the house over one opponent.

Except for 4 years, it has been my great honor to have served ever since as speaker. It is my information that no other man has ever served so long in this capacity in this or any other State.

And so, as a Jew, and proud of it, I feel that I can speak from full experience when I emphasize again that there is no intolerance in public life in South Carolina.

In the beginning, I pointed out that no other generation has enjoyed more progress in South Carolina than has the generation of which most of here tonight are a part.

In 1933, South Carolina was in the throes of the great depression.

For a moment, let's pause to make several pertinent contrasts between then and now.

Listen to this: In 1932 the legislature had appropriated $9,500,000 for general purposes, and the highway department whose funds were separately accounted, had received $9,900,000 in revenue, a grand total of $19,400,000 for all State purposes as compared with more than $200 million a year at this time.

We were concerned only with the $9,500,000 for general purposes, and the State had, mind you, a deficit of $9 million. We were running, therefore, almost exactly a year behind in finances. Our credit had been exhausted and we could not borrow a dime.

The Farmers' and Taxpayers' League met the new legislature with mass demonstrations on the State house steps, demanding that we cut 1933 appropriations in half. As a matter of fact, during the opening week the house, by a vote of 79 to 34 resolved to hold appropriations below the $5 million level. That was less for all purposes than the single item in our current appropriations of $6 million for the State hospital.

State aid to public schools had amounted to only $3,600,000 in 1932, but the budget commission, under pressure of the Farmers' and Taxpayers' League, was recommending just $2,042,000 for 1933. Think of that. Today for public schools alone the State appropriates more than $85 million a year.

Conditions were like that 27 years ago.

But we had weathered the depression, and in every year since, during war and peace, we have weathered problems, all of the time moving forward into eras of greater development.

The restoration of South Carolina most certainly has experienced its realization during the past quarter of a century.

We believe that South Carolina taxpayers get as much, if not more value received from tax dollars, than those of any other State of the Nation.

It has taken a tremendous amount of working together, and of putting first things first. The taxpayers demand services from

the State government and if these services are to be given the people, then they cannot and must not complain about the imposition of additional taxes to provide the demanded services.

What has been accomplished already, and what we have reason to believe will continue to be accomplished in the future, as a result of the solid foundations which have been laid, could not have been attained without the services of dedicated men and women in government, without free and loyal citizenship in general, and without the contributions made through such essential services as improved public education, public health, and highways.

Probably in no other State has a better balance of government and private enterprise been reached. Our progress has been rapid but sound and our accounts are being balanced without backbreaking taxes on anyone.

South Carolina, for a decade now, has been enormously conscious of the industrial development which has been enjoyed, bringing with it the blessings of payrolls, revenues for government, and money in circulation for all types of business and the professions. All over South Carolina, the additional money in circulation is reflected in new school buildings, highways, hospitals, and other desirable and necessary public institutions. These businesses and industries should and must be protected from those who would destroy them.

From an agricultural viewpoint, within a relatively short time, a considerable transition has occurred, complicating the general economy of the State.

Agriculture will always be a major factor in our economy, but mechanization, irrigation, pest control, and artificial fertility have brought about extensive changes in the methods of farming. The result has been much larger yields, much better produce, and wider diversification.

But, while these good things were taking place in agriculture, the other side was not nearly as bright—because the modern trends have resulted in declining employment. We get heavier production with fewer human hands.

In many counties of the State, no employment was available for thousands of people who could no longer find jobs on the farms. New industries have helped in many areas to fill this void, but still there are many counties, especially in the low-country, the midlands, and the Pee Dee sections which do not have either new industry or enough existing industry to employ the people.

The future prosperity of South Carolina, especially in those areas without industry, unquestionably will depend upon the continued development of new industry and the expansion of existing industry.

Decisively important in the attraction of new industry is the constant improvement of governmental atmosphere, both statewide and in the counties and municipalities. We feel that excellent progress has been made already, but much remains to be done. We not only have conditions which need legislative adjustment and correction, but we must continually be alert to constructive new ideas.

Not only is more industry developing, but more and more of the larger industries are dispersing their operations, locating additional plants in various parts of the country. This is a healthy trend, both from the standpoint of bringing further balance to the whole economy of the Nation, and in the area of national defense. Where industry is too concentrated, an attack on this country might easily disrupt production unless plants are widely scattered throughout the Nation.

As industry shows a growing tendency to spread, the competition among States, particularly in the Southeast, has become more aggressive.

Your native son, the new Governor of South Carolina, our mutual friend Fritz Hollings, has clearly recognized the need of the State and the pulse of our citizens on the subject. Throughout his campaign and during the early months of his administration, he has placed major emphasis upon the subject.

First, however, it was necessary to solve the temporary financial deficits, and the Governor took bold and courageous action from the outset to assure a balanced budget. In all of my service in the State government, I have never seen a Governor act as forthrightly on financial problems. It would have been much easier for him to have passed the buck to the legislature, but he realized that if we were to get on with constructive economical development, we first had to put our financial house in order.

Every citizen of South Carolina should applaud his willingness to place first things first so that the way would be cleared for greater progress.

Please remember this, that the current session of the legislature is not imposing new taxes for extravagance in government. It simply is balancing the budget for the kind of government the people have demanded, and our financial crisis resulted from a slowing down of industrial development during the recent national recession, plus a 5-year drought in profits for our largest industrial resident, the textile industry.

If the textile industry had been enjoying just normal profits during the last 5 years, it would have been paying enough in income taxes and additional employment, with the benefit of extra payrolls, to have kept us on a balanced basis.

Our textile leaders tell us now that they have strong hopes for a return to reasonable profits within the near future. If this develops, then we will have considerably more revenue from existing taxes, and we will be able to do more for education, public health, and other humanitarian causes without additional and increased taxes facing us at every session.

Now, in my opinion, one of the prime reasons why South Carolina has boomed in recent years has been the wholehearted spirit of good government. It do not believe that business, professional, and other substantial citizens are yet exerting themselves enough, but I do believe that the active interest they have shown in recent years in proper government has had a remarkably healthy influence upon those who try to perform public service.

I cannot urge you enough to extend even further your good citizenship. For too many years substantial citizens seemed to think that their responsibility as citizens was to complain about everything that happened in government.

In the legislature, we have noticed in the last 5 or 10 years that business people especially are showing a more constructive interest in what goes on and a greater appreciation for the proper services of government. If you continue to do that, and if you acknowledge the good things about government, and if your criticism is sincere and intelligent, then we in government welcome your criticism.

All over South Carolina there has been a much better statewide acceptance of both blessings and responsibilities. No longer do we hear petty arguments of sectionalism. Charleston, perhaps more than any other community, should recognize this change in attitudes because there were times in our lifetime when other sections of the State looked upon Charleston with suspicion and jealousy.

What finer illustration could I use here tonight than to point to the fact that both houses of the legislature voted for the $21 million ports' development program for Charleston, Georgetown, and Port Royal. I was proud and I know you were proud that one of the foremost leaders in this great development has been Milton Pearlstine. Enactment of the port's program demonstrates that, insofar as economic development is concerned, fulfilling the advantages of one area is important to the whole State.

Let me thank you again from the bottom of my heart for this opportunity to be with you tonight. It is truly one of the highlights of my lifetime. I will never forget your kindness in inviting me, and I assure you that everything I do I will do as a South Carolinian, as one of your faith interested in the welafare of all our people, and I believe I will be a better man because of this experience. May God bless and keep you, each and every one.

The Indian Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I include for the attention of the Congress a letter to the Christian Science Monitor by Mrs. Angus F. Lookaround, a person with many years of firsthand experience in Indian affairs. The letter appeared in the April 25, 1959, issue of the Monitor as follows:-

THE INDIAN PROBLEM

TO THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR:

The purpose of this letter is to comment upon the article, "The Indian Problem: A Challenge," by Kimmis Hendrick, in your issue of March 17.

The writer has lived on the Menominee Indian Reservation in Wisconsin, is a white woman, and the widow of a noted Menominee Indian athlete and musician. She has been a resident of the reservation since 1934, has written several books about Indians and lectured widely on the subject of Indian history. She is the owner and curator of the Angus F. Lookaround Memorial Museum at Keshena and a member of the Midwest Museums Conference.

Therefore, she speaks from experience and out of 40 years of research in Indian history and folkways.

It is difficult to solve the problem resulting from the more than 300 U.S. treaties with the the Indians that have been broken by the Government of the United States. This is what we have to face up to and solve.

Mr. Hendrick refers to the relocation program. It has succeeded in very few cases. I personally do not know of a single successful experience. It uproots Indian families who should have been helped to stay at home. That help should have been through te establisment of industries and schools on the reservations.

There have been schools, the Industrial Government schools (my husband who was born in 1893 went through the 6th grade three times because there was no seventh grade), but these were not adequate for an Indian's necessary competitive living in modern times. And he must compete.

Now, we have to make up for lost time, for the ineptitudes and errors of the past. If

there is an answer, the Association on American Indian Affairs has the answer. This large organization, headquartered in New York City and under the chairmanship of Oliver La Farge, has a legislative program headed by House Concurrent Resolution 40, a bill introduced by Representative GEORGE MCGOVERN of South Dakota.

This bill embodies a point 4 program for Indian communities advocating economic aid so that tribal resources can be better utilized, industrial developments made, and tribal lands retained by the Indians for their own use, benefiting at the same time the neighboring areas.

There is also the Indian economic development bill (S. 953) introduced by Senator WILLIAM LANGER, of North Dakota, and now before Congress.

If these programs are put to work, Indians need not be forced into unfair competition away from home. Indians have a great deal to teach us, a great deal to contribute to our civilization if we will only be humble enough to learn and to accept, willing to discard prejudices and keep open the way for a better understanding of, and opportunities for, the Indian people. It is up to us. Writing your Congressman will help.

Mrs. ANGUS F. LOOKAROUND.

KESHENA, WIS.

Misrule for the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the Federation of Women's Clubs of the District of Columbia very wisely adopted a resolution against so-called home rule. These ladies are tremendously interested in a beautiful, cultural and charming National Capital with an American, patriotic atmosphere. These ladies are taking a stand alongside of George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin, Alexander Hamilton, James Madison, James Monroe and the other great Founding Fathers of our country.

The Federation's resolution opposing home rule is in absolute keeping with their resolution favoring Washington's Cultural Center. I hope they are successful in both projects. This great and wonderful organization is presently headed by Mrs. T. David Gates in the District of Columbia who is doing an outstanding job as president.

Mr. Speaker, the proposed home rule program would be anything but home rule. It would be misrule with the government of Washington being run by political bosses in the smoke-filled headquarters of some dues-paying society of agitation in other areas of the country.

The following are excerpts from my talk before the Federation of Women's Clubs of the District of Columbia on last Saturday:

You are to be congratulated on your patriotism and foresight in opposing home rule for the District of Columbia. Millions of Americans in every section of the United States share your thinking that representative government and freedom might suffer by home rule in the District of Columbia.

Under home rule in a very short time the Congress, the courts, departments of the Federal Government, and even the President would be subjected to harassment, demonstrations, picketing, undue pressure, and propaganda coined and conceived in a socialistic mill hundreds of miles from Washington, if not in foreign lands.

Under home rule the local political machine would soon become the pawn of more powerful and sinister pressure groups with headquarters elsewhere. There would be no real democracy in Washington under home rule. Local politics would be controlled by pressure groups, propaganda, and stupendous slush funds from other areas. The local machine would become a stepping stone to be used by every Capitol Hill presidential aspirant on his way to the national convention. Both national political parties would use the local political machine to lobby for their pet projects on Capitol Hill at the expense of the taxpayers at the grassroots of our country. If Washington were granted home rule, conditions would become so intolerable that the people of the United States would demand that the Capital be moved.

In considering this home rule question, we all should remind ourselves that the overthrow of every French Republic was bred and nurtured by the Parisian mob of France's capital city. Only last year the Communist coup d'etat in Iraq was made possible by the capital city mobs of Baghdad who, overnight, lynched the government officials, mobbed Americans, and took over the government.

The Founding Fathers moved the Capital to the District of Columbia to escape local political pressure in Philadelphia. The Founding Fathers saw the immediate necessity of the Government operating in an atmosphere free from undue local pressure and mob psychology.

Annual Sudeten Germany Day To Be Observed May 17–18 in Vienna

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter dated April 15, 1959, from Dr. Walter Becher, secretary-general, member of the Bavarian Landtag:

SUDETEN GERMAN COUNCIL,
München, den, April 15, 1959.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
U.S. Representative,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE FLOOD: I take the liberty to call your kind attention to the annual Sudeten German Day which will take place on Whitsuntide, May 17–18, in Vienna, Austria. Hundreds of thousands of Sudeten German expellees are expected to visit the day, coming from Austria, West Germany, and other countries, members of the Austrian Federal Government being festival speakers at the rally.

The Sudeten German people will reassert their dedication to the cause of freedom, democracy and anticommunism, their faith in the right for self-determination for every people and in the right to live in freedom in the native homeland for all those who have become victims of Communist totalitarianism. The Sudeten Germans will appeal to the free world for freedom for the enslaved nations, Czechs, Slovaks, Poles, Ukranians, Bates, Hungarians and all other nations and will take stand against any West German confederations with Communist regimes which could end only in the way they ended in China. The close and firm cooperation with the nations of the West, especially the United States is for the Sudeten German people the highest maxim.

It would be a great honor and encouragement for the 3.5 millions Sudeten German people, if you would kindly sent a few words of message for their Sudeten German Day.

With best personal regards.

Yours very sincerely,

Dr. WALTER BECHER,
Secretary General, Member of the Bavarian Landtag.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of April 25, 1959:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

Legislative activity now is mostly in the committees' study of spending bills. Many big spending proposals are marking time as Members of both Houses of Congress weigh the temper of the citizens. The Johnson resolution proposed by the Senate majority leader is indicative of this new stop, look, and listen attitude. This resolution is intended to set up a joint legislative-executive commission composed of leaders of business and labor "charged with the responsibility of visiting * * * centers of abnormal unemployment" to "taste, smell, feel, and hear the dispair of those parts of the country where men and women cannot find work * * * required to report back to Congress within 60 days." Tied to these findings are listed a depressed areas Federal aid bill, a housing bill, acceleration of public works, and other Federal expenditures. There are, as usual, the two fallacious underlying assumptions: (1) That Government is responsible for providing jobs for everyone, and (2) that throwing Federal money at a problem will solve it. Forgotten apparently are the two current studies, one by the joint House-Senate Economic Committee on maximum employment and a second by the Cabinet Committee on Price Stability for Economic Growth. These two studies are already underway. The Johnson resolution thus has the earmarks of political expediency.

My suggestions are: (1) Get the findings of the two committees already authorized; (2) study areas of full employment to learn techniques, new products, and "lessons of success" that can be transplanted to underemployment areas; (3) study unemployment figures to learn actually the correct extent of unemployment, recognizing that at least 2½ to 3 million unemployed is normal in a 68 million work force; take into account the fact that anyone over 14 not working and seeking a job is listed as unemployed, that many others are secondary or part-time workers, such as housewives, seasonal workers, and other workers by choice; (4) reduce,

not increase, Federal spending, so that we live within our means, cut the debt and cut taxes, thus restoring State and local government strength and preserving the value of the dollar; (5) remember that Congress, not the President, controls spending, taxes, and the national debt. (Item.—Since 1900, the 32 Democrat years of Congress control have seen a debt increase of $284 billion and in 26 Republican years a debt decrease of $6 billion—significant or not?)

The need for a labor bill to control dictatorial labor leaders and monopolistic unions was never better demonstrated than as a result of Harry Bridges' (head of the ILWU) testimony before a House committee this week. He showed a ready willingness to take action directly contrary to U.S. Government policy, if he personally saw fit. Of course, it is not unusual for union leaders to act as though above the law, but it is not right. Such arrogant dictatorial flouting of the national interest must be curtailed, even as union lawbreaking and violence must not go unprosecuted here at home. It's up to the Congressmen now to write a law providing this protection.

In testimony against a civil rights bill before the House Judiciary Subcommittee, I pointed out that (1) the timing is wrong; ((a) we just passed a bill; (b) we haven't weighed the Civil Rights Commisison findings); (2) the pending bills give the Attorney General unlimited discretionary power to sue citizens ((a) defendant would be pitting his own resources against the U.S. Treasury; (b) there is no limit to staff and expense the Attorney General can use); (3) both political parties are trying to garner the Negro vote and political expediency in this field can jeopardize all the civil rights we enjoy; (4) what civil rights are we talking about, other than voting—freedom of speech, assembly, press, worship—what? (5) Federal laws, nonconforming to local custom and usage, like prohibition, are unenforceable: You can't safely or successfully legislate social customs.

(6) The 10-point code of ethics for Government employees should be taken to heart by all public servants. These include: Put loyalty to the highest moral principles and to country above loyalty to persons, party, or Government department; give a full day's labor for a full day's pay, giving to the performance of his duties his earnest effort and best thought; make no private promises of any kind binding upon the duties of office, since a government has no private word which can be binding on public duty; seek to find and employ more efficient and economical ways of getting tasks accomplished; and uphold these principles, ever conscious that public office is a public trust.

We should not lose our capacity to become angry over malfeasance in office, nor should we tolerate cynicism. In our country, actually everyone has a part in government.

Armenian Martyrs' Day, April 24

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on April 24, 1915, all the leaders of Armenian communities in Turkey were arrested by Turkish authorities, kept incommunicado and then, in small groups, taken to various parts of Asia Minor and put to death there. This sudden and shocking move by the Turks was the unfolding of the hideous plan of exterminating 2 million Armenians in the Ottoman Empire.

The coldblooded execution of the plan sounded the death knell of the Armenian race in the Empire, for within a year, while Europe was in the death throes of the First World War, the Turks had successfully and with impunity carried out their mission through wholesale massacres. At the end of that war, when the sky had cleared, and the dust had settled over the areas formerly populated and cultivated by Armenians, there was hardly any trace of life. In this unprecedented human holocaust in modern times more than 1 million Armenians lost their lives; most of the survivors were scattered as refugees in neighboring lands, and only a small number of Armenians were spared.

From that day on, every year Armenian communities everywhere observe April 24 as the day of their martyrs, paying homage not only to the memory of a few thousands of their leaders, but also in commemoration of 1 million innocent and helpless Armenians who lost their lives in that human carnage.

I gladly join Americans of Armenian descent in the commemoration of that event, the Armenian Martyr's Day.

Bill To Amend Transportation Act of 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which provides for thorough consideration and review by the Interstate Commerce Commission before commuter and passenger trains are permitted to be discontinued.

My bill would amend the Transportation Act of 1958, which now permits railroads to automatically discontinue passenger trains 5 months after the application for discontinuance if no formal action has been taken by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

I would like to point out that 27 notices to discontinue approximately 100 trains are presently pending before the Commission. And railroads are threatening to discontinue additional service affecting many more thousands of passengers. The records show that a time range of 5 months has been proven inadequate for the Interstate Commerce Commission to properly investigate and make findings upon this flood of discontinuance requests. Thus, it seems to me, the net result would be discontinuance of passenger trains which will be accomplished by default, without public hearings and without a careful determination by proper authorities. This inevitably would be followed by an ignoring of the public interest.

Mr. Speaker, my bill is designed to correct this situation. For example, after the filing of an application for discontinuance of passenger service, the Interstate Commerce Commission must hold a public hearing prior to acting upon the application. Likewise, all interested parties would be permitted to be heard at the hearing. It would seem that the restrictive 5-month time limitation now placed on the Commission should be eliminated. The Commission must be empowered to protect the public interest. Under the present law the Commission has no such power. By following this procedure the interests of both the railroads and the commuting public, as well as the public at large, would be properly recognized, and any decisions regarding railroad passenger service must be made only after all relevant factors have received full consideration in the appropriate body.

I understand very well the financial troubles of the railroads, especially those on the eastern seaboard, and I am willing to assist them in their present difficulties. As a matter of fact, the Transportation Act of 1958, for which I voted both in committee and on the floor of the House, provided $500 million for their relief. On the other hand, I insist that we must give every consideration to the interests of the public.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, this problem is certainly not a brand new one. In fact, 2 years ago I strongly protested the curtailment of passenger service in my Eighth Congressional District by the Boston & Maine Railroad. At that time I stated that I thought such large curtailments were in disregard of the public interest. Many of my constituents cannot reach Boston by public conveyance, inasmuch as the only bus line serving the district has been on a very prolonged strike. The fact of the matter is that for all practical intents and purposes there is no bus service. This, coupled with the continuing abandonment of train service, forces most to reach their place of employment by private automobile. On arriving at Boston, the motorist finds no place to park; he also finds that both he and his car are unwelcome, that parking for pay facilities are nonexistent, and his personal transportation problems almost unsolvable.

Dr. Paul Dudley White recommends bicycling as a way to strengthen our heart and preserve our health. However, the inclement winters and springs of Massachusetts make this alternative to the transportation problem a difficult one, even if at times it seems as the only possible solution to the present attitude of the railroads against carrying passengers.

Many hundreds of my constituents have either purchased or built homes with reliance on train service which was then in existence but presently is merely a memory. Their problem is personal, but their interest is public. To that extent I feel legislation to return the concept of public interest to the running of railroads is imperative.

I realize that my proposal today is not a cure-all for solving the present commuter crisis in cities along the Eastern Seaboard. But I do believe that maintenance of adequate railroad commuter service is of critical importance to these

areas. It is, therefore, my hope that hearings by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, of which I am privileged to be a member, will soon be scheduled on this important legislation.

Teacher Recognition Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, speaking as a former teacher in the public schools in California I honestly believe that the teachers of America probably contribute more to our present and future way of life than any other one group.

Unfortunately the marvelous work done by our teachers, at ridiculously low rates of pay, often goes unnoticed by the American people.

I am proud to announce that the Santa Clara County School Trustees Association in my own congressional district is recognizing the value of the teachers in our public schools with Teacher Recognition Week during the week of April 5–11. It appears to me that similar observances all over the country would be in order.

I am enclosing a copy of a resolution to be introduced by Assemblymen Bradley and Allen of the 28th and 29th Assembly Districts of California in the Assembly of the California State Legislature. This resolution focuses proper attention upon Teacher Recognition Week in Santa Clara County:

RESOLUTION RELATIVE TO TEACHER RECOGNITION WEEK

Whereas the American public school serves as the basic unit of grassroots democracy and a close bond between the community and its teachers and schools contributes to the strength of democracy; and

Whereas in the daily interaction of teacher, pupil, school and community the most lasting and most vital attitudes are built as bulwarks to our democratic faith; and

Whereas the outstanding successes and achievements of the teaching profession are evident in the unusual teacher contributions to the cultural and social life of the community and the Nation; and

Whereas the teacher is a vital member of the community, a human, sympathetic, skillful individual serving as a molder of youth and the preserver of America's heritage; and

Whereas the essential nobility of the teaching profession is animated by unselfish zeal and devotion and numbers within its ranks men and women of courage, ability and vision; and

Whereas the Santa Clara County School Trustees Association is directing its attention toward creating and strengthening the interest and support of the people in their teachers and schools since such interest and support is an inevitable obligation of citizens in a democracy; and

Whereas in furtherance of this effort, the Santa Clara County School Trustees Association is initiating a Teacher Recognition Week program in Santa Clara County during the week April 5–11, 1959, to provide an opportunity for every citizen to discover and to understand more fully the relationship of our schools and teachers to the values from which democracy receives its deepest meaning: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That members of this body join with the Santa Clara County Trustees Association in proclaiming April 5–11, 1959, as Teacher Recognition Week; and be it further

Resolved, That the assembly approves and commends the project of the Santa Clara County School Trustees Association in this important field of teacher-community relations and pledges full and active support and participation to insure the success of this worthy program.

Farr Terms Fair Trade a Useless Crutch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Home Furnishings Daily on April 22, 1959.

The article by Mr. Bob Johnston tells how Mr. Mort Farr, board chairman of the National Appliance and Radio Dealers Association, declared that fair trade is a crutch of no use to dealers and has never been enforced fairly.

I hope all will read this article and will discover how all the heat and smoke on this subject has obscured the real issue in the preservation of small business and in what is needed to protect and help the small businessman.

Certainly, fair trade is not the way.

FARR TERMS FAIR TRADE A USELESS CRUTCH

(By Bob Johnston)

PHILADELPHIA.—Fair trade is a crutch of no use to dealers and never has been enforced fairly, Mort Farr, board chairman of the National Appliance and Radio Dealers Association, declared here Monday night.

Addressing a dinner meeting of the Philadelphia Housewares Club, Mr. Farr stated he was flatly opposed to fair trade. However, he was speaking as an individual and not for NARDA, he asserted.

"We are being kidded by the legislators who indicate there is some chance of passing a national fair trade bill," the Upper Darby, Pa., dealer declared.

"In any event, fair trade never covered more than 10 percent of all retail items and only about 2 percent of all appliances, including majors."

Instead of a return to fair trade enforcement, Mr. Farr called for stricter enforcement of the Robinson-Patman Act. "We also need a law to prohibit transshipping, if any Government regulation is needed," he added.

ASKS INDEPENDENCE

"It's up to the individual dealers to make a profit by their own ingenuity, and not depend on the Government. We have only ourselves to blame for the present abuses in the appliance industry.

"More redtape and Government regulation can lead only to curtailment of individual initiative. This is not the American way; we shouldn't look to the Government to stifle competition." He asserted that discount houses have profited as much as anyone from fair trade."

Commenting on the hopeful signs for an upturn in the appliance business, Mr. Farr said that "never has an industry been so good to so many people and so cruel to itself."

This dealer cited as possible factors for an improvement in sales the trend toward more leisure time for consumers and increasing interest in their homes.

SEES SPECIALTY'S DECLINE

Specialty appliance retailers now are accounting for only about 20 percent of electric housewares sales, while some years back they were a much bigger factor, he noted. "Perhaps we need better distributor salesmen, more store demonstrations, and creative selling."

Mr. Farr proposed that electric housewares be added to utility bills so that customers could purchase them on a $1 down $1 a month basis. He suggested that some floor planning program be worked out for electrics, similar to those now in effect for major appliances.

John W. Ferguson, Rival Manufacturing Co., and newly elected housewares club president, also spoke.

Three veteran PHC members, now retired, were given life membership cards: Benjamin Weiner, founder of Weiner Manufacturing Co., here; George Spangler, formerly of Westinghouse Electric Supply Corp., and Walter S. Kucker, ex-Knapp Monarch representative. Mr. Farr also was presented with an honorary membership in the club.

Oscar Howe: Indian Artist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to know as a friend and former teaching colleague, Oscar Howe, now a professor at the University of South Dakota, who is the foremost living American Indian artist in the United States today. The designer of the murals of the Corn Palace in my home town of Mitchell, S. Dak., Professor Howe has had his paintings exhibited at the Chicago Art Institute, Denver Art Museum, Gallerie for Living Artists, Museum of New Mexico and the Modern Museum of Art as well as foreign exhibits in Paris and London. In 1947 and again in 1954 he won the grand purchase award at the Philbrook Art Center in Tulsa, Okla. Acclaimed as artist laureate of the Middle Border, Professor Howe is an outstanding example of a reservation-born Indian who has with great personal courage and amazing artistic skill carved for himself a place of honor among the people of our State. Under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD a biographical account of Mr. Howe prepared by Dr. George Agogino of the University of South Dakota and Professor Howe's wife Heidi for the Museum News, Vermillion, S. Dak., March 1959:

OSCAR HOWE SIOUX ARTIST

(By George Agogino and Heidi Howe)

Prof. Oscar Howe is a neat, conservatively dressed, mild-mannered, and well-appreciated member of the faculty of the State

University of South Dakota. In appearance he is rather stocky, slightly above medium height, and with features and skin color that might easily allow one to imagine he was talking to an oriental exchange professor.

Oscar Howe is, however, a fullblood Sioux Indian. His parents were George T. Howe and Ella Not Afraid of Bear. He was born May 13, 1915, at Joe Creek, a small community on the Crow Creek Indian Reservation of South Dakota. His paternal grandparents were Don't Know How (grandfather) and Bone Necklace (great-grandfather). Bone Necklace was head chief of the lower Yanktonaise, and was noted for his gift of oratory. Perhaps his most famous speech was made on behalf of his people before the Northwestern Indian Commission in June 1886.[1] Oscar Howe's maternal grandparents include the Yanktonaise chief, Not Afraid of Bear (grandfather) and White Bear (great-grandfather) who distinguished himself at the time of the Santee uprising in 1862 and received a plaque from the Government for his services to the whites at that time.

Oscar Howe's preadolescent years were characterized by poverty, illness, and frustration. He attended the Pierre Indian School until 1933. This institution at the time was under the military system. The boys wore uniforms with stiff celluloid collars. Punishment was swift and severe even for minor violations and the school sought to discourage runaways by offering a bounty for the return of students who sought to return to the reservation without the proper authorization.

It was a violation at the Pierre Indian School for an Indian to speak his native tongue. Since Oscar Howe could speak only Sioux when he entered this institution he soon had the opportunity of testing the corrective physical punishments administered by those in authority. Among punishments experienced were being shoved into heated radiators which if not sufficiently effective was often followed by the traditional rubber hose applied to his face and head.

While at this school Oscar Howe developed a serious but unidentified skin disease. So disfiguring was this affliction that he suffered social isolation to the extent that even his own brothers completely avoided him. His misery increased when he discovered he had trachoma, a painful eye disease that almost blinded him. It is no wonder that after the school doctors informed him that his skin disease was incurable the 10-year-old boy contemplated suicide by jumping out of the second story hospital window. There was to be no bounty on Oscar Howe, for it was the policy of the school to send hopeless cases back to the reservation.

The next year was one of crisis in the young Indian's life. Determined to rid himself of his skin condition, he washed his entire body with a commercial soap, allowed it to dry on the skin, and then rinsed the product from his body. This procedure was repeated hour by hour, day by day, and week by week, until after many months his skin condition began to clear and finally was cured, along with his trachoma.

While Oscar Howe was now physically sound, there were still deep psychological wounds to repair. By hard work he must make up for the shame of ostracism leveled against him by his friends and relatives when ill. He must find an avenue of success, a medium to fame, so that "they would be ashamed for ever being ashamed of him."

He returned to school and finally completed his high school education in 1938 at the Santa Fe Indian School. While at this progressive institution he first took up art under the direction of Dorothy Dunn Kramer. He was an instant success, and before he graduated he had exhibited his paintings across the Nation from the Brooklyn Museum's Gallery for Living Artists to San Francisco's Civic Center. Even more impressive was the fact that he also had his work exhibited overseas in both London and Paris. Many of his paintings entered private collections, and some were reproduced in magazines both at home and abroad.

Returning to his father's home (his mother died when he was 9) led to another period of despondency. To the little Indian community of Joe Creek on the Missouri his artistic success was evaluated only in dollars and cents since South Dakota at that time offered little market to the art that had been honored in great galleries. It was during the depression and desperate for work, Oscar Howe accepted the position of art instructor at the Pierre Indian School, his pay consisting of room and board.

In 1940 Oscar Howe was assigned to the South Dakota artists project where at Mitchell he painted the interior dome of the Carnegie Library with symbolic designs of sun and rain clouds over hills. After a course in mural painting at the Indian Art Center, Fort Sill, Okla., he was assigned to paint in oil 10 large murals depicting in lifesize figures the history of the Missouri River Basin. The work was to decorate the walls of the new auditorium at Mobridge, S. Dak. Although the artist had to make concessions to local tastes favoring literal portrayal, these paintings still retain several aspects of Oscar Howe's imaginative art.

With the advent of World War II, Oscar Howe spent 3½ years in the U.S. Army with combat battalions in North Africa, Italy, and Germany. It was while a corporal in Germany that he first met Miss Heidi Hampel, who today is his wife and a naturalized U.S. citizen. Her trip to America was financed by Oscar Howe's first national award. In 1947, Mr. Howe entered his tempera picture, "Dakota Duck Hunt," in the second annual National Indian Painting exhibition at Philbrook Art Center, Tulsa, Okla. His entry won the grand purchase prize of $350. After traveling and marriage expenses were deducted, the young couple found they had but $20 for a nest egg. However, it is doubted that an Indian ever had a better deal from a "white," for in addition to a wife, Heidi Howe also became a biographer, historian, business manager, and publicity agent for her husband.

Shortly after his marriage, Oscar Howe was commissioned to supply the illustrations for a two-volume book titled "North American Indian Costumes." The text was written by Dr. O. B. Jacobson of the University of Oklahoma, and the book was published in Nice, France, in 1952. The money was certainly welcome because in June 1948, their only child, a daughter, Inge Dawn, was born in the Talahina, Okla., Indian Hospital.

In the fall of 1948 Oscar Howe was chosen by Dakota Wesleyan University, Mitchell, S. Dak., as artist-in-residence. There he was an instructor as well as a student in art. More important than his formal education and recognized status was the fact that he found people in his own region who began to recognize his achievements and potentialities as an artist. Before he received his undergraduate degree he had won the Harvey Dunn medal in art and had been offered a full-time position in the art department, but he decided to engage in graduate art studies at the University of Oklahoma. He received his master of fine arts degree in 1954.

The people of Mitchell more than those of any other community consider Oscar Howe their own since it was here he first received acceptance within the State of South Dakota. For the past decade he has yearly designed the decoration of the 11 panels at the Mitchell Corn Palace. Each of these panels depict larger than life size scenes carried out with corn in its natural colors. When the Friends of the Middle Border dedicated their new museum near the Dakota Wesleyan campus, the society presented him with a scroll naming him artist laureate of the region.

Beginning in September of 1943, Oscar Howe became director of art at the high school at Pierre, S. Dak., a position he held until his appointment in 1957, as an assistant professor of fine arts at the State University of South Dakota. He is the artist in residence at the university and also serves as assistant director of the university museum.

In every moment that he can obtain aside from the time he must devote to carrying out the duties in these positions, Oscar Howe is busy creating new work of art. His many awards, exhibits, and other achievements are listed at the end of this article. It is suitable to close this brief biography of Oscar Howe with a statement of his work by art critic, Dorothy Dunn Kramer, on the occasion of his one man show in Santa Fe, New Mexico, in 1957.

"How well Oscar Howe's art progresses was clearly evident in his recent Santa Fe exhibition. The paintings demonstrate eloquently how true is Rene d'Harnoncourt's assertion that a capable, creative artist with a strong native background can become erudite in the techniques and philosophies of the art schools and come through, at last, with his original art strengthened, not harmed, by his experience. Howe's painting emerges broadened, deepened, and uncorrupted, still Sioux at the core.

Most of Howe's compositions would be at home in any contemporary show; yet were it possible for the artist's great-grandfathers, Bone Necklace and White Bear, to see them, they could at once recognize each motif and symbol of the rites, the dancers, warriors, and other tribal figures. This seeming paradox lies not so much in the fact that Howe, through skilled use of modern media and techniques, brings his pictures up to date as in the fact that the art of the old chieftains' day appears modern. It is, so to speak, an art that was ahead of its time so far as style is concerned. In Howe's work, the resemblance of old to new is inherent rather than acquired.

This painting states emphatically that the artist knows the value of his particular cultural heritage to the amalgam culture of the whole country; that Sioux art forms are eternal in significance to the American scene."

AWARDS

Grand purchase award, Philbrook Art Center, Tulsa, Okla., 1947.

Second award, Philbrook Art Center, Tulsa, Okla., 1949.

Second award, Philbrook Art Center, Tulsa, Okla., 1950.

First price, Philbrook Art Center, Tulsa, Okla., 1951.

Second and third prize, Philbrook Art Center, Tulsa, Okla., 1952.

Dorothy Field award, Denver Art Museum, Denver, Colo., 1952.

Second award and honorable mention, Philbrook Art Center, Tulsa, Okla., 1953.

Purchase award, Denver Art Museum, Denver, Colo., 1953.

Grand purchase price, Philbrook Art Center, Tulsa, Okla., 1954.

First prize and honorable mention, Philbrook Art Center, Tulsa, Okla., 1954.

Santa Fe Railroad award, Denver Art Museum, Denver, Colo., 1954.

Second prize, Philbrook Art Center, Tulsa, Okla., 1956.

Purchase award, Santa Fe, N. Mex., Museum of New Mexico, 1956.

[1] Historical Collections of South Dakota, vol. IX, p. 466.

Mary Benjamin Rogers award, Museum of New Mexico, Santa Fe, N. Mex., 1958.

MURAL PAINTINGS

Mitchell Library, South Dakota, "Rain in the Hills," symbolic.

Mobridge Auditorium, South Dakota, "History Along Missouri River."

Nebraska City, Nebr., "Origin of Corn."

Exterior ceramic tile mural, Hinsdale, Ill., depicting Sioux life and nature, 1958.

BOOKS ILLUSTRATED FOR PUBLICATION

"Legends of the Mighty Sioux."

"The Little Lost Sioux."

"Bringer of the Mystery Dog."

"North American Indian Costumes," Nice, France, 1952.

ART WORKS PUBLISHED IN AMERICAN MAGAZINES AND BOOKS

Cover for design, Columbia University (March 1941).

School Arts magazine (November 1936, October 1938).

Indians at Work.

Art Education Today (Columbia University, 1937).

Time magazine, July 1947.

Oklahoma Today, 1958.

Indian Art of the United States, by Renee D'Harnoncourt, 1941.

"A Pictorial History of the American Indian," by Oliver La Farge, 1956.

WORK PUBLISHED IN FOREIGN MAGAZINES

Riding (published by Country Life, London, May 1938).

Animal and Zoo magazine (London, November 1938).

L'Illustration (vol. 94, No. 4861. Paris, 1943).

EXHIBITS IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Paris, France, 1936.

London, England, 1936.

PAINTINGS ON PERMANENT EXHIBIT

Joslyn Art Museum, Omaha, Nebr.

Gallup Art Galley, New Mexico ("Sioux Skin Painter").

Museum of New Mexico, Santa Fe, N. Mex.

Philbrook Art Center, Tulsa, Okla.

Denver Art Museum, Denver, Colo.

Mont Clair, Art Museum, New Jersey "War Dance."

ONE-MAN SHOW

Philbrook Art Center, Tulsa, Okla.

Fort Dodge, Iowa.

Santa Fe, N. Mex., Museum of New Mexico, 1957.

Denver Art Museum, May 1958.

Joslyn Art Museum, Omaha, Nebr., March 1959.

AMERICAN MUSEUMS IN WHICH PAINTINGS HAVE BEEN EXHIBITED

Philbrook Art Center, Tulsa, Okla.

Chicago Art Institute.

Smithsonian, Chicago.

Denver Art Museum, Denver, Colo.

San Francisco Museum of Art.

Gallerie for Living Artists, Brooklyn, N.Y.

Museum of Fine Arts, Stanford University.

South West Museum, Los Angeles, Calif.

Museum of New Mexico, Santa Fe.

Modern Museum of Art, New York City, and so forth.

Tribute to Tom Rivers: Ambassador of Recreation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, Howard Henderson, vice president of J. Walter Thompson Co., the world's largest advertising agency, has sent around a memorandum to his friends about a graduate of Mount Hermon School. Since the days of Dwight L. Moody, this Massachusetts institution has enkindled within its students a world vision and world mission. One of these graduates, Mr. Speaker, is Thomas E. Rivers, director general, International Recreation Association, with offices on the United Nations Plaza, New York. In Mount Hermon, Rivers caught a vision which has matured through more than 4 decades of service to recreation. As a young man he learned from John R. Mott that life should be an earnest effort to make every decision in the light of the whole world from the perspective of the dedicated heart.

For nearly 40 years "Tom" Rivers, as he is known around the world, served as an executive of the National Recreation Association. In 1956 a great international recreation congress was held in the city of Philadelphia with the effective cooperation of the Nation's foremost recreation executive, Commissioner Robert W. Crawford. With the active leadership and financial support of the National Recreation Association, the International Recreation Association was incorporated under the laws of the State of New York on October 3, 1956. Among the important projects developed by IRA has been the annual cooperative community recreation exchange project, administered under grants from the State Department. Lord Luke, chairman of the International Recreation Association Board, said at a reception at Buckingham Palace recently that "Mr. Rivers has taken a technical subject and lifted it to the level of statesmanship."

Now, Mr. Speaker, the reason for my mentioning Mr. Rivers in connection with the memorandum circulated by Mr. Henderson is that Paul Douglass, a member of the bar of the U.S. Supreme Court and one of America's leading educators, in an address on "Types of Creative Leaders" at the 13th annual Great Lakes Training Institute of Indiana University at Pokagon Park, selected Rivers as one of our representative creative leaders, "the kind of human beings who dream, pioneer, invent, act, and lead."

Quoting Paul Hoffman's favorite phrase from Kipling, Mr. Douglass said that today there is a search for a principle that will "walk up and down in the hearts of men." He went on to say that the world struggle of ideologies does not seek merely more bread, but rather to increase income as surplus over minimum needs to provide for man the most prized of all desires—leisure in freedom—and the wherewithal to enjoy it. What all the people of the world want, Mr. Speaker, is to share a common dividend of creative leisure from the operation of our heavily industrialized society.

You will remember, sir, that Emerson, one of our Massachusetts' immortals, advised us that "every great and commanding moment in the annals of the world is the triumph of some great enthusiasm" and that Thomas Paine observed that "an army of principles will penetrate where an army of soldiers cannot; it will succeed where diplomatic management would fail." Mankind everywhere is yearning for the enjoyment of the creative life in the experience of leisure. As the international ambassador of recreation, Tom Rivers deserves the support of every American. Massachusetts is proud of him.

Michigan Meets Its School Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, the State of Michigan is meeting the challenge in the field of education.

This is brought out in a recent report by the citizens research council which pays tribute to the willingness of the people of Michigan to support their schools. Instead of standing at the doorstep of the U.S. Treasury seeking Federal handouts for their schools, the people of Michigan rolled up their sleeves, taxed themselves, and built their own schools. They have kept supervision, management, and control exactly where it should be—at the local level.

I would suggest that other States take note of what is being done in Michigan.

In that connection I submit for consideration an editorial in my hometown newspaper, the Bay City Times, entitled "Greater Support for Schools."

The editorial follows:

GREATER SUPPORT FOR SCHOOLS

In a survey which, it claims, explodes myths about public school education in Michigan, the Citizens' Research Council pays a glowing tribute to the willingness of the people to support their schools.

Although surveys tend to be controversial or can be used to prove almost anything, the council's report appears to have a great deal of validity as a measure of the performance of Michigan in meeting the well-known challenge of education.

The shortcoming of the report, which is readily admitted by the authors, is that it presents only the overall view of the school situation in the State.

Conditions vary from district to district. For example, the council's finding that the pupil load per teacher in the State as a whole has steadily declined and now is at its lowest point is of little comfort to the people of Detroit, who are seeing their high schools lose accreditation because of overcrowding.

By the same token, a teacher in a district which still is paying substandard salaries may not be at all impressed by the report that the average annual salary in 1957 was $5,067 per year.

At the same time, the survey is valuable because it does, as the authors claim, explode some extremely popular myths.

One of these is that the State is lagging desperately behind in the effort to recruit teachers, that financial support of the schools is weak when related to personal income, that districts lack the financial potential to supply needed classrooms, and that overcrowding is a general condition.

The council reports that, on a statewide basis, Michigan has been able to add teachers faster than enrollments could climb. The pupil-teacher ratio in 1947 was 29.5 to 1. In 1957 it was 27.2 to 1.

As for teachers' salaries, the council claims the gain from 1947 to 1957 was 44 percent

in absolute increases—that is, over and above the cost-of-living increases.

One of the most striking figures offered is that showing the increase in spending for operating purposes per pupil in the public-schools system. The council says that in 1957 Michigan's schools were spending more than twice the amount per pupil spent in 1947.

But how about inflation?

Well, the council claims that when the figures are adjusted for the inflation factor, operating expenditures per pupil are from 30 to 50 percent higher.

Expressing this spending in terms of percent of total Michigan personal income, it still presents a picture which reflects favorably on the people. In 1947 revenues for operating purposes—as distinguished from building—amounted to 1.7 percent of total personal income. By 1957, the last full year for which figures are available, the percentage had risen to 2.7.

Dipping into spending for capital improvements and the status of the race to end the classroom shortage, the council found definite figures hard to obtain.

It could establish that annual property tax revenues for capital outlay showed a 570 percent increase between 1947 and 1957.

Whether this seemingly magnificent effort has really met the classroom needs, the council cannot say, claiming that no reliable inventory of facilities is available.

It reports, however, that although the school debt in 1957 was five times greater than that of 1947, State school districts as a whole had plenty of credit left to meet any forseeable school building needs. This conclusion was arrived at by balancing total debt against valuation.

Now it is not possible to jump to the conclusion that just because the people's performance with respect to any given public need has improved immeasurably that a perfect job is being done.

In the final analysis, the important thing is whether the spending for schools today meets today's demands, not how it compares with a decade ago.

And, as the council points out, what is true for the State as a whole may not be true in any given local district. Conditions may vary widely among the schools of a single county—which certainly is true here.

Still, the figures are extremely significant as a general gauge of what Michigan is doing to meet the challenge of the preseent and future.

And certainly some of the claims about the crisis in education, which are dinned into the people's ears day after day, are "myths." The crisis may not be nearly as bad as it has been pictured.

National Forests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 8, 1959

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, my intense and continuing interest over the years in the well-being of our great national forests is well known to this distinguished body. We in the Congress are proud of the fact that when issues affecting our forests are at hand there emerges a singleness of purpose that assures the future safety, conservation, and wise use of these forests.

Mr. Speaker, the report on a "Program for the National Forests" which Secretary of Agriculture Benson sent to you on March 23, and which I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 24, 1959, is a significant step forward toward more complete development and intensive management. Secretary Benson, Assistant Secretary Peterson, Chief McArdle of the Forest Service, and the others involved in the preparation of this report are to be congratulated.

On July 31, 1953, in a special message to the Congress about the Nation's natural resources, President Eisenhower stated that the Federal Government has a responsibility to see that the national forests are managed wisely. Secretary Benson's report clearly states the measures and action needed to achieve the full development and use of the resources involved. It is now the responsibility of the Congress to study this "Program for the National Forests" and to take the necessary action to carry out both the short-term and long-range objectives.

I am interested in this program not only for its impact on the 181 million acres of national forest in 39 States and Puerto Rico, but also for the opportunities it presents to make the one-half million acres of the Allegheny National Forest in my State more productive and more useful to all our citizens.

The national forests are an operating public enterprise. The timber, wildlife, recreation, water and other resources are not locked up or withheld from orderly public use. The total cash receipts from the sale of timber and related resources now exceed a billion dollars. The second billion dollars in receipts should be reached within the next 10 years.

Each resource on the forests, however, must be developed, managed, and used in a coordinated manner if full renewability and adequate supplies are to be maintained for ourselves and the generations ahead.

We are not harvesting the full allowable cut of timber on all national forests. On the Allegheny we are now cutting about 22 percent of the cut the national forest will sustain. Research in new uses for hardwoods, better quality tree growth and better protection from insects and disease is needed. The accelerated forestry research program covered in this report will do much to improve the forests for expanded use.

The Armed Services Committee, of which I am a member, is constantly confronted with the staggering amounts of nonrenewable natural resources which are consumed to maintain a strong position in this nuclear age. We in the Congress must never overlook the need to build up and improve the renewable natural resources of the national forests as an added source of stability and strength. Research, therefore, is a must.

The flood of people from our cities to the national forests for recreation, hunting, camping and fishing and to enjoy the scenic beauty of the out-of-doors is now a major forest use.

The 1950 census showed some 47 million people living within 300 miles of the Allegheny National Forest. This is a day's drive by car. The next census will show more.

In 1958 over 800,000 people visited the forest for some type of outdoor recreation. An additional 930,000 people from Pennsylvania and surrounding States made day visits to the forest to enjoy beautiful scenery. If this present trend continues we anticipate an annual use over the next 10 years of about 1½ million people. This estimate is based on the forest as it now stands without any major developments to increase the recreation potential.

This "program for the national forests" tells us that the recreational use on all our national forests is expected to almost double within the next 10-year period. Where population figures are concerned, estimates are usually on the conservative side. Hence, we might have more than the 130 million people expected on the national forests by 1959.

The report tells us also the kind and number of improvements needed to meet this demand for more outdoor recreation by more millions of our citizens. The major improvements needed to provide better hunting and fishing by the increasing numbers of Americans going to the forests each year is revealing.

As America's population and economy expand, we in the Congress should make sure that the management, protection, and use of the resources of our national forests expand also. The direct benefits to our Nation will be rewarding.

Our small national forest in Pennsylvania now returns cash receipts of over one-fourth million dollars annually. Under this "Program for the National Forests" the cash receipts for all the national forests could be doubled in the next 10 to 15 years to over $210 million annually. The capital value of our forest property would be increased about a billion dollars. Payments to local counties for schools and roads will increase. Some 620,000 people would be employed in the harvesting and processing of national forest timber.

We cannot place a dollar value on the recreation, soil, and wildlife benefits that will accrue to millions of Americans in all walks of life. Better and more ample supplies of water for industrial and domestic uses, so vital in the West, will also be a benefit here in the East.

Mr. Speaker, we have made substantial progress in the development of our national forests over the past 50 years. Our past accomplishments are not sufficient to meet the resource demands of the future.

In this "Program for the National Forests," we now have a solid base for launching the most realistic and responsible national forest improvement program in our history.

Poison in Your Water—No. 67

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am inserting into the Appendix of the CON-

GRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the New York Journal-American of January 12, 1958, entitled "Rensselaer Boils Water."

The article follows:

RENSSELAER BOILS WATER

RENSSELAER, N.Y., January 11.—The 15,000 inhabitants of this city and two of its suburbs were ordered today to boil their drinking water to guard against an epidemic of hepatitis.

The precaution was taken after an outbreak of the disease was threatened by pollution of the Hudson River, source of the city's water supply. The towns of East and North Greenbush are also part of the Rensselaer system.

Dr. Andrew C. Fleck, county health commissioner, said the Hudson water needs seven parts chlorine per million to make it fit for human consumption. The chlorine level had been reported at one-tenth the required minimum.

Change of Command Ceremony, U.S. Naval Support Force, Antarctica

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, during the summer season in Antarctica, November 1957, I had the privilege of visiting this vast continent as a member of the Subcommittee on Transportation of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. I was greatly impressed, at that time, with the work being done by both the military services and the scientists.

I was particularly impressed with the excellent morale of our servicemen stationed at the bottom of the world in Operation Deep Freeze. I know the fine morale of these servicemen was directly attributable to the outstanding leadership of the operation's commander, Rear Adm. George J. Dufek, and I would like to commend him for the great contribution he has made in the exploration of this heretofore unknown continent.

On Tuesday, April 14, I attended the change of command ceremonies held in New York on board the historic icebreaker *Glacier*, and the luncheon given in honor of Admiral Dufek and Admiral Tyree by the Navy League, at the Waldorf Astoria. The New York Times covered the historic event, as follows:

Rear Adm. George J. Dufek relinquished his post yesterday as commander of U.S. Naval Support Forces, Antarctica.

In a sunlit ceremony here aboard his flagship, the Navy icebreaker *Glacier*, Admiral Dufek turned over his command to Rear Adm. David M. Tyree, a 1925 classmate at the United States Naval Academy.

The ceremony took place at 10:30 a.m. on the fantail of the *Glacier* berthed at 46th Street and the Hudson River. Before the ceremony Admiral Dufek held a news conference—his last as head of Operation Deep Freeze—in the icebreaker's wardroom.

For the last 4 years he headed the operation that supported U.S. research in Antarctic under the International Geophysical Year.

Yesterday he spoke of jet aircraft that would in 10 years be flying a south polar route. Admiral Dufek noted that a present-day flight from Sydney, Australia, to Buenos Aires, Argentina, covers 12,000 miles. A south polar route would cut the mileage in half, he said.

To support such a route, he said, a permanent, ice-free airfield would be necessary as a safety field for the flights of jet airliners. Admiral Dufek noted that for 2 years engineers had been surveying a strip of land near McMurdo Sound for such a field.

Mayor Wagner designated April 14 as U.S. Navy Antarctic Day.

A number of messages commending Admiral Dufek for bringing a new challenge to the U.S. effort in Antarctica were read at the ceremony. Among these was one from Adm. Arleigh Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, who himself has had much to do with the success of the U.S. effort in Antarctica during the past 5 years. The message from Admiral Burke also commended Admiral Dufek's successor, Admiral Tyree, to the new tasks and challenges before him:

On the occasion of the Navy League change of command luncheon for Admiral Dufek and Admiral Tyree, I should like to again pay tribute to the initiative and planning that has gone into the Deep Freeze operations. The Navy has been fortunate to have men with the experience, courage, and ability exemplified by Admiral Dufek. Admiral Tyree continues the work that has begun in this vast and most unexplored continent. He brings to his new command a wealth of enthusiasm, initiative and ability to continue the pattern that has been established so outstandingly by Admiral Dufek.

The Navy is proud of the part it has played in the exploration of Antarctica but in the final analysis, it is men like Admiral Dufek and Admiral Tyree who determine the success or failure of projects like this. They have established a tradition which will go down in the annals of Navy history as one of the brightest moments for our nation. To Admiral Dufek I extend a most sincere and grateful well done. To Admiral Tyree, my congratulations on receiving this command and my best wishes for a successful tour of duty. (Arleigh Burke.)

Mr. Speaker, until his retirement on September 1, Admiral Dufek will be assigned to the Office, Chief of Naval Operations. I am sure I can speak for my colleagues here in the House when I say our very best wishes go with him for success in any endeavor he may undertake.

Economic Aid for Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the Milwaukee Journal, speaking through its editorial colums recently, has pointed up the fallacy of our overemphasis on military aid and our underemphasis of economic aid to Latin American countries:

CUT OR DROP MILITARY AID TO LATIN AMERICA

If there is any area where American military aid is indefensible, it is Latin America. The area does not need armaments. It cannot afford them. All American arms do is stir feuds among neighbors, encourage military dictatorships and earn ill will for the United States. The claim that these countries must be armed as part of the free world effort against Communist aggression is dream stuff.

Senator ELLENDER, Democrat of Louisiana, recently returned from a Latin American study of U.S. Government operations. He paid particular attention to military aid activities. Here are excerpts from his report to the Senate Appropriations Committee.

"It is my fear that armies created in Guatemala or other countries to the south of us may end up doing nothing but fighting each other.

"It appears to me that if Nicaragua wants arms, it is well able to buy them. I do not think it is advisable to indiscriminately create large armies throughout this section of the world.

"Equipment is flowing into Colombia. * * * Much of this will be used for road-building. I question the use of military forces to build roads. * * * In many of these countries the military forces exert a strong, if not controlling, influence over civilian goverments. I question the wisdom of a move which would have the effect of further vesting civil functions in a foreign military service.

"The United States should immediately reevaluate the need or necessity of maintaining advisory military missions in the countries to the south of us. I found that we were not wanted in some countries, but we seem to persist in remaining there.

"Most of these governments are now struggling to make both ends meet, and for us to suggest imposing greater burdens upon their already struggling economies may well result in making them more dependent upon the United States."

Economic aid is something else. This is needed and is generally prudently and constructively administered. The new Inter-American Development Bank, to which the United States will subscribe $350 million, should have a helpful place. But military aid, other than helping us to dispose of some obsolete American weapons, serves no good purpose in Latin America.

And President Eisenhower has proposed raising military aid to Latin America by 72 percent. A wise Congress will reduce it by that amount.

Better yet, it will eliminate it.

Scripps Professor Receives Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to make part of my remarks an extraction from the clip sheet issued by the University of California pertaining to an award made to Martin W. Johnson, professor of marine biology at the University's Scripps Institution of Oceanography.

Professor Johnson has made a great contribution in this important field. I know that you, who are interested in it,

are happy to see that his work has been recognized by the National Academy of Sciences.

The field of oceanographic study is one that affects all the people of this country. It behooves us to recognize its importance so that through our support benefits may be reaped in our defenses, our economy, and our food supply:

SCRIPPS PROFESSOR RECEIVES AWARD

LA JOLLA, April 4.—Martin W. Johnson, professor of marine biology at the University of California's Scripps Institution of Oceanography, has been awarded the Alexander Agassiz Medal of the National Academy of Sciences—one of the greatest honors in the field of oceanography.

Established in 1911 by the British oceanographer Sir John Murray in honor of the American oceanographer Alexander Agassiz, the medal has been awarded at infrequent intervals for outstanding contributions to the science. Only two members of the Scripps staff have previously won the award. They were Thomas Wayland Vaughan and Harald U. Sverdrup, both of whom were directors of the institution.

The award to Johnson cites his outstanding contributions both to biological oceanography and to oceanography in general.

Johnson is an authority on marine invertebrates, animals without backbones, including such creatures as lobsters and crabs. He is the coauthor, with Sverdrup and Richard H. Fleming, of the book "The Oceans," which is the first modern reference book in oceanography. It was published in 1942.

Johnson's achievements in research during World War II won him wide recognition, including a Certificate of Commendation from the Navy for outstanding research.

Moral Re-Armament, a World Force for Peace and Harmony

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to insert the text of an article I have received from Mr. Vicente Villamin, a well known Philippino of Los Angeles County, Calif. His calling attention in paragraph 2 of this article to the fact that Hon. Joseph Scott, late of California, a distinguished lawyer of national renown, was an active endorser of Moral Re-Armament gives me opportunity to state that I am ever grateful to the memory of Joseph Scott. I say this because when I was a young lawyer in Los Angeles County just starting out, he, on more than one occasion without financial compensation, extended me courtesies of his office and of his wonderful staff of associate helpers in his office. In those days my law office was situated in Long Beach, Calif., about 20 miles from Los Angeles courthouse, and also in those early days there was no branch of the Superior Court of Los Angeles situated in Long Beach. Hence, as a Long Beach lawyer his courteous extension to me of his office courtesies on many occasions was then and now is very appreciatively recalled.

The article following appeared in the Windsor, Canada, Star, Saturday, January 10, 1959:

NO CONFLICT BETWEEN MORAL RE-ARMAMENT, CATHOLICS—PHILIPPINE WRITER SEES VATICAN SUPPORTED IN ANTI-COMMUNIST DRIVE

(By Vicente Villamin)

What is Moral Re-Armament? It is a world movement to bring about harmony between individuals and between nations. It seeks to change individuals by shedding their bitterness and introducing instead the four moral standards of the movement—absolute honesty, absolute purity, absolute unselfishness and absolute love.

It is not a religion nor a religious movement. Persons of different religions are admitted to it. There are thousands of Catholics in it. Among them are Princess Castelbarco, of Italy, whose family have produced a Pope; Mr. Gabriel Marcel, the leading Catholic philosopher-writer of France; the late Mr. Joseph Scott, of California, a leading Catholic layman in the world and a papal knight; and many others prominent in their countries.

All the Catholics in Moral Re-Armament testify that their interest in the movement has not shaken by an iota their Catholic faith. As Archbishop Cushing, of Boston, told me last September, the Catholics who were with Moral Re-Armament became better Catholics and that, therefore, he was for it, adding that he did not mind at all if he was quoted anywhere to that effect. The dynamic prelate has since been designated a cardinal by Pope John XXIII.

I was in Rome last October and November. I was going to be received in private audience by the late Pope Pius XII to discuss the subject of communism in Asia on which I submitted an 11-page memorandum to him and other Vatican authorities. But he passed away before I arrived in Rome. So I had to make other arrangements and talked with many cardinals and other prelates in and out of the Vatican.

I found deep interest and sympathy about the work of Moral Re-Armament, particularly in the international field. While the preservation of the purity of the faith is of prime importance, what is at stake in the world today is the preservation of religious faith itself, which the Communists are determined to abolish.

In reality, there are no basic conflicts between the Catholic Church and Moral Re-Armament. The Catholic publication in London, the Tablet, affirmed this in connection with the so-called gentleman's agreement in Switzerland.

A few years ago the Holy Office in the Vatican, which guards the purity of the Catholic faith, issued directives to Catholics regarding participation in Moral Re-Armament, cautioning them about possible indifferentism. Indifferentism is the idea that all religious faiths are at bottom the same in their moral validity. Catholics are expected to reject that.

This danger is answered by the Catholics themselves in Moral Re-Armament. They affirm that that question never comes up in the observance of the four moral standards mentioned above. In fact, they add, that that observance helps them to discharge their duties as Catholics more faithfully and assiduously.

Another danger which the Holy Office pointed out is that Moral Re-Armament might lead to syncretism, which is defined as an "error (which) consists in uniting conflicting religious beliefs so as to reduce them to a common denominator acceptable to all." This is met by reiterating the fact that by no stretch of the imagination could Moral Re-Armament be considered a religion or religious movement.

There must be no mistaking the massive fact that Moral Re-Armament believes in God, His dominion and His direction, first, last, and always. On this, the Moral Re-Armament accords to compromise no sanction and to criticisms no fear.

I was profoundly impressed by the bigness, goodness, and devotion of the prelates whom I met at the Vatican. With many of them I had more than an hour's talk, on more than one occasion. As a Catholic, I felt proud that the heads of my church were of such caliber.

I was told that the late Pope Pius XII was very much worried about the advance of communism, especially in Asia, and that, realizing the necessity of presenting a formidable united front, he wanted to see all religions act in unison, but that he found no way to bring it about.

It was my purpose to suggest that Moral Re-Armament might be used as the common ground for all efforts to face and resist communism, which is ever stepping up its cold war propaganda in the free countries of Asia. In my memorandum, I pointed out that no group of any kind and character is doing that except for the military and the inadequate work of information of the American Government.

I discussed these matters with high prelates in the Vatican. I found them both understanding and sympathetic. One of them, very high in the Vatican category, even said that there would be a change of attitude toward Moral Re-Armament. Another, a cardinal, told me that he read an Moral Re-Armament book "America Needs An Ideology," during the solemn conclave to elect a Pope, and liked it. Still another, also a cardinal, complimented Dr. Frank Buchman, the initiator of Moral Re-Armament, for his good work for humanity and for the world.

In the last 8 months I have traveled around the world on two occasions for Moral Re-Armament. I met the heads of many nations in Asia as well as many leaders in different fields of endeavor. I found them all worried about communism and the lack of united effort against it on the part of the free countries.

They all expressed hope that Moral Re-Armament will furnish the plan, the method, the purpose and the men to carry on the fight against communism, proving its superiority, dynamism and appeal of its principles and policies. Moral Re-Armament is charged by mankind with that grave responsibility. And it will meet it with all the sacrifices that it might entail.

Thus Moral Re-Armament richly deserves the support of all persons of good will. Why should it be discouraged among the Catholics or others who profess other religions? It does not infringe on the sacred mission of the Catholic Church. It does not produce indifferentism, synchretism or any other effects corrosive of the Catholic faith.

And, above all, it does not oppose the Catholic Church, either, openly or covertly. The only church in the grounds of the Moral Re-Armament training center in Caux, Switzerland, is a Catholic church, owned by Moral Re-Armament, where masses are said regularly.

In this enlightened day and age, especially when humanity is challenged at every point in its life by militant, godless communism, movements, like Moral Re-Armament should have the universal support of all men and women who consider themselves as God's children faithful, loyal and true to Him. Moral Re-Armament, when its ranks are swelled by such men and women all over the world, has the capacity to bring more happiness to the world and to save it from disaster at the hands of the Communists.

Poison in Your Water—No. 66

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard of March 8, 1959, an article entitled "Sewers Called Health Threat":

MEDICAL SOCIETY URGES REMEDY—SEWERS CALLED HEALTH THREAT

(By Dean Rea)

Sewage disposal and drainage problems in east Springfield were termed "dangerous" health threats to Eugene and Springfield area residents in a resolution adopted Tuesday night by the Lane County Medical Society.

The medical group, which represents more than 150 physicians, in the resolution also urged Eugene and Springfield residents to actively support those measures which will eliminate this health threat.

In the society's action, which comes under the heading of "Preventative Medicine," attention was called to contamination of Eugene's source of drinking water supply by effluent which drains into the McKenzie River from the east Springfield area.

The resolution also noted that even current high chlorination of Eugene's drinking water may not destroy organisms producing disease found in human excreta.

Dr. Harold Osterud, county health officer, said Wednesday morning that chlorination of Eugene's water has prevented any epidemic to date.

However, Osterud said certain diseases, including typhoid, infectious hepatitis, polio, viruses and dysentery, may be transmitted through a water supply. He added the east Springfield area is fortunate in having a good water supply.

The current incidence of infectious hepatitis cases is not necessarily linked to the water, he said. "About 90 percent of the cases diagnosed have resulted from person-to-person contacts," Osterud explained.

The county health office reports 28 cases of infectious hepatitis so far this year, including 4 this month, in Eugene and Springfield.

Osterud said his department has been concerned, too, over the possible spread of diseases which might result in an epidemic resulting from health problems posed in the east Springfield area.

He said a committee is studying the problem in east Springfield and that a solution "will be a difficult one, won't be cheap but for the survival of the area is necessary."

The medical society's resolution states that "there exists at the present time heavy contamination by human excreta of surface water and drainage ditches in the area east of Springfield and that this contamination is due to poor soil drainage and inadequate sewage-disposal facilities."

It also states that "this heavily contaminated water flows by drainage ditches directly into the McKenzie River in considerable amount, one-half mile above the intake for the water supply by the Eugene area."

"Because of the excessive contamination," the resolution continues, "heavy chlorination of the water supply is mandatory and this has made the water objectionable in taste and odor to many people.

"Certain organisms, producing disease found in human excreta, may not be destroyed even by hyperchlorination," the resolution adds.

In summary, "the Lane County Medical Society states emphatically it's deploring the existing dangerous condition."

The resolution was the first stand by the medical society on the "fringe" area health problems which have been part of a controversy that has raged for more than 3 years east of Springfield generally between 32d and 58th Streets.

Measures for eliminating the health hazard were not detailed in the medical society resolution but may refer to three unsuccessful annexation attempts held in the area during the past 4 years.

Sixty medical society members gave overwhelming support to the resolution in a voice vote; one dissented.

Physicians, in discussing the resolution, called attention to "other" fringe area health problems but were generally agreed that the east Springfield health problem was more acute and felt they should sound a "warning."

Osterud said Wednesday other fringe area health problems include those in Danebo, south Eugene, Bethel, and Willakenzie, and are the result of rapid population growth. He said there is a serious health threat in polluted surface water which drains in the McKenzie ditch near schools and residential areas.

The medical group met jointly with the Lane County Bar Association to discuss mutual problems relating to court cases.

Hear That Lonesome Whistle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Railway Labor Fact Sheet No. 6 provided by the Railway Labor Executives Association of Washington, D.C.:

SOARING RAILROAD PROFITS: NET EARNINGS NEAR PEAK OF WHOLE POSTWAR PERIOD

The railroads of the Nation today, as always, are crying poverty, but are their cries justified? Not at all when you check into the facts and figures which reveal that railroad profits are nosed upward and nearing the peak of the entire postwar period.

Truth of the matter is that U.S. railroads have snapped back from the recession of 1957–58 and their basic financial position is excellent today.

In the last 4 months of 1958, the railroads were chalking up earnings at the rate of more than $1 billion per year in net railway operating profits.

That figure represents a higher mark in profits than in most of the postwar years; in fact it is close to the peak earnings during that period.

Meanwhile, profits in 1959 are showing a further upward trend with carloadings on the rise. In the first 3 months of this year, carloadings registered a 6 percent gain over the similar period of 1958.

Rail labor's contention that the rail profit picture is far better than the carriers would have the public believe is confirmed by information released by the railroads.

For instance, the estimated net railway operating income of class I roads in February of this year amounted to $39,793,000—that compared with $9,067,000 in the same month of 1958. And in the first 2 months of 1959, the estimated net railway operating income was $75,963,000 compared with a net of $40,982,000 in the corresponding 1958 period.

Other figures stemming from the Bureau of Railway Economics of Association of American Railroads reveal that total operating revenues showed a 4.1 percent increase in the first 2 months of this year—$1,532,496,964 compared with $1,472,791,123 in the corresponding period of 1958 while operating expenses increased less than one-half of 1 percent.

The railroads are and have been recovering very well from the recession that hit most industries, carloadings-wise and profitswise.

In the week ended April 4, 1959, the railroads loaded 590,133 cars, representing a boost of 73,886 cars or 14.3 percent over the corresponding week in 1958.

The Wall Street Journal recently conducted a survey which unearthed some interesting information that disproved the gloom and doom cries of the Nation's railroads.

The survey showed that the railroads have been doing much better in the profit column, in making a return from the economic slump, than have the big corporations of the country in general.

Profits of the major firms in the fourth quarter of 1958 were approximately 2 percent above those of a year earlier. Class I railroads, however, had registered a whopping 23 percent increase in that period. They earned $248 million compared with $202 million in the last quarter of 1957.

As did many industries of the Nation, the 1957–58 recession hit some railroads severely, but no serious damage was caused. No new railroads found themselves in a state of receivership or bankruptcy.

Dividends of some carriers were reduced or abolished for the year of 1958, but total dividends for the rail industry as a whole were reduced only moderately.

Total net railway operating income for all railways from September through December 1958, was $368,932,000—20 percent higher than for the similar period of 1957 and only 6 percent below the corresponding period of 1956, a year when net railway operating income surpassed $1 billion.

After all charges, net income during the last 4 months of 1958 was $323,774,000. That was a 25-percent increase over the 1957 level; only 6 percent under 1956.

The net railway operating income, which is the operating profit of the railroads, has continued to be $1 billion or near it during most of the postwar years. Before World War II, the net operating income frequently slumped well below $500 million and even below $200 million during the depression years of the 1930's.

It has not dropped below $750 million since 1949.

Net income—the final corporate profit of the railroads—has remained very stable.

The carriers as a whole reported net deficits in some years prior to the war. This has not occurred since the war's end and in recent

years the net income has been well over $500 million.

The same has held true for the individual railroads as for the rail industry as a whole—nearly all carriers have maintained net income in each postwar year. The number of roads which have failed now and then to register corporate profits has been small, even in times of temporary recession.

Following the 1949 recession, with recovery in 1950, the railroads of the United States moved ahead to attain new earnings' records. They amassed the largest net income in history, up to that time, in 1953, when they bettered the best of the lucrative 1920's and the peak years of World War II.

They endured another recession in late 1953 and throughout most of 1954, but hit a new peak level in 1955 when the 1953 record was smashed.

The U.S. railroads are making an impressive recovery from the 1957–58 recession and nearly all individual roads have shared in the industrywide return to better days.

Most carriers have increased their earnings well above the closing months of 1957 and near to the high peaks of 1956.

Some railroads have made higher profits than in 1956.

The outlook for 1959 is excellent.

Predictions for carloadings, stemming from shippers' advisory boards and other authoritative groups, are that a substantial traffic increase above last year's level will be registered in 1959.

Profits are looking up.

Less-Than-Honorable Discharges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to present to the attention of your own busy self and all the other Members of this great legislative body, the text of three letters of approval and endorsement which I have recently received from three of the nationally known veterans groups in the United States of America. I am sure that you and all of us interested in this ever-present and vital subject of less-than-honorable discharges to thousands of our military personnel each year will be pleased to see these three letters.

They are as follows:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
OFFICE OF DIRECTOR, NATIONAL
LEGISLATIVE SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., March 17, 1959.

Hon. CLYDE DOYLE,
Member of Congress, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DOYLE: This is in response to your letter of February 16, 1959, with attached copy of H.R. 88 which proposes to amend present law to provide that the Board for the Correction of Military or Naval Records and the Boards of Review, Discharges, and Dismissals which give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and exemplary conduct in civilian life after discharge and dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals and to authorize the award of an exemplary rehabilitation certificate. The Veterans of Foreign Wars is on record as having endorsed in principle H.R. 8772 of the 85th Congress and we gave this bill our full support. We shared your keen disappointment when the bill failed to move forward in the Senate and died with the adjournment of the 85th Congress. It is noted that H.R. 88 is almost identical to H.R. 8772, with one major exception: For those meeting the requirements of this legislation an exemplary conduct certificate will be issued rather than a general discharge limited as was proposed in H.R. 8772.

The VFW wholeheartedly agrees with the principle of issuing an exemplary certificate based solely on the record of rehabilitation after service with no change in discharge—solely because of such rehabilitation. We endorse the proposal that an exemplary certificate is much more preferable and appropriate than general discharge limited. As has been pointed out this bill is not designed to grant or change discharge certificates but rather is intended to remove the stigma that attaches, sometimes for life, to a veteran with a less than honorable discharge certificate.

We certainly will lend our full support to the principles and objectives of H.R. 88. If further hearings should be scheduled with respect to this legislation, the Veterans of Foreign Wars will be deeply appreciative of being advised so that a representative from this office may be present and testify in behalf of our organization.

Thanking you for inviting the views of the VFW concerning this most meritorious legislation, I am,

Respectfully yours,
OMAR B. KETCHUM,
Director.

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
NATIONAL SERVICE HEADQUARTERS,
Washington, D.C., April 1, 1959.

Subject: H.R. 88 and about 30 companion bills on the same subject.

Hon. CLYDE DOYLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DOYLE: Your interesting letter of March 24, 1959, on the above subject, with enclosures, has been received and very carefully considered.

The then DAV national director of legislation, Maj. Omer W. Clark, in his letter of June 26, 1957, addressed to you as chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Military Discharges, House Committee on Armed Services, commented upon the provisions of H.R. 1108, 85th Congress, and the numerous identical bills before that Congress. Major Clark stated in effect that the Disabled American Veterans did not have an official mandate either to support or oppose such proposed legislation but he indicated that the DAV viewed with considerable misgivings the possible effect of the bill in question should it be enacted into law and placed into operation. As the above mentioned statement is a part of the printed record of the hearings conducted by your subcommittee it is not believed necessary at this time to reiterate the reasons given for our doubts and apprehensions.

In my opinion, H.R. 88 of this Congress, in eliminating the reference to "General Discharge (Limited)," is more acceptable than was H.R. 1108 and its companion bills. However, there is considerable doubt in my mind as to just how much good the possession of on exemplary rehabilitation certificate will do the holder of a less than honorable discharge from the Armed Forces, when he goes to seek civilian employment. It seems to me that if such veteran shows such certificate to a prospective employer the latter will immediately note the word "rehabilitation" on it with the distinct possibility, if he if he is interested enough to follow it up at all, that he will delve into the adverse facts and circumstances resulting in separation from the service with an other than honorable discharge. In the VFW letter of March 17, 1959, a copy of which you enclosed, the term "exemplary conduct certificate" is used in one place and I believe this is an improvement due to omission of "rehabilitation." It might even be advisable to add the word in parens "(civilian)" after "exemplary conduct certificate" to emphasize that the good conduct was post-service and had no reference to the actions in service, as previously determined by the Armed Forces.

In providing a certificate such as that contemplated by H.R. 88, designed for a special purpose (employment), the question arises as to whether or not such a certificate would militate against some veterans obtaining favorable reconsideration of their service discharges by the Department of Defense. Human nature being what it is we cannot help but feel that it would react unfavorably in an appreciable number of cases. The existence of the certificate and the procedure incident to its issuance would offer an easy way out for interested officials of the Defense Department by enabling them to take some action in the interest of the veteran-applicant without going to the extent of changing the character of his service discharge. There are still other considerations that come to mind bearing upon the advisability of adopting such legislation, and these relate to morale in the Armed Forces, the very considerable burden that would be placed upon the Department of Defense during these highly critical and dangerous times—both as to investigating and adjuticating these cases, and the possible threat that such a system might impose on our nationl defense through permitting dangerous elements who had been separated from the service because of communistic affiliations or actions to infiltrate our great industrial network and to wreak havoc when the time came for them to carry out the orders of their foreign masters.

Some might say that there would only be a comparatively few such instances in the last mentioned category. That could be true but it would only take one agent who gave no thought to his own safety, and one nuclear bomb, to completely wreck a vast industrial complex, and the entire area for many miles around.

In conclusion, permit me to thank you for communicating with me about this proposal of yours. I know how sincere and earnest you are in pressing for the enactment of the legislation. I am also certain that you appreciate the position of the Disabled American Veterans, in the absence of a mandate binding upon this legislative department. In this letter I have tried to touch upon some of the points that require much soul searching upon the part of the Congress before taking the long step embodied in H.R. 88 and its companion measures.

Sincerely yours,
ELMER M. FREUDENBERGER,
Acting National Director of Legislation.

AMVETS NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS,
Washington, D.C., April 9, 1959.

The Honorable CLYDE DOYLE,
U.S. House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DOYLE: This will acknowledge your letter dated March 25, 1959, with enclosures, relative to H.R. 88, a bill introduced by you which would make certain changes in the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 regarding the type of evidence that should be considered by the Boards for the Correction of Military and Naval Records and Boards of Review, Discharges and Dismissals. Additionally, your bill would authorize an award of an exemplary rehabilitation certificate to certain veterans who

have demonstrated exemplary conduct subsequent to service. AMVETS has long been interested in this general subject of discharge reviews and has always made our views known not only in supporting bills that you have introduced but also in discussions on this subject with various Defense Department officials. We are of the firm opinion that this entire area is in need of further study including not only the laws, regulations, and procedures under which the Correction Boards and Boards of Review, Discharge and Dismissals operate, but also procedures under which various branches of the services discharge personnel administratively and otherwise.

AMVETS is in full agreement and strongly endorse the first section of your bill which would mandate the Correction Boards and Discharge Review Boards to take into consideration, when reviewing an other-than-honorable discharge, conditions and circumstances prevailing at discharge of the individual, his age, what the punishment in civil life would be for the same offense, and the moral turpitude involved. Making the consideration of these features mandatory may tend to make the members of these Boards more liberal and equitable by permitting them to consider a wider range of factors in their determination as to whether or not a discharge should be changed. It will also enable the veteran or his counsel to build a stronger case. In our judgment, therefore, your proposal, if enacted, would greatly benefit the veteran in his application for a change or correction of discharge.

We also support the concept underlying the other major feature of your bill calling for an award of an exemplary rehabilitation certificate. This would be issued, according to your bill, to a veteran with an other-than-honorable discharge who can establish by affidavits and other evidence that for 3 years following service he demonstrated exemplary conduct in every respect in civilian life. While this award would have no bearing on the veteran's discharge, it would certainly tend to mollify to some degree the stigma attached to his undesirable discharge or other discharge not under honorable conditions. While we can envision difficulties in the administration of this law, as it relates to this award, this fact would not alter our support of such legislation. As we have indicated earlier in this letter, this entire area, including inservice discharge procedures and procedures governing postservice reviews are in need of continuing study and review in order to develop the most equitable and fair method of handling these matters. We commend you for your interest in these problems and your efforts to institute changes for improvement in the entire system. AMVETS appreciate very much this opportunity to express our views on H.R. 88.

Very sincerely yours,

JAMES W. HAFEY,
Assistant National Service Director.

In addition to H.R. 88, 30 Members of this House have also filed companion bills and I am pleased to state that just a couple of days ago, after waiting about 3 months for report from the Pentagon Building, Hon. CARL VINSON received an adverse report to H.R. 88 and all of the companion bills. In due time, Mr. Speaker, I hope and expect that this whole subject matter of less-than-honorable discharges in the initial form of H.R. 88 and companion bills will again come to the attention of the House of Representatives. In fact, I hope it will be before long. As you will no doubt remember, during the 85th Congress, owing to your gracious and understanding courtesy and cooperation, the Doyle bill, H.R. 8772, which was the predecessor to H.R. 88, passed the House by an overwhelming vote of 226 to 8, but largely because of delays in transit in getting the report out from the Pentagon Building at an earlier date, said bill did not get to the Senate committee's attention as early as it should and, therefore, the Senate did not consider the bill last session. But I am pleased to state that Senator STENNIS from Mississippi is ready to file the text of H.R. 88 and companion bills in the Senate.

These bills, Mr. Speaker, are very moderate bills; they do not ask nor intend to ask the Military Establishment to change any military record nor to grant any boy who uses the provisions of any of these bills any upgrading of any discharge. The proposed Certificate of Exemplary Rehabilitation does not compete with any honorable discharge or discharge under honorable conditions. In fact, is it not a discharge. It is a proposed certificate by the Military Establishment that if a boy, after living an exemplary life in civilian pursuits for not less than 3 years, and if he can prove that to the satisfaction of the Military Establishment; in their sole discretion, then they can at their sole discretion issue to such boy an exemplary rehabilitation certificate. It is hoped that this certificate will at least help a deserving lad who has made minor offenses or errors while in the military to remove at least a little of the stigma and help him at least a little bit to get employment. It grants him no Government benefits. It will not interfere with military discipline.

Mr. Speaker, it seems significant, does it not, that these three great nationally known veterans groups so cordially and emphatcally support H.R. 88 and companion bills? I have received word from the American Legion that they cannot act upon the proposed legislation until their national convention later on this summer.

Railroad Traffic Is Up—But Railroad Employment Is Down

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Railway Labor Fact Sheet, No. 7, provided by the Railway Labor Executives Association of Washington, D.C.:

RAILROAD UNEMPLOYMENT: CHRONIC AND CRUEL

Railroad unemployment is extremely acute. Over 200,000 railroad workers were unemployed in January 1959. More than 160,000 of them were drawing unemployment insurance, but 40,194 had exhausted all payments available to them under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act.

During fiscal 1957–58 more than 300,000 workers, representing 21.2 percent of the qualified work force, drew unemployment compensation.

The picture is even darker than these figures indicate.

Thousands of workers lost their jobs before the 1957–58 recession. These workers no longer qualified for unemployment compensation, and thus were not counted among the unemployed in this computation.

The latest figures—for December of last year and January and February of 1959—show railroad employment is at the lowest level of the 20th century.

Average midmonth count of positions on class I railroads

1952	1,206,312
1956	1,042,664
1959 (January)	810,675

Traffic is up on the railroads but employment is down.

January carloadings were slightly above the same period last year.

February carloadings were 8 percent above the 1958 level.

March carloadings were 11 percent above March 1958.

Railroad jobs in January 1959 were lower by 8 percent than in January 1958.

Railroad jobs in February 1959 were lower by 5.6 percent than 1958.

Railroad unemployment hits the older worker particularly hard. It should be remembered that railroading is different from other work, and most railroaders cannot carry their skills—and more than their seniority—to other industries.

Of the more than 300,000 workers unemployed in the rail industry last year, 111,600—36 percent of the total—were over 45 years of age; an additional 36,000—11.7 percent of the total—were between 40 and 45.

Despite the overwhelming statistics of unemployment hardships, railroad management has consistently refused to alleviate any of the suffering. The railroads stubbornly resisted even negotiating on job stabilization. Rail management has vigorously opposed improved unemployment compensation benefits for employees.

Ground-Breaking Ceremonies, Sunday, April 26, 1959, for the New Reserve Training Center, Bellefonte, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, before a large crowd of interested citizens ground was broken Sunday, April 26, 1959, for the Army's new Reserve Training Center at Bellefonte, Pa. It was my privilege to deliver the principal address, which follows:

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE GROUND-BREAKING CEREMONY FOR THE NEW ARMY RESERVE TRAINING CENTER, BELLEFONTE, PA., APRIL 26, 1959

It is an honor to have been invited to participate in these ceremonies.

The Reserve training facility which will be constructed at this location is one of thousands of similar installations throughout the country authorized by the Congress of the United States to provide our Reserve forces with the necessary physical facilities.

The Army Reserve training facility which will be constructed here will house the 430th Quartermaster Company, and the 1st platoon, A Company, 491st Engineer Battalion.

This armory, when completed, will cost nearly $300,000 and both of these combat support units will then be able to maintain their proficiency in the complicated art of modern warfare.

Speaking of our Reserve forces as a whole, they have not always been in the favorable position of having available adequate training facilities that the Bellefonte units will have available in the near future.

Frankly, prior to World War II and also for a period of 4 or 5 years after World War II, our Reserve forces were sadly neglected.

However, at that time the Congress recognizing the deplorable state of our Reserve forces enacted into law the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950.

The National Defense Facilities Act of 1950 enacted as Public Law 683, 81st Congress, initially authorized the appropriation of Federal funds in the amount of $250 million over a period of 5 consecutive fiscal years for the acquisition, construction, and expansion of facilities for the several Reserve components.

In 1955, Public Law 302 of the 84th Congress increased this basic authorization to $500 million and extended the time period during which this authorization remained in effect until 1958.

Subsequently, by succeeding legislation this general authorization was increased to $668 million.

Under the provisions of this basic law—which is the keystone upon which our Reserve facilities programs operate—Congress has indicated it would underwrite the construction of permanent training facilities throughout the country so as to insure the maintenance of an adequate Reserve program.

Under the provisions of this legislation armories are constructed which are 100 percent federally owned and authority is also given to contribute to the individual States for the construction of new National Guard facilities.

In the latter case, the Federal Government contributes 75 percent of the money required for the development of the Reserve facilities in conformance with Federal requirements.

At this point I would like to briefly review the actual status of this program.

ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

Upon enactment of the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950 the several States and Territories had in existance only 916 armories adequate to properly house federally recognized units, and these facilities were constructed without Federal assistance provided therein.

Subsequent to the enactment of the aforementioned legislation the Army National Guard has completed or placed under construction contract more than 1,000 armories with appropriate Federal contributions as I previously indicated.

U.S. ARMY RESERVE

There are, in the case of the U.S. Army Reserve over 1,810 U.S. Army Reserve centers in use including those constructed, leased, or donated.

However, only 458 of these leased and donated facilities are reported by Army commanders concerned to be adequate for continued longrange use.

Therefore, in the cast of the U.S. Army Reserve the Department of Defense with the permission of Congress has initiated a vigorous and accelerated program of construction designed to replace existing inadequate facilities.

Thus, during 1958 there were 112 new centers under construction and 80 additional centers were programed for fiscal year 1959 and 1960 thereby resulting in a total of more than 465 newly constructed facilities for the U.S. Army Reserve by the end of fiscal year 1961.

NAVAL RESERVE

At present, there are 300 Naval Reserve training centers, 19 Naval Reserve training facilities, 155 electronics facilities, and 9 electronic stations.

Of the 319 training centers and facilities, 74 percent are used jointly with one or more other Reserve components of the Armed Forces.

MARINE CORPS RESERVE

The Marine Corps Reserve occupies a total of 230 facilities.

Of the 230 training centers 156 are jointly occupied with the Naval Reserve, 2 jointly with the Army and Naval Reserve, and one with the Army Reserve.

The remaining 71 facilities consist of 48 federally owned training centers and 25 commercially leased.

AIR NATIONAL GUARD

The Air National Guard program is of comparatively recent origin.

However, during fiscal year 1958 funds in the amount of $22 million were utilized in the construction of facilities for the Air National Guard.

Under the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950, these projects are completely supported by Federal funds and require no State contribution.

At the present time there are 573 Air National Guard units in operation occupying a total of 134 Air Force National Guard bases.

Ninety-three of these bases are flying bases and the balance of 41 are nonflying bases.

AIR FORCE RESERVE

In the case of the Air Force Reserve 37 flying bases are now operational.

Twenty of these bases are jointly used with the Regular Air Force, nine bases are jointly used with the Air National Guard, three bases are jointly used in connection with the Navy, and only five bases are confined solely to Air Force Reserve operations.

In addition to the foregoing, there are 93 Air Reserves centers (nonflying) where tactical nonflying training is conducted.

COAST GUARD RESERVE

Due to its relatively small size, the Coast Guard utilizes training facilities of the other Armed Forces, primarily those of the Navy or existing facilities of Coast Guard operating units.

In a few instances, space is leased for drill sites from other Government agencies or commercial interest.

READINESS OF THE RESERVE

The assignment to the National Guard of concurrent responsibility with Regular Army forces for the manning of Nike batteries located throughout the United States is indicative of not only the state of readiness of various Reserve components but reveals the new mission of the Reserves in modern warfare.

Assignment of 24 more Army National Guard Nike batteries to the air defense of key U.S. cities will take place between June 30 and September 1, 1959.

These batteries, now in their final stages of training, represent elements of 14 National Guard air defense missile battalions in 7 States.

They will take over Nike-Ajax sites from the Active Army and will have full operational responsibility for manning these sites 24 hours a day.

In each battalion, one or more batteries will become active.

The designation of these National Guard units to man Nike batteries will bring to 28 the total number of Army National Guard batteries in the on-site missile program.

The overall program calls for the deployment of 33 battalions at 116 sites by June 30, 1962.

All 24 of the batteries scheduled to go on-site this summer have key personnel currently training at the Army air defense center at Fort Bliss, Tex.

The remaining members are actually training at Nike sites under the supervision of the Active Army.

Final transfer of the sites from the Active Army and deployment of the National Guard units will take place following 2 weeks of field training this summer.

National Guard missile sites are operated in much of the same way as a volunteer fire department.

A nucleus of full-time technicians man the equipment around the clock, keeping it in constant readiness and capable of initiating effective fire on the enemy without additional help.

The remaining members of the unit are citizen soldiers in their communities and keep up on their military skills by attending weekly drills with their units.

In the event of an air attack, they would report immediately to their Nike sites, ready to perform their assigned mission.

Similar to the utilization of the Army National Guard units in connection with the manning of Nike installations is the proposed plan of the Department of the Air Force which envisages utilization of Air National Guard units for the manning of Bomarc defense installations throughout the country.

Inasmuch as these Bomarc installations are still in the process of construction actual assignments of individual Air National Guard units have not occurred.

However, it is fully intended by the Department of the Air Force to utilize these Reserve forces in connection with the future development of this program.

In conclusion, as a member of the House Committee on Armed Services, which has legislative jurisdiction over the Reserves of our country, I wish to take this opportunity to commend the officers and men of Bellefonte's Army Reserve units and at the same time congratulate and thank the citizens of this area for the support they have always given our civilian soldiers, sailors, and airmen who in the final analysis are the bulwark of our Nation's defense.

Passover, 5719

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, now, as the solemn and joyous season of the Passover is observed by the Jewish people, it is appropriate for Americans to think over the relationship between our Nation and the nation of Israel, and the history of the Jewish minority group within our multifarious civilization. This is a time for making sure that our national policy toward Israel keeps to the generous and helpful direction set during the Truman Administration, so that the courageous new country, with its ancient traditions and its strong moral purpose, may form a center of both spiritual growth and material prosperity for the discouraged and impoverished region of the Middle East. As, with the Jewish people, we recall the Biblical tale of oppression in the land of Egypt, let

us work with the Jewish people to make sure that no such authoritarian rule, no Communist or other dictatorship, shall prevail in that region, and that no nation or race shall oppress another. We must do all that we can to open the channels of trade, of travel, of immigration and emigration. Political freedom is freedom in name only so long as it does not include freedom of trade and freedom of movement. Our American immigration laws should be liberalized and equalized so as to admit more refugees from eastern European nations, and particularly from Rumania, where the need is particularly pressing.

WE JOIN WITH THE CHILDREN OF ISRAEL IN PRAYER FOR PEACE

Within our own borders, and throughout the world, we should be ready to speak and act with firmness and vigor to eliminate discrimination, and to prevent violence against the Jews or any other minority groups. Surely all Christians, and men of good will of all faiths, can join wholeheartedly with the children of Israel in the prayer that forms the final benediction of the Passover Seder:

With songs of praise we have lifted up the cup, symbolizing the divine promises of salvation, and we have called upon the name of God. Let us again lift our soul to God in faith and hope. May He who broke Pharoah's yoke, forever shatter all fetters of oppression and hasten the day when swords shall at last be broken and wars ended. Soon may He cause the glad tidings of redemption to be heard in all lands, so that mankind—freed from violence and from wrong and united in an eternal confidence of brotherhood—may celebrate the universal Passover in the name of our God of freedom.

Continued Gains in Our Economy Predicted by President of B. F. Goodrich Tire & Rubber Co., of Akron, Ohio, in Speech to Marshall, Tex., Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, as a subscriber I receive the Marshall News Messenger, published at Marshall, Tex., in the congressional district that I have the honor to represent. In the April 22, 1959, issue I read a very interesting speech made by Mr. E. F. Tomlinson, president of the B. F. Goodrich Tire & Rubber Co., of Akron, Ohio, at the annual Marshall, Tex., Chamber of Commerce banquet the night before. The Marshall News Messenger referred to this speech as follows:

Highlight speaker of the 40th annual Marshall Chamber of Commerce banquet was E. F. Tomlinson, president of the B. F. Goodrich Tire & Rubber Co., of Akron, Ohio. Mr. Tomlinson's address was on the topics of business, growth and expansion—all things that mean a greater future for Marshall as a city.

In his speech he said:

I want to talk to you tonight about business. Business, growth and expansion—a subject that I know is of great interest to many of you men here tonight who are actively working to attract new businesses to your community.

The growth and prosperity of your community and the Nation are linked closely to the successes of business. Business, in turn, relies on an enlightened community, attitude and action, to maintain a climate favorable to a profitable business growth.

WHIPPING BOY

There are some political figures who consider it smart politics to use business as a whipping boy and unduly attack business. The capacity of such politicians for public disservice is very great.

Nothing is more important to the progress, prosperity, and security of your community and of our Nation than a mutually responsible and respectful relationship between those who conduct our public affairs and those who operate our private enterprise system.

We have the responsibility in our educational system to teach a better understanding of the profit system which has been the backbone of our business growth in this country.

The word profit is too often related to those moneys paid the stockholders—the capitalist. So many thousands of our people do not realize that from profits we pay taxes that run our Government, that provide us the social benefits that we enjoy, that provide the funds for the replacement of equipment in existing plants, that provide the moneys from which we build and expand into new plants—all of which create jobs. Without profits there could be no growth in our business system.

IMPORTANT TO ALL

What happens to business happens to everyone. If business is good the employment level is high, people have money to spend and they live a better life. When business is bad unemployment is high and people suffer. The interdependence of business and the employee are inseparable.

Young people coming into the labor market must have jobs. Older people leaving the labor market must have accumulated savings, investments, annuities, pensions or other means of living out the balance of their lives.

From 1957 through 1968 business will have to absorb 7½ million 18- to 24-year-old applicants. In this same period of time the family unit will increase by 500,000 per year and, of course, we must have an equal expansion in the labor market.

LARGELY IN GAINS

These new jobs will be found largely in products and services. We believe that the largest growth in the next 10 years could well be in the services field.

We believe there will be a shift of consumer's tastes. For instance, they will buy fewer numbers of automobiles—they will spend more money for recreation.

With the shorter workday and workweek and the increase in paid holidays and vacations, there is going to be more time for recreation. With the improvement in roads there is going to be more desire to see other parts of our country or, for that matter, the world. The want to go is going to substantially increase the amount of money spent in the field of recreation.

There will be a need for an increase in the level of education and this cost of education will be greater. The average family will be spending more money for education and less money for capital goods.

INFLATION TO GROW

We do not believe there is much question but what inflation will continue to grow at a rate of approximately 1½ to 2 percent each year.

The backlog of demand for existing goods are fairly well satisfied. In these areas the industries affected will have a growth rate approximately equal to the expansion of our national economy—which is estimated to be 3 to 4 percent per year.

Such a rate of growth obviously will not be sufficient to absorb the 7½ million new members of the labor force. It becomes quite apparent that our economy must expand or we must provide ways to accept higher unemployment levels.

There undoubtedly will be some of both. As a result, we can anticipate that the government will attempt to spend its way out of unemployment—which will create further inflation trends.

CHANGE NECESSARY

On the other hand, industry must look to change in order to obtain expansion.

This change will be dictated by consumer tastes. What the consumer wants will have to be furnished and his wants in the next 10 years will be different than they have been in the last 10 years.

As an illustration, in the past 20 years we have seen natural gas take over the fields formerly had by coal. But now we see coal making a comeback.

Coal priced itself out of contention. Now with the mechanization of mines, larger equipment for stripping and the increase in costs of distribution of gas it is possible for coal to come back and resume a substantial position in the industrial fuel field. As a result, natural gas will likely grow at about the rate of our national economy whereas coal will exceed this rate.

CONSTANT TUG

We see each year the results of the constant tug between costs and prices. As one product prices itself out of business another product takes over. In a few years that product goes through the same evolution and another product, or the old product, rehabilitates itself into the marketplace.

As transportation costs increase industry moves closer to its markets. As industry moves into new markets, new family units are created and all services of the community—including homes, water, heat, electrical and the many, many other requirements of community life—must be expanded in that community.

In this next 10 years we expect to see the large growth in the following industries:

"First—residential building. With the 500,000 annual increase in new family units and the very heavy attrition in old housing, the tendency to move to the urban areas is going to create a demand of over 1 million homes per year.

SALES CLIMB

Into these homes must go all of the utilities common to a modern home today. Increased sales in the refrigeration industry, for instance, will not be as a result of people purchasing refrigeration for existing homes but be purchased for new homes. The backlog of demand in the existing homes is fairly well filled so we will see the change from the conventional refrigeration to the built-in unit and from the removable kitchen stoves to the built-in type.

The second industry for the greatest potential growth is the boating industry. There is going to be more time for recreation—there are going to be longer holiday periods and more vacation time.

"Today time payment terms have been extended to boats—this paper is being handled by many banks much the same as automobile payment terms.

MORE AVAILABLE

The development of the outboard motor has taken the boat out of the luxury class and made it available to the multitude.

The third area of expenditures will be in the field of recreation, primarily in travel. Today it is possible to take world trips on a time payment basis—either accumulating the funds before the trip or taking the trip and paying for it after it is completed.

The airplane has cut down travel time, making it perfectly possible to spend a 2 weeks vacation in a foreign land.

A few years ago travel was considered a luxury that could be indulged in by a relatively few but the airplane has changed all this and the world has become immeasurably smaller.

NEW DRUGS

Our fourth selection for a growth market is in the field of drugs. A very large segment of our total population today are on one or another kind of a health program.

As a larger percentage of our population gets older and with the increasing numbers of young people the need for drugs will increase.

The records will show that the young and the old are the drug consumers and as these two extremes will be increasing in this next 10 years the drug industry will increase proportionately.

OTHER GAINS

The fifth area of expansion will be in business services.

Let's take a very commonplace example of the bank checking account. As new families are created more checking accounts will be opened. The clerical force used in a bank to handle commercial checking accounts is growing very large and very expensive. They will have to be replaced by mechanization.

This is not only true in the bank but it is true in all clerical areas. In so doing, new equipment will be needed and additional maintenance will be required. The clerks will be replaced by the mechanics. The need for greater skill becomes apparent.

This same thing is true in the field of automobiles. We feel confident that the average ownership of automobiles will increase. Instead of trading your late model car in 2 to 2½ years the tendency will be to run it for another year. As the cost of the automobile increases the need for a longer depreciation becomes apparent.

INCREASED NEED

At the same time, all of the services necessary to proper maintenance will be increased. In the automotive industry we will need more mechanics and fewer salesmen.

Our sixth area of growth we believe will be in the field of air transportation for reasons which we have stated earlier—primarily related to recreation. The future of the overnight passenger train is very limited.

The seventh area of growth is in electrical energy. As we mechanize our plants and build new ones and as we build new more modern homes and equip them with all our modern appliances—television sets, and so forth—the amount of electrical energy needed will increase very rapidly.

NEW FIELD

The eighth area of growth is in the field of electronics which have opened up whole new avenues of the control of equipment—machinery as well as missiles and communications.

We believe the big growth in electronics will be primarily in the military field. The conventional manned military airplane as a combat vehicle is rapidly coming to the end of its effectiveness.

Our present weapons systems are not adequate for our future defense and fantastic and radical changes are coming rapidly.

ONE-TRIP ITEMS

As we gain proficiency in the use of our new defense mechanisms and as we practice the art of war, there will be millions of dollars of electronic equipment used up completely as much of it is only designed for one trip.

Our ninth growth area is in the field of aluminum where we in the United States are far ahead of Europe.

This metal is domestically available. The cost is being rapidly decreased and the differences in cost that have existed between aluminum and other metals are fast disappearing.

We will see a very large increase in the use of aluminum in the automobile. For that matter, in all fields of transportation. The effort will be made to get the weight of carrier down in order to improve the revenue load which returns the income on the investment.

In these growth businesses are the new products that will have to be supplied, the new jobs that must be created and may well represents opportunities for Marshall, Tex.

What does new industry look for in a community? What effect does a new industry have on a community? What does industry need after it is located in a community?

MANY FACTORS

The answers to these questions are a real big subject in themselves. We can touch on only a few of them tonight.

Many industries today look very favorably on the smaller communities—in the semirural setting rather than in or near a large city.

A principal reason behind this interest is the stability of the labor market in the smaller communities.

But a responsible manufacturer must also appraise the adequacy of the labor force to his needs so that he does not dominate the local market and assume too great a responsibility for employment in any given community.

Industry will look at your public school system and what churches are represented. Are there vocational schools that might enter into mutual training programs with the industry? Does the community have a definite plan for attracting new industry which will fit the community's needs. Is the community a pleasing place in which to live and work and raise a family? What are the available transportation facilities?

TAXES OVEREMPHASIZED

Many communities overemphasize low taxes or no taxes at all, low rent, free insurance, free land and even free buildings.

"Many large companies look upon these concessions as artificial concessions and they feel that they may be offered at the expense of other companies already located in the community.

In providing them it may result in poor service from the community and at some future date may lead to higher tax rates for them to pay.

Industry is not looking for concessions. They are looking for favorable working conditions—where employees want to live, where fair wages and a fair day's work aré synonymous.

EFFECT GREAT

What effect does new industry have on a community? Most people think of a new industry in their community in terms of economic benefits. A company moving into a new community makes a substantial capital investment.

The company builds or buys a plant and stocks it with production machinery. The community supplies the talent and the manpower to staff the plant and operate the machinery. It is an arrangement of mutual benefit.

The company brings new capital into the community. It pays taxes, it gives jobs and pay-checks, and it buys materials and services directly from local merchants. It causes economic expansion of many other facets of the community life—such as banks, retail sales, residences, telephones, and all other services.

The majority of forward looking, progressive industries recognize their community responsibilities and support the various social agencies—the YMCA, the YWCA, and hospitals—or any project in the community that is in the public interest and is not related to race or to religion.

MUST BE CITIZEN

Industry must be a good citizen and it must support all of the community interests that are in the interests of the community.

New industry means new schools and roads, hospitals, better fire protection and more public services.

New industry in a community means that the young people—especially the young men—will find employment and careers at home instead of leaving and migrating as strangers to other parts of the country.

Now what does industry need after it is located in a community?

Well in general it wants about 3 things:

First, it wants fair treatment—the right to run its business in a businesslike way. It wants the same consideration and the same protection as that you give to any other taxpayer—no more, no less.,

NO PENALTIES

It wants no privileges. It wants no penalties.

The second thing that is important to a new industry in a new community is that it wants to be accepted as a citizen of the community and not looked upon as an outsider.

The third thing that industry wants is understanding by the community of its operating problems and its responsibilities of what it must do in the community to run a successful operation.

The community must realize that the management of a manufacturing plant must organize and use efficiently the company's human resources—the people who will be employed.

Management must train men who can move up into the managerial positions of the company and management must manufacture a product which will sell competitively in the market place and return a profit. If management is not permitted these prerogatives it cannot organize its effort and pay its own way. If it does not pay its own way it will not survive.

Today you read many pathetic stories of industries leaving communities, of the unemployment problems that are left behind and of the numbers of people who have worked for many years for the company who are now closing their doors.

These industries are often accused of having no heart but, generally speaking, the results of these moves have been the results of community lack of understanding of the problems of the business and the failure to cooperate and correct the problems in time to save the business.

MUST BE COMPETITIVE

A new plant located in any community must compete with similar plants in other communities. Competition is not merely between companies but also between communities.

It is extremely important that the business leaders and the people of a community understand the problems that a business may have and take an active interest to see to it that their community and their businesses do not become noncompetitive.

Management, labor, the citizens of the community and government must recognize that what happens to business happens to everyone.

Statement by Mrs. Virginia M. Gray Before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, by Mrs. Virginia M. Gray, executive secretary of the Citizens Committee for UNICEF, on April 27, 1959:

STATEMENT OF MRS. VIRGINIA M. GRAY ON BEHALF OF THE AUTHORIZATION FOR THE APPROPRIATION FOR THE UNITED NATIONS CHILDREN'S FUND

The Citizens Committee for UNICEF, an informal clearing house of legislative information serving a number of national organizations which support continued U.S. participation in the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), has been authorized by the following such organizations to present this joint statement:

American Association of University Women, American Parents Committee, Inc., American Veterans Committee, Association for Childhood Education International, Cooperative League of the U.S.A., Friends Committee on National Legislation, General Alliance of Unitarian and other Liberal Christian Women, Jewish War Veterans of U.S.A., Methodist Church-Woman's Division of Christian Service of the Board of Missions, National Association of Colored Women's Clubs, Inc., National Association of Social Workers, Inc., National Board of Young Women's Christian Association, National Council of Jewish Women, United Church Women, and Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.

These organizations support enthusiastically the request of the Executive Branch for a U.S. contribution of $12 million to UNICEF in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960. Many of our organizations have supported the work of the children's fund since its beginning. Others have become interested more recently as knowledge of the accomplishments of UNICEF has spread and recognition of its enduring benefits to children has likewise grown.

We believe that a U.S. contribution of $12 million is a modest request both in relation to the resources of the United States and in terms of the enormous needs of children in the underdeveloped areas of the world.

SIZE OF CONTRIBUTION

In case a doubt exists as to the financial ability of the United States to contribute this amount, it is important to point out that, while the United States has been the largest single contributor to the children's fund to date, it ranks only 27th among the donor nations for 1958 when its gift is correlated with our gross national product.[1] In other words, 26 other countries, led by Costa Rica, Iran, and Honduras in that order, contribute to UNICEF an amount that is a higher percentage of their gross national product. Or, on the basis of population our gift of around 6 cents per capita could not, in any sense, be considered excessively generous.

In this connection attention should be called to the steady financial growth of UNICEF's resources to meet the needs of the underprivileged children, a growth measured both by the increase in the number of governments contributing to the central account, which rose from 30 in 1950 to 80 in 1957 and to 87 in 1958, and in the absolute amount of money so contributed by central governments. In 1957, 80 governments gave $17.9 million; in 1958, 87 governments gave $19.9 million. One half of this increase represented gifts by governments other than the United States and the other half was an increase by the United States. The 1959 pledge of the United States remained the same as its 1958 contribution: $11 million.

When one realizes that this growth in voluntary contributions to the central account of UNICEF has taken place at the same time that many donor countries are financing other urgently needed projects of economic development that compete for their limited financial resources, and in addition, that many of these same governments are struggling to provide the necessary internal matching funds for meeting their own children's needs, the conclusion is clear that their is almost universal agreement on the merits of this work for children and on the high priority that governments attach to it. At this point a word should be added regarding the dramatic increase in the internal matching by the assisted governments. From the beginning of UNICEF's operations, every government seeking UNICEF aid has been required to contribute from its own resources (in goods and services) an amount equal to the funds given by UNICEF. At the March 1959 executive board meeting allocations of funds amounted to slightly over $10 million. The corresponding commitments of recipient governments totaled $31.9 million, thus matching at a rate of more than 3 to 1 the international funds received.

Now, however, the fact should not be overlooked that the number of governments contributing to the central account has about reached its maximum. Little further increase can be expected therefore from any untapped sources of support. Steady but not spectacular increases may be anticipated from the regular contributing governments but, in the year ahead, these could not offset any loss to UNICEF should, for any reason, the full amount of the recommended $12 million contribution not be received from the United States.

NEEDS OF CHILDREN

To turn now to the story of the enormous needs of the world's children, we find that UNICEF is currently assisting 328 projects in 105 countries and territories. The Executive Director reported to the UNICEF Board last month (March 1959) that over 50 million children and expectant and nursing mothers benefited in 1958 from the principal large-scale disease control campaigns and maternal and child feeding programs. These were direct beneficiaries; the number of children indirectly aided, for example, through the availability of safe milk bought from a pasteurizing plant that received help from UNICEF cannot be counted. A study of the 105 countries now receiving UNICEF aid shows that these areas fall almost entirely within the category defined by the Population Branch of the U.N. as technologically underdeveloped areas. The child population (up to 15 years of age) of this area is approximately 550 million. Of course, no one would even hope to reach all of these children with aid in any form, but such statistics can give a rough idea of the magnitude of the need. When to this is added the increasing child population of the countries assisted by UNICEF—an increase estimated at the rate of approximately 2½ percent a year due primarily to a reduction in infant mortality rather than to an actual increase in the number of births—the fact becomes vividly clear that there is, indeed, "need to run faster just to stand still." Furthermore, the needs of these increasing numbers of children come on top of the present programs directed toward improving the level of services to children.

Sheer numbers of children doomed to starvation or to a life of hopeless poverty, chronic illness, and ignorance is not the whole story, however. UNICEF, while sensitive to these almost limitless opportunities for assistance, is not attempting to increase direct aid on such a mass scale. Rather there is a major effort to improve the quality of the programs which recipient countries are carrying forward, and to concentrate on the type of project that will use the limited resources available for aid most efficiently and thus to promote basic permanent gains for the greatest number of children. Thus programs of aid are determined not only by the existing need but, also, by the ability of the country itself to carry forward its own assistance beyond the limited period of UNICEF aid. A fundamental requisite is the availability of local people who can be trained to carry forward the immediate gains over the long run in an ever-widening area of effectiveness.

There is an awareness also of the interrelationship of the problems of hunger, disease, ignorance and poverty; of the fact that the temporary cure of illness is not enough unless the dangers of reinfection are also removed; that education in basic principles of personal and environmental sanitation is essential; in short, that an an ounce of prevention is from every point of view better than the necessity for more expensive cure. Thus we have the continued battles against the major scourges of yaws, malaria, tuberculosis, and leprosy, and an expanding work against the ravages of trachoma. While these basic programs are making progress, the community development movement expands the usefulness of maternal and child health clinics by demonstrating to the beneficiaries of aid how they can best help themselves toward the goals of a healthful life and a useful place as citizens in their country. In these ways UNICEF is laying foundations for programs of economic development upon which sound future growth and political stability of many areas will depend.

These then are some of the broad needs of the world's children and a glimpse of the way UNICEF is mobilizing a relatively small budget to accomplish a very large measure of permanent betterment for the future citizens of the world. Our organizations believe firmly in the soundness of procedure and the value of the results already obtained by UNICEF. We hope that the United States will continue to afford an unwavering example of leadership by supporting this work with every cent of the $12 million recommended for the year ahead.

[1] Figures for GNP in 1955 taken from "The Role of Foreign Aid in the Development of Other Countries," a study prepared for the U.S. Senate Special Committee To Study the Foreign Aid Program, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington: 1957, p. 81.

Individual Liberties, National Security, and the Courts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include in the Appendix remarks

that I made on the subject of the Supreme Court, individual liberties, and national security in a panel discussion conducted by the National Civil Liberties Clearing House in Washington a few days ago. I include these remarks in the RECORD because this subject currently is of such great importance and may come before the House shortly in the form of one or more bills designed to overcome certain decisions of the Court:

Today our attention is properly focused on the Supreme Court, which necessarily has been required to find a fulcrum between the forces seeking to broaden and tighten the circumference of our national security and those seeking perfection in the safeguarding of our individual liberties. It is the judicial branch, rather than the executive or legislative branches, that has been required for one reason or another, to assume the risks of decision in this field, and consequently has drawn the fire. If the lightning rod thus proffered by the judiciary has drawn the heat, the legislature and executive correspondingly have been spared. As a legislator I should be grateful for small favors. But I would be foolish if I didn't recognize that we are all part of this show, and will continue to be, and that responsibility for its proper performance must necessarily be shared by all of us.

I rather suspect it is a dangerous state of mind to become overly persuaded as to the cyclical nature of controversy over the Supreme Court. Like diseases of the body or intellect it will not do to adopt an "it will pass" attitude. If I am persuaded about anything it is that basic liberties do not maintain themselves and must continually be fought for. The mere fact that the Bill of Rights is pedestaled and permanently enshrined in the Archives Building insures us absolutely nothing. I fear that when one or more of our basic rights are destroyed they will not be felled like a giant tree under the woodman's ax, but will be whittled away, chip by chip, with no instrument more ominous looking than a pen knife.

It doesn't seem to do much good, however, to point out to those who view with despair and alarm certain decisions of the Supreme Court that the Court does not go about blithely creating constitutional dilemmas for itself; that the Court did not give the Negro darker skin than Caucasians; and that it did not plant in the minds of the Soviet dictatorship a thirst for world domination. And to those who seem to be guided by passion rather than reason it seems only to feed the flames of impassioned overstatement to point out that the Court must cut new paths in the course of resolving deep social and political clashes. These are clashes which are themselves made inevitable by the inexorable passage of time and the movement of history. And just as inevitably those paths lead across political soil. But if this be trespass, then time has stopped and the human situation remains frozen and unchanged.

Today the search for individual and collective security reaches such monstrous proportions that the preservation of the status quo has become a national craving. Material well-being, the sheltered life, and conformity blank out everything else. We assume that we will live forever and that what was good for us is necessarily good for our children and our grandchildren.

I do not mean to say here that in seeking new adjustments, in keeping with a changing world, the courts, or this Supreme Court, are infallible. Far from it. Their decisions and their methods of arriving at decisions are often quite properly subject to strong criticism, as often are the decisions and methods of the legislature and the executive. But there is need here for restraint. Being a legislator I of course reserve the right to be foolish. Being also human, I reserve the right to be nettled when the Court points out the error of my ways. But I can express my disagreement publicly—a prerogative that is not directly available to the courts. This is a distinction which legislators will do well to remember, along with the realization that the function of a judge is quite different from that of a legislator or administrator.

To the legislator, I suppose that Justice Holmes ought to be the ideal Justice. Alpheus Mason puts it this way, bringing in a rather well-known remark of Holmes: "Having himself no infallible measure of right or wrong, he (Holmes) upheld the programs and policies of legislators even though he considered them in error or foolish. As he himself said, 'I am so skeptical as to our knowledge about the goodness and badness of laws that I have no practical criterion except what the crowd wants. Personally I bet that the crowd if it knew more wouldn't want what it does—but that is immaterial.' Holmes was asked by a friend one day if he had ever worked out any general philosophy to guide him in the exercise of the judicial function, 'Yes,' the aged jurist replied. 'Long ago I decided that I was not God. When a State came in here and wanted to build a slaughterhouse, I looked at the Constitution and if I couldn't find anything in there that said a State couldn't build a slaughterhouse I said to myself, if they want to build a slaughterhouse dammit, let them build it.'" This would indicate a degree of judicial restraint that legislators would find admirable. But, I submit, it is a restraint which exists today in the Court far more than is generally recognized. And Holmes, like the present Court, was progressive in his interpretation of the Constitution and laws when the individual and personal liberties of human beings were at stake.

The briefest examination of previous uproars over the Supreme Court lends proof to the thesis "that time has upset many fighting faiths"; that much more is at stake in the present-day consternation about the Court than the reconsideration of a few decisions.

It is worth remembering, for example, that the political temperature surrounding the Supreme Court at the time *Marbury* v. *Madison* was such that the new President, Jefferson, had refused to permit the Secretary of State to appear in the proceedings, and that the new Congress had not only repealed the Judiciary Act of 1801, defying Marshall and the Court, but even went so far as to legislate out of existence all terms for the Supreme Court scheduled for 1802. This step alone constituted one of the severest setbacks the Court has ever suffered. And then after Marshall had the audacity to hand down his opinion, now universally hailed, public statements condemning the Court came crowding in from every direction. The following excerpt from a contemporary letter to an editor is a mild example:

"Is it right, sir, that an extrajudicial opinion should be given * * * in any case? Is your tribunal organized to exhaust its time in dissertation on ordinary subjects of political speculation? To decide upon the merits of any cause without jurisdiction to entertain it (is) contrary to all law, precedent, and principle."

Some time later, after *McCulloch* v. *Maryland*, the South and the West lashed out at the Court for failing to strike down an act of Congress, much in the same tone that these sections had assailed the Court after *Marbury* v. *Madison* for having claimed the power to do so. As a matter of fact, Ohio refused to accept the McCulloch decision and forcibly seized money from the Ohio branch of the U.S. bank to cover the State taxes which the Supreme Court had flatly declared unconstitutional. Federal marshals had to unscramble that one.

No one here has to be educated about the attacks against the Court from the North after Taney's opinion in the Dred Scott case. The North's own Atlantic Monthly in protest wrote "* * * The most sacred and binding compacts of former years were annulled to make way for it; and the judicial department of the Government was violently hauled from its sacred retreat, into the political arena, to give a gratuitous coup-de-grace to the old opinions and the apparent sanction of law to the new dogma." And in a later issue: "Whatever the * * * Judges of the Supreme Court may seek to maintain, they cannot upset the universal logic of the law, nor extinguish the fundamental principles of our political system." Denunciations of this sort were immediately followed by plans and proposals to clip the Court's wings. There were few who foresaw that it would take a civil war to reverse Dred Scott. An error, no matter how basic, is not cured by abolishing or crippling the constitutional institution from whence it came.

The current consternation over some of the recent decisions of the Supreme Court in the area of national security is possibly small stuff compared to some of these more ancient battles that the Court has survived. But danger signs are nevertheless clearly present, particularly in the form of proposed legislation once again designed to curtail the jurisdiction of the Court.

History, commonsense, instinct, and a small knowledge of the fallibility of systems, programs and organizations all tell me that Watkins, Nelson, Cole, Kent, and Dayton are sound decisions and that the Court has properly exercised its legitimate powers in deciding them as it did. It misses the point to argue that these decisions and opinions give aid and comfort to those who would undo us. The function of the Court is not to oppose those who would overthrow us; it is to apply constitutional and legal principles to specific cases. It is even more absurd to attack the Court because of these decisions on the ground that the Court has overreached its powers. Even if one were tempted to call these decisions political moralizing they can hardly be said to break new frontiers—they only bring us back to a level of sanity below which this country had descended for a period of time, caught up as it was in a frenzy of fear out of all proportion to the facts. "Such fears as these," Learned Hand tell us, "are a solvent which can eat out the cement that binds the stones together."

May I comment briefly on one specific area, which is again before the Supreme Court in another context, and therefore I approach it with restraint. This is the question of the use of confidential information in the administrative process. A few weeks ago, in discussing the problem of passport legislation I summed up what I conceive to be the danger here as follows:

"The authority to use confidential information in the administrative process, under imprecise standards, coupled with the power to delegate the authority to subordinates, can result in a breeding ground of arbitrariness in the course of which innocent people may suffer."

Most people might generally agree with this statement as a matter of principle. But then the "for"—"buts"—and "ands" commence and we are back where we started. The high-wire balancing act performed by those who press for the preservation of the device is interesting. The most current argument is that it is universally used in other democratic countries in dealing with the question of passports and other aspects of national security. On reflection, I find this relevant but hardly material. Not long ago this country was regarded as the cradle of a new liberty and we thought it important to set up a structure which would safeguard our liberties from the arbitrariness of the

sovereign. That structure imposed standards which I like to think are just a bit higher, go a bit further, in protecting the individual from the possibility of arbitrary or capricious acts.

On a more practical note, it is interesting to look back on the action taken by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization following the decision of the Supreme Court in *Jay* v. *Boyd*. That happened to be a case argued by me for the Government and by our friend Will Maslow as amicus curiae for the petitioner. In a 5 to 4 decision the Court sustained the use of confidential information in connection with the Attorney General's discretionary power to suspend deportation, under certain circumstances, of aliens otherwise deportable. The funny thing was that after the hullabaloo was all over the Commissioner of Immigration, a man of courage and fair instincts, met the still lingering problem head on and took steps to abolish, for all practical purposes, the use of the device in this area. A recent check with the Commissioner's office reveals that no case presently exists in which resort to the use of such information was found necessary to a decision. My point is that not only may the damage that can be done to individual liberties under such procedures be all out of proportion to the needs of the security that we seek to safeguard, but the corollary is also true, namely, that the advances we make in the safeguarding of individual liberties, however small, do much to strengthen the foundation of our liberties and, often to our surprise, do not result in any shocking impairment of our safety and security.

There will always be disagreement with the work of the Supreme Court. The Court does not labor in a vacuum. We may support the Court's conclusions, or we may oppose them. We are of course secure in our right to approve decisions of the Court only insofar as others are secure in their right to criticize them. But there is a difference between criticism and ignoble attack. The Supreme Court is a naked institution. The Constitution has provided it with no means of enforcing its decisions; its effectiveness as an institution and as a constituent element of our system of government rests entirely upon the voluntary acceptance of its decrees by other elements of government and by the people. Disagreement with the Court's decrees will not enfeeble its institutional strength. But disagreement coupled with broadside attacks upon the institution itself or upon the character or purpose of the justices will surely erode the institution at its base.

We, who by reason of training or office are in positions of public responsibility, have a duty to expose the destructiveness of any attempt to weaken the Judiciary as an institution. Particularly in times of stress we cannot risk the loosening of our strongest bulwark against any enemy, namely our Constitution and the fundamental liberties embodied in it. Without a strong and independent Judiciary the weakening of both our individual liberties and our national security will surely result.

Southern Regional Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter from Mr. Charles J. Lewin, editor and general manager, the Standard-Times, New Bedford, Mass.:

THE STANDARD-TIMES,
New Bedford, Mass., April 1, 1959.

Congressman JOHN BELL WILLIAMS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WILLIAMS: On March 2, 1959, an editorial which had been published in the Richmond Times-Dispatch was introduced into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A1647.

The Times-Dispatch editorial challenged the accuracy of certain statements in a 1958 series of articles written by Mr. Edward B. Simmons of the New Bedford Standard-Times and republished in the Times-Dispatch.

We would appreciate it if you would publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this substantiation of the accuracy of the statements made in the Standard-Times articles.

The Times-Dispatch described as inaccurate a statement that the Southern Regional Council was an "offshoot" of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare. It also challenged the accuracy of the statement that "the Communist Daily Worker openly boasted that James E. Jackson, chief of the southern branch of the Communist Party, was a cofounder of the regional council."

These statements in the Standard-Times articles were in no way inaccurate.

Papers of incorporation of the regional council and the latest listing of officers and directors of the organization (April 1957 listing was latest at time articles were written) show the following:

"Three of the five persons listed as incorporators of the Southern Regional Council had been active in the Southern Conference for Human Welfare. One had been a member of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare's executive board, and a second incorporator was a member of its southern council.

Three top officers of the Southern Regional Council, as of April 1957, had been affiliated with the Southern Conference for Human Welfare: the president, a vice president, and the chairman of the executive committee.

Fourteen members of the Southern Regional Council's board of directors, as listed in April 1957, had been affiliated with the Southern Conference for Human Welfare.

Thirteen members of the Southern Regional Council's board of directors, as listed in April 1957, were or are affiliated with the Southern Conference Educational Fund. This latter organization was identified by the U.S. Senate Internal Security Subcommittee as "operating with substantially the same leadership and purposes as its predecessor, the Southern Conference for Human Welfare."

Twelve former directors of the Southern Regional Council had been affiliated with the Southern Conference for Human Welfare.

In summary, then, three incorporators of record, three of the top officers and a total of 39 interlocking directorships link the Southern Regional Council with the Southern Conference for Human Welfare and its lineal descendant, the Southern Conference Educational Fund.

As to the statement about James E. Jackson, the Communist Daily Worker of December 1, 1954, stated on page 6, that Jackson "participated in the formation and building of * * * the Southern Regional Council and many other movements which in any important way challenged the status quo of Negro oppression and southern social backwardness."

The Times-Dispatch editorial conceded that "a James E. Jackson" attended the meeting of "leaders" that led to formation of the Southern Regional Council. Both James E. Jacksons are one and the same.

We would emphasize that the purpose of the Standard-Times articles was not to expose a particular individual or organization. However, we feel that the cause of racial harmony and justice is best served when the qualifications and background of all who are active in racial matters are open to public inspection.

If it is desired, we can substantiate all of the above information by photostated documentation.

Yours sincerely,

CHARLES J. LEWIN,
Editor and General Manager.

Soviet Publications in Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 16, 1959

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include an article by Mitsuru Uchida that I recommend to the reading of my colleagues who may not have been alerted to the intense campaign the Soviet is making to capture the minds of the younger generation in Japan by the printed word.

Recently I spoke at length on the classics of democracy program, which is meeting the Soivet challenge by translating into many languages. The classics of democracy that inspired our forefathers and making them available in inexpensive editions. I have spoken also in support of the information media program that enables American publishers to distribute American books in foreign countries by furnishing a means of converting local currencies into American dollars.

Nothing could more convincingly picture the necessity of these programs than Mr. Uchida's factual presentment of what the Soviet is doing in his native Japan. Mr. Uchida has a master's degree from Waseda University in Japan. He is preparing for his doctor's degree, and is now in the United States as a congressional intern in the program sponsored by the American Political Service Association. Up to the Easter recess he was a member of my congressional staff, I might add a most valuable member, who did the little chores and performed the important assignments with equal willingness and grace. He is serving the remainder of his congressional internship in the other body. His article follows:

COMMUNIST PUBLICATION ACTIVITIES IN JAPAN

(By Mitsuru Uchida)

Before the end of the war, Communist activities were strictly outlawed in Japan. In those days, therefore, its propaganda activities were carried out inevitably in a clandestine, underground fashion, mostly through the printed word. Communist and leftist books, magazines, pamphlets, etc., were then surreptitiously distributed by secret party members and sympathizers.

It was partly due to the high rate of literacy among the Japanese people that the Communist Party could rely so much upon these kinds of communication channels for its propaganda. But it was also due to the fact that the party, under such difficult con-

ditions, had almost no other means to appeal to the public and that the Communist influences were restricted at that time within a small portion of the intelligentsia, students, and workers with rather high education.

After the war, however, the Japanese people really experienced a revolutionary change in the political atmosphere. The Communist Party came out in the sun and was publicly recognized as a political party for the first time in its history. Today, publications of leftist or Communist origin reach readers quite openly through the facilities of a modern and highly sophisticated publication and distribution network.

Under the circumstances, the Japanese Communist Party (JCP) and its front groups regularly publish their own newspapers and magazines. The daily party newspaper, Akhata (Red Flag), is estimated to have a circulation of 59,000 copies. The monthly magazine Zen'ei (Vanguard) has a circulation of 30,000 copies. Among the readers of these publications, one can find not only members of the party, but also some rather independent citizens who want to know the Communist view concerning various issues.

In addition to these nationally distributed publications, some 460 publications are turned out by local JCP organizations. These range from newspapers and magazines, tracing their lineage back to prewar clandestine sheets, to workshop throwaways published in only a few successive issues before either dying or being replaced by new publications. Be that as it may, these local publications undoubtedly play a role in linking the leaders of the party with its supporters at the grass roots.

The JCP has its own printing plant in Tokyo. The Akatsuki Insatsu Kabushiki Kaisha (Akatsuki Printing Co.) is its name. Needless to say, many of the central party newspapers, magazines, leaflets, and other propaganda literature are turned out by this plant. Party publications are also produced by other publishers such as the JCP publishing front, Shin Nippon Shuppan Sha (New Japan Publishing Co.).

The JCP is not the sole figures in the leftist or Communist publication program. Some private publishing companies produce a number of leftist books and magazines. The Mokuyo Kai (Thursday Society) is known as a group of these democratic publishers. This organization, which was set up in 1952, has a core membership of some 15 publishers and it boasted of some 1,670 items in print as of March 1957.

With these publishers, two translations societies have a quite intimate relationship. One is the Nisso Honyaku Shuppan Konwa Kai (Japan-Soviet translating and advisory group), and the other is the Nitchu Honyaku Shuppan Konwa Kai (Japan-China translating and publishing advisory group). In cooperation with the Mokuyo Kai publishers, these groups translate and distribute Russian and Chinese works. Thus, the Nisso Honyaku Shuppan Konwa Kai reported in 1956 that it had translated and distributed 170 titles in 934,000 copies in that year alone.

It must be noted, moreover, that all of the Communist publications are not produced internally. Great quantities are imported directly from Communist China and from the Soviet Union. The Foreign Languages Publishing House of Moscow and the People's Publishing House in Peking are the primary suppliers. While statistical data on the numbers of titles and copies or the yen value are not available, an official Japanese Government publication in October 1957, estimated that the annual total imports of Communist bloc publications, including magazines and newspapers, was 1.5 million items from Communist China and about 3 million items fro mthe Soviet Union. A fair share of the imports from the Soviet Union are technical works and are in the original Russian.

In this way, a considerable number of Communist publications from foreign countries are spread among the Japanese people, especially among the students. The primary reason for it is that books of this kind are unusually cheap and inviting. For instance, as a state controlled enterprise, the Foreign Languages Publishing House of Moscow does not have to be concerned with the need for profit. This fact in itself obliterates many obstacles to the export of books through normal commercial channels.

The existence of loyal, disciplined and energetic party organizations presents a second favorable stituation for the importation and distribution of Soviet and Communist bloc publications into Japan. In most cases, these publications are imported free of charge and any revenues earned allegedly go into the local party treasury. This technique has been recognized as an important means of raising funds for the support of Communist parties and front organizations throughout Asia including Japan.

Generally speaking, American books are far more popular among the people of Japan. Of late, at least two series of American novels and poems have been published in Japanese and both have been well received. The names of American authors such as William Faulkner, Ernest Hemingway, and John Steinbeck are quite familiar in Japan—particularly to the younger generations. Some books in the fields of social sciences and the natural sciences are likewise translated into Japanese. In spite of this, the Japanese students cannot get all the American books they want in Japanese editions.

The American books in their original English language, however, are too expensive for them. Books by Profs. Robert M. MacIver and Paul A. Samuelson, for example, are greatly desired by the Japanese students. But, regrettably, very few students can afford to buy even a single copy of such books. As you know, these books cost from $5 to $10. You can easily see how discouraging these prices are to students in Japan when you remember that a graduate gets some $30 a month just after he has left his college. The average price of Japanese books is less than 300 yen ($1 is equivalent to 360 yen), and among the students there, books which cost them less than 100 yen must be the most popular.

Recently, to the great joy of the Japanese students, cheap editions of American classics have been published in Japan. Thomas Paine's "Commonsense," Benjamin Franklin's "Autobiography," and Herbert Schneider's "History of American Philosophy" are now within the easy reach of students, costing them only 10 or 15 cents. Unfortunately, it is not enough. Too few contemporary works are included in this series. The Japanese students are anxiously waiting for more of the low-priced editions of good contemporary works in all fields.

Pontifical Mass in Honor of Most Rev. John W. Comber, M.M.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, one of America's most beautiful churches, St. Mary's, is located in Lawrence, Mass.

April 11, 1959, was homecoming day for a famous ecclesiastic who once served as altar boy at St. Mary's, and there received the inspiration which revealed to him his true vocation.

A pontifical Mass, attended by many church dignitaries, prominent laymen, and a crowded congregation of the faithful, was celebrated in honor of Most Rev. John W. Comber, M.M., who was recently elevated to the office of bishop in the missionary order where he first took his priestly vows.

The sermon on this impressive occasion was delivered by the pastor of St. Mary's the Very Reverend Edward J. Carney, O.S.A.

Father Carney is tall and broad-shouldered. When he ascends the pulpit to speak, his platform presence, his winning personality, and his eloquent sincerity, hold his listeners spellbound.

He is known as the veterans padre.

As a naval chaplain in the South Pacific during World War II, he brought spiritual strength to thousands of our fighting men.

After the war, he continued his interest in their welfare. He became a dynamic member of Lawrence Post No. 15, of the American Legion. Blessed with an abundance of energy and an outgoing heart for the problems of veterans and their families, his good work in their behalf attracted national attention. The Legion recognized and honored his leadership qualities by electing him to the position of National Chaplain where his achievements established a high standard that will be difficult to surpass.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I bring you Father Carney's moving and memorable sermon that graced the pontifical Mass for Bishop Comber:

FIRST SOLEMN PONTIFICAL MASS, MOST REV. JOHN W. COMBER, M.M., ST. MARY'S CHURCH, LAWRENCE, MASS., APRIL 11, 1959

In the 6th verse of the 62d chapter of the Book of Isaiah we read: "Upon thy walls, O Jerusalem, I have appointed watchmen all the day and all the night." In the 19th verse, and the 28th chapter of the Holy Gospel according to St. Matthew we read: "Going, therefore, teach you all nations, baptizing them, in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost."

Your Excellency Bishop Comber, Your Excellency Bishop Lane, Rt. Rev. and Very Rev. Monsignori, very reverend and reverend fathers, reverend brothers and sisters—dearly beloved in Christ:

In the history of every nation, state, city or parish, there is always some one achievement, some special event or anniversary that is treasured by the people in loving and lasting remembrance. Even so in the life of the individual, there is a certain day or a particular event, around which will ever linger the holiest, the happiest and the sweetest of memories.

Seldom, perhaps, does this fact come home to us so forcibly as on occasions like the present when we are assembled amid hallowed associations around the altar of God, to participate in the joy of a triumph whose meaning and inspiration are more easily felt than described.

Today we are privileged to attend a first solemn pontifical mass and to observe its great solemnity. Everything about the altar and the sanctuary imports joy and gladness, and involuntarily the words of Mother Church spring to our lips: "This is the day

which the Lord hath made; let us be glad and rejoice therein."

A stranger present at this solemn and beautiful pontifical ceremony might conclude that we are here to honor the genius of some great statesman or scientist, or to praise the hero of some gory battlefield or to listen to the latest preacher of some new brand of manmade religion.

But it is not any of these. This inspiring ceremony is just one more witness to the divinity of Jesus Christ and the perpetuity of our heritage—the Catholic faith. It plainly demonstrates that He does not change—"Christ yesterday and today and the same forever." Hebrew xiii: 8. This is ample proof that the divine charm of His personality over the minds and hearts of men has not waned. His invitation extended to the fishermen of Galilee—the first priests and bishops of more than 1900 years ago—"Come, follow Me," is still heard and answered—has been heard and answered by one whom we honor today; for within the sanctuary, upon the altar steps, the episcopal robes upon him, the chalice in his consecrated hands—we look upon one of God's anointed and consecrated ones whom He has chosen from your midst to labour in His vineyard, to spend and be spent in His service—another watchman upon the walls of the new and more glorious Jerusalem the Catholic Church.

Look upon him then, this anointed one, this Levite, this other Christ—Look upon him with pride and joy, exultation and thanksgiving, for he is yours, who only a few yesterdays ago was a boy of your parish and, therefore, especially near and dear to you. At the same time pray for him with fervor today and all days as you think of the dignity, the power, the responsibility of the individual bishop, the mutual obligations of bishop and people.

"Boyhood dreams of long
Saw an altar fair,
Consecrated, trembling hands
Lifted there in prayer.
And those dreams have led him on,
Dreamlike though they seemed;
Now dear friends thank God with him;
He is what he dreamed.
Other dreams has he today,
Bright in spite of fears;
That his human heart might be
Christlike through the years.
Pray for him when on your knees
That this dream come true;
Bowed before this altar fair
There he'll pray for you."

The episcopacy is the fullness of the priesthood of the Catholic Church, the continuation of the eternal priesthood of Jesus Christ; what mind can comprehend it, what tongue can describe this exalted vocation? Saints, doctors, scholars—the great and learned of all ages have acknowledged their inability to do justice to this sublime subject.

There is no dignity so exalted, no power and responsibility so great, no rank on earth so high as that of the Catholic bishop; and thus a certain saint has well said: "If I met a priest and an angel, I would salute the priest before the angel."

In the infinite and unfathomable mind of God, there are innumerable images of all that is beautiful, perfect, enchanting, sublime, magnificent conceptions beyond the ken of mortal man; but of all that we can conceive after Jesus and His own Blessed Mother Mary, the bishop of God's church stands out—the grandest and noblest we either know or have power to imagine. Jesus Christ and nature itself, separate the bishop from other men as an ideal and for this reason a cry of horror escapes the lips if it be discovered that he is not all he was set apart for.

At times, dearly beloved, you stop and wonder and ask yourselves: "Why such deference and respect for the Catholic bishop or priest in all ages?" Why do the people, almost without exception, look upon him as one in the world—yes—but not of it? Why is there no earthly dignity, power, or responsibility comparable to his, which transcends this earth and reaches even to Heaven itself?

It is the intimate union of the priest with Jesus Christ that entitles him to respect, honor, and love; which vests him with powers and prerogatives supernatural; which makes him conscious at once of his dignity and yet of his humility. In the words of Holy Writ: "Not that we are sufficient to think anything of ourselves, as of ourselves; but our sufficiency is from God." (II Corinthians iii.) "He humbled Himself becoming obedient unto death, even to the death of the cross." (Philippian ii: 8.) "You have not chosen Me; but I have chosen you; and have appointed you, that you should go and should bring forth fruit; and your fruit should remain." (John xv: 16.) "You are the salt of the earth." (Matthew v: 13.) "A minister of the holies and of the true tabernacle, which the Lord hath pitched and not man." (Hebrew viii: 2.) "Called by God a high priest, according to the order of Melchisedech." ((Hebrew v: 1.)

The bishop is adorned with the surpassing prerogatives of sacrifice and absolution and consecration—power over the natural and over the mystical body of Christ, prerogatives which belong to God alone. Christ at the Last Supper said to His apostles and through them to their successors, the bishops and priests of His church: "This is My body, this is My blood. Do this for a commemoration of Me." In these words and by His command, He gave them power over His natural body, to renew daily from the rising of the sun even to its setting, the sublime sacrifice of Calvary, and to give to the faithful His body and blood.

Moreover, Christ gave to His bishops power over His mystical body, the church, in the words: "Whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them; and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained." John xx: 23. At Christ's word, the blind saw; the deaf heard; the dumb spoke; the lame walked; the dead rose to life; and sins were forgiven. Christ's minister by the words of absolution restores to the soul the beauty of sanctifying grace, the friendship of God, her place in His mystical body—the church.

The two powers of sacrifice and absolution are beyond the reach of created beings, beyond the angels, the archangels, the cherubim, the seraphim, the thrones, the dominations, and all the rest of the heavenly host—yes even more, beyond the power of Mary Immaculate, full of grace. These powers belong to God alone and He has entrusted them to His bishops and priests. Do we marvel now when we hear St. Catherine of Sienna say: "If I met a priest and an angel, I would salute the priest before the angel" or the author of the Imitation when he writes: "Great is the mystery and great the dignity of priests, to whom is given that which is not granted to the angels."

Christ associates the bishop with Him in the glorious work of the Apostolate, in the evangelization of the world. On the Mount of the Ascension, He stands and speaks to His bishops: "Going, therefore, teach ye all nations; baptising them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Teaching them to observe all things, whatsoever, I have commanded you and behold I am with you all days even to the consummation of the world." Matthew xxviii: 19. In these words, in fact, the last words of Jesus, He strikes a deathblow to the popular fallacies of the present day such as, "It makes little difference what a man teaches or believes, so long as he leads a good life," or "Deeds not creeds our motto," or "Love your neighbor and be not concerned about religious differences." But the Saviour says so clearly and trenchantly: "Teaching them"—not what you think ought to be taught—not your fads, fancies and vagaries, but all things, whatsoever, I have commanded you," and then, and not until then, "I am with you all days even to the consummation of the world."

In the early dawn, close by the quiet waters of the lake of Galilee, we see the Master and St. Peter; Peter the bishop and apostle who had been a coward, who had denied Christ, but now penitent and humbled, hears these wondrous words—to him and to all those bishops who would come after him until the world's consummation: "Simon, son of John, lovest thou Me?" Jesus said to him: "Feed My lambs; feed My sheep." John xxi: 17.

Is not then the bishop the shepherd of the sheep? Is he not the father of the people committed to his care? Is he not the watchman on the walls of Jerusalem all the day and all the night? He must in very truth, as St. Paul says: "Be all things to all men, to save all."

He has his part in all the varied scenes of this life. From the time he takes the little infant babe from the arms of its earthly natural mother to make it an heir of heaven, a child of mother church, through the regenerating waters of baptism, he parts with that child no more. Not even when the Angel of Death touches its eyes and steals from them the light of day, for does he not offer up the great sacrifice, chant over the grave the eternal requiem, and usher that soul at last into the house of God? But few of us ever ponder over the blessings that are ours from a priest's beautiful anointed hands.

"We need them in life early morning
We need them again at its close;
We feel their warm clasp of true friendship
We seek them when tasting life's woes;
When we come to this world, we are sinful
The greatest as well as the least;
And the hands that make us pure as angels
Are the beautiful hands of a priest.

"At the altar each day we behold them,
And the hands of a king on his throne
Are not equal to them in their greatness
Their dignity stands all alone
For there, in the stillness of morning
Ere the sun has emerged from the east,
There, God rests between the pure fingers
Of the beautiful hands of a priest.

"God bless them and keep them all holy
For the host which their fingers caress;
What can a poor sinner do better
Than to ask him who chose them, to bless?
When death-dews on our eyelids are falling,
May our courage and strength be increased
By seeing raised o'er us in blessing
The beautiful hands of a priest."

There is only one High Priest, properly speaking, in the world—Jesus Christ, but one shepherd and guide of souls—and this shepherd and guide of souls ever and always is Jesus Christ. Jesus is the source whence come all the graces that enrich the church: The episcopacy and the priesthood are the channels through which these graces flow. Jesus is the voice, the bishop but the echo of that voice. The bishop speaks, no matter how feebly, no matter how unworthily, but he speaks what the Saviour spoke, he utters nothing that Christ has not said. This is the work of a bishop, not to preach self, not his idea of religion, not modern 20th century paganism, but Jesus Christ and Him crucified: to carry on the work of saving souls a little farther but to be succeeded by another in the eternal priesthood of Jesus Christ, "according to the order of Melchisedech."

In the words of St. Pius X of happy memory to his priests on the occasion of his

own 50 years in the priesthood, he said: "Let us rejoice in the heights upon which we stand, but let us fear the depths to which we may fall."

How little you know, dear friends, or realize the trials of those who minister to you spiritually. How much it costs at times for the bishop to be cheerful, kind and patient when his heart is torn by unfriendly criticism, misunderstanding, lack of charity, no appreciation of what he does; when his words and admonitions go unheeded, when he sees the ugly gaping wounds in Christ's mystical body, the church—then it is that he begins to realize that his union with Christ cannot be consummated on Mount Tabor alone—in the shining sun, the white garments and the glory of the transfigured Lord, but rather amid the gloom, the darkness and the blood of Calvary, he must become another Christ.

Today as never before, your bishops and priests need your encouragement, your cooperation and your charity in their work. In these days of "false Christs and false prophets who come to you in the clothing of sheep but inwardly they are ravening wolves" look to the watchman on the walls. In these days when enemies of the priesthood and enemies of the cross of Christ seek to stir up racial hatred and hatred of the church, that church which saved the world when they were of generations yet unborn, taking upon their polluted lips the sacred name of patriots, while waving high their flag of antigodism, communism, and of bigotry—in times like this do you, O Christian men and women, rally round the true cradle of patriotism—the Church of God—and there learn the principles of justice, liberty, equality, fraternity, love of God and love of one another—principles learned and practiced by the Catholic Church and taught to the faithful for more than 1,900 years.

Dear friends, today is a day of rejoicing in the court of heaven, a day of rejoicing in the Christian world in general and for you who are gathered here in particular, as another shepherd goes forth to labor in the Master's cause, to stand between heaven and earth offering sacrifice for the quick and the dead, absolving the contrite of heart, preaching God's changeless word, being another apostle, another Christ.

It is a day of unspeakable joy to Bishop Comber himself, for he has run the race well and today "receiveth the crown" not a fading, perishable, corruptible one; but an unfading, imperishable and incorruptible one. He has become a link in the unbroken chain which binds him directly back through the ages in a royal lineage to Peter and Christ Himself.

His Excellency Bishop Comber's heart is filled with joy and gratitude today, despite the apprehensions that abound because of the responsibilities of his high office.

He is first of all grateful to Almighty God in so many ways. Then to our Holy Father the good Pope John XXIII who conferred this great honor upon him. He looks back in blessed memory to the wonderful father and mother who raised him and his brothers and sisters in a model Christian home. Even now ever so deeply he feels he is what he is because of them. What a shining example they were of Christian parenthood. Under the inspiration of God, they must have indelibly implanted the words of his episcopal coat of arms "going, therefore, teach" in the hearts of his sisters, Sister Frances Helena, a sister of Notre Dame, a repatriated prisoner of the Japanese, who taught school in a Notre Dame convent in Japan and Sister Rita Clare, a Maryknoll Sister presently assigned to the Philippine Islands and formally doing missionary work in China, captured and imprisoned by the Japanese and repatriated as was her brother his Excellency Bishop Comber.

What awe and admiration all must have at beholding these Sisters in the religious life and the rest of his family as they kneel here now in thanksgiving before the altar of God. What joy his father and mother must feel as they adore him this day and at this very moment from their mansions in heaven. To them, the heart of the newly consecrated bishop goes out today as never before. Father, mother, home, a trinity of joys, whose completion and perfection are to be found only in the trinity in heaven. Around these loved ones—father, mother, sisters, brothers, cluster memories too precious, associations too endearing for utterance. They will ever remain a shining recollection in the lives of all; but they have a still deeper and more tender effect upon those who did leave them for a little while, not for worldly ambition, power and name, but to follow Him who reigns and rewards beyond the everlasting hills and carry out His wish, "Go you and teach all nations, baptising them in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost."

With pardonable pride the Augustinian Fathers here at St. Mary's take great honor in having you and Bishop Lane, two Maryknoll bishops and superiors general, come out from St. Mary's School—surely a justification and reward for our efforts. You never seemed to lose sight of the Augustinians who loved you from the day you served mass at this very altar. For in every country you labored, the Augustinians had been laboring there for centuries before.

The Sisters of Notre Dame, the Xavarian Brothers, the Jesuits and most of all your own men of Maryknoll can be justly proud of the part they played in molding your career. Today you salute them with gratitude overflowing. I do not dare to vex or oblige you, your excellency, to listen to personal accolades, tributes, praise, or flattery. Nor your men of the Catholic Foreign Missionary Society of America. You and Maryknoll's deed have renown.

It is my great privilege and honor today and personal satisfaction to voice the good wishes, the heartfelt congratulations to you, your excellency of the priests here present, the good Sisters and Brothers, who have come here and your brother priests of Maryknoll, one and all, and all of my fellow priests in the Order of St. Augustine. Last, but not least, your relatives and friends of your family and parishioners of St. Mary's and all who are here today. With you we rejoice and we look with confidence to your future for we know that during the long and arduous years in the mission fields of foreign lands, you have not been found wanting.

Your excellency, may God's benediction rest upon you today and all the days of your episcopacy. May our Mother of Good Counsel guide all your ways, and may St. Paul and St. Francis Xavier inspire you and yours of Maryknoll with an everincreasing zeal, so resplendent in their lives. Keep ever before you the admonition of Saints Peter and Paul to the bishops of their day. Continne to: "Labor as a good soldier of Jesus Christ." (II Timothy II, 3.) "Feed the flock of God which is among you, taking care of it not by constraint but willingly according to God; not for filthy lucre's sake, but voluntarily * * * And when the Prince of Pastors shall appear, you shall receive a never-fading crown of glory." (I Peter: 2.)

From the hearts of one and all gathered around God's altar on this festal day, may fervent prayers ascend to the Most High for you and all your flock. May He help you ever and always as you work your work in the souls of men. May He help you ever to stand worthily on the mystical Mount Moses, the great high priests of days long gone, and out of the darkness and sin of Egypt look toward the light and peace of the promised land—until the reign of "one God, one faith, one baptism" be blessed reality, until the prayer of Jesus, "That they all may be one as is the Father in Me and I in Thee" be fulfilled, and there shall be "one fold and One Shepherd."

Very Rev. Edward J. Carney, O.S.A.

The Problem of Presidential Disability: An Analysis by Prof. Paul C. Bartholomew

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, the question of Presidential disability is one to which Members of Congress have in recent months given serious attention.

Prof. Paul C. Bartholomew, professor of political science at the University of Notre Dame and an outstanding authority of American Government and constitutional law, has prepared an extremely interesting discussion of the constitutional problems raised by the problem of Presidential disability and of some of the proposals aimed at solving them.

I am pleased to include Professor Bartholomew's article in the Congressional Record:

A Summary View: The Problem of Presidential Disability

(By Paul C. Bartholomew)

"In case of the removal of the President from office, or of his death, resignation, or inability to discharge the powers of the said office, the same shall devolve on the Vice President, and the Congress may by law provide for the case of removal, death, resignation, or inability, both of the President and Vice President, declaring what officer shall then act as President, and such officer shall act accordingly, until the disability be removed, or a President shall be elected (art. II, sec. 1, clause 6).

This is the portion of the Constitution that presents a major problem that is disturbing a lot of persons—Government officials, academic personnel, and others. Furthermore, it is a problem to which no pat answer seems to be available and, in fact, a matter on which there is no real agreement. The past dozen years of cold war have taught us that we do not need an immediate solution to all problems. We do not need a definite answer to everything. Some things just have to be lived with until such time as Fate decides an answer. This may very well be the case with the matter of Presidential disability, and that viewpoint may not be at all irrational.

Two questions immediately present themselves. (1) Who or what body is to determine the disability of a President? (2) Does the Vice President, once disability has been determined, succeed to the office of President or only to the powers and duties of the office? There is a corollary question as to whether an amendment to the Constitution is necessary in order to answer either or both of these questions, and on this the experts are not agreed. There does seem to be sufficient reliable opinion that Congress has the power to act for us to assume that Congress can act legally, but certainly a careful student of the subject must urge, regardless of what action is taken, that an amendment be introduced concurrently as a

cover for congressional action in case of an adverse Court decision.

What of the proposals for deciding the person or persons on whom the burden shall rest of determining the disability of a President? The suggested solutions are many and diverse. However, all of them contemplate initial action by either the Vice President or the Congress. As for the Vice President, himself and alone, declaring that the President is unable to carry on the duties of this office, obvious difficulties present themselves. Judging by the men who have held the post in our history, the Vice President might be very reluctant to do this. Such a decision would certainly be embarrassing to a man with any sensitivity of nature. Then, too, there is some doubt as to the legality of unilateral action by the Vice President. However, no less authority than the Attorney General of the United States has recently noted that "it is a well-established rule of law that in contingent grants of power, the one to whom power is granted is to decide when the emergency has arisen. Thus the Vice President is constituted the judge of the President's inability."

Mr. Brownell was simply echoing previous observations by men such as Judge Lyman Trumbull, and the bulk of opinion today seems not to question this legal view. However, the view is not unanimous, and many question the prudence of placing the decision solely in the hands of the Vice President. There may even be some danger of usurpation (although experience with our Vice Presidents is all to the contrary) both in the initial assumption of power and in the relinquishing of power if and when the presidential disability passes. Again, this is a case of more power than a good man should want or a bad man should have. Some have suggested that provision be made for a medical board named by the President at the time of his inauguration. This board could then advise the Vice President as to the President's mental or physical condition, and thus an objective judgment would be available to guide the Vice President in assuming or giving up presidential powers.

DECISION BY CONGRESS—FURTHER PROBLEMS

Congress is often suggested as the agency to take the initiative in determining presidential disability. Those who favor leaving the question to Congress rely upon the "necessary and proper", or the "elastic" clause of the Constitution.[1] Thus they hold that Congress could pass a resolution determining the procedure for answering the question of presidential disability.

At this point the experts part company. There are almost as many specific procedures suggested as there are persons talking and writing about the matter. Some propose that Congress designate itself as the body to determine (when the occasion arises) that a President is disabled. Others urge that Congress give the Supreme Court this duty because it can act quickly and without partisan political overtones. This, no doubt, in the light of previous Supreme Court decisions, would require a constitutional amendment to get around the question of judicial jurisdiction.

Still others have suggested that the Cabinet be entrusted by Congress with answering the disability question. A variation of this Cabinet approval is that the Secretary of State inform the Cabinet and that that body should then decide. Another plan is that any two members of the Cabinet should inform the Chief Justice of the United States of the supposed disability, and that the Supreme Court should then decide. Still another variation is for the Cabinet to advise the Vice President who, in turn, would inform the Congress, which would then call on the Supreme Court for a final decision. The practical defects of any plan involving direct action by Congress, if, as, or when a possible case of disability arises, are obvious. Congress itself is not always in session, and it is an unwieldly body in such a situation. Political partisanship would be a real danger.

A PERMANENT COMMISSION—SOME PROBLEMS RAISED

In this general area of congressional initiative, the most frequent suggestion is that Congress provide for some kind of permanent commission to "stand by" and determine when there is a real mental or physical disability on the part of the President. These proposed commissions have been "baptized" by their sponsors with a variety of names—Advisory Council, Commission on Presidential Disability, Inability Council, Special Continuing Committee, Presidential Commission, Commission on Presidential Inability, and Presidential Powers Commission. Likewise, the specific composition of these groups is diverse. Some would have the Vice President, the Speaker of the House, the President pro tempore of the Senate, and the Cabinet constitute the board. Others suggest that there be six members from Congress and five from the Cabinet. Others get more specific and urge that the Chief Justice and the two senior Associate Justices of the Supreme Court serve, along with the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Treasury, and the majority and minority leaders of the Senate and the Speaker and the minority leader of the House. Another suggestion is that the committee be composed of the President's wife or a member of his family, two members of the Supreme Court and the leaders of the President's party in the House and Senate. One suggestion is that this group be composed entirely of physicians named by the Chief Justice. Another urges that the commission be composed of private citizens with no more than three from any one party and including at least two men of outstanding reputation in medicine and psychiatry.

There seems to be general agreement that in case of temporary disability of the President, the determination of the cessation of disability (when that is not apparent) should be made by the same body that decided that the President was disabled.

These are the chief answers that have been given to the first question. Some, including Speaker Rayburn and Professor Howe, maintain that the best answer is to make no provision at all, that we can meet the situation if and when it arises, that the great virtue of the Constitution is its flexibility, and that any determination of procedure to determine disability would introduce an unnecessary element of rigidity.

Not one of these solutions is entirely satisfactory—the Vice President probably will not and should not exercise the power, the Congress is too unwieldy, too involved in partisan politics and not always available in emergencies. Also, congressional action on this matter might be construed as a violation of the doctrine of separation of powers. Political partisanship would be increased whenever the Congress might be controlled by the party in opposition to the President or even by a hostile faction of his own party. The Supreme Court is a judicial body and is not supposed to solve political questions, even though its objectivity might not be doubted. However, in the absence of a constitutional amendment, there are real legal difficulties in any arrangement that would involve the Court, since giving it the power to determine Presidential disability would involve giving it jurisdiction in a political question, the problem of original jurisdiction, and the question of Presidential immunity from court action.

Any proposal giving such power to the Cabinet has a disadvantage in view of the reluctance on the part of trusted advisers to suggest that "the Chief" is disabled. The other side of that coin is the possibility—verified by history—that Cabinet members might be feuding with the President and take this means of attacking him. If a commission should be used, obviously, the make-up of that group would be all important. The Speaker of the House and the President pro tempore of the Senate probably should be excluded because of their placement in the order of succession to the Presidency after the Vice President.

No matter what plan may be ultimately adopted, the great and overriding consideration will be the objectivity of the agency selected to determine Presidential disability. Only with complete objectivity can we secure the essential requirement of public respect and acceptance of the decision.

As to the second great question, does the Vice President succeed to the office of President or only to the powers and duties of the office, the experts seem to be agreed on this. The Constitution specifies that "In case of the removal of the President from office, or of his death, resignation, or inability to discharge the powers and duties of the said office, the same shall devolve on the Vice President. * * *" Regardless of what the Founding Fathers may or may not have meant by this (and there is no agreement on this), the experts today are as one on the point that, in case of the temporary disability of the President, the Vice President succeeds only to the President's powers and duties, that he becomes "Acting President." However, should the Preesident's "disability" be permanent, as in the case of death or resignation, then the Vice President succeeds to the office itself and becomes President. Succession to the title is a matter of constitutional custom based on the actions of the seven Vice Presidents who have fallen heir to the office. Two conclusions seem necessary, if we are to assume, as most persons do, that some provision is needed. First, Congress must initiate action aimed at a solution of this problem. Both from the point of view of the strictly legal and the practical, that seems to be the proper procedure. Second, a resolution of amendment to the Constitution should be started on its way to ratification regardless of what interim provision is made by Congress. This will insure legal, if not practical, perfection.

[1] Art. I, sec. 8, clause 18: "To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof."

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*——Carroll Arms
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*——Cleveland House
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*——6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*——1718 33d Pl. SE.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*——
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*——
Bible, Alan, *Nev*——
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*——
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*——
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*——
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*——The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*——
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev*——
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*——The Westchester
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*——Sheraton-Park
Carroll, John A., *Colo*——
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*——
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*——4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*——2525 P St.
Church, Frank, *Idaho*——
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa*——
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky*——
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*——
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*——
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*——
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*——
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*——
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*——
Eastland, James O., *Miss*——5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*——
Engle, Clair, *Calif*——3840 Lorcom Lane, Arlington, Va.
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*——
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*——
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*——
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*——
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*——
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*——University Club
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*——
Hart, Philip A., *Mich*——
Hartke, Vance, *Ind*——
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*——
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*——
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*——5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*——
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*——Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*——
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*——
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*——
Javits, Jacob K., *N. Y*——
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*——
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*——
Jordan, B. Everett, *N. C*——
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*——3509 M St.
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*——4929 Hillbrook Lane
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*——
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*——
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*——
Langer, William, *N. Dak*——2101 Conn. Ave.
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*——
Long, Russell B., *La*——
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn*——2930 Chesapeake St.
McClellan, John L., *Ark*——
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo*——
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*——
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*——The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*——
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*——4501 Conn. Ave.
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*——
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*——4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky*——
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*——
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*——122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*——The Shoreham
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*——
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*——
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*——Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*——
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*——
Proxmire, William, *Wis*——
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va*——
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*——
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*——
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*——2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*——
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*——
Smathers, George A., *Fla*——
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*——
Sparkman, John, *Ala*——4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*——
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*——
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga*——
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C*——
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*——2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J.*——
Williams, John J., *Del*——
Yarborough, Ralph W., *Tex*——
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*——Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*——

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Johnson of Texas (chairman), Russell, Magnuson, Anderson, Kerr, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Bridges, Wiley, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Martin, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Humphrey, Symington, Talmadge, Proxmire, Jordan, Young of Ohio, Hart, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams of Delaware, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Johnson of Texas, Pastore, Kefauver, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, Dodd, McGee, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Dworshak, Kuchel, Hruska, and Allott.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd of Virginia, Johnson of Texas, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Thurmond, Engle, Bartlett, Cannon, Saltonstall, Bridges, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Bush, and Beall.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Fulbright, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Clark, Proxmire, Byrd of West Virginia, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Capehart, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Javits.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, Frear, Hartke, Beall, Case of South Dakota, and Prouty.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Butler, Cotton, and Curtis.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Green, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long, Kennedy, Gore, Lausche, Church, Wiley, Hickenlooper, Langer, Aiken, Capehart, and Carlson.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Humphrey, Gruening, Muskie, Mundt, Curtis, and Capehart.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Neuberger, Carroll, Church, Gruening, Moss, Dworshak, Kuchel, Goldwater, Allott, and Martin.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Thurmond, Lausche, Yarborough, Engle, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Schoeppel, Butler, Cotton, Case of New Jersey, Morton, and Scott.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, O'Mahoney, Ervin, Carroll, Dodd, Hart, Wiley, Langer, Dirksen, Hruska, and Keating.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Kennedy, McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Goldwater, Cooper, Dirksen, Case of New Jersey, Javits, and Prouty.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Monroney, Neuberger, Yarborough, Clark, Jordan, Carlson, Langer, and Morton.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, McNamara, Neuberger, Randolph, McCarthy, Young, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Case of South Dakota, Martin, Cooper, Scott, and Prouty.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Hennings (chairman), Hayden, Green, Mansfield, Jordan, Cannon, Curtis, Morton, and Keating.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Whittaker, of Missouri, 5000 Van Ness St.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, Fairfax Hotel.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—James R. Browning, 454 New Jersey Ave. SE.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Richard J. Blanchard, 427 St. Lawrence Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS
JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

Appendix

Growth for the Nation and the West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. CARROLL
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 28, 1959

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, we Democrats of Colorado are greatly indebted to the able and distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] for the recent thoughtful and inspiring address he delivered at our annual Jefferson-Jackson dinner in Denver.

The Senator from Missouri was received with wide acclaim by the people and press of Colorado, and inspired the unanimous enthusiasm of Democrats.

It is my opinion that his fine speech should be read by all who are interested in an expanding economy in the Nation, and with particular attention by all who seek a blueprint for the full development of the American West.

I ask unanimous consent to have this address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GROWTH FOR THE NATION AND THE WEST

(Address by Senator STUART SYMINGTON, Jefferson-Jackson dinner, Denver, Colo., April 18, 1959)

It is a great privilege to be here in Denver tonight, and see so many old friends, including my colleague, JOHN CARROLL, one of the West's finest representatives in the Senate of the United States, and a fighting Democrat to the tips of his fingers.

Every time I come to Denver, I wonder at the continued growth of your city. You now have over a million people in your metropolitan area. With real progressive leadership, there is no limit to what you can do in this beautiful land.

When I say "progressive leadership," I mean Democratic leadership. The last election showed us that the people of Colorado and the West have pinned their hopes for progress on the Democratic Party.

With 23 Democratic Senators and 7 Democratic Governors, the West is going to have an increasingly strong voice in our national councils. And it is going to be a clear voice, calling for full development of the wealth of this great country.

This Democratic voice will drown out the feeble cries of pessimism and bankruptcy which are coming out of official Washington today.

Perhaps it cannot make itself heard properly between now and 1960 under a Republican administration. But that voice will make it even more certain that we will elect a Democratic President in 1960.

And then watch the progress.

The pattern was set clearly in the last election. The people of Colorado examined the record of their superb Governor, Steve McNichols. They saw his accomplishments as chairman of the Western Governors' conference. They were mighty proud about how he represented to the entire Nation the western views on resource development. So they reelected him by a great majority, and along with him practically the entire Democratic ticket.

The people of Colorado looked at the fine job being done by WAYNE ASPINALL and BYRON ROGERS. So they reelected them, and also BYRON JOHNSON. This gives our party a 3 to 1 margin in the Colorado congressional delegation.

Last fall the pattern of Democratic victory was the same all over the country. If ever there was a mandate, this was it. You would think the Republicans would have learned from this experience. Instead they have taken the result of the election as an invitation to commit political suicide by continuing to pursue the same backward policies they have championed for the last 6 years.

As a result, in 1960, we Democrats will have such a gigantic victory, it will make 1958 look like a draw.

Of course, we're not going to win without a fight, but it's comforting to know the Republicans like to warm up for a national election by first fighting with each other.

In fact, it appears some of them would rather do that than take on the Democrats.

Right now, it looks like the Governor of New York is trying to get a half-Nelson on the Republican nomination for President.

The Vice President noticed how effectively Mr. Rockefeller campaigned in New York when he spoke in Spanish. So this week he is taking Spanish lessons from Fidel Castro.

Seriously, though, my friends, the Democratic party will have to move forward with dynamic responsible leadership if we want to be certain we will be entrusted with the leadership of the Nation in 1960.

We lost the last presidential election by some 10 million votes. Therefore, we have a lot of converts to make.

We will never win the next election if we kick away our chance, with our heavy majority in Congress, to meet the growing needs of a growing Nation.

We will win if we pass the laws we think America needs—veto or no veto.

We will win only if the people are convinced that the Democratic Party is still the party of action and growth, the party always striving to have our country's reach exceed its grasp.

To do this, we must first destroy some misconceptions that have been spread throughout the land in recent months.

The first concerns deficits, and balanced budgets. From 1953 until last year, we did not hear very much from Republicans about deficits. They were ashamed to bring it up because they were piling up a deficit in those years of $20 billion.

At the beginning of this year, the administration realized that the recession had cut down tax revenues, and the deficit for the fiscal year 1959 alone was going to run about $13 billion.

Imagine—$13 billion in 1 year alone—the largest deficit in peacetime history.

This problem was too big for the Republican fiscal experts, so they turned it over to the political managers, who hit on the following ingenious political trick. If the onus of deficit financing could be placed on the Democratic Congress, the administration would be relieved of the blame for the terrible fiscal mess it was developing.

So the word went down from the political to the fiscal managers: Balance the budget.

They balanced it, all right, like the Leaning Tower of Pisa. It was balanced with new revenue that is not going to come in, and new taxes which are not going to be levied. The latest objective estimate is that, even if Congress does not appropriate 1 nickel more than the President recommended, the deficit for next year will still run into many billions of dollars.

Let me tell you tonight that this Congress is not going to play into the hands of the political managers of the next Republican campaign by running away from this issue.

We know that these deficits came about, not because Democrats invested money to make the country grow, but because Republican cutbacks caused our revenues to shrink.

In 3 weeks we are going to celebrate the birthday of a great American President, Harry S. Truman. When Mr. Truman was President, our economy grew at the rate of 5 percent a year. Since he left office, it has grown at the rate of 1 3/10 percent per year.

Is this the way to provide for a population that has reached 176 million people; and by 1975 will be 235 million?

Is this the way to promote the growth of the West? Or is it the way to stunt the growth of the West?

Is this the way to arm ourselves for the protracted conflict we now know we face with the Communist world—a conflict we know is going to be political, economic, psychological, and perhaps physical?

I visited Berlin a couple of weeks ago. Even in East Berlin, which we have been told is a poor and exploited city, the rate of economic growth is 10 percent per year.

And ours is 1.3 percent per year.

What a tragedy to have this lag in the country with the greatest resources, and the greatest productive skill, in the history of the world.

The second misconception we Democrats intend to correct is that, if we invest in those public projects needed to keep up with our growing Nation, we will have inflation.

Now, obviously, no one wants inflation. But there is a difference between inflation and growth. In the first, prices rise because production lags. In the second, a rising price level is absorbed by the rising well-being of the people.

From 1922 to 1928 the price level was quite stable.

But that did not reflect any healthy economy, as was so well proven by the great depression.

And the third misconception we are laboring under is that spending and investment are somehow bad for the country; while only saving is good.

Now, thrift is a great virtue and waste in Government is inexcusable. But the man who put all his money in his mattress did not help build America.

What would there be in the West if people had not spent effort and wealth to get out here; and their Government had not helped them? What would our great industries be like if they had not, and did not, spend for expansion? Would we not be a pygmy country, instead of the giant we are today?

We need saving and what we need to save most is the American economy.

That economy needs to be saved from the terrific waste of manpower and other resources which are now lying idle.

It needs to be saved from more years of economic stagnation.

It needs to be saved from the ultimate peril of neglected national security, neglected education and scientific research, and neglected development of our great natural resources.

My friends, all this talk we hear from the Republicans about balanced budgets, inflation, and spending, is just a smokescreen to conceal their real ideas. The fact is that the Republican Party is afraid of growth. In its scheme of values, money is more important than people, and balancing the books comes before increasing the wealth of the country.

So the Republican Party tries to scare the people with threats of deficits and inflation, just as it used to warn people that if we adopted social security we would all be wearing dog tags.

Let me give you some figures to show what the economic lag under the Republicans has already cost this country.

If we had been able to keep up the Democratic growth rate between 1953 and 1958, it would have meant: $2,800 more income for each family; $31 billion more for our farmers; 10 million more man-years of employment; and $39 billion more private investment.

Every segment of our economy would have been more prosperous than it is today.

It is important that we Democrats set straight the economic record. But if we are to win in 1960, we must do more. We must come forward with a positive program for growth.

We Democrats must plan now to operate as near as possible to full production. Right now, between 15 and 20 percent of the productive capacity of the United States is idle—and unless we recognize this condition, it will only grow worse. Because by 1960, our population will be up over 5 million from 1958; and our labor force up over 2 million. And by 1964, the population will be up 17 million—our labor force 7 million.

This tremendous increase can be either a blessing, or a curse. It can be the cause of more unemployment and suffering; or it can be used as a great engine of increased productivity.

With these additional people at work, we can forge ahead in our standard of living, and at the same time generate more tax revenues to meet the needs of the larger population.

The greatest field of idle resources lies right here in the West. In your mountains and your valleys, your fields and rivers, you have the riches to provide additional wealth for millions.

I believe there are three requisites to the full utilization of the resources of the West.

First, there must be more general appreciation of the vast economic opportunities which lie waiting.

I don't want to knock the television western, which one of our national magazines has called the "great American morality play." But in the minds of many people it has perpetuated the ideal of the West as still a frontier.

Today the West is far from any frontier. It is a prosperous and cosmopolitan part of our Nation. If every American could come to Denver, this illusion of Cripple Creek would soon vanish as he saw the old corner saloon replaced by your mile-high center, and six shooters with NORAD.

Secondly, there must be more willingness on the part of Government to conceive and carry out broad economic plans, instead of responding haphazardly to such crises as droughts, slum areas, and floods.

As we all know, the difference between civilized man and the savage is planning. The difference between men and animals is that men look ahead.

Long-range planning of resource development, therefore, on a multi-State basis, would enable the West to know where it was going, and how fast.

Third, and most important, there must be a new willingness to invest in projects for the development of western resources, resources which our exploding will need critically in the years to come.

The present policy of no new starts in public works is a recipe for stagnation.

No successful corporation ever got started without investing in capital expenditures. It is a fundamental of good business management that sound expenditures repay themselves many times, and with interest.

Investment in natural resource projects is the best way to bring the prosperity of full production to our Western States.

Programs of this sort are in the democratic tradition. They wear the brand of the Louisiana Purchase, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the electrification of our farms through REA, and other democratic programs characteristic of our history.

Such a program can win, because it is right.

With continuing faith in the principles of our party, and the Nation, we can establish for the people a dynamic and progressive leadership, and through that leadership bring about the peace and prosperity they so richly deserve.

Salute to the Turners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 28, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Sunday, May 10th, the Milwaukee Turners and their friends will hold their 105th annual exhibition in Milwaukee, Wis.

As we know, the Turner program is designed to develop the physical and mental training of individuals in order better to enable them to be energetic, patriotic citizens of our Republic. In attempting to strengthen the fiber of the individual, as well as family life, Turner societies have classes and study groups in many mental and cultural activities; including basketry and weaving, ceramics and sculpture, the study of history and economics, development of photographic and hobby clubs, competition in gymnastics, including competition in volleyball, basketball, and track and field events, and a variety of other constructively organized and healthful activities for folks in the community.

For the program on May 10, the Milwaukee Turners have outlined an outstanding program which will have a cast of more than 500 men, women, and children participating in a unique and colorful presentation.

Recognizing that activities of this nature contribute constructively to the development of better individuals, stronger family ties, and firmer-knit communities, I ask unaimous consent to have excerpts from an editorial by Loretta Schultz, entitled "Salute to the Turners," printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SALUTE TO THE TURNERS

Sunday, May 10, 1959, will be a very special day for all Milwaukee Turners and their friends. This is the date of our 105th annual exhibition, to be held at the Milwaukee Auditorium at 2:30 p.m. The excellent program, "Salute to the Turners," will have a cast of over 500 men, women, and children; costumes will be inspiring, unique and colorful. It has been our privilege and good fortune to secure the Milwaukee Auditorium, centrally located and with a seating capacity of 2,000, for the show by which the Milwaukee Turners will celebrate their 106th year of physical education, cultural, and social activities for the entire family. We can certainly be proud of the fact that we have no juvenile delinquents and are the most healthy people in the city.

This exhibition will also be the Schigets' 10th year with the Milwaukee Turners and the program that will be offered will be more outstanding than in the past, due to the hard work put in by both of them.

J. E. (Ed) O'Connell, Founder of the Eddy Bakeries in Helena, Mont.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 28, 1959

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, recently my good friend, Mr. J. E. (Ed) O'Connell, founder of the Eddy Bakeries in Helena, Mont., was honored at a testimonial dinner.

During the early years of our State, Mr. O'Connell had great faith in its development and in that of the whole Northwest section of our country. He started his bakery in Helena, and through the years it has grown and prospered into the bakery empire it is today. Well over a million loaves of bread are distributed by his company throughout the Northwest.

Friends and executives gathered from all over the country to pay tribute to Mr. O'Connell as a leader in his industry and in his community.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the newspaper story concerning this testimonial dinner, and the list of guests from coast to coast who attended from out of State.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Helena (Mont.) Independent-Record, Apr. 12, 1959]

J. E. O'CONNELL LOOKS BACK ON PLEASANT ADVENTURE MEMORIES AT FETE SATURDAY

Founder J. E. O'Connell looked back Saturday night on his efforts which welded together the baking empire of Eddy Bakeries as a pleasant adventure full of memories which made it worthwhile.

The silver-haired baking industry leader told the testimonial dinner friends and executives gathered from coast to coast at the Montana Club that his was the role of camp tender, not dynamic leadership, in the creation of an industry whose products are a byword throughout the Northwest.

"Memories are always pleasant," Eddy O'Connell mused, "and humanity is so constructed that we cannot retain unpleasant happening.

"All of us look back on occasions that were pleasant adventures for us and pleasant circumstances for those about us."

O'Connell said building memories was his prime motive in the years that took his fortunes from that of a club steward to a nationally known executive.

Putting aside the leadership role ascribed to one of such prominence in the business world, O'Connell described the operation he heads as "We have been a bundle of twigs bound closely together in a common purpose."

O'Connell went on to explain about the position considered all important by sheep ranchers in the West.

"It is the camp tender," he said, "the man who cares for the shepherds high in the hills, sees that their commissary is well cared for, there is kerosene for the lanterns, cornmeal for the dogs, and liniment-salve to care for his sheep, horse, and dog.

"In Eddy's, I have been the camp tender. I've been the man who brought the groceries, who solicited and sorted ideas of operating heads, of suppliers who sold us merchandise and equipment, of merchants who displayed and sold our products, and of the buying public who are the court of last resorts."

Helena is a great little town, the silver-haired baking executive mentioned, and excels in many things, but most of all in the quality of its people.

"Our family has taken great comfort in Helena, and our Helena friends. We have taken much pride in the fact that on well over a million loaves of Eddy's bread going out each week across the this great Northwestern empire goes the message 'General Offices, Helena, Mont.'"

During the evening, Hugh D. Galusha, Jr., master of ceremonies, introduced several men who paid their respects to the honored guest.

Russel Hug, of New York, president of the General Baking Co., of which Eddy's is a unit, said "We, in the General Baking family, are tremendously proud of Ed O'Connell.

"His counsel as a member of our board has been an inspiration to all of us, as has our association with the fine organization of Eddy's. His wisdom, his unfailing humor and tact, and above all, his capacity to give so generously of his time and energies, has not only made him a first citizen of Helena, but a first citizen in the hearts of his friends from coast to coast."

Gov. J. Hugo Aronson praised O'Connell for his faith in Montana and his business judgment, which has materially helped this great State of Montana, while A. T. Hibbard, Helena banker, told of O'Connell's activities in ranching, raising livestock, and horsemanship.

"Ed is a man who loves to work and with his executive ability is able to surround himself with a hard-working staff," Mayor O. L. Brackman said. He went on to explain that he first met O'Connell in Cody, Wyo., in 1906 and their acquaintances have grown since both arrived a few years later in Helena.

Montana's Democratic delegation in Congress also sent a congratulatory telegram, signed by Senators JAMES E. MURRAY and MIKE MANSFIELD as well as Representatives LEE METCALF and LEROY ANDERSON.

"We, too, pay our respects to Eddie O'Connell for his contributions to the development of the Northwest," the telegram stated. "Starting in Montana, he pioneered the establishment of a major industry, a wholesale bakery group in the Northwest. We are sorry we cannot be with you to honor him."

Very Rev. Robert J. McCarthy, chancellor of the Helena diocese, gave the invocation. D. E. Walsh provided accordion music during the evening.

LEADERS OF BUSINESS, FINANCE COME FROM ALL OVER UNITED STATES TO HONOR J. E. O'CONNELL

Out of town guests attending the J. E. O'Connell dinner Saturday night came from both the east and west coast.

Those present included:

J. M. Feist of Minneapolis, district manager for Standard Brands, Inc.; Vern Fortin of Los Angeles, president of Van De Kamp's; Rush Harris of Denver, president of Colorado Mill and Elevator; E. O. Jenkins of Minneapolis, chairman of board of First Bank Stock Co.; John Johnston of New York, General Baking Co.; Fred Kuhlman of Ogden, Utah, manager of Continental Bakery; Walter Lamphier of Minneapolis, sales manager of International Mills; Walter J. Malmberg of San Francisco, regional manager of Standard Brands; and Lloyd Mitchell of Seattle, president of Van de Kamp's.

George Morrison of New York, chairman of the board for General Baking Co.; M. G. (Dusty) Rhodes of New York, president of Standard Brands; Ernie Rhodes of Aberdeen, S. Dak., president of Rhodes, Inc.; Jack Robins of Minneapolis, sales representative of Joe Lowe Donut Corp.; Lawrence Tomsky of San Mateo, Calif., vice president of Standard Brands; and W. T. Winn, of Minneapolis, president of W. T. Winn Co.

Jack Arnold of Birney; Garland Boone of Havre, superintendent of Eddy Bakery; Clarence Fishbaugh of Great Falls, manager of Eddy Bakery; Harry Hahn of Missoula, sales manager of Eddy Bakery; Rep. Tom Haines of Missoula, secretary of Montana Food Dealers; Henry Keehn of Minneapolis, manager of Eddy Bakery; C. R. McClave, Jr., of Great Falls, president of Montana Flour Mills; S. K. Malone of Choteau, and L. J. Lambkin of Lincoln.

Steve Maronick of Great Falls, manager of G. L. Tracy Co.; Fred Martin of Livingston, manager of Park County News; Paul Matteucci of Great Falls, president of Super-Save Drug; William Meyer of Butte, Sig Meyer of Butte; Gene Murphy of Great Falls, Montana Flour Mills; Ralph A. Nelson of Billings, manager of Eddy Bakery; Charles F. Noble of Great Falls, vice president of Noble Mercantile Co.; Robert B. Noble of Great Falls, president of Noble Mercantile Co.; R. A. Neil of Butte, Montana Power Co.; Trev Povah of Yellowstone Park, president of Hamilton Stores; Haskell Preffer of Yakima, manager of Eddy Bakery; Frank Reardon of Butte, president of Pay and Save Super Market; Rt. Rev. Msgr. Emmett J. Riley of Butte, and J. E. Dougherty of Elliston.

Jack Roberts of Dillon, Roberts Food Store; Charles Rubie of Havre, vice president of Citizens Bank of Montana; Richard Rubie of Havre, president of Citizens Bank of Montana; Melvin Sather of Bismarck, N. Dak., manager of Eddy Bakery; George Schotte of Butte, president of Butte Motor Co.; Frank Stayner of Boise, president of Town and Country Bakery; Earl Stemple of Great Falls, superintendent of Eddy Bakery; T. E. Uppinghouse of Great Falls, Uppinghouse Market; R. S. Williams of Great Falls, president of Buttrey Foods, Inc.; and Frank Young of Butte, manager of Eddy Bakery.

Another Civil Defense Fiasco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEPHEN M. YOUNG
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 28, 1959

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent editorial entitled, "Civil Defense Fiasco," which was published in the Springfield Daily News of April 18, 1959. This newspaper is one of Ohio's important daily newspapers.

The editorial presents convincingly the waste of taxpayers' money on an utterly useless program, and deals with inept management of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization. I commend the editorial to my colleagues in the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CIVIL DEFENSE FIASCO

If that mythical mass nuclear bomb attack Friday had been the real thing, there probably would have been just about as many victims under the current civil defense program, as if no such program existed. Those precautionary measures as were taken in various communities could have been handled just as well and just as efficiently by existing civilian authority as was possible with the expensive Federal civilian defense organization.

The sounding of alerts in the various communities is, of course, desirable and necessary, but beyond this, the precautions taken as the result of those alert signals would have likely saved few lives even with a comparatively low-power nuclear bomb such as the first one exploded in Japan. Today's bombs are terrifically more powerful. Certainly the price that the Nation is paying for virtually this sole service of sounding alerts by the civil defense organization is excessive.

Take a look at what happened Friday. The State government temporarily moved from Columbus. In hospitals, public schools, and similar institutions, the existing authorities handled all precautionary measures whose value is questionable but possibly might have some beneficial results.

In New York City, traffic was stopped and the streets cleared. Most of the folks took refuge in neighboring office and business buildings. The protection against nuclear attack thus afforded is negligible. Probably Columbus turned on its synchronized traffic light system to which taxpayers throughout the Nation contributed nearly a half million dollars, and possibly because this was an imaginary attack, the motorists may have obeyed it. But if real bombs had been falling, how many would have heeded a red light?

In the most cases of evacuation, there was movement of parts of the civilian populace to stations not more than 30 miles distant. What good would that have been had a real nuclear bomb landed in the area?

Scientists acquainted with nuclear weapons admit there is at present no known protection for human beings who happen to be anywhere within a tremendously large area in which one or more of the bombs may be

exploded. It is somewhat a matter of luck, though some precautionary steps may be of help.

Why not keep the local authorities throughout the United States acquainted with these precautions, advising them what should be done to obtain community or area cooperation? They have the facilities, and certainly in most cases, just as much "brains" as might be obtained for the purpose otherwise.

Some place in Federal Government, there are obvious attempts to establish Civil Defense as a new Federal Government agency. The fact that certain Federal Government surplus equipment is withheld from political subdivisions which decline to go entirely along with the Civil Defense organization is somewhat proof of this.

It is to be assumed that in the eyes of the Federal Government or at least that group which sets up Civilian Defense, that persons residing in areas which decline to throw their money away on foolish Civil Defense programs are not worthy of protection?

Senator STEPHEN M. YOUNG, who has been calling Civil Defense on the carpet, would be doing the Nation a great favor if he would awaken his colleagues to the point where they would insist that surplus Federal property be distributed to the political subdivisions without any condition that they contribute money to the existing Civil Defense setup.

The wasteful neglect which led to the loss of several thousand dollars worth of radio equipment entrusted to Civil Defense in Washington, D.C., is now almost equalled in the same city by the offering for sale of a bus; the cost $15,000 to Civil Defense, never used except for practice, and now offered for 50 cents. Yes, that is right, 50 cents. These wastes have been duplicated in many another community.

So it stands as of now that virtually the sole value of Civil Defense is establishing a nationwide communications system to handle the operations of Conelrad and local alert systems, plus possibly advising local authorities what to do in case of a bomb attack. Does this require all the money being spent and being asked by the national Civil Defense organization? That would appear extremely doubtful.

Big Boost for Padre Island National Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 28, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President—

Padre Island presents one of the last remaining opportunities for this Nation to preserve such a length of beach in its natural state. In future years, America's growing population will have few chances to experience and gain inspiration from a vast sweep of ocean shore unaltered by man. To its people, this country has always symbolized bigness and spaciousness. * * * To preserve America's longest beach will provide not only an outstanding area for biological and geological study, but also a place where future generations of Americans can experience a wild spaciousness that is their heritage.

Mr. President, the words I have just read are not my own. They are taken from the very eloquent and absolutely factual report of workers from the U.S. Department of Interior National Park Service who made a field investigation of Padre Island.

In addition to this report, I am in receipt this date of a letter from Secretary of the Interior Seaton advising me that the Advisory Board on National Parks has adopted resolutions favoring establishment of a national seashore on Padre Island. These resolutions urge the Secretary of the Interior to report favorably on my bill, S. 4, to set aside portions of Padre Island as a national seashore.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of this resolution of the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHORELINES

Whereas the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments has consistently urged that an effort be made to salvage and protect our outstanding natural shoreline areas; and

Whereas there are several bills in Congress calling for the acquisition and protection of shoreline areas, which already have been recommended by the Board; and

Whereas significant shoreline areas, which can be preserved, are rapidly disappearing:

Therefore, the Advisory Board recommends that the Secretary of the Interior report favorably on those bills now in Congress intended to set aside portions of Cape Cod, Padre Island, the Indiana Dunes, and the Oregon Dunes, stipulating (1) that these should be created as shoreline areas as distinguished from national parks; (2) that steps will immediately be taken to eliminate hostile uses in any of those areas as quickly as possible; and the Board hopes that the Secretary will view with favor and lend his support to the principle of establishing, in the other relatively few remaining suitable areas, shoreline areas as entities different in standards and administration from national parks, monuments, or historic sites.

Approved: April 22, 1959.

H. S. WAGNER,
Secretary.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I wish to emphasize that establishment of this park, a matter which I have been urging on the attention of the Senate for a year and a half, is not for the benefit of Texans alone. It is a project of immeasurable inspirational value to millions of Americans, including generations yet unborn. The park sought here is a monument to our country's greatness which will link its magnificent yesterdays with its fabulous tomorrows.

But it is an opportunity that will not last much longer. We must move this session. Enabling legislation on the State level has been introduced by the Honorable State Representative Roger Daily of Houston, and others. It already has been favorably reported out of committee in the Texas House of Representatives. On this project, particularly, State and Federal legislators are working in harmony for the people.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the summary section of the Field Investigation Report on Padre Island, February 1959, made by the U.S. Department of the Interior National Park Service, region 3.

There being no objection, the summary section was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Padre Island, stretching for 117 miles along the Texas Gulf coast from Corpus Christi on the north almost to Mexico on the south, is the longest island or barrier beach along the shores of the United States. It affords the longest stretch of undeveloped seashore remaining in America and has been recognized for more than 20 years as one of the Nation's outstanding potential seashore recreation areas. So outstanding are the features of Padre Island that it has been recognized to be of national significance and worthy of preservation for public use and enjoyment.

The island is a typical example of a barrier beach, unusual because of its great size which enhances its primitive character. The wide, clean beach, composed of fine sand and broken shell, extends in an unbroken sweep from horizon to horizon. The slope of the shore is uniformly gentle, providing ideal conditions for swimming, surf fishing, and other beach recreation.

A distinctive feature of Padre Island are the windswept, irregular dunes. Lacking extensive vegetation, much of the sand is shaped and reshaped by the wind. When stable, the dunes bordering the beach are often imposing, up to 40 feet high. Elsewhere, unstable dunes are smaller, often in the shape of small rippling mounds, or else nonexistent, resulting in flats stretching from sea to sound. The general atmosphere of the island is one of undisturbed isolation and seemingly endless expanses of flat, sparsely vegetated beachland.

Somewhat broader at the north than in the south, the island varies in width from a few hundred yards to about 2 miles. Laguna Madre, the bay separating the island from the mainland, achieves a maximum width of 10 miles, although large portions are little more than mud flats, and the water seldom reaches a depth of more than 6 feet.

The vegetation of Padre Island is quite uniform in appearance and consists of a relatively small number of species. Typical dune vegetation consist of seaoats, beach croton, and beach morning glory. Other plants commonly ecountered are sea-purslane, beach evening primrose, ragweed, seaside spurge, partridge-pea, and a variety of other shrubs and grasses.

Between the coastal dunes and the lagoon are many large areas well covered with grasses and low shrubs. The only trees appear to be a very few scrubby oaks near the north end of the island. Extensive grazing over a long period has destroyed much vegetation, resulting in widespread areas of shifting sand. Large salt marsh areas are found along the northern part of the island adjacent to the Laguna Madre.

The coastal region of Texas is noted for its excellent waterfowl habitat and productive fishing waters. The sheltered bays, marshlands, and islands along Padre Island are especially attractive to many forms of birdlife, providing both feeding and nesting grounds. Some of the more common resident birds include white and brown pelicans, American and snowy egrets, little blue and great blue herons, gulls, and at least four species of terns. South Bird Island, in the Laguna Madre, is famed for its large nesting colony of white pelicans and other water and shore birds.

The animal population of Padre Island itself is relatively small, both in numbers and species. There is ample evidence of the presence of many small rodents and there should also be rabbits, raccoons, coyotes, and badgers. Deer and peccary are among the larger animals reported.

Both surf and deep sea fishing are popular sports, and commercial fishing operations are carried on from nearby ports. Chan-

nel bass and pompano are among the fishes caught in the surf, while boats land bonito, cobia, black grouper, snappers, snook, and tarpon. Oysers and shrimp are taken by commercial boat. The usual forms of shore marine life and a wide variety of shells are found along the beach.

The history of Padre Island is highlighted by many colorful events. The island was the domain of the savage, cannibalistic Karankawan Indians when the first Spanish fleet sailed along the beach in 1519. Through the years its bleak expanses invited little permanent settlement until about 1800, when the Spanish priest Padre Nicolas Balli, for whom the island was named, obtained sovereign right to the island and carried on grazing operations with longhorns and mustangs. Cattle and, for a time, sheep, have continued to be the main residents of the island.

Occupying the same latitude as the south Florida coast, Padre Island enjoys an attractive climate for year-round outdoor recreation, with cool gulf breezes in the summer and warm sunshine in the winter. The average January temperature of 57° insures that most winter days will be in the sixties and seventies. The average July temperature is 83°. Freezing temperatures are rare and citrus fruits and other semitropical plants flourish on the Texas mainland in this region. On the island the prevailing winds are southerly, and hurricanes may on occasion strike during late summer or early fall.

Just a few years ago Padre Island was almost inaccessible, totally undeveloped and unspoiled. Today it is readily reached by causeways at each end, where considerable development is underway. However, the major part of the island is still unspoiled and might yet be preserved for public use and enjoyment if steps are taken without delay.

Virginians Honor Fauquier County in Her Bicentennial Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 28, 1959

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from an article in the Virginia Record of March 1959 by Philip V. Brennan, Jr., entitled "Fauquier—A Virginia County Ages Gracefully."

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAUQUIER—A VIRGINIA COUNTY AGES GRACEFULLY

(By Philip V. Brennan, Jr.)

February 22, Washington's Birthday, took a bit of added significance this year for the residents of Fauquier County, Va. Two hundred years ago, on February 22, 1759, the colonial assembly enacted legislation which created Fauquier County by excising it from the body politic of Prince William County as of May 1, 1759. Thus, on May 1 of this year, Fauquier will celebrate its 200th birthday. No "200-year-old" ever looked better. * * *

Warrenton, county seat of Fauquier, was originally known as Fauquier Courthouse. On January 5, 1810, it was incorporated as Warrenton. It was named for the Revolutionary War hero of Bunker Hill, General Warren. It is a thriving and prosperous town. The county courthouse sits on a rise near the center of town. The courtroom is a marvelous example of Virginia colonial decor. Richly paneled, its walls are of pale and dignified green. Soft light filters in from its high windows and the room takes on a quiet and almost churchlike atmosphere. Arranged on the walls are portraits of former circuit judges and State officials and, at the rear of the judge's bench, an enormous and magnificent painting of John Marshall presides over the silence with stern and judicial assurance. A solitary visit to this empty room is a lesson in Virginia history. Its quiet elegance, rustic but dignified, speaks eloquently of the character of a State. * * *

On April 30 of this year Fauquier will commence its observance of its 200th anniversary by opening the doors of John Marshall's home, Oak Hill, to the public. The following day, after a giant parade, honor will be paid to one of Fauquier's great native sons, HOWARD WORTH SMITH. "Judge" Smith, chairman of the powerful House Rules Committee, is the South's most articulate and effective spokesman in the House of Representatives. A rock of intelligent and dynamic conservatism in a muddy sea of confused and meaningless liberalism, HOWARD SMITH is what Virginia excels in producing—a gentleman of dignity, well-rounded knowledge, quiet good sense, and courage.

Another native of Fauquier will be honored that day when a statue of John Marshall, the Nation's greatest Chief Justice, will be unveiled. Many other memories will be honored silently, including those of the industrious people who lived quietly and simply through 200 years of Fauquier history—people many of whose names are long forgotten but whose existence was vital to that of the county's.

Fauquier's present is little different from its past. It continues to provide its share of greatness to the Nation—its Howard Smiths. Its future seems to hang suspended above it, from the northeast, in Washington. The exodus from that city has engulfed the suburbs immediately beyond its borders, and suburbia creeps ever southward. Fauquier will someday, in the not too distant future, have to cope with the problems of suburbanization.

This encounter should be interesting to observe, a true collision of the old and the new. Fauquier's 200 years of experience, however, weighs heavily in its favor, and the transformation of this old Virginia county into a suburb of Washington will undoubtedly take place on Fauquier's terms. Properly planned for, it will bring to Fauquier its greatest prosperity and it might very well turn fox hunting into a new suburban rage. One thing, however, is certain—Fauquier will do whatever it must do as it has done everything else in the past—gracefully.

American Press Reaction to Fidel Castro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 28, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, because our relations with Cuba are so vital to hemisphere safety and solidarity, all of us are concerned over the recent visit to the United States of the Cuban Prime Minister, Dr. Fidel Castro.

Dr. Castro addressed the American Society of Newspaper Editors, and one of the observers of his presentation was Robert C. Notson, managing editor of the Oregonian, of Portland. Mr. Notson is one of the first Pacific coast editors in many years to be elected a director of the society.

In the Oregonian of April 24, 1959, Mr. Notson has analyzed the reaction of his fellow editors to Mr. Castro's views and statements, and I ask unanimous consent that this article by Mr. Notson from the Oregonian be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CASTRO MADE A HIT WITH U.S. EDITORS

(By Robert C. Notson)

Fidel Castro has done an outstanding job of selling himself to the American people on his current visit to the United States. This was a general opinion voiced among members of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, who heard him speak Friday in Washington, D.C., and who watched him perform elsewhere over the weekend. Appearance of the Cuban Premier had been attacked by some of the editors. Others had expressed misgivings over the invitation, which had bypassed the State Department. Despite all controversy, there was great curiosity as to Castro, as a person, and what he would do and say. A throng greeted him in the Presidential Ballroom of the Statler Hotel.

When he entered with his whiskered entourage, applause was sparse. A few editors struggled to their feet, a gesture common in case of a distinguished guest. Then a few more got up, followed by more. Most of the crowd stood, but it was a ragged demonstration.

At the end of 2½ hours of very earnest speaking by way of questions and answers, the crowd rose spontaneously and gave Castro a real hand. Editors who had been cool to him admitted that they were convinced of his essential sincerity and good intent.

Castro labored to get over his ideas in English, and did a pretty fair job of it, with only occasional aid from his interpreter, as he searched for the right expressions. It was difficult to cast this soft-spoken, but intense, young man in the role either of a vengeful conqueror or potential dictator.

The editors applauded roundly his statement that he was not a Communist and that Communists, if any, played no significant role in his Government. They also gave approval when he made it clear that he would favor the United States in any clash with Iron Curtain countries. He said that his "neutrality statement" had been widely misunderstood. He meant, he said, only that Cuba had no present ability to assist in any military enterprise.

He made it clear that he would honor all international commitments, including those for U.S. bases in Cuba. Without American bases, Castro said, Cuba would have no defense against external aggression.

The Premier strongly justified his executions of war criminals. He protested the statement that has recurred in the American press that he was executing followers of Batista. Executing mere followers would be a crime in itself, he said. While proceedings had been summary in some cases, in every one of them there was a well-documented dossier of proof, supported by testimony, he maintained.

Castro charged that 20,000 persons had been tortured and put to death under Batista, and that the public treasury had been stripped of $200 million.

He made two telling points with the editors:

The revolutionary army had been singular for its discipline, and there had been no substantial instance of mistreating prisoners or abusing civilians.

This was the only revolution in history where there had been an orderly take over of power without rioting, looting, and lynchings.

The reason, he said, was that he had promised the people expeditious justice for war criminals and, lacking this, the people would have taken matters into their own hands. Military courts handled the cases, because all other courts had been corrupted by Batista.

He promised reconstituted courts in a few weeks and free elections in 2 to 3 years. An election now would simply result in overwhelming victory for his 26th of July movement, as there is no opposition worthy of the name, Castro observed.

He told of 20 percent unemployment and serious economic dislocations and declared that the first job of his administration would be to get business and farms functioning. Castro noted that he had been prodded by the press of this country as to when he would restore all freedoms. He said most of them had been restored, and all would be, but the right to eat comes first.

Despite demonstrations, picketing, and challenges, as the large delegation disported itself around Washington, no untoward incident was reported. The bearded retinue behaved in exemplary fashion. Castro brought many of his intimates who had been long with him in the mountains. He said he couldn't pick and choose.

Desirability of Increasing Consumption of Dairy Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 28, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we recognize that one of the major problems confronting the farm industry is the task of establishing a consumption-production balance of farm commodities.

Particularly is this true of the dairy industry. Today dairy production supplies 30 percent of the Nation's diet of animal proteins and produces 15 percent of the total retail food sales. Dollar for dollar, these products are the best buy in the family food basket.

In addition, dairying produces about 10 percent of the gross national income from agriculture. Consequently, improving the health of the dairy industry would result in an accompanying improvement in the overall farm economy.

A major challenge confronting the industry, therefore, is that of increasing the consumption of dairy products. As accomplished, this will not only contribute to better economic health for the industry, but also will provide greater health and well-being for the American people.

Among the ways and means by which consumption can be increased, is that of greater sales and promotion efforts.

The April issue of Pure Milk News contains an article entitled "Occasional Milk Drinkers Offer Best Promotion Target for Increasing Sales." The article offers a summary of methods for increasing milk consumption and thus improving the outlook for the dairy industry.

In view of the fact that there are a number of bills pending before Congress relating not only to the dairy industry but to the farm economy, I suggest that this article offers one constructive way in which the Government, through its Promotional Services Department in the Department of Agriculture, the State departments of agriculture, and the dairy industry, itself, can tackle this problem of achieving greater consumption. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCCASIONAL MILK DRINKERS OFFER BEST PROMOTION TARGET FOR INCREASING SALES

The Alfred Politz Research, Inc., has announced its findings in the eighth of a series of studies conducted for the American Dairy Association to determine public attitudes toward dairy products.

Following is a quick summary of the findings:

1. The best way to expand the market for fluid milk is to increase the frequency of consumption of occasional milk drinkers.

2. The occasional milk drinker is most likely to consume milk at meals, or in the evening and at bedtime.

3. A smaller portion of adults consume milk on Sunday than any other day of the week.

4. Milk is more acceptable as a mealtime beverage away from home than as a between-meal beverage.

5. Refreshment and thirst quenching are closely associated with between-meal beverages, whereas nourishment is closely associated with beverages consumed with meals.

6. Energy is an important factor in consumers' attitudes toward beverages both between and with meals.

7. A beverage that provides energy is thought to have nutritional value, probably is sweet, more likely to be hot than cold and may be fattening or refreshing.

8. Proteins and sugars are thought to provide the best type of energy.

9. Sugars are thought to provide quick energy while proteins provide longer-lasting energy, energy without being fattening and energy that helps build the body.

10. People are more concerned about getting enough protein than any other nutrient.

11. Consumers feel that milk is a top supplier of protein along with meat and fowl.

12. Consumers think of chocolate milk and chocolate drinks as children's beverages. Buttermilk, skim milk and 2 percent milk are all considered adult beverages.

13. Housewives do not look with disfavor on the idea of stocking more than one variety of milk. Chocolate milk is more frequently mentioned as another variety to be stocked by families with children while buttermilk is more frequently mentioned by housewives with no children.

14. Almost two-thirds of all housewives have to make special trips to the store and almost half go to a different store from where they usually shop.

15. More housewives have to make a special trip to the store for milk than any other product. However, once they are in the store they also buy numerous additional products on their shopping list.

New British Air Route Threatens U.S. Taxpayer and U.S. Airlines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1959

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, prior to the Easter recess, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEROUNIAN] brought to the attention of the House a current proceeding of the Civil Aeronautics Board involving the application of British Overseas Airways Corp. for a foreign air carrier permit to begin service on a route extending from Hong Kong to Tokyo, Honolulu, San Francisco, and New York.

The gentleman's remarks interested me greatly, because the circumstances which he described appear to indicate that this is another instance in which this Government has conceded valuable air rights to another nation which will have an adverse economic effect on the U.S.-flag air carriers.

The extent of this economic damage to U.S. carriers is apparent from a report made last week to the Civil Aeronautics Board by Examiner Ferdinand Moran. This report recommended that the CAB deny BOAC's application to serve Tokyo on its transpacific route in the public interest, because, among other things, BOAC would divert $13 million a year in revenue from the two U.S. transpacific carriers, Pan American and Northwest.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I have been familiar with the costs involved in subsidizing the development of international air routes, and I am gravely concerned with the growing competition of foreign-flag carriers, and the potential effect of this competition on the future economic well-being of U.S. air transport enterprises.

It has been gratifying to observe that, in recent years, most of the domestic trunkline and international air carrier operations have reached a stage in which they can operate profitably without further Government assistance in the form of direct subsidy payments.

In the Pacific area, this status was achieved only after substantial assistance from the Government. During the years 1946 through 1955, the transpacific operations of U.S. Airlines required more than $87 million in Federal subsidy. Of this, Northwest received about $24 million and Pan American about $63 million. Additional subsidy, in amounts yet to be determined, is being claimed by Pan American for the years 1956 through 1958, but Northwest has been subsidy-free since 1954 and Pan American will be in the future.

None of the U.S. international carriers will be able to maintain a subsidy-free status, however, if this Government continues its past policies giving away valuable air rights without regard to the effect on the U.S. carriers, and without obtaining rights of equal value in return.

It is imperative that every effort be made to give the U.S. carriers the protection required to maintain their subsidy-free status. No further air rights should be relinquished to foreign flag carriers unless compensating U.S. rights are obtained.

In the case under discussion, if BOAC is handed this route between the two largest cities in the world—Tokyo and New York—the initial diversion is estimated, as I have mentioned, at $13 million. But that is not the end.

If this precedent is established, other foreign flag carriers authorized to operate between Tokyo and the west coast will have a powerful argument that they, too, should be given co-terminal status at New York, with further losses in revenue resulting for the U.S. transpacific and transcontinetal carriers.

The ultimate effects of this diversion, particularly during a period when the carriers are undergoing a costly transition to the jet age, could well be so serious that the sound economic status which the U.S. carriers have achieved, at great expense to the taxpayers, will be sacrificed and further subsidies may be required.

It does not seem reasonable or logical that this Government should be in the position of diverting revenue to the foreign flag carriers by the award of routes to which they have no legal entitlement under existing international agreements, particularly when the American taxpayer may be called upon to pick up the tab.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the gentleman from New York has made a sound suggestion in proposing an immediate investigation of this case, and I urge that the Transportation Subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee undertake such an investigation at once.

New British Air Route Threatens U.S. Taxpayer and U.S. Airlines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 28, 1959

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to the gentleman for his comments regarding the economic impact which the award of this new route to BOAC would have upon the competing U.S.-flag carriers.

As I have pointed out previously, the award of a Tokyo-New York route to the United Kingdom was never contemplated in the Bermuda agreement. Tokyo has been added to that agreement without negotiations, and no equivalent rights were obtained for the U.S. carriers in return.

In addition, however, the traffic on the route would be largely "fifth freedom," or third country, traffic to which a British air carrier has no claim. The examiner in the case refers to the fact that an estimated 99 percent of the passengers diverted from the U.S. carriers by BOAC would not be British subjects, or passengers traveling between points in British territory. The vast majority would be American citizens.

This fact makes the diversion to which the gentleman from Wisconsin has referred of even greater significance, since the passengers diverted would be largely passengers who properly should be carried by airlines of the United States or Japan.

This increasing diversion of American traffic to foreign-flag airlines is of growing concern, not only to the U.S. airline industry but the U.S. airline employees.

Pan American Airways pilots have pointed out, in a document circulated recently to many Members of the Congress, the extent to which foreign carriers are increasing their position in the international air transport market.

They point out that in 1948, 74 percent of the air traffic across the North Atlantic was handled by American carriers. In 1957, TWA and Pan American carried less than 43 percent of the total—this despite the fact that approximately 70 percent of the passengers were U.S. citizens.

The award of a Tokyo-New York route to BOAC will hasten the day when the same situation will prevail in the Pacific, to the great detriment of the U.S. air transport industry and its employees.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his support of my suggestion that a committee of the Congress undertake an investigation of this problem, and I hope that this will be done.

National Coal Policy Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 28, 1959

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, following is the text of a speech by Howard E. Simpson, president, Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co., at the national fuels policy dinner, sponsored by the National Coal Policy Conference, in the presidential ballroom of the Statler-Hilton Hotel, Monday evening, April 27, 1959:

The opportunity for a railroadman to participate in this program and to put in a word for a national fuels policy is deeply appreciated. As you will readily understand, the industry I represent has an enormous stake in the outcome.

First of all, it should be pointed out that failure to evolve a well-reasoned, all-inclusive national fuels policy will seriously affect the ability of your railroads to serve all segments of the economy. The Nation's railroads have available for coal traffic a fleet of over 500,000 hopper cars and an investment of over $3 billion in equipment and facilities used primarily for the movement of coal. Beyond this, practically every portion of the rest of the overall plant is used in part for coal handling.

As an example, the Baltimore & Ohio owns 48,000 hopper cars, and has invested more than $300 million in cars, locomotives and fixed plant used almost exclusively for coal traffic, which contributes 30 percent of our freight revenues. On some roads the relative importance of revenues from coal is even greater—as much as 70 percent.

It is clear that a progressive drying up of coal's share of the fuel market will seriously affect railroad plant. Cars, locomotives and tracks supported primarily by coal traffic don't stand idle indefinitely until they are suddenly needed again. Lost also would be a substantial portion of more than 800,000 skilled railroaders now at your service. Business concerns like railroads are forced to scrap excess facilities. No self-supporting enterprise can afford to maintain standby service.

The fuels issue is not a simple fact of open competition for a market. If it were, we wouldn't be here tonight. The issue, as I see it, is this: Is the present policy assuring this country a steady supply of fuels and transportation service susceptible of rapid growth and expansion and able to serve without interruption in a time of national emergency?

Certainly, the coal industry adequately passes these tests. It is a stable domestic enterprise, and is capable of immense expansion in time of need, provided it does not have to contend with further shrinking of its market. The railroads pass the same tests with a wide margin. Like coal, they are a realiable domestic industry. Furthermore, railroad charges are regulated by public authority. Granted fair and equitable Government policies for transportation, the railroads can absorb striking increases in traffic volume.

Continued shrinking in the market for solid fuels will seriously affect the ability of the railroads to move coal, and it will also force a contraction of the overall plant, thereby making the rail industry less able to serve the entire traffic needs of the country. For the prime characteristic of the American railroads is that they are volume carriers. Without volume they cannot exist—certainly not under private ownership and operation. Moreover, in terms of importance to the Nation, the railroads are the only true common carriers. They are the only form of transportation that can, and will, haul anything, at any time, in any quantity, between any points on a continent-wide system.

The railroads have built-in flexibility enabling them to expand the use of their roadway, or fixed plant, capacity almost indefinately and with a minimum drain on the country's resources in time of need. In World War II, the railroads were sufficiently flexible to increase and expand their facilities and operations, with the result that they handled 91 percent of the military freight and 97 percent of military passengers. This is one of the reasons why, in military logistics, the railroad is regarded as basic.

The issue before us, then, is whether this country is to have a steady, dependable—and expandable—supply of fuel, whatever the future may bring, and, secondly, whether we are to have a strong, reliable system of railroad transportation for all of our traffic.

The business interests of the coal industry, or of the railroads, or of the consumers of coal are really not the issue here. The real issue is our Nation's economic strength and security.

I emphasize that the railroads—the Nation's strong arm of security—face the future with confidence. An important reason for that confidence is our conviction that leaders in Government will promptly consider and adopt a fuels policy that will be sound and farsighted, and, in addition, protect its citizens in peacetime, as well as in times of national emergency.

We urge you as Americans dedicated to the Nation's interests and survival to support the objectives of the national conference.

The Place of Coal in the Present and in the Future Economy of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 28, 1959

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, the following is the text of a speech by Philip Sporn, president of the American Electric Power Co., at the national fuels policy dinner, sponsored by the National Coal Policy Conference, in the Presidential ballroom of the Statler-Hilton Hotel, Monday evening, April 27, 1959:

It is a signal honor and privilege to have this opportunity to speak to this distinguished audience on the role of coal in our economy. This subject, I strongly feel, is of vital importance not only to the coal industry and to the railroad utility industries, but also to the very well-being, strength, and even survival of the United States.

The coal industry has had a great history. It has provided the very foundations of the industrial expansion and development in all of the Western World, starting with the industrial revolution some 200 years ago. Its first use was as a source of heat energy converted into mechanical energy; later as a major component in steelmaking. If the last 50 years have been the age of steel, they have been even more so the age of fuel-generated energy, and until quite recently this has meant primarily the age of coal.

Although oil and natural gas have now been under development for about 100 years in this country, their growth to a position of primacy in the energy picture of this country has been relatively slow and gradual. Natural gas, particularly, made no significant impression on the energy supply of the country until the last decade and a half.

In 1920 coal, both bituminous and anthracite, supplied over 78 percent of the energy consumed in this country, and as recently as 1947, when the production of bituminous coal reached its historic all-time peak of 630 million tons, it still provided about 50 percent of this country's energy supply. But since that date there has been a rapid change in coal's position, and coal production has now declined to the point where, in 1958, it supplied less than 25 percent of the country's energy, while oil and gas supplied over 70 percent. Coal production has fallen from the record levels of 1947 by over 200 million tons, or about one-third.

This, of course, has confronted both the management and labor segments of the coal industry with many very difficult adjustments. Some people have been prepared to write off the coal industry as a major factor in our economy, but this certainly is not true of those who are knowledgeable or who have given serious thought to our energy problems. It definitely is not true of the coal industry itself, which in the postwar period has made substantial strides in technology that have rapidly increased efficiencies and productivity.

And yet the coal industry is in difficulties. These difficulties have resulted from several important developments. In railroad transportation, the rapid change to the diesel locomotive since 1947 has resulted in almost complete loss to the coal industry of a market that at its peak was close to 150 million tons per year. The extensions of gas pipelines throughout the country in that same period have materially decreased coal's position in the home-heating market. The competition of imported oil, particularly residual oil, in the eastern seaboard has made significant inroads on coal's markets both in utility and in industrial fields. The combined effect of these last two attritions has been a loss close to that of the railroad market.

Thus, there now remain only two major growing markets for coal—the metallurgical and the electric power—and of these two, the more rapidly growing by far is the electric power market. Since 1947 the increased tonnage consumed by the utility industry has absorbed about 70 percent of the lost railroad tonnage.

The electric power industry has demonstrated remarkable vitality and growth that has resulted in a doubling every 10 years throughout its history of a little over three-quarters of a century. And there is every reason to believe this will continue for the next several decades. In 1920 the electric utility industry accounted for a little over 10 percent of the total energy consumption of the United States and of this, about 55 percent, or 43 million tons, was coal. By 1957 the utility industry utilized about 20 percent of the total energy consumed in the United States. The use of coal by the utilities increased fourfold to over 160 million tons and continued to account for about 55 percent of the utility industry's total energy use. This has happened despite all the dramatic improvements in the efficiency of electric power generation which have reduced requirements for electric generation from over 3.5 pounds of coal equivalent to about 0.9 pound per kilowatt-hour.

For some time now I have been studying the question of the likely energy requirements of this country for the period around the middle of the decade of 1970–80, and more recently I have tried to carry these studies to the year 2000. While I realize the difficulties and dangers of such long-term projections and recognize the danger of substantial margins of error in such long-term projections, the directions and order of magnitude indicated by these studies are, I believe, sound. These projections indicate that by 1975 energy consumption by the electric utility industry will account for about 25 percent of the total energy requirements of the United States, and this will increase to 40 percent by the year 2000. At the same time, total energy requirements of the United States will increase 2½ times.

There are those who mistakenly believe that the future increases in total energy utilization, and even more rapid increases in electric energy use will be met by nuclear power. I have studied this question very carefully and have come to the conclusion that on the whole this is a mistaken oversimplification. Specifically, it fails to recognize coal's important position in the period of the next 20 years, and even as far ahead as the year 2000.

In my judgment nuclear power will, by the year 1975, provide no more than the equivalent of 50 million tons of coal for electric power generation. Further, this will constitute virtually the entire nuclear contribution to our energy supply. Coal, on the other hand, will have to supply 475 million tons for electric generation alone and as much as another 425 million tons for metallurgical and other uses. This represents well over a doubling of present coal production and 50 percent more coal than the peak production achieved by the coal industry in 1947.

In the period 1975–2000 nuclear power is likely to become more widespread. But even granting it the benefit of extreme optimism about the peacetime atom, and assuming that nuclear power accounts for 75 percent of all the additions to electric generating capacity between 1975 and 2000, and allowing for a tripling in electric generation in that period from 2 trillion to 6 trillion kilowatt-hours, atomic energy will still provide, in the year 2000, the equivalent of only 855 million tons of coal. But the use of coal for electric generation will continue to grow—although more modestly than in the period between now and 1975—to 600 million tons, with an additional 600 million tons required for all other purposes. Thus, while nuclear power may provide as much as 21 percent of this country's total estimated energy requirements in the year 2000, coal will continue to provide about 30 percent.

I have said nothing about the role of oil and gas and hydroelectric generation in the growth of electric utility generation in these periods because, relative to the total generation and total energy required for this generation, they will play only minor roles. But they will still have an important place in the total energy picture.

This optimistic picture of the potential growth and prosperity of the coal industry has led some people to look upon the coal industry's present problems with some complacency. They forget that if the coal industry is to be the strong, vital, efficient supplier of one-third of this country's growing energy requirements 40 years from now, it must first solve its present problems of growing up and living so as to survive what currently is a near crisis in its economic condition. If coal is to successfully play its indispensable role in the future—a role without which the welfare and even the defense of this country cannot be assured—then coal must have markets, production, earnings, and employment for its skilled work force in the present—right now.

But this requires a reorientation of policy vis-a-vis coal and the coal industry. This requires that everyone—not just the people in the coal industry itself and even Government, but major users—the utility industry, for example, which has such a large stake in the continued availability of adequate and economical sources of raw energy to be utilized for conversion into electrical energy—and including literally everyone interested in the welfare and safety of the United States must be concerned with the present state of the coal industry's health and with finding the means necessary to assure its vigorous survival.

National Coal Policy Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 28, 1959

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, there follows the text of a speech by George H. Love, chairman of the National Coal Policy Conference, at a dinner arranged by the conference, April 27, 1959, in the presidential ballroom of the Statler-Hilton Hotel, Washington, D.C.:

On behalf of those groups who form the National Coal Policy Conference, I have the pleasure and honor to welcome you tonight. Your hosts have joined together in this conference to find a solution in the national interest to their common problem: the revitalization of the essential coal industry. We are mine operators and owners, officers of the United Mine Workers, presidents of the some 30 railroads which transport coal in volume, coal consumers represented by the great utility companies, and we are presidents of the companies which produce the great machines and equipment now used in our coal mines.

As world trade has become more important and we have learned more about the other nations, we have all been impressed most strikingly by the concern of each nation for its energy sources. Everyone everywhere knows that the increasing use of energy is a key to progress as an economic society, is a way to leadership as a nation, and in the end is the one way to win the world race with communism. We have all heard of the Russian 5-year plans and their programs to double steel and aluminum production but at the bottom of it all is the race to use increasing amounts of energy. Not only does it take great quantities of energy to produce steel and aluminum but the amount of energy used is the best barometer of a nation's standard of living.

That being true, every country with which I am familiar feels it is almost the prime purpose of government to have a national policy toward energy and toward the sources of such energy. A typical example of this national interest in energy sources occurred in Western Germany last year. A company for which I work was building a large dock in Dotterdam, with Dutch associates, to handle iron ore for the German steel industry along the Rhine. We had in mind doubling the size of the dock to handle coal for these same German customers, coal that would come from this country and could be delivered to the industrial Rhine area for several dollars cheaper than their own coal. In addition, we were prepared to store the coal for the German steel companies on our docks, as this heavily industrialized Rhine area has very little storage place around the plants. However, the Germans said in essence: "Everything is fine, gentlemen. We need the savings you suggest and we like the quality of your coal, but our own coal mines are one of our greatest national assets and we must keep them in existence and not lose a single worker from them, because these mines are our only domestic source of energy. Yes, we will take your iron ore, but our own coal mines must continue to work." This story is typical, and I might also point out in passing that our neighbor to the north, Canada, has had a recent study of that country's energy sources by a royal commission.

This, fundamentally, is the reason for this meeting tonight. We believe that this Nation must establish a national fuels policy and do it at the earliest date. We are fortunate enough to have in varying amounts all the major sources of such energy. Therefore, we need a national policy more than any other Nation because we must balance the use of these fuels with their varying reserves so that each makes the greatest possible contribution to the national welfare. Let me mention three problems, the proper solution of which can only come from an unbiased government—

You have heard, even in the Halls of Congress, that the present mandatory controls on importation of residual oil promulgated by the President on March 10 might serve to deny heat to our citizens in New England and along the coast. This is purely ridiculous, as home heating oil and residual oil are two completely different animals, the former selling for at least twice as much as the latter. Restrictions of residual oil have nothing to do with heating homes, because this particular product is used in large industrial and utility plants under boilers where domestic coal or natural gas can also be used.

Let me explain very quickly why residual oil is such an unfair competitor from time to time and can alone wreck the entire coal industry and the eastern railroads, which need the coal traffic so badly. Any great natural resource such as oil must at times be in oversupply. Plans for production of oil are made five and ten years in advance, and exploration and development sometimes bring in great new fields unexpectedly. Every 4 or 5 years the world seems to be faced with a tremendous oversupply of oil. This never happened in greater volume than in 1958.

The only place in the entire world where this oil surplus could suddenly be absorbed in volume is along the eastern seaboard where so many of our large industrial plants and utilities are equipped with dual burning equipment, so that by turning a valve a plant may switch from coal to oil.

That is all right, if coal were not the fundamental and cheapest fuel for these seaboard plants (at least 80 percent of the time) and if the coal and railroad industries could survive as standby industries during this short period of oil surplus. And finally, it would be all right if this foreign oil could be available during the next world emergency. But in every past crisis it has rapidly disappeared.

Let me give you two or three sentences about natural gas and, in doing so, point out that it is a perfect household fuel when it is available on an economic basis. It is a clean and convenient fuel and has other higher uses where coal or oil does not fill the bill. Because it does have these unusual properties and because its reserves are limited, certainly then it should not be dumped under large industrial boilers at prices frequently as low as one-third the price the householder pays and actually sold at less than cost to knock coal out of that particular market merely to give a pipeline company or two a 100% load factor. Obviously our natural gas reserves must be thought of as having a life of two or three decades as opposed to 1,000 years for coal, or there would not be such great present efforts being made to import increased amounts from Mexico and Canada.

Finally, let me mention atomic energy. Of course, this country must be first in knowledge, and ability, to use this great new source of energy and that is the situation today—we are first. The coal industry wants us to stay that way, but we do not believe that any rational, national fuel policy would permit us to rush to produce energy from the atom costing 60 mills in coal territory where coal can produce the same energy for 4 mills. Do we put our own essential coal miners and railroad workers on the streets in order to have our taxpayers subsidize power costing 10 to 15 times as much? Let us continue to be first in knowledge, but then let this new source of energy find its proper place among the other fuels on the basis of economics rather than politics.

In conclusion, let me say that this country has had many inquiries into its energy sources. In the late thirties a group headed by Harold Ickes issued recommendations seeking a sound national policy concerned with conservation and prudent utilization of our basic energy resources. In 1951 Senator O. MAHONEY, as chairman of a study group, raised many questions still unanswered. There was the Paley Committee Report on natural resources in 1952. As late as February 1955, a Cabinet Advisory Committee on Energy Supplies, appointed by the President raised the question: What steps may be taken to improve the economic position of the coal industry, now seriously depressed, without penalizing competing industries as a means of enhancing the ability of that coal industry to contribute to the national defense? Incidentally, this Committee recommended limitations on foreign residual oil and prohibitions against the sale of natural gas at less than cost.

We, the National Coal Policy Conference, now ask for an unbiased Joint Congressional Committee to study this whole problem and thus provide a forum where representatives from the gas, oil, atomic, and coal industries may be heard and then find the proper policy for the balancd use of these fuels from a broad public point of view. Having found that proper policy, let us then implement it by law, if necessary, so that the recommendations may be carried out this time.

Colorado Communists Convicted Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 28, 1959

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Santa Monica Outlook of Santa Monica, Calif.:

COLORADO COMMUNISTS CONVICTED AGAIN

A jury in a Denver Federal court has just convicted the same Communist leaders that a previous jury convicted, but who had been granted a new trial by the U.S. Supreme Court. That could have happened in California if the U.S. attorney had sought a new trial, but he felt a conviction was not obtainable under the rules of law the High Court prescribed for Smith Act trials. So he let them go, and we read recently that those same Communist leaders are busy leading their flock into more subversive activity and recruiting new members of the subversive party.

Maybe the U.S. attorney was right in dropping the case, but in view of what has just happened in Denver, maybe not. There could have been stronger evidence of inciting to action in the talk of the defendants in the Denver case, but to most aware observers there was plenty here, and the feeling was general that the Commies were properly convicted and should have been sent to prison to serve their 5-year terms.

There are two heartening things about the Denver case. One was the courage of the Federal prosecutor in bringing a new case. He was up against heavy odds of a High Court's frowning on the use of the Smith Act—the same act it had favored in the original case up from Judge Medina's New York Federal court. The other is the action of the jury in convicting. Juries are good cross sections of American opinion, and though they heed the judge's instructions on the law to apply, they invariably temper their findings in controversial cases with the general thought and modes of the community.

Though the Denver defendants will doubtless appeal from this adverse verdict, there is always the chance that this time they will fail and that the High Court will sustain the conviction. It might do it, and meanwhile, other communities can be heartened by the conviction to the point of prosecuting their own Commie leaders. And with juries indicating that their sentiment is still to imprison the people who urge violent overthrow of our system, even Congress may wake up to the need of repassing the Smith Act in form that is bound to be acceptable to the judges.

Nomination of Brooks Hays Commended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 28, 1959

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the nomination by the President of our former colleague, Brooks Hays, of Arkansas, as a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority, has been greeted with commendation in the press of my State. As examples of the press' reaction to this appointment, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Nashville Banner and the Washington Report from the Nashville Tennessean for Sunday, April 26, 1959. The editorial and article follow:

[From the Nashville Banner, Apr. 24, 1959]

HAYS APPOINTMENT ACCEPTABLE

President Eisenhower's choice of Brooks Hays, of Arkansas, to succeed Frank B. Welch on the Tennessee Valley Authority Board hardly will encounter formidable opposition.

It did evoke surprise—for the former Congressman's name had not been among those on which speculation turned for this assignment. It does incur some regional regret, for the reasonable preference was for an appointment from within the valley area: someone both acquainted and identified with the interests served by this vast operation.

The President patently has avoided playing partisan politics, for he had named a Democrat to join two Republicans on the Board, and his choice accents the factor of public respect and personal integrity. Those are elementary in any treatment of office as a public trust.

With Chairman Herbert Vogel, and Arnold Jones, Mr. Hayes will round out a capable directorate—and apart from the valley's natural wish for a more direct representation at the agency's supervisory helm, it will welcome the appointment. Its genuine interest forbids perpetuation of the political gambit which fabricates a conspiracy on TVA every time some incumbent or aspirant runs for public office.

TVA is in good hands, and the Hays appointment will not detract from that.

[From the Nashville Tennessean, Apr. 26, 1959]

WASHINGTON REPORT—BROOKS HAYS' PRESTIGE HIGH—TVA APPOINTEE MAY BE THE ANSWER TO AGENCY'S MOST PRESSING NEEDS

(By Lois Laycook)

WASHINGTON.—Evangelist Billy Graham once described Brooks Hays as a rare combination of a man possessing the humor of Mark Twain, the common sense of Benjamin Franklin, and the integrity of Lincoln.

The former Arkansas Congressman, nominated for appointment to the TVA Board of Directors by President Eisenhower last week, probably has more congressional friends and admirers in both political parties than any figure in public life. Despite his defeat for reelection last fall, his prestige in Washington remains at a high level.

Even Southern Members of Congress who were pressured into a public display of hostility toward Hay's views on civil rights privately expressed admiration for his courage and integrity. There is no evidence that any Southern Senator will oppose Hay's nomination on the Senate floor. In fact, a number of Southerners, including Senators JOHN SPARKMAN (Democrat, Alabama), and J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT (Democrat, Arkansas), have issued laudatory statements on the nomination.

Hays may turn out to be the answer to one of TVA's most pressing needs—a public relations missionary who can restore congressional and public confidence in the Agency's objectives.

Because of his many close friendships on Capitol Hill, Hays could be of invaluable service in helping TVA overcome repeated private power victories in the legislative field. He may be of assistance in the forthcoming battle over the TVA self-financing bill, provided he is confirmed by the Senate in time.

FERVENT SPOKESMAN

In addition to better liaison with Congress, TVA has long needed a fervent spokesman on the Board willing to go before the American people and give an eloquent presentation of the TVA story. Not since the days of David Lilienthal and Gordon Clapp has the agency had a dedicated spokesman ready to give TVA a real hard-sell campaign.

Hays has been in constant demand as a speaker throughout the country for many years. His humorous Ozark stories made him the best-known, best-liked raconteur in Congress with the lone exception of the late Alben Barkley.

Hay's humor has even reached the serious halls of the United Nations. As a U.S. delegate to the U.N., he once answered a Russian demand that Outer Mongolia be admitted to the U.N. by offering a counter proposal that Texas also be admitted to the U.N. under the new name of "Outer Arkansas."

The proposal broke up a tense U.N. meeting with belly laughs.

KIND-FACED MAN

Hays is a 60-year-old thin, kind-faced man with eyeglasses and a receding hairline. Never outwardly ruffled, he keeps a busy schedule with little fuss. A deeply religious intellectual, he became the first layman ever elected president of the 8 million-member Southern Baptist convention. His 2-year presidential term expires May 22.

As a moderate on civil rights, Hays tried desperately but unsuccessfully to play the role of peacemaker in the Little Rock school integration crisis. He arranged the Newport, R.I., meeting between President Eisenhower and Governor Orval Faubus in an attempt to prevent a direct clash between State and Federal authority in Arkansas. The effort failed.

Faubus later instigated the write-in campaign that resulted in Hay's defeat by Dale Alford in the November congressional election.

SOUTHERN CATALYST

In 1949, Hays stepped into what was virtually a vacuum to become a Southern catalyst in trying to find a formula for solving racial problems.

He introduced a bill—later to become known as "the Arkansas plan"—which sought to compromise three highly controversial issues, the poll tax, the proposed northern-supported antilynch bill, and the so-called fair employment practices commission.

The bill attracted widespread editorial support in newspapers throughout the country, including several in the South. However, the Truman administration insisted on its stronger proposals and the Hays' proposal died.

FIRM BELIEVER

For the most part, Hays supported New Deal and Fair Deal proposals during the Roosevelt and Truman administrations. A member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, he was a firm believer in a bipartisan foreign policy.

Hays was a supporter of TVA throughout his service in Congress with the lone exception of the Dixon-Yates contract. He favored the contract, he said, because the construction of a powerplant in West Memphis, Ark., would have helped the critical unemployment situation in Arkansas. He also argued the contract was good for TVA.

There was no record vote on the Dixon-Yates contract when it was before the House in 1954. However, Hays openly supported the measure and voted for it on a teller (nonrecord) vote.

RECORD IS FAVORABLE

On public power issues generally, Hays' record is for the most part favorable. According to a National Rural Electric Association tally of votes on major power issues during his service in Congress from 1943 through 1958, Hays voted propublic power on 35 out of 41 opportunities.

Three of the thirty-five dealt with TVA legislation. In 1949, he voted for funds for the New Johnsonville steam plant on two separate rollcalls. The vote on this issue was crucial because it represented TVA's first venture into steam plant construction and stirred up the all-out opposition of the private power lobby.

In 1957, Hays cast his vote against a Republican amendment to kill all funds in the TVA appropriation bill earmarked for power facilities. The amendment was defeated.

The tally shows Hays supported all appropriations for the REA as well as for the Southwestern Power Administration. However, he is listed with unfavorable votes on two issues affecting the Bonneville Power Administration and the Southeastern Power Administration.

He also voted to turn over to the private power companies the development of Niagara Falls power projects in 1953.

Fire Prevention Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 28, 1959

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, on Monday night, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce presented awards for its annual interchamber fire safety contest. For the 14th time, the city of Hartford, capital of Connecticut and principal community in my district, received first award in its population class. Moreover, in 1940, 1943, and 1953, Hartford achieved the distinction of being chosen as the grant award winner and is now in permanent possession of the trophy. These awards recognize the outstanding effort made by the community and the distinguished record of the Hartford Fire Department, headed by Chief Henry G. Thomas. Chief Thomas is retiring this week and I think this latest chamber of commerce award is fittingly timed to call attention to the splendid record he has achieved. In addition, I should like to mention the work done by Fire Marshal George Kennedy in organizing the activity that is the basis for the award.

Hartford has had some destructive and tragic fires in its history. In all of them, the Hartford Fire Department has battled with remarkable speed, order and effectiveness to control this tragic

force. Many Hartford firemen have demonstrated exemplary bravery in action and all have shown the courage and resourcefulness that has inspired gratitude in adults and admiration in children. But the department realizes that firefighting is only part of its job. It turns to the fire prevention effort with vigorous steps because it knows that here is the most rewarding part of the problem—the public education that can stem losses.

Untold property damage and countless lives have been saved by the progressive program of fire safety that Hartford has carried out. Three times Hartford has been singled out for the grand award of the U.S. Chamber, retiring the trophy. Among the highlights of this program has been the naming of junior fire marshal, grammar school students trained in habits of fire safety.

The Hartford Fire Department and the city of Hartford deserve acclamation for their efforts. I am proud to salute Hartford as the Fire Prevention City.

The A-L-S-O of School Lunch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1959

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, in November of 1958, I spoke before the American School Food Service Association at its national convention in Philadelphia, Pa., in connection with the school-lunch program. The speeches and the discussions regarding the school-lunch program were very informative, and I observed the intense interest of the dedicated public servants and directors who are guiding the school-lunch program in the schools throughout the United States.

One of the speeches which I heard pleased me immensely and demonstated foresight and vision. The speech of Dr. John N. Perryman, executive secretary of the American School Food Service Association, was a forerunner of the program to utilize our food surpluses as a bold instrument in our U.S. foreign policy. Our school lunches are programs providing food for thought and food for health. The following is the speech delivered by Mr. Perryman which I am certain will prove of immense interest to the readers:

You know, 1 week from today is Thanksgiving Day and this means we are not only on the eve of the Thanksgiving season, we are on the eve of the whole holiday season, the Christmas period as well. And very soon, as part of that glad and glorious occasion that is Christmas, we will be singing again those wonderful old Christmas carols. This is my favorite and possibly yours as well:

"O Little Town of Bethlehem,
How still we see Thee lie.
Above Thy deep and dreamless sleep,
The silent stars go by.

"Yet in Thy dark street shining,
The everlasting light.
The hopes and fears of all the years
Are met in Thee tonight."

You know, Bethlehem is not just a name. It is also a word from the Hebrew language meaning "house of food," and is one more of the legion of examples in the literature and the history and religion of mankind of his dependency upon food. And so, in this carol, "O Little Town of Bethlehem," what, in a sense, we are saying is that in the house of food there is an everlasting light that shines. In the house of food are met "the hopes and fears of all the years," and certainly, with the devoted and dedicated people who work in the world of school lunch, this is true.

Well, now, you might possibly be thinking at this point, "Aren't we getting carried away just a little bit here? Is it school lunch we are talking about after all, isn't it? And we have lights shining and devoted and dedicated people, etc. Isn't it just a feeding program? Aren't we just giving food to hungry little monsters at noon?" Unfortunately, I am afraid this is a rather widely held belief and is held even among some school administrators.

A young mother said to me in my travels this autumn, "I don't get away from home during the school year because I have to fix lunch every day for my young daughter." I said, "No school lunch program?" "Oh, yes, but we live too close to school to be able to use it. All families within a considerable radius of the school are not permitted to have their children participate in the school lunch program." She said, "Our superintendent doesn't believe in overtaxing the supervisory facilities of the faculty and he has consequently made this rule." This seems to me, if you will pardon the expression, like a plumbing approach to school lunch, that it is nothing more nor less than a physical facility to meet an urgent, pressing, physical need. If the child can possibly wait long enough to get any place else to fulfill that need, he is expected to do so—a terribly, pathetically, tragically inadequate definition and description of the school lunch program.

So, this afternoon I want to talk to you about the "also" of school lunch. We know school lunch is intended to serve food. We take that as our point of departure and go on from there to examine the "also" of school lunch. I intend to use this word as a word and also to use it for its initials because, you know, initials can be very handy pegs on which to hang ideas. I think perhaps our featured speaker of the afternoon might enjoy a chuckle with us if we reminisce for amoment about the early days of the Roosevelt administration. You will recall that at that time the Government was undertaking many additional activities and creating additional agencies to administer these activities, and for purposes of brevity and convenience most of these agencies had their own separate initials. I remember a political wag of the day commented that the New Deal administration was setting up an alphabetical government which the Supreme Court was throwing out the window three letters at a time. (To Mrs. Roosevelt.) That may bring back some memories.

Nevertheless, initials are useful, a useful means of remembering ideas, and I had planned to use them this afternoon to help me remember what I want to say and I hope you will use them, too, for the same purpose. In other words, the initials A-L-S-O, I hope you will not throw out the window but rather take with you out the door.

The A-L-S-O of school lunch. What are you in addition to those who prepare food? Architects of the anatomy; leaders of learning; sources of survival; and as you try to communicate with your own communities as to the real meaning of the program in which you function, you are hopefully also operators of opinion. Architects of anatomy, leaders of learning, sources of survival, and operators of opinion—the "also" of school lunch.

Let's look at each of these briefly. First of all, architects of the anatomy. And what a fantastically wonderful mechanism the human body actually is. Two billion muscle fibers in each of us. In the brain, 14 million distinct cells. In the lungs—have you thought, perhaps, they were just like a couple of collapsible paper bags? Hardly. Seven hundred and fifty million air sacs. In each kidney, 1,200,000 little tubes. And the heart—the heart is the most amazing part of the whole mechanism. Each and every day it pumps 500 gallons of blood, 17 million gallons in a lifetime, and beats 2,500 million times to get the job done. The average family eats 2½ tons of food a year to provide the fuel for this amazing mechanism. We think the family car nowadays is quite a gadget, and it is. But the chances are good that you will see several of them on the ash heap while you are still going strong. It is an amazing mechanism this package in which we walk around, but it takes a lot of fuel and it takes fuel of the right kind, the right proportion, the right mixture, the right amount. And as you look at the youngsters around you and watch them grow up and see them as they are, you may realize that you have the opportunity of actually being architects of the anatomy, of actually helping them physically to be what they should be.

But even at best, if you are just a crackerjack at this school lunch business, you have provided only 5 meals out of the 21 in a week for less than 10 months in a year and for very few years in a lifespan. So it is not enough for you to be an architect of the anatomy. Now you must also be a leader of learning so that as these youngsters go on from your care they will be educated to the point of making intelligent choices. Oh, this is so tremendously important. General Hershey, in testifying to a congressional committee, stated that 150,000 men were rejected, were classified as 4–F, during World War II because of difficulties traceable directly or indirectly to nutritional deficiencies; 150,000 men physically unable to serve the needs of their country because no one had taught them how to eat. It is no accident and it is no meaningless phrase that the National School Lunch Act starts with the words, "In the interest of national defense * * *." What more vital, what more important information can our youth acquire in school than this knowledge that will give them health, that will give them vigor, that will give them physical ability for the rest of their days. And yet I wonder how many schools represented in this great ballroom have a nutrition course in their curriculum; and I would be willing to wager a sizable amount of money there is not one school represented here that has any required nutrition information.

Not only is this knowledge tremendously vital to the living of life itself, not only is it just a part of every minute that we live and breathe, but, more than that, if the youngsters don't learn it from you, they are very likely not going to learn it at all. What a tremendously significant and frightening teaching opportunity you have in your hands. And so, architects of anatomy today; leaders of learning for tomorrow.

Third, sources of survival, and I think again there is a today and a tomorrow in this activity. The today, of course, is preparation and planning for the disaster that may happen today. You have the know-how; you have the kitchens; you have the dining rooms; you have the equipment; you are very likely to have some food. You have, in short, the ability to help meet the needs of an emergency. But I think I would mention this to you, not exclusively from the humanitarian standpoint this afternoon. A school superintendent whose community had been badly hit by a disaster discussed his experiences with me some months ago, and let me tell you in approximately his words what he said.

He said, "Someone called me up one night, got me out of bed and said, 'We are coming into your school at 5 o'clock tomorrow morning. Who will be there to open the door?'" And he said, "They came in at 5 o'clock the next morning, people who did not know the school, our equipment, how to handle it, sincere, well-meaning, hard-working people. But we suffered a considerable amount of damage. And, finally, our own people had to come in in the long run." And he said, "I am telling you if I ever get out of this mess, I am going to take a different approach." He said, "This was my own fault—nobody's but mine. I said to my staff, 'We want no part of this. We do not want to become involved in disaster operations.' But," he said, "I now realize that if disaster strikes, schools are going to be used and we want them to be used by people who know our facilities.

I believe this is tremendous important and I hope when you go home you will talk this over with your own administrators and even endeavor to work your staffs and your facilities into the disaster planning of your own communities.

Well, this is the today part of it. There's a tomorrow of this long-ranging that I believe people, such as yourselves, who have a deep knowledge and comprehension of food must consider. Disaster planning for today, of course, is what to do in the event of a disaster. Disaster planning for tomorrow is how to avoid one, how not to have one at all. And I think by understanding a little better the world in which we live and the tremendous role the food plays or can play and should play in this world, we can do much to prevent a disaster. History has played a peculiar trick on us which perhaps not too many people have stopped to think about. Three hundred years ago, before the industrial revolution, the world was far apart geographically and close together economically and politically. It took a long time to go from anywhere to anywhere, and yet if one had made the journey from the England of Henry the Eighth to the Russia of Peter the Great he would have found that people were living much the same in both parts of the world. He would have found absolute monarchs; he would have found similarities in both government and economy. France, as we today know it, is the most ornery country in the world as far as being a democracy is concerned. One of Louis XIV's court asked him once, "What is the state?" And he sneered and he said, "L'etat? L'etat c'est moi." ("The state? The state is me.") People lived under similar governments and under similar circumstances throughout much of the civilized world.

Today the situation is exactly reversed. No one lives far from anyone now. The size of the world shrank by 40 percent this fall with the introduction of commercial jet aviation. You know, while we are gathered in this room this afternoon, even if Mrs. Roosevelt and I do not become carried away from the meeting and precisely on time, one of the manned satellites in the heavens will have circled the globe. That's as long as it takes. Everyone lives close to everyone else nowadays. But does everyone live in a manner similar to everyone else? We know that there are violent extremes in government between the democracies and the totalitarian states. And what about economies? The per capita income in the United States is $1,870 per person per year. In Canada, our nearest rival, it is $1,310. In England and West Germany, about $870; in Israel, $470; in Egypt, $120; and in India and China, $60 a year, and one-third of the earth's population lives in that $60 area.

Why the spread of communism? Not the ideology but the stomach. It's stomach communism; it's hunger. Why not fight with food? The empty promises of communism are only appealing to people of desperation. Now, please do not misunderstand me and think I am suggesting that we should do away with our military forces because certainly I do not. If we were not well armed today, we would be overcome tomorrow, and I have not the slightest doubt of that. But what I am saying is if we look ahead to the future, if we plan for the next 50 years, in a world as small as ours we can no longer rely upon political intrigue to save our lives. We must plan differently.

A jet fighter costs $9.9 million. That's about the amount of money spent on all the turkeys given to all the schools in 1957. One nuclear submarine costs $200 million. Two of these are the equal of all the food distributed last year to all outlets, domestic and foreign. I am proud that my countrymen developed the nuclear submarine and I am tremendously thankful that we have it in our arsenal. But I do not believe that that weapon or that any weapon of death will preserve the peace of the world in a shrinking world. Why not concentrate upon weapons of life? Why not fight with food? Food is the key to the future of the world and its survival.

Finally, operators of opinion. A friend of mine said the other day, and he is connected with the school lunch program from a business standpoint, "You will get a kick out of this. My oldest daughter is a senior in high school this year. She's decided she doesn't want to eat the school lunch." And I inquired as to the reason why. "Oh, well," he said, "she thinks it isn't in vogue. None of the gang she runs around with are doing it. So she makes her mother pack a sandwich for her." I think this is so typical of the thinking of many people: that it is something that can be so easily taken or left behind. I said to him, "What would you do if your daughter came home and said, 'Gee, I'm not going to study English and American history. None of my gang's doing it.'" He said, "I'd turn her over my knee and tell her to be with the gang in the evenings and get her education during the day."

Why not the school lunch program? Probably for two reasons: 1. We may be failing to make that program the education it should be; and 2, we are not communicating the real potential of this activity to others. I think we just have to make up our minds that we are not going to accept the plumbing approach to school lunch; we are not going to accept a definition of our work that does not go beyond the preparation of food. And as we concentrate on these goals in our own thinking and in our own working, we must also emphasize them in our communications with others.

Well, perhaps at this point you may be inclined to say, "Well, now, all of this sounds fine, but it really does mean a lot of work and you know, after all, the job doesn't pay too awfully well and I don't know whether I am really being successful if I am in this work. It doesn't carry too much prestige with it," and what have you.

You know it is only the "also" of school lunch that turns your job into a profession. It is only the "also" of school lunch that really gives your work a purpose, a tremendously deep and meaningful significance.

Henry Wadsworth Longfellow wrote these words:

> "Life is real, life is earnest,
> And the grave is not its goal.
> Dust thou art, to dust returneth
> Was not spoken of the soul."

It is only with the "also" of school lunch that your work has a soul.

I want to tell you a little story. It is appropriate for the autumn, I think, because a duck was flying along, heading south and getting rather tired. Looking for a place to rest, he saw this very attractive, little pond and another duck floating on the water. So he flew in for a landing and just swam up for a little chat. And he happened to look up into the cattails and realized that he was looking right down both barrels of a double-barreled shotgun. So the first duck said to the second duck, "Duck," and he ducked. He heard these two great explosions over his head and he came back on the surface of the water and looked for his companion, but he didn't see him. Then he noticed some splinters floating on the top of the water and he said, "Oh, 'wooden' duck, huh."

Of course, the moral of the story is to always look up. I think that's very true in our work as well. If you don't look up, then your work becomes just so many splinters floating on the surface. The temperature of the rinse water, the monthly report that has to be gotten out, the piece of equipment that needs repair, it's always splinters. But if you look up to the "also" of school lunch, if you realize that you are also architects of the anatomy, leaders of learning, sources of survival, and operators of opinion, then your job will take new meaning and new form and will not be just a bunch of disconnected and superficial splinters.

I would like to leave you with what I believe is a workable formula for success. How does one achieve success? It's very easy. Just fall in love with something big enough to fill your heart. The "also" of school lunch is big enough.

Poland's Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 28, 1959

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, May 3, 1959 marks the 168th anniversary of the adoption of Poland's Constitution.

This anniversary provides a unique opportunity for the Congress to evaluate the situation of the people of Poland who suffer under Communist domination as part of the totalitarian bloc.

I include here a short resume of the facts pertaining to the present situation in Poland, which were assembled for me by the Polish American Congress:

FACTS PERTAINING TO THE PRESENT SITUATION IN POLAND

The political and moral oppression and the economic misrule and exploitation by the regime, clearly subservient to Moscow, resulted in the Poznan revolt of June 1956. It forced the Communists to make concessions and to liberalize the regime headed by Wladyslaw Gomulka, the new first secretary of the party. Moscow, fearing repercussions in the other captive nations, protested violently but in the showdown in Warsaw in October 1956 Khrushchev, who had personally flown in to stem the tide, had to give way lest an attempt at brutal oppression lead to disastrous results.

Among the gains won by the Polish people were the regime's new policy toward the church, which again permitted religious teaching in schools and other concessions which led to the liquidation of the collective farms so detested by the peasants; the relaxation of censorship which permitted greater freedom of the press—though criticism was tempered by the common knowledge that Soviet Russia would not permit the installation of a non-Communist regime; and the

cessation of terror by the security police. Although these achievements by no means restored the full enjoyment of human rights they were important.

As the Communist Party regained control of the situation, the improvement was short-lived. Developments in the course of 1958 have been marked by intensified repression of the people, retrogressing toward the conditions in force before October 1956. This retreat from the gains of the Polish October is particularly evident with regard to the freedom of intellectuals, to workers' rights and church-state relations. There are many signs that the gains of October are to be further reduced.

For several months, a ruthless press campaign has been waged against the church and against religion. The Minister of Education of August 4, 1958, forbade religious instruction in state schools by members of religious orders and congregations. On August 9, 1958, the Catholic hierarchy lodged a protest, calling the order an unconstitutional violation of the basic church-state agreement.

Recent statements by leading party members indicate that collective farms are to be reinstated. Gomulka himself stated on September 7, 1958: "The only correct road must in the long run lead to the collectivization of Polish agriculture."

There has been no genuine freedom of opinion in Poland since the loss of independence, and even the freedom of criticism which Gomulka announced at the VIIIth Plenum in 1956 lasted less than a year. Censorship has been reestablished. Many papers have been banned, including the outspoken organ of the young Communist intellectuals, Po Prostu, party control was increased over newspapers and the planned weekly Europa was not allowed to appear at all. In May 1958 a ruthless campaign against the more independent newspapermen and writers was proclaimed by Werblan, head of the party propaganda machine. Today the press and other media of information are again becoming as subservient to the party and the regime as before October 1956.

Increasingly, the regime in power in Poland is resuming the traditional Communist pattern of violating and denying the basic human rights and freedoms.

The people of Poland always manifested strong attachment to the Western World and their desire for the democratic way of life which we enjoy. It is important that this flame of freedom burning in the hearts of freedom-loving Polish people be not permitted to be extinguished.

It is therefore very important that the United States give economic aid and moral support to the Polish nation in this difficult period which they are now enduring.

Congress Should Override the Veto of the REA Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 28, 1959

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, as one of the sponsors of the legislation which Congress recently passed by a large margin restoring full loanmaking authority to the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, I was keenly disappointed that the President saw fit to veto such a logical proposal.

I cannot understand why anyone would think it is sound policy to ask the Rural Electrification Administration to examine a loan application from one of our rural electric cooperatives, make a careful appraisal of that loan based on the criteria laid down by Congress, and then have the whole evaluation reversed by an arbitrary decision made by Secretary Benson or some future Secretary of Agriculture.

Why do we bother to establish an REA administrator and furnish him with a competent technical staff to examine loan applications if we are then going to permit a politically appointed Cabinet officer to use some kind of a political test or his own personal whims to decide whether or not a loan should be approved or disapproved?

Mr. Speaker, I am getting weary of government by veto. It seems that every time we are successful in passing legislation through the Congress to help farm people, Mr. Benson speaks to the President and all our hard work is lost with one stroke of the veto pen.

In 1956, after great effort and long hours of hearings and debate, the Congress passed a 90 percent of parity bill for agriculture to help give our farmers a fair return on their labor and investments. That much-needed bill was quickly vetoed by the President at Mr. Benson's insistence.

Last year, Congress passed legislation simply to hold the line against further price drops. Even this modest legislation was killed with a Presidential veto after it drew the opposition of Secretary Benson.

Now once again, after Congress has passed a measure necessary for the protection of our rural electric associations, the President has used the veto weapon.

I urge my colleagues in the Congress to reverse this ill-advised veto. It is in the best interest of rural America and sound administration that we do so.

Nehru Must Choose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 28, 1959

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from Time and Tide, London, England, of April 4, 1958, and a press release of April 16, 1959:

[From Time and Tide, London, England, Apr. 4, 1959]

NEHRU MUST CHOOSE

Mr. Nehru, Prime Minister of a great nation which aspires to the leadership of the uncommitted countries of Asia, seeks, as he told the Indian Parliament on Monday, friendship with both Tibet and China. He regards the destruction of Tibetan monasteries by Chinese Communist artillery and bombs as most unfortunate, but asserts that it would be impolite to discuss Tibetan affairs in the House of the People.

Mr. Nehru is known to be a sensitive man. Yet the Western Powers, and particularly those which still have imperial commitments, may be forgiven if they feel that his sense of politeness extends in an eastern direction only. No considerations of etiquette have inhibited the Prime Minister from criticizing in the freest terms and on every suitable public occasion any activities of which he disapproves, undertaken by Great Britain, France, Portugal, or other Western Powers in their dealings with the overseas territories for which they are still responsible. When the Soviet Union, 3 years ago, chose to crush a spontaneous rising by the people of a nation technically sovereign and independent, Mr. Nehru could scarcely summon a word of disapproval to his lips. As with Hungary, so now with Tibet. Mr. Nehru's politeness appears to operate in one direction.

The Indian press and informed opinion in the subcontinent have already noticed the blinkers which the Prime Minister has clamped upon Indian policy. The acid comments of Indian political leaders and of most of the influential newspapers of the country and the angry protests of the crowds which demonstrate in New Dehli and elsewhere, in favor of hands off Tibet, indicate clearly that the Prime Minister and the Congress Party which he leads lag far behind enlightened opinion.

The Government of India now faces one of the great decisions of its brief history. For the past 12 years Mr. Nehru and his colleagues have had things easy. To ensure a steady flow of sympathy and of material assistance from the United States, from whom, in the experience of the Republic of India, all blessings flow, it has sufficed to conjure up the bogeyman of imperialism against any European power which happened to present a suitable target at any given moment. Now the aggressor is not an ally of the United States, but on the contrary, her avowed enemy. The heart of official Washington can be wrung by the suffering of Mau Mau Kikuyu, of Cypriots, of Algerians, of Goanese when these are eloquently expounded from New Delhi and when the "oppressors" are America's own allies. It is hardly likely that Washington will be equally sympathetic to Mr. Nehru's complete indifference to the agony of the Tibetan people at the hands of Communist China.

Mr. Nehru says, quite rightly, that no one should expect India to go to war with China over Tibet. Nobody expected Great Britain and her allies to go to war with Russia over Hungary. Yet public opinion in this country and throughout the free world was allowed to express its abhorrence of the methods used by the Soviet Union in crushing a small state of South-East Europe. The British Government lost no time in condemning the Russian rulers for a violation of human rights no more flagrant than that from which the Tibetan people are now suffering. Moreover, the Western Powers opened their frontiers to refugees from Communist oppression. It remains to be seen whether India will dare to do likewise.

Not very long ago, and at a cost in blood of which India too paid her share, the world learned that appeasement can never bring peace. If India now aspires, as she is well entitled to do, to the leadership of the Asiatic nations which seek to live in peace between the two great blocs she must learn the meaning of neutrality.

In this matter India might learn a lesson from a nation far smaller than she and far more perilously situated. Sweden seeks no leadership in the world. She seeks neutrality and she is prepared to make great sacrifices to defend it, as the state of her armed forces testifies. For the past 10 years Russian designs upon Finland have been checked by the knowledge that Sweden, with

a population of 7 million people, would not remain indifferent to the fate of her northern neighbors. It must not be said that India with her 350 million inhabitants is less capable at least of speaking up on behalf of a small peaceful nation on her own northern frontier.

For that matter neutral Austria, with Russian shells falling across her frontier did not hesitate, in 1956, to give sanctuary to Hungarian refugees or to express her detestation of their tormentors.

Mr. Nehru must choose. There can be honor in neutrality, but people who truckle to bullies cannot hope to lead their fellowmen. On the contrary it is all too likely that those who today ignore the cries of the oppressed will tomorrow themselves be the victims of the evil forces which they sought to ignore.

APRIL 16, 1959.

His Excellency, JAWAHARLAL NEHRU, *the Prime Minister of India, New Delhi.*

DEAR MR. PRIME MINISTER: In the world press on April 8, 1959, there appeared a notice that before the Dalai Lama reaches New Delhi you are going to meet with him and request that he leave the territory of India and return to his native land. Such a request is said to be motivated by the following considerations:

1. The Chinese Communist Government has never accused the Dalai Lama but only his "reactionary entourage," of fomenting revolt;

2. The Panchen Lama has not been appointed by the Chinese as the successor of the Dalai Lama but is only the guardian of his throne until its rightful possessor returns to Lhasa;

3. The Peking Government recognizes the great influence of the Dalai Lama over the Tibetan people and therefore Peking wishes to arrive at an agreement and cooperation with the spiritual leader of Tibet.

This information is not official but issues from "reliable sources." However, we find it credible in the light of your past position vis-a-vis the Peking and Moscow Governments and in the light of your recent statement to a Tibetan delegation: "Fortify yourself with wisdom and patience. Return to your homeland. Your cause will triumph."

Therefore, we American Kalmyks, who are adherents to Buddhism and who look to the Dalai Lama as our spiritual leader, are very much concerned. The Dalai Lama has just escaped safely from enemies of freedom. It is hard to believe that you would press him to return into their hands.

Our concern is the greater because we Kalmyks have also experienced Communist rule. As a national minority in Russia, we were among the first victims of Bolshevik communism. We became such in virtue of our religious beliefs, in virtue of our regard not only for human life but also "for all six kinds of living beings," as our Buddhist faith teaches.

We are well aware of the untruthfulness and merciless intent of the Red leaders. We heard many beautiful promises from them and saw them commit many more inhuman acts. Solemnly they promised us national autonomy, and they brought us slavery. They promised us full religious freedom but razed our Buddhist monasteries, over a hundred of them. NKVD tribunals passed judgment, sight unseen, on all our Buddhist monks, who numbered over 2,000, and sentenced them to serve terms in concentration camps. Matters came to such a point that the Soviet leaders exiled the entire Kalmyk people, detaining them in forced labor under insufferable conditions of life and work for 13 years.

The parallel between our experience and recent events in Tibet is all to plain. And so your reported intention to advise the Dalai Lama to return home where the Communist Chinese are killing innocent Tibetans has given us great alarm. Such advice would be tantamount to suggesting that he put his head under the axe of an executioner to make the job of executing easier For we frankly fear for his life.

We therefore respectfully request you not to take such a fatal step, not to press our spiritual leader to turn back into the Red Chinese maw but rather to grant him the privilege of political asylum. By the custom of all civilized nations every person seeking to save himself from political oppression is given this privilege. The more should the spiritual leader of millions of Buddhists be granted it.

We also hope that your protection of the Dalai Lama, once granted, will not be tantamount to giving him the status of political prisoner by restraining his freedom to speak out as the rightful spiritual and temporal ruler of Tibet.

SOCIETY FOR THE PROMOTION OF KALMYK CULTURE,
GEORGE ZAGADINOV, *President, Philadelphia, Pa.*
RASHI GEMPIL-LING, INC.
NORON ADIANOV, *President.*
THE KALMUCK BROTHERHOOD SOCIETY IN AMERICA,
SANDSHA STEPANOV, *President.*
THE KALMYK SOCIETY IN U.S.A., INC.,
ALEXEI IWANTSCHIKOV, *President.*

A Program for Developing Our National Forests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 28, 1959

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, the "Program for the National Forests" is a document that sets forth a realistic approach for developing our national forests toward the end of future needs.

This is a splendid effort, one that deserves high praise from all who are interested in the preservation and development of this invaluable national resource.

In conjunction with this program, I submit a statement to the RECORD, and I would like to commend Assistant Secretary Erwin L. Peterson, Forest Service Chief Richard E. McArdle, and all others in the Department of Agriculture who have played a part in drawing up this constructive and forward-looking program.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Agriculture Committee, I have reviewed with interest and enthusiasm the report referred to the Congress just prior to the Easter recess. I refer to the document entitled, "Program for the National Forests."

I predict that this far-reaching conservation plan for the full development of the Nation's national forest system will not only stimulate action in the Congress but also move the public, who owns these forests, to demand accelerated development and more intensive management. This prediction is based on the tremendous benefits that can be expected by implementation of the program.

Forests cover 85 percent of the land area of the State of Maine. The care and wise use of the renewable resources from these forests is essential in an expanding economy. In fact, few people realize that New England has a higher percentage of its land surface covered by commercial forests than any other region in the United States.

Wherever forests occur their resources of water, timber, recreation, forage and wildlife habitat affect the economy. Over one-third of all the people employed in Maine are engaged in activities involving the harvesting and manufacture of forest products. Many communities in America are completely dependent on the resources provided by adjacent forest areas whether in public or private ownership.

My interest, therefore, in the development of the national forest system in America to its full potential is based on a "grassroots" perspective of the true economic and esthetic value of a well managed and wisely used forest resource.

Population in the United States has increased 32 percent in the 13 years following World War II. If estimates for the future hold, there will be some 332 million people by the year 2000. This is just 40 years away, and is more than double the 1950 census. During this same period the gross national product is expected to increase over five times.

My colleagues from the West who have most of the national forests, should be interested in the estimates for population growth in their section of our country. In the 11 Western States the population is expected to triple by the end of this century.

Today an average American has 50 percent more time for leisure than he had 40 years ago. In the next 40 years there may be one-third more time for play and recreation than now.

Our expanding economy demands great amounts of nonrenewable resources not only from America but also from the free countries of the world. At the same time, the impact of our rapid population and economic growth is demanding ever-increasing quantities of renewable resources; the resources covered in this "Program for the National Forests."

The national forests are truly national in character because they affect millions of our people whether they are cutting timber for a living or pitching a tent in the forest for a few days hunting, fishing or recreation. The national forests, particularly those in the West, have only begun to feel the relentless pressures of our space-age economy. The forests are no longer generally inaccessible. Their stores of timber, wildlife, water, and recreational areas are no longer hard to reach. With more people and greater use we have the urgent need for the strong national-forest action program covered in the document now available to the Congress.

The short-term proposals for action in the next 10 to 15 years and the long-range objectives for the year 2000 involve all facets of resource development and management on the national forests. To

mention them briefly, they are: More and better timber for the Nation, adequate recreational facilities for added millions of people, increased water supplies of finer quality, better hunting and fishing, improved range resources for better grazing, intensified forest protection from insects, fire and disease, an expanded road system for timber sales, protection and recreational use, accelerated research in many fields of forestry, boundary and ownership adjustments, and finally provision of the structures and equipment needed to keep this resource development program moving.

I refer you to the complete report in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Tuesday, March 24, 1959, for the multiple benefits of this "Program for the National Forests." I do want to mention in closing that the report states for timber alone, "it is estimated that for every dollar of national-forest stumpage sold the end products will be worth $20 by the time they reach the ultimate consumer. This means that the annual sale of 11 billion board feet of sawtimber expected to be reached by the end of the short-term period will have a total consumer value of $3.7 billion."

A program of this magnitude and promise for our national forests merits the serious consideration of every Member of the Congress.

Statement of the Attorney General of the State of Tennessee Before the Civil Rights Subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary at Hearings on Proposed Civil Rights Bills, Thursday, April 23, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CARLTON LOSER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 28, 1959

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the statement of the Honorable George F. McCanless, the attorney general of Tennessee, before the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Civil Rights, in which he voiced opposition to the pending bills relating to the subject.

I believe each Member of this great body will want to read this excellently prepared testimony. It follows:

STATEMENT OF GEORGE F. MCCANLESS, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TENNESSEE

Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of the committee, may I express my thanks for this opportunity to make a statement about the bills designated as H.R. 3147 and H.R. 3148, to which I am opposed. His Excellency Buford Ellington, Governor of Tennessee, has asked me to extend his greetings to the members of the committee and to express his regret that an engagement of several weeks standing has made it impossible for him to appear before you and voice his opposition to these bills.

My first reference is to title VI of H.R. 3147 and to H.R. 3148 which would confer upon the Attorney General of the United States the authority to institute "for or in the name of the United States a civil action or other proceeding for preventive relief, including an application for an injunction or other order, against any individual or individuals who, under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom or usage, of any State or territory or subdivision or instrumentality thereof, deprives or theatens to deprive such person or group of persons of the right to the equal protection of the laws by reason of race, color, religion, or national origin and against any individual or individuals acting in concert with them." Clearly, the suits authorized by this provision could be brought not only against State and local officers to deter official action but also against individual citizens whenever the Attorney General should decide that a person had been deprived or threatened with deprivation of some right under circumstances within the provision just quoted.

Under the principle of the reserved powers of the States there can be no doubt that the Congress would be without jurisdiction to enact legislation of the kind now under study if it were not for the provision of the first section of the 14th amendment to the Federal Constitution, which forbids the denial by any State to any person within its jurisdiction of the equal protection of the laws. The draftsmen of these bills have skillfully sought to bring them within the limited provisions of this "equal protection" clause, but the Supreme Court itself has consistently refused to extend the scope of this clause beyond that signified by the language used therein. We find in the opinion in the comparatively recent case of *Shelley* v. *Kraemer* (334 U.S. 1, 92 L. ed. 1161, at p. 12 of U.S. and p. 1180 of L. ed.) this statement:

"(The 14th amendment erects no shield against merely private conduct, however discriminatory or wrongful." It is thus clear that, to the extent that the bills in question undertake to ordain sanctions against private individuals in redress of discriminations or wrongs committed against other individuals, they find themselves without basis in the Constitution.

As I have already said, the legal proceedings that the Attorney General would be authorized to institute could be against private citizens in their private capacities as well as against State and local officers: such a precedent could be grave in its consequences and this and other legislation patterned after it, and the litigation that might be prosecuted under its authority, could be used as a weapon of tyranny to impair seriously the rights and liberties of all the people. I urge that power so pregnant with evil should never be conferred upon any official.

I seriously object to the provision in H.R. 3147 that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may prescribe and put into effect a plan for the elimination of racial segregation in the public schools of a State, municipality, or school district. This would be an intolerable invasion of State sovereignty and should not be authorized. The provision that grants of Federal money may be made to localities which are in the process of eliminating racial segregation in their schools is evil in principle: it would provide for the purchase by the Federal Government for cash of the consent of the States and their political subdivisions to the Secretary's program. The suggestion is deplorable.

It will not be inappropriate for me to remind the committee that for the past 5 years the people of the southern States have lived under a heavy burden of dread. They have seen the Supreme Court of the Nation put aside the precedents of more than a century; they have experienced an assault upon their social order of a kind and intensity not experienced in this country since the shameful years of the reconstruction. The southern American is as law abiding, as patriotic, as stanch, and as charitable as the citizens of any other region. He and his forebears have lived in this land of ours for 2 centuries and more and he is second to none in his appreciation and love of the traditions that have made America great. He requires no tutelage in personal or civic morality from his brother of the north or the west. What he needs and needs so badly now is a small measure of kindness, of sympathy, of patience; his dangers, his problems, his hopes require understanding; his virtues deserve a degree of appreciation.

This is not the time for coercive or punative legislation; it is a time for forbearance and charity.

Space Age Essays

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 28, 1959

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of the House an essay contest recently held in a community in my district. It was sponsored by the Smalley Brothers Auxiliary, Veterans of Foreign Wars in the high school at Windsor Locks. The subject was the space age. I think it is an indication of the interest and awareness, both on the part of the adults and of youngsters on the magnificent possibilities and the awesome responsibilities that science has opened for us.

First prize was awarded Miss Martha Vecchione. Second was given Miss Anita Favata. The presentation was made at the annual installation of officers by the post and auxiliary last week. Mr. Victor Sasali was essay committee chairman.

I think it is remarkable that both winners, while conscious of the implications of the space age, stressed also that there remains a great challenge on earth. In the words of Miss Anita Favata in her essay:

I believe that space is important to our future, but equally important is our need to live in peace with one another on earth. We must also give money, time and effort to the cause of human relationships so that we can learn as much as possible about all peoples. We must understand and communicate freely and without fear. And before we go farther in the exploration of space we must organize an international space program under the direction of qualified delegates from all countries. These delegates should set up a body of laws pertaining to activities in space and satisfactory to all.

Only through cooperation can Americans meet the challenge of the space age.

Under unanimous consent, I include the text of the first prize essay by Miss Martha Vecchione:

"The heavens and the earth were finished, and all the furniture of them. And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made, and he rested."

For thousands of years man has been studying creation, the vastness of creation which God made in 7 days. He has studied

the sky, the earth, the very air we breathe, and he has been carried away by his imagination. He has tried to comprehend infinity and to grasp a grain of truth on that wondrous beach of knowledge. He has tried to imagine, to reach out for the grotesque things of his imagination, and to create. He has tried to conquer disease, to invent, to reproduce of his own kind and of others, and to accustom himself to his surroundings. Now he is trying with profound and complete ingenuity to conquer the heavens.

Man, a self-righteous creature, is attempting to conquer space, while he has yet to conquer himself. He wants to be superior to everything, to everyone, and anything that gets in his way must be destroyed, lest he be overcome. He must be first in everything he does, or he shrivels up and hides, and gradually becomes obscured.

But now, after 2,000 years of creation, man's mind is starting to bloom. He is attempting to conquer space. He has launched his rockets; he must be the first one to reach the moon. Instead of working wtih his neighbors of all countries and uniting with others in a common interest, he feels he must be first, or he will be destroyed.

The space age is not a challenge to America alone. It is a challenge to the world. Men can't be classified by the color of their skins or by their language. No race has the right to feel superior to any other. If men want to advance themselves, they must do it intelligently and tolerantly. They must extend their hands and share their thoughts. Above all, they must trust and respect each other.

Yes, God did create the world in 7 days, and men will go on studying it for a thousand years, but some morning the sun may rise to light a world bursting with prosperity, creativeness, and peace.

Afghanistan Is a Land That Has Everything

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CARLTON LOSER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 28, 1959

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously grated to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including the third of a group of articles written by the Honorable Coleman A. Harwell, editor of the Nashville Tennessean, during a world tour.

This article on Afghanistan is a most interesting one. Mr. Harwell vividly describes the trip there, the country, its people and some of the customs. You will want to see this country through the eyes of this American newspaperman and I commend the article to your reading. It follows:

AFGHANISTAN IS A LAND THAT HAS EVERYTHING

(By Coleman A. Harwell)

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

KABUL, AFGHANISTAN.—The American woman spoke with real emotion when she said:

"What a pity you will only be in Afghanistan a week."

We responded with a cliche to the effect that we were lucky to come for even a short visit, to which she replied:

"But if you stay here 2 years, as we have, you'd see why we love it so."

A number of other Americans had indicated they liked the place. But her enthusiasm set me to thinking.

There are two things that give a place its character. One is its geography—that is, its climate, scenery, and other attractions of nature, including food. The other thing is the people.

ON BOTH COUNTS

And during our week here we encountered the most perfect weather imaginable, cool nights and sunny days, breathtaking scenery and an abundance of fresh vegetables, fruit, and tasty bread. And, more importantly, we met some of the most charming and gracious people we've ever known, Afghans and foreigners, with emphasis on the Afghans.

Now, don't be in too big a hurry about giving up your vacation trip to Europe or Florida or Gatlinburg in favor of Kabul. There are a few disadvantages. For instance, getting here.

Our last program had been in Israel, some 4,000 miles away as the plane must fly. You have to avoid Arab countries when you come from Israel, so we flew roundabout to Turkey, where we had an interesting Sunday, and then to Teheran, where we spent 24 hours sightseeing and resting because our flight was delayed.

A RELIC OF THE WAR

From there we flew via Ariana (Afghan) airline in one of their prized DC-4's, a relic of the war, but trim and good to fly in, especially when you know there is a veteran pilot up front like Wiry John Willard, of Phoenix, Ariz.

First we flew 1,000 miles over arid mountains and deserts to Kandahar, ancient former capital in southern Afghanistan.

We dropped passengers in Kandahar and picked up more, including a quaint old gent in a white turban who smiled and counted his worry beads as we took off. Sorry mine weren't handy, for I would have used them. First, when we were told we would not be able to land in Kabul because the airport was under floodwater. And later when we flew between some of the handsomest and most forbidding snowpeaked mountains you'll ever see. We were considerably lower than some of them.

These were part of the Hindu Kush Range, of which even higher peaks were visible toward the north. Hindue Kush means "Hindu killer," the name thus recalling that many men had died trying to scale the range.

We had the frustrating experience of flying over Kabul, which looked trim and green from high up, except for the water-covered airport. After that we wove between other mountains, glimpsing historic Khyber Pass, gateway to what was once part of India and is now Pakistan.

DOWN ON THE DIRT

Then John Willard set us down neatly on a hot, dusty dirt runway near the city of Jalalabad. The terminal office was in a tent. The air-conditioned bus we had expected turned out to be a wood bench job, and a narrow bench at that. We were lucky that a fellow passenger was Roger Lewis, of Los Angeles, vice president of Pan American Airways, who was going to Kabul to attend the annual board meeting of Ariana, which Pan American is nurturing. He was met by Frank Swayze, Pan Am's man at Kabul, and they included us in the passenger list of their Chevrolet station wagon.

The thrilling ride, unbelievably dusty but equally beautiful and exciting, took us 100 miles through three gorges of the Kabul River that match, maybe outdo the Rockies. We made Kabul in record time, 3 hours against 7 for the bus.

First impressions of Kabul are not favorable. Seeking homes on streets that depart from the few main paved thoroughfares, you are on rutted, dirt byways, lined by ditches that serve as drains and impromptu sewers. Walls 12–15 feet high run the length of them. Entrance gates range from a few neat ones to many nearing collapse, but all securely locked. A string rings the bell, tied to a tree inside.

A bright-eyed youngster, in ground-length cassock, met us at the home of the American press officer, where we were to stay. We found our hosts concerned as to our arrival, which had been expected much earlier. Such irregularity, we found, is customary here.

A GUEST COTTAGE

We occupied an attractive guest cottage in the enclosure, fixed up for visitors' use by the embassy. The problem of feeding us was shared by various hospitable Americans and, in one instance, by an Afghan graduate of Vanderbilt.

Inside the enclosures, the Americans had homes that made you feel at home. The U.S. furniture and family photos blended with paintings and art objects that always told you where the man or woman had served previously.

Spring was in the air, so we found gardening going on at a great rate, flower beds being trimmed, plants and seeds being put out.

CELEBRATION OF ID

As we arrived on the last day of the religious observance of Ramadan, we next encountered the big 3-day celebration of Id. This is the time when everyone breaks his fast, families visit together for big meals, children receive gifts and wear gay costumes. Weird Persian music blares from the radio and gramaphones continuously. The kabab stands—roast lamb—cook constantly. You'll see a family of four riding a burro across the hills to visit relatives. Groups dancing. Man ceremoniously shaking hands doubly and wish one another happy Id and God's blessing.

We joined a small group of Americans for picnics on two days. One day we drove 20 miles to the mountain town of Istalif. There is one narrow street, running three or four blocks. Bazaars of every kind were open, tiny stores of all kinds. The ones doing big business were the sweet shops and souvenir stores. A favorite sweet was ice cream—made by scraping from a burlap sack of snow brought in from the mountains, to which was added sugar and goats' milk. A line of youngsters were gobbling it up.

We drove to a public inn higher up and spread our lunch there. We had Spam and similar Danish canned meat, Kraft cheese from Australia, Norwegian sardines, coarse, delicious Afghan bread, French wine, German beer and canned U.S. cokes. Consumed to tunes of an itinerant tamboor player, sounds of a mountain waterfall and a magnificent view of the Hindu Kush.

Next day we went to Paghman, another mountain village, where the king and other higherups have summer homes. We drove to a park near the snowline, had lunch there beside a gushing stream. Afterwards Howard McVitty, U.S. press officer, and I took a walk several hundred feet higher into the snow and around a bend that opened into another spectacular valley. The mountain side has been terraced with rocks and was under cultivation up to the snow. A village was perched on the opposite mountain and people were out in bright costumes dancing; a thousand feet higher two eagles were soaring above the topmost snowpeak.

You have never seen more gracious people than Afghans. We had no idea what to expect of the press people. They proved to be

intelligent, attractive men, from the press department president, who holds cabinet rank, on down. This included men who spoke no English. Of course we were able to communicate better with those who did, especially Sabchoddin Kushkaki, assistant editor of Islah, who spent five years in the United States, graduating from Nebraska and Illinois, and M. H. Zhobal, director of cultural relations for Afghanistan, who graduated from Princeton.

Especially interesting was our luncheon visit in the home of Ahmad Isa, 1957 graduate of Vanderbilt's valuable economics course for foreign students. He is now on the planning staff here. He and his wife and her brother served us a variety of dishes—a vast platter of saffron rice, with a smothered chicken inside; tender, fried eggplant, an elaborate egg dish and another of lamb—their bread favorite, nan, with the texture of souffle potatoes. Ending with coffee and fruit.

They recalled with much gratitude their days in Vanderbilt, when they lived on Highland Avenue and West End. Did she have trouble keeping house there? She replied that shopping was somewhat puzzling but they lived well, mostly on rice and chicken.

THE CLINCHER

The welcoming clincher for us was the entertainment program put on at radio Kabul. It was a replica in nearly every detail of grand ole opry. Roy Acuff, Chet Atkins and the zaney Oswald were all there. Maybe a bit more restrained, a bit less tuneful.

We heard doleful vocals in Persian and Pushtu that held everyone in a spell. The crooners were big stars Hussein Arman, Bailtoon and Sher Zaman. We had instrumental numbers on the dutar, tamboor and rubab. Fun, man, fun. Really.

Maybe this doesn't make quite clear why we enjoyed Kabul. Maybe part of it was the realization behind this mixture of charm and mystery there was a game being played with unknown rules for vast, unspecified stakes.

Be that as it may we understand what the woman had meant. The charms of Kabul are very real.

Presentation of Portrait of John McRaven Holbrook to the Lowell, N.C., High School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BASIL L. WHITENER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1959

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, April 27, 1959, I had one of those rare experiences that come to a man only once in his lifetime. On that date it was my honor to participate in the ceremony at which a portrait of Mr. John McRaven Holbrook was presented to Lowell High School, at Lowell, N.C.

I am a graduate of Lowell High School, now John M. Holbrook High School, and Mr. Holbrook was principal of the school at the time I graduated. He is an outstanding educator and has rendered long and faithful years of service to the youth of his community. His sterling character and spirit of helpfulness meant much to me in my youth in formulating those ideals by which my life has been guided.

I am taking the liberty of including in the Appendix of the RECORD the remarks I made at Lowell on Monday when Mr. Holbrook's portrait was formally presented to the school and community for which he has labored so long.

REMARKS OF HON. BASIL L. WHITENER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, ON THE OCCASION OF THE PRESENTATION OF THE PORTRAIT OF JOHN MCRAVEN HOLBROOK ON APRIL 27, 1959

It is great joy for me to be here today to participate in this very delightful occasion which does honor to one who has meant much to so many of us—John McRaven Holbrook.

The gentleman whom we honor has made his mark in every phase of worthwhile community life. Since early boyhood in Huntersville and Mecklenburg County, he has evidenced the qualities of leadership which have contributed so much to the wellbeing of the people of his community, county, and State.

His record as a student in the schools of Huntersville and at the University of North Carolina is a brilliant one indeed. His service as a soldier in the U.S. Army during the World War I period was equally lustrous.

While a very young man, he dedicated himself to the field of public-school education and has held positions in the schools of both Mecklenburg and Gaston Counties. It was a fortunate occasion in 1924 when he became affiliated with the public-school system of Lowell. His continuous service here now approximates 35 years.

Mr. Holbrook has not confined his worthwhile efforts to his employment as head of the Lowell school system. He has held a broader view of public service as is evidenced by his participation and leadership in the civic, religious, and economic life of the area.

Always he has been active in the work of the Presbyterian Church. He has served as a deacon and elder and held many other important positions as a lay member in the church of his choice. His devotion to the broad programs of the Presbyterian Church has been a very vital factor in the advancement of the spiritual welfare of his community.

In the field of civic activity he has been an outstanding leader in our community, county, and State. He has served as president of the Lowell Lions Club, president of the Schoolmasters Club of Gaston County, official in the Alumni Association in the University of North Carolina, and as a member of the Board of Trustees of Peace College. He has been an active Mason and Shriner. In all of these, and the many other important positions of honor that have been bestowed upon him, he has always fully measured up to the highest standards in his efforts for the causes of those organizations.

During his career, John McRaven Holbrook has had the assistance and cooperation of his beloved wife, Mrs. Elizabeth McGirt Holbrook. She, too, has for several years been active as a public school teacher and an official in Gaston County. The zeal of this dedicated couple for the cause of public school education has been transmitted to their only daughter, Miss Betty Holbrook, who now occupies an important position in the public schools of the State of New York.

I believe that I can speak of the man whom we honor today with some authority. I know that I can speak of him with a deep sense of personal appreciation for what he has meant to me during my boyhood and manhood. In 1929, I became one of his students at Lowell High School and was then impressed with the personal interest which he took in my welfare.

Throughout the years that I have spent in college, in profession of the law, in military conflict during World War II, and in government service, he has continued to show a constant interest in my welfare.

I do not mention this personal relationship which I have enjoyed with the man whom we honor today in a sense of vanity. On the contrary, I hasten to point out that he has had the same interest in the welfare of each person who has been privileged to be one of his students.

It is most fitting that the Beta Club of this high school has provided the portrait of our dear friend which will everlastingly hang in this magnificent high school building which was named "John M. Holbrook High School" in 1956 in recognition of the splendid service of our honored friend to this community.

In presenting a portrait of a true gentleman whose career has been so full of inspiration, whose accomplishments are a great credit to the education profession, who has a brilliant future still ahead, we are doing an act which will become even more significant in future years. What finer tribute could be paid to any person than to have the youth of the community who have been in his charge say that he is a gentleman; that he is one who merits their beautiful token of appreciation for his service. Yes, this is a wonderful occasion since it marks a gracious expression of gratitude which generally is done only after the completion of a man's activities.

This portrait is evidence of more than just appreciation of its donors. It is recognition of the zeal of John McRaven Holbrook, his personal sacrifices, his devotion, and his allegiance to the cause of public education and the highest devotion to public service. It is a beautiful attempt of these young people to say that he is a good leader; that he has all of the attributes of leadership including those of courage, loyalty, understanding, initiative, and vision, and a saving sense of humor.

Just as the community of Lowell unanimously approved the naming of its new high school in honor of our friend in 1956, the people of this community will today again unanimously applaud the action of the Beta Club in making this presentation of a handsome portrait. As the future years unfold this portrait will be a reminder of the unselfish service of this outstanding citizen to the school and community which he loved so much.

It is, therefore, a high privilege and a great honor for me, as an alumnus of this outstanding high school, to participate in these proceedings in which the Beta Club presents this excellent portrait of John McRaven Holbrook. In doing so, I express to him the good wishes of every person of this assembly for his future health and happiness. We express the hope that he will continue his outstanding public service for many more years as a leader in our educational, social, and civic life.

Japanese Competition in the Hardwood Plywood Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1959

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, the tragedy facing the hardwood plywood industry in America should concern every Member of Congress. How this industry keeps going with competition from Japan is one of the miracles of the ages.

Unless the U.S. Tariff Commission or the Congress gives relief to the hardwood plywood industry, it will become another thing of the past. I can safely say that unless the U.S. Tariff Commission or the Congress gives relief to this industry, by the end of this year there will be no hardwood plywood industry in northern Wisconsin, and thousands will be added to the unemployment rolls.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include with my remarks a statement delivered by M. C. McIver, president and general manager of Splicewood Corp., Ashland, Wis. After reading his remarks before the U.S. Tariff Commission, Members of Congress will have a clear picture of how our present policy of imports is driving another industry into bankruptcy, further swelling the unemployment rolls within our borders.

HARDWOOD PLYWOOD

(Statement of M. C. McIver, for Splicedwood Corp., before the U.S. Tariff Commission)

Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, my name is M. C. McIver. I am president and general counsel of Splicedwood Corp., Ashland, Wis., which I will hereafter refer to as our company.

Our company is a small business concern located in the small community of Ashland in northern Wisconsin. In 1955 we had an average of 177 persons working for our company in Ashland. In 1958 the average was 140. Today we have 93. Our company produces ordinary hardwood plywood for sale to distributors, industrial users, and the furniture industry. We are solely dependent on our hardwood plywood sales to keep our plant operating.

Our principal product was high-quality birch plywood of the top grades until 1957, when market conditions created by low-priced imports required us to add to the line lower grades of plywood in an attempt to stay the serious decline in our sales. Our salesmen had reported to us that the much lower priced imported plywood and the entire price structure of the market had been lowered. We could not produce our plywood to sell at lower prices than we were then charging; so we added the lower quality and lower priced panels in 1957. Unfortunately, this move, as you will see, did not stem the flood of imported plywood, and our sales in 1958 were at an alltime low for our company.

In considering what has happened to our company in the past few years due to the imports, I would like to call to your attention a most pertinent fact. The Department of Commerce statistics on birch plywood imports from Japan show the following:

Year	Quantity	Total f.o.b. Japan value	Average value per thousand square feet
1954	7,510,000	$836,000	$111.32
1955	17,083,000	1,894,000	110.87
1956	31,007,000	3,856,000	124.36
1957	27,126,000	3,488,000	128.58
1958	31,235,000	3,586,000	124.81

The average value of the Japanese birch including all thicknesses was $128 per 1,000 square feet f.o.b. Japan. Duty and shipping might increase this by 30 percent on the average, so a U.S. average sale price would be $167. The report which we have filed with you shows that in 1957 and 1958 when we were producing a lower grade than previous years our price for one-quarter inch was $68 higher than the average price of the Japanese plywood f.o.b. United States duty paid. The $68 shows only a part of the difference as the margin widens in the prices of the thicker and more expensive panels.

Here is what the imported plywoods have done to our business:

Production in 1958 was 42 percent less than 1955. For the 3 years 1956 through 1958 we lost 10,200,000 square feet of production. Birch plywood represented 77.3 percent of our production in 1955. Our production of birch plywood in 1958 was 62 percent less than 1955 and we lost in the 3-year period 9,500,000 square feet of birch plywood production.

It has been stated that our plants made no thin panels so the thin panels from Japan did not injure our companies. This statement is pure fabrication without a fact to support it. In 1955 62.7 percent of our production was panels less than seven-thirty-seconds inch in thickness. In 1958 only 28 percent of our production was in these thin panels. Over the past 3 years we have lost 9,600,000 square feet of thin panel sales.

In our efforts to meet the competition created by the low-priced imports, we have sold off our list price and have reduced our list price on our principal items by 10 and 15 percent, respectively.

The community where we have our plant is small, our payroll plays a substantial part in the economic welfare of our area. For this reason we have tried to keep our employees on the payroll, nevertheless.

Our plant work hours have declined by 254,000 for the past 3 years in relation to 1955; 1958 plant hours were 30 percent less than 1955. Our payroll has also declined. We have contributed $216,000 less to the community in the past 3 years. In 1958 our payroll was 21 percent less than 1955 which you will agree is ridiculous when our sales dropped 46 percent.

Our feeling of responsibility for our employees may appear foolish to the persons opposing the American producers but we believe that Americans have a responsibility to their employees which is not recognized in other countries or by some in this country whose greatest worry has been to meet the rent or pay a secretary.

In addition to shipping tremendous quantities of Lauan in the white or not prefinished, the Japanese are shipping a large quantity of prefinished Lauan which has been printed or colored to look like American hardwoods. This prefinished Japanese Lauan is sold at prices consideraly less than we require for our panels in the white. The Japanese prefinished Lauan is given the names of American woods so that the American consumer, not being a wood technician, will believe that he is receiving genuine American woods. One importer in San Francisco calls this prefinished Japanese Lauan by names such as the following:

Golden oak, smoky beige oak, colonial walnut, honey walnut, titian walnut, smokey beige walnut, colonial oak, silver walnut, desert bloom walnut, honey oak, titian oak, golden walnut, and blonde walnut.

There is not one single sliver of walnut or oak in any of the panels so described nor do the importers disclose that the panel is Lauan made in Japan.

I bring this matter up with the hope that you will consider this new unfair method of competition which has been devised not only to take our business but to deceive the American consumer.

In 1955 we heard a great deal from the importers' attorneys and the importers about how the American public insisted on the exotic Lauan which brought new beauty into the American home. Well, the bloom of the beauty of Lauan has finally caught up with the importers and Japanese producers because they now have to hide under a print and paint, sell it at less than American producers' costs, and falsely represent their product.

In closing I would like to say that we managed by extreme measures, such as officers reducing and waiving in part their salaries for 1956, 1957, and 1958, to keep our company in the black in 1956 and 1957. In 1958 we could not withstand the tide and we went into the red.

We are close enough to other American hardwood plywood producers to know that the difficulties encountered by our company are universal in the industry. The Wisconsin plant of one of the largest producers of ordinary hardwood plywood has a pattern similar to our company. This is true throughout the industry. The question you must decide is whether we are to be allowed to continue to operate our plants or will you determine that we must go out of business so the importers and foreign producers can have all of the market. If the American industry is to survive it must no longer be treated like an unwanted stepchild to take the crumbs dropped from the table by the more favored importers and foreign producers. We must be allowed to compete for business on a fair competitive basis, not with a club over our heads.

Our officers and each one of the employees firmly believe that they are entitled to the protection of our Government when invasion threatens. Our markets have been invaded and the forces of the invaders are too strong for the Americans so it is up to our Government to give us the protection we require. This may be over simplifying the issue but I can assure you that is the way our workers feel and I agree with them.

Further Events in Battle To Save Uncle Sam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1959

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, the membership of this body knows that I have been greatly disturbed about an apparent campaign to discredit "Uncle Sam" as a symbol of the United States. I guess that there is some good in everything, if one looks hard enough to find it. I believe that this compaign may have stirred some of us into a fight to preserve him for posterity.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on May 7, 1959, will hold hearings on House Concurrent Resolution 106, introduced by my colleague, the gentleman from New York, DEAN P. TAYLOR. This resolution expresses the sense of Congress with respect to the recognition of the grave of Samuel Wilson, progenitor of the symbol "Uncle Sam" in Oakwood Cemetery, Troy, N.Y., as a national shrine. I call upon my colleagues to rally to the support of this resolution.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter on this subject written by Mrs. Helen P. Lasell which appeared in the April 25, 1959 edition of the Tablet:

FURTHER EVENTS IN BATTLE TO PRESERVE UNCLE SAM

DEAR SIR: It has been said, "The pen is mightier than the sword." So the result depends upon whose pen it is. Along with this, we can say that all the important battles for our country are not necessarily fought

on the battlefield under military command, nor will they all be fought in space. An illustration of this is the battle stirred up over Uncle Sam by the pen of an extreme liberal historian, Allan Nevins, and published in the magazine section of the New York Times March 1, titled "Let's Disown Uncle Sam."

So many protests of that article were received (which they refused to print) that Mr. Nevins apparently found it necessary to appeal to his so-called liberal colleagues to come to his assistance. Therefore a second long, vicious, and unwarranted article appeared in the same magazine section of the New York Times on April 12, titled "Is Uncle Sam Obsolete?—A Fiery Debate." We fail to see where the debate comes in, since the Times, which claims loudly to oppose discrimination, printed no signs of debate.

It should not be necessary to defend Uncle Sam, our national anthem, or our Stars and Stripes, all symbolizing very much the same things, but this attack was, of course, not an attack on a picture or a man dressed in a familiar costume representing the United States of America, but an attack by the pen resulting in rank propaganda intended to undermine the significance of Uncle Sam and, therefore, help destroy that which he symbolizes. This, of course, means our American tradition and our America as we have known it and wish to keep it, free from agents who infiltrate our schools, colleges, churches, papers, and even expensive magazines with fine sounding names such as American Heritage, with the intent of changing our traditions and undermining our form of government.

It is interesting here to note that one of Mr. Nevins' friends who came to his rescue in the Times article of April 12, stating that "Uncle Sam is just plain ugly," happens to be another extreme liberal professor, which the New York Times thought deserved space in an article they printed January 18: Prof. Eric Goldman, of Princeton University, who conducts the American modern social history course there. The article states, "Some 371 Princeton undergraduates have decided the present U.S. Constitution does not meet requirements. * * * Changes were recommended by Professor Goldman, termed an 'intellectual experiment' * * * the project takes the place of a final examination * * * changes ratified by the entire course membership were for stronger Federal Government, a diminishing of States rights, more power to the President and less power to Congress."

Needless to say if these students fail to cooperate, they would not pass their examinations. Why this professor does not like Uncle Sam is obvious but unfortunately is he not promoting the dislike equally among the college students—our future citizens?

To review the many liberal affiliations of Mr. Nevins and others who expressed views in accord with his would take far more space than a letter of this kind could cover. But rest assured that whenever there is such a vicious and sinister attack directed at Uncle Sam or any other symbol of our American traditions, all that is necessary to expose the reason why is to check and expose the record and affiliations of the attackers.

The deplorable part is, our so-called free press can be used, or rather misused, to spread such destructive propaganda across the Nation. In this instance it places the New York Times in the same category with the attackers.

Sometimes such attacks boomerang back to the attackers, and the result: What they desire is defeated by their own overzealous efforts. This story of Uncle Sam has become a veritable serial story, and we would be amiss if we did not complete it. Americans have taken such matters for granted in the past and have not taken the necessary measures to protect them. In this case, the story of how Uncle Sam originated has not been sufficiently known. The symbol of Uncle Sam we love and respect was never officially protected through the proper congressional action.

Now, because of these attacks, there will be hearings May 7 at 9:30 a.m. before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to accomplish what should have been done long ago. Thomas Gerson, who sent an article to the Times refuting the attackers' charges, has compiled a most attractive booklet, "The Story of Uncle Sam," and is leading a delegation to Washington for the hearings. It was through his work, also, that the New York State Legislature passed a resolution just before closing to support all this concerning Uncle Sam and calling for September 13, the birthday of Samuel Wilson, the creator of Uncle Sam, to be declared "Uncle Sam Day" in New York State.

In the delegation with Mr. Gerson, which includes members of veterans groups and Boy Scouts, will be a tall man, dressed in the costume of Uncle Sam. They expect radio, TV, and press coverage. All patriotic groups are asked to participate, and if either or both of the resolutions (H.R. 104 and H.R. 106) are passed, this will be the final chapter of our serial story.

Let us all help, by letters or other means, to make our answer to these attackers, that Uncle Sam is here to stay.

HELEN P. LASELL,
Chairman, U.S. Flag Committee.
JACKSON HEIGHTS.

Challenge to the American Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT GORE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 28, 1959

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] before the National Press Club today.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

President Lawrence, distinguished guests, and gentlemen, thank you very much for asking me here today.

Every man in this room knows the nature of the basic conflict in which we are engaged.

It reaches around the world, and from outer space to the bottom of the oceans.

It involves our deepest beliefs in God and man.

It involves freedom or slavery for our people and the people of every other nation.

It extends all the way from cultural exchange to nuclear war; and from economic growth at home to economic growth in Ghana and India.

It is a protracted conflict. If we are fortunate enough to avoid nuclear war, it will last without letup through this century, and perhaps into the next. We are in for a long pull.

You have been writing about this for years—explaining the danger and sounding the warning. You have compared the continued complacency among the American people with the dynamic dedication of the Russians and Chinese Communists.

You have reported how the Sino-Soviet leaders plan their foreign policies years ahead, while we only react to the crises these policies create.

The history of the last 6 years has been one of long and inglorious retreat by the United States from world influence, world power and world prestige, even from adequate capacity to defend ourselves. It has been a period in which the Communists have been persistently on the offensive, the United States constantly on the defensive.

Most statesmen, and all serious students of world affairs, agree we are losing the protracted conflict—the political, economic, technological, psychological, and physical conflict we are engaged in today. These analysts do not exaggerate and are not hysterical. After much study, they conclude that the Sino-Soviet group is gaining on us in strength—and steadily extending its influence throughout the world.

In an effort to avoid this situation, some of us have been talking for years about the growing missile gap, and other gaps. But the greatest gap of all is that between the precepts of this administration, and its performance.

It is a gap which cannot be written off to weakness, or even carelessness. There is mountainous evidence to support the belief that it is the product of intent; that it is part of a deliberate policy to conceal from the people the weakness of our position, and the ineptness of the administration in correcting that weakness.

Let me present several examples.

For a long time the administration led us to believe that the defenses of this Nation included planes on air alert. Last year, however, the Congress elicited the admisison that we did not, and do not, have any such alert.

Another example: for a long time we have known of extensive ballistic missile firings by the Russians. But that fact, plus other information about their tremendous progress in this field, was concealed from the people for years, until the launching of the first Sputnik made that particular Soviet progress obvious.

And another example: when the Berlin situation once more became critical, the administration announced it did not intend to get caught in any ground war, and emphasized that it placed its main deterrent on massive nuclear retaliation.

The administration added that over 90 percent of that capacity for retaliation lies in the Strategic Air Force. Under questioning, however, the administration admitted that three-quarters of the present Strategic Air Force bombers are obsolescent; and that its 3-year plan for replacement of these old bombers will replace only 5 percent of those now in operation.

And here is one I recently encountered. Last January the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff testified there were intermediate range ballistic missiles in England "which are just as effective or more effective than those ICBM's" and that these American IRBM's were "sitting there and ready to go."

Ten weeks after that statement was made to the Congress, I visited that IRBM base of ours in England which was nearest to completion.

There was nothing "ready to go."

There was nothing which met operational standards.

There was nothing adequately dispersed.

The entire installation was literally a sitting duck for sabotage.

And those naked IRBM's in England are by far the most advanced of anything we have on that score in any foreign country.

Yet the administration continues to compress the military budget, and continues to allow the Russians to increase their lead in intercontinental ballistic missiles, while at the same time assuring the country that we

have a balanced defense capable of deterring attack.

The present period in this country is ominously reminiscent of England under Stanley Baldwin.

The people of England were lulled into a false complacency because they were not given the facts.

Turning now to another field, I fear that we are no better prepared to meet other forms of Soviet and Chinese attack than we are to meet military attack. Lenin's fondest dream was to overcome capitalism without war. You will also recall that Stalin shifted the emphasis to economic performance, penetration, and domination. Khrushchev and Mao Tse Tung proclaim this to be their goal.

It is incredible to note how long it took the administration to recognize the existence of the Soviet economic offensive.

This program was recognized publicly only 2 years ago; and even since then any counteraction has been wholly inadequate.

Consider the mutual security bill before the Congress today. Responsible officials in the Department of State let it be known last year that there was urgent annual need for a billion to a billion and a half dollars for the Development Loan Fund. They actually had urgent screened applications totaling one and a half billion dollars awaiting action. But as of today, the administration asks for only $700 million for the Development Loan Fund, and has dropped its request for any long-term program.

How can the Congress proceed with any wisdom under executive leadership of this quality?

Only the President can lead and inspire the people to do the job and make the sacrifices that are needed to protect the vital interests of this nation.

He is not doing it.

You here today know the importance of the psychological front in this protracted conflict with communism.

In this country we have, in rich measure, freedom, religious ideals, material abundance, and cultural accomplishment.

The Communists have tyranny, deprivation, and compulsion. Their only gods are state power and economic materialism.

Nevertheless, even though they offer only the hope of material progress, they are steadily gaining adherents or slaves, all over the world. Science and technology have opened up great vistas of opportunity to all peoples.

But are we leading the world toward anything in particular? Are we communicating effectively with peoples who still dream of a better life in their generation?

We are not. We do not even equip ourselves with the necessary tools.

For want of funds, our information program, our cultural relations program, our educational exchange program—are all kept on short leash.

I realize there is considerable resistance to these programs in Congress. But the administration does not ask for adequate funds, or ever really fight for them.

I have said only enough to suggest that in a wide variety of fields we are not doing what we must do, to even begin to win this conflict with the Sino-Soviet Empire. There are glaring needs across the board.

Does this administration point out the needs and ask the Nation to make the necessary sacrifice? It does not.

Instead, it calls on us to worship at the altar of the budget—and not just any budget, but its own conception of a budget which is balanced by looking backwards.

Does this administration speak the words which move men's souls to the defense of freedom?

It does not.

It uses the great publicity power of the office of the President to divert our attention from the real needs and rivet it on the account books.

It has appealed to instincts which should be subordinated, and has created an atmosphere in which it is extremely difficult to pierce public complacency.

It labels as "reckless spenders" all those who are willing to make the necessary sacrifices for our national security and well-being.

I am as opposed as anyone to wasteful spending—in business and in government. I have always fought excessive payrolls, duplication, extra committees and commissions, useless programs.

But it is totally unsound to describe what is essential as wasteful spending. All wise investment is sound.

I would classify as such, investment in our people, investment in our cities, investment in scientific research; investment in the development of our resources—including our greatest resource—our children.

And investment in our allies and those uncommitted nations who some day will have a major part in determining the destiny of the world.

In business, after making a major decision for plant expansion, a president doesn't present that decision to his board with embarrassment. On the contrary, he considers the proposed expansion an asset, recommends it as such, and expresses it on the asset side of his balance sheet.

Why is there such pathetic reluctance on the part of this administration to provide, for all the people, such necessary assets as dams, and adequate highways, and an adequate defense.

Why do they treat such potential assets as liabilities?

Far from wasteful spending, these are sound investments in the future of America.

With real leadership in this country, we can meet the Communist challenge, win the conflict and stay solvent and prosperous.

To do this, however, we must have two prerequisites now clearly lacking.

One is vision. The other is application of good business management to government.

We have had a lot of constructive advice to this end—from the Rockefeller report, the Gaither report, the Report of the Committee for Economic Development, and others.

But the prophets of bankruptcy in this country say we cannot afford to do what these reports all recommend that we do, because that would result in a deficit, or a rise in taxes.

So let me list three areas in which, through the application of sound business practices, we can provide more funds for our needs, without raising taxes and without deficit spending.

First, we can save billions of dollars, and at the same time build a more adequate defense, if we stop preparing ourselves against the way the enemy would have attacked 10 years ago, and start preparing for the way they will attack now, if they attack at all.

This means that we should stop building our defenses on the basis of the traditions and the command structure of World War II, and start building them and operating them in recognition of the nuclear space age in which we now find ourselves.

As an example: This Nation, each year, is now spending over $5½ billion on a continental air defense which is completely ineffective against ICBM's and against missiles launched from submarines.

Most of this gigantic sum of money is being put into protection against long-range bombers, even though for some time our intelligence has told us that the Soviets are building an extremely small number of such bombers, but are pouring a steadily increasing percentage of their resources into long-range missiles.

Also, a large part of this $5½ billion has been spent in an attempt to defend our cities with ground-to-air missiles which, in modern warfare, would not travel far enough to reach those bombers.

In this year's budget, we are being asked to spend some $300 million for a new aircraft carrier for limited wars—even though we already have plenty of carriers for that purpose.

We are spending too much money on tactical airpower, when its only real role is in close support of ground troops.

We are spending far too much money on ground-to-air missiles and short-range fighters whose usefulness in possible future wars will be negligible.

And we are allowing waste and duplication to be compounded in a Military Establishment in which honest participants admit service friction is increasing instead of being reduced.

We still have no true semblance of service unification. As an example, we have six separate air forces and the enormous expense which results from these duplications.

Second, we could raise several billion dollars in new tax revenue at existing rates, if we would enforce the present tax laws as they should be enforced.

This month the Commissioner of Internal Revenue testified that between $25 and $26 billion of taxable income is not now being reported for tax purposes.

The Commissioner emphasized that substantial additional revenue could be collected with more enforcement personnel. He further stated that each additional employee used for this purpose would, in 1 year, bring in 10 to 15 times his salary.

Yet again in the name of its false economy, the administration has cut enforcement personnel by thousands.

If this is economy, it is the most short-sighted economy I ever heard of.

Finally, if our economy grows as it should, and operates at full production, we could raise far more revenue at current rates.

Right now, over 15 percent of our economic capacity lies idle—and of course one result of unemployment is smaller revenues.

What we need is more national wealth and production—more production every year to accommodate our growing population, our growing needs and our growing responsibilities.

It has been estimated that if under the present administration, our economy had grown as fast as it did under the preceding administration, tens of billions of dollars would have flowed into the Treasury.

Under present world conditions, our nation can no longer tolerate a stagnant and partially idle economy. We must make whatever investments are necessary to assure the high rate of economic growth which in turn is essential for security and prosperity.

I believe in this country.

I believe in its capacity to grow.

I believe in its ability to snap out of this complacency. I believe that, with leadership, we can mobilize our energies and resources and turn back the Communist challenge, keep the peace, and build a better world.

I have faith and confidence we will do so.

Action at Gettysburg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1959

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, 8 days ago on the floor of the House I urged the Congress to reconsider the appropriation

which would enable the Park Service to acquire land at Gettysburg Battlefield. At that time I stated that the problem was one which needed local action in addition to whatever Congress might provide—that Congress could only rectify mistakes of the past and that it was up to the greater Gettysburg community to see to it that no mistakes would be made in the future, namely, that Cumberland township and other interested localities should institute modern zoning practices.

Today I am happy to report to the Members of the Congress that Cumberland township has initiated action in this direction. Within the last 2 days a planning commission of five citizens has been appointed to study the planning and zoning question and to report measures to accomplish that end. The members of that committee are Col. Thomas H. Nixon and Messrs. John D. Teeter, Charles C. Garland, Paul R. Knox, and Frederick Green.

Now that greater Gettysburg has begun its part of the job I can only trust that Congress will get on with its responsibility and restore to the budget the necessary funds to remove from this field of honor the presently existing desecrating structures.

Chemical and Biological Weapons Can Provide Us With a Deterrent to War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues an unclassified excerpt from a classified briefing given by Maj. Gen. Marshall Stubbs, Army Chief Chemical Officer, before the American Chemical Society Advisory Committee of the Chemical Corps in Boston, Mass., on April 7, 1959. I feel that this briefing carries an important message for the Congress and for the public. I submit it for printing in the RECORD, as follows:

In the gathering momentum of world tensions since the close of World War II, it has become increasingly apparent that this Nation must forge ahead in all fields of military preparedness if we wish to maintain our position of supremacy among the nations of the world. Rapid technological advances have been and are being made both by the free world and the Communist world, changing the nature of war itself. Since scientific and technological advances can make an impact upon our weapons systems and determine our military strength, we must look to science for the advances that will help us maintain our world leadership.

Today, when our national survival depends on the availability of weapons systems superior to those of a potential enemy, time is the controlling factor. I believe that two things are beginning to become increasingly clear to the public, as well as to the experts: (1) that we are in a weapons research and development race, and (2) that all weapons systems must be adequately provided for if we are to have no chinks in our armor. Soviet leaders have openly stated that future wars will be characterized by various means of mass destruction, such as atomic, thermonuclear, chemical, and bacteriological weapons.

In the light of that statement, it must be clear to you that we cannot lag for a moment in the development of chemical and biological weapons systems and defenses, both for protection against the use of these agents against us by a possible aggressor and as a deterrent to war.

I firmly believe that chemical and biological weapons can provide us with that deterrent to war. An enemy, convinced that our chemical and biological capability is effective enough and that our defenses are invulnerable would hesitate to launch an attack knowing that the counterattack would be devastating to him.

In 1866, Jules Verne said, "the Yankees, those foremost technicians of the world, are engineers, as the Italians are musicians, and the Germans metaphysicists—from birth." That national attribute is a prerequisite for our continued success. We must continue to be the foremost technicians of the world. But even more than ever before, we must originate new ideas.

We in the Chemical Corps are actively pursuing a program which, I am confident, will give us a constant input of ideas and concepts, both from within the corps and from scientists and engineers of industry, universities, and research organizations. Known as the blue sky program, it is designed to stimulate imaginative thinking on chemical and biological weapons.

We need new and novel ideas that are applicable to our field of interest, and we want them before they have been laboriously perfected and put on your drawing boards. While not all of these will prove fruitful, failures must be accepted as a part of the program. For if we wait until we can be sure that we can be successful, we will in many cases have waited too long. We must close the time gap between the birth of an idea and its translation into a reality.

I hope you will encourage your people to freely submit ideas to us, no matter how "out of this world" they may seem. You may recall that not too many years ago space ships and missiles were only figments of the cartoon artist's imagination.

Let me give you a few examples of areas where the blue sky program could be put to good use. One of our primary aims is to so equip our fighting men that they would be impervious to a chemical and biological attack and would be so unencumbered that they could effectively continue their mission.

We are also vitally interested in developing more adequate and rapid early warning systems that will detect a chemical or biological attack. Since many chemical and biological weapons agents cannot be detected by the senses, it is imperative that simplified methods be devised that would rapidly warn our Nation and our Armed Forces of chemical or biological weapons attack. An enemy could easily launch an attack such as this from submarines lying offshore or from planes and missiles.

Novel ideas are needed in concepts of employing physiologically active materials to stifle an enemy's will to fight.

I have great confidence that the blue sky program with contributions of scientists throughout the free world will provide us with the margin of difference that will keep us in the forefront in the technological race for chemical and biological supremacy. It is clear that the Russians are making a bid for first place. We know that the strength of our military forces depends directly on technology and we must keep Jules Verne truthful in labeling us Yankees as the foremost technicians of the world.

Radio and Television Ratings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 28, 1959

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, in further support of the statement I made on Saturday regarding the slavery of networks to the TV-radio rating services, particularly in regard to the networks' refusal to sell prime time to "The Voice of Firestone," despite its sponsor's willingness to pay for such time, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article distributed by the New York Herald Tribune News Syndicate and printed in the Washington Post of April 27, 1959. It is written by John Crosby, one of our outstanding TV critics.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WRITER SAYS RATINGS ARE LOT OF NONSENSE
(By John Crosby)

This is the first year that I have dipped a very tentative toe into the field of lecturing. I have reached two broad general conclusions. First, it is wonderful fun, a conclusion I did not at all expect. Second, the broadcasters don't know what they are talking about when they talk about their audiences, a conclusion I very much did expect.

Audiences out of town seem to be no different from those in New York. People are very much the same everywhere—a finding that will strike Madison Avenue dumb with astonishment. The most famous entertainer in the United States at the moment—now hold on to your hat here—is Jack Paar. Yet his rating is nowhere near that of "I've Got a Secret."

All of which goes to prove that ratings are a lot of nonsense. The rating people will say I didn't talk to enough people—yet I have talked to a lot more people than Neilsen samples on his hallowed rating service which determines whether a show lives or dies, whether a sponsor will blow 25 million bucks or not. (I never heard anyone mention Desilu Playhouse or whatever they call that darned thing that Westinghouse spends $12 million a year on. I don't think anyone has ever seen it. Betty Furness has had people commiserate with her because she's off the air—except that she's been on for 10 years.)

The questions that I am asked in Wichita are no different from the ones your literate friends ask you here. What happened to Firestone? Aren't they ever going to get enough westerns? What's Jack Paar really like? (An awful lot of people say: "I don't like Jack Paar but I like his program"—something that would bother me if I were Paar. Paar, on the other hand would be flattered, perhaps even alarmed, if he knew what a national phenomenon he is. Paar today is far bigger than Steve Allen ever was in the same spot and bigger—that is, in sheer conversational value, speculation, national awareness than anyone since the apotheosis of Arthur Godfrey 4 or 5 years back.)

If I were the head of a network, I would worry about the numbers of people who say they don't look at television any more. Immediately, this will be countered by the assertion that I'm talking to a lecture audience which isn't at all typical. Certainly it

isn't typical. But if you move around the country, you meet a lot of other people besides those in your audience. You meet airline hostesses and taxicab drivers and waitresses and the guy who carries your bags and the people who sit next to you in airplanes and newspapermen and TV interviewers and friends and relations—and oh, lots of people.

One general rule you can make is this: That a guy who moves around the country and asks questions knows a lot more about what is going on in the country than a guy who sits on his duff and pores over charts prepared by somebody else. You may set this down as Crosby's law: That any research service you pay money to will, in general, tell you what you want to know; they're not going to tell you a lot of unpalatable truths because you might stop paying the money.

It is no accident that Capt. Joseph Medill Patterson, founder of New York's Daily News, was the most successful publisher of his day. He didn't hire a survey outfit to check the subway crowds he was aiming at. He rode the subways himself during rush hours and looked over people's shoulders to see what they were reading in his paper. Or, if they were reading somebody else's paper, what they were reading.

One vice president wandering around the grassroots wouldn't cost any more than one of those silly surveys, and he would be amazed at the amount of wisdom he'd bring back with him about the taste and the intelligence of the countryside which the networks so consistently and grievously underestimate.

Georgia's Great Industrial Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 28, 1959

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the May issue of Coronet magazine contains an excellent article by Mark Nichols reporting on the tremendous rate of industrial growth which is reshaping the economy of the State of Georgia. It is entitled "Everything's Jumping in Georgia," and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EVERYTHING'S JUMPING IN GEORGIA

(By Mark Nichols)

"Jumpin' gerrymanders!" the native Georgian exclaimed. "Where did all the cotton-pickers go?" As he looked around Atlanta—after an absence of 10 years—he discovered that ante bellum white-columned houses had given way to a sprawling metropolis of skyscrapers, glass-enclosed factory buildings, and elegant entertainment facilities. Traveling across the State on business, he became increasingly excited about prospects he spotted. Whereupon he rushed back to New York, resigned his job and moved his family to Atlanta. That was 3 years ago. Today, he has a comfortable income as a small-parts manufacturer, few business pressures, and a gracious way of life. Presiding over the barbecue spit in his honeysuckle-entwined back yard, he has fallen back into the habit of southern hospitality that comes as naturally to Georgians as their drawl.

His story has been duplicated by literally thousands of servicemen, college graduates, and industrial workers, all contributing to a new look in Georgia today. The land of magnolias and languid living wears the proud look of economic growth and success. Since the end of World War II, this enterprising State has combined research and southern charm to attract 17,000 new commercial and industrial firms. These businesses provide jobs for nearly 250,000 persons.

"Georgia couldn't go on relying just on cotton," an American newspaperman explains. "When it was a good crop, it was very good for the State. When it was bad, it was disastrous." Awakened to the folly of one-crop dependency, Georgians began looking earnestly for other crops and industries to diversify their economy. Their success can be measured by the jingling change in Georgia jeans today.

The State now leads the United States in the production of tufted textiles, poultry broilers, saddles, mobile homes, naval stores, marble, peanuts, and pimiento peppers. "Not bad, huh?" smiles State Director of Commerce Abit Massey, whose department concentrates on the encouragement of new industry. "And four new businesses every day are taking advantage of our year-round temperate climate, natural resources and our anxious-to-please labor force—plus the cooperation of every State government department."

"Not bad" is typical Georgia understatement. Massey's roster reads like a Who's Who of American business: American Cyanamid Co., Armour Co., Continental Can Co., General Electric Co., Johns-Manville Corp., Manhattan Shirt Co., Viking Trailer Corp., Westinghouse Electric Corp.

"Georgia industries now turn out everything from automobiles to zippers," says Massey. "Like chain reactions, one business seems to spark another." As an example he cites the 105 plants that turn out tufted textiles in the State. These created such a demand for latex backing for the carpet products that a latex rubber company moved in to service them better. Other related industries followed.

This kind of chain reaction is jet-fueled by the resulting prosperity, too. Earning more, Georgians are spending more, creating a supply and demand cycle that multiplies at a vigorous rate.

Why have so many manufacturers established plants in Georgia? A food canner lists some reasons: "For me, the weightiest factor was the all-out help I got from the State. After I expressed interest in the Savannah area, the State department of commerce came up with every relevant bit of information, including weather, water and power, and even the types and number of workers available.

"The picture looked good to me," the canner continued, "but I couldn't spare time from my Ohio plant to supervise construction in Georgia. The department of commerce met with the town's civic leaders and persuaded the community to finance and erect a building to meet my needs. Then it was leased to me at advantageous terms—with options to buy later. Because the site was in a rural district, I had to have good roads for shipments. The highway department stepped in and laid new roads. Next, the State department of education trained workers in the area. I provided the machines and the training space and they put my foremen on salary as instructors. By the time the plant was ready to open, the workers were familiar with our methods.

"And with the community financing the building," the canner concluded, "everyone in town is rooting for the business to succeed."

One look at northwest Georgia would dispel any notion of southern indolence. Here, the raising of broilers is a 24-hour-a-day enterprise. Commercial broiler production began before World War II when Jesse Jewell, a feed merchant, tried to boost his poultry feed sales. He bought chicks, sold them on credit to nearby farmers, and then sold them feed on an IOU basis. Soon a widespread, easy-to-operate industry was underway. The beef shortage during World War II helped accelerate its growth and broiler raising has become Georgia's largest agricultural enterprise.

Farm mechanization released large numbers of rural workers for industrial jobs, increasing the labor pool. To present an attractive labor picture to prospective businesses, the State last year passed its own right-to-work law, allowing citizens to work without union affiliation if they so chose.

Georgia's college graduates today have no need to migrate elsehere in search of career advancement. Take, for instance, interior decorator, Carolyn Becknell, Atlanta's 1958 Woman of the Year in Arts. Setting up shop as Becknell Associates, she found a ready need for her services by industry and homeowners.

"Everything's jumping in Georgia," says Miss Becknell. "Northerners may come here and decide to slow down, but they are likely to be bumped from behind by a Georgian who is swinging with the times."

Lockheed Aircraft Corp. has discovered that its Marietta location is a persuasive attraction for hard-to-get engineers who yearn for the majestic vistas and open country of the State. Another valuable asset for Lockheed is the availability of the Georgia Institute of Technology's graduates and research facilities.

Two other industrial giants have made Georgia their focal point for southeastern operations. The General Motors Corp. plant at Doraville alone turns out 46 different types of passenger cars on the same assembly line. Ford Motor Co. has nearly doubled the space of its first postwar plant on 75 acres outside Atlanta.

Why do manufacturers choose one particular location? The reasons vary from solid business sense to whimsy. Manufacturer Dan Brown chose Dawsonville because his mother's maiden name was Dawson. Another businessman, advised by his engineering consultants to locate in town A, was persuaded by an industrial development go-getter to look over town B. Learning that he was a sportsman, town B organized a quail hunt for him, followed by a pheasant dinner. (P.S.—The plant is now located in town B.)

An Iowa industrialist, vacationing at Sea Island, fell in love with the peaceful palmetto country while indulging in his favorite sport, boating. He moved his commercial insecticides plant to Brunswick, and now spends all his free time on the water.

His passion for the water is shared by thousands of Georgians. With plenty of leisure and lakes, they have turned to boating for fun in the sun—and brought a new industry into their midst.

One Georgia boast is not idle: the State has a more-than-abundant water supply for recreation, industry, and agriculture. Farmer John Butler, resting his elbow on a hoe and regarding the warm, blue sky, says, "We get an average of 49 inches of rainfall a year. And we don't have to worry about floods since we got all those new dams." Five new dams constructed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers make navigation smooth on Georgia rivers.

The State has plenty of power, too, to match the water supply. "In the past 10 years," a George Power Co. spokesman declares, "we have doubled our generating capacity to keep ahead of this boom."

Also serving industry are harbors that maintain a steady stream of materials for

men and machines. In 1946 the State organized the Georgia Ports Authority to deep dredge and develop further the existing Port of Savannah on the Atlantic seaboard. Pointing to a European freighter unloading Volkswagen automobiles from Germany, Dockworker Roy Gateson grinned: "We're getting foreign cars and just about everything else direct now."

Over 100 steamship lines load and discharge freight in Savannah. And the new inland port at Bainbridge hums with barge traffic bringing chemicals, oils, and fertilizers from as far away as Chicago. Spurred by the success of these operations, the ports authority has future plans for developing additional ports at Brunswick, Augusta, and Columbus.

Georgia's capital, Atlanta, ranks as the largest transportation center in the South, with 31 railroads, 6 major airlines and 500 bus departures daily.

Atlanta's central location has also made it a telephone communications hub, one of the largest long-distance switching centers in the world. It is also a major television control center, filtering cables for TV and radio transmission throughout the South.

Rich in natural resources, too, Georgia is harvesting its gifts from nature. Its lofty pine forests, largest in the South, yield reams of paper after processing and also furnish over half the world supply of resin and turpentine. Wastelands are rapidly being converted into timberland to supply pulpwood for companies like Union Bag-Camp Paper Corp., Owens-Illinois Glass Co., and Container Corporation of America. "We can hardly keep up with the new uses they find for pine," says a forester. "Good thing it grows fast."

Georgia's youthful government administrators—from Gov. Ernest Vandiver, 40, to Abit Massey, still in his early thirties—have pledged special emphasis on aiding the State's smaller communities to secure new industries. From Massey's department of commerce office in the Atlanta State Capitol Building, thick packets of brochures and surveys go out daily to manufacturers across the United States who want to investigate what Georgia has to offer.

Convinced that research will help open more industrial doors, the State department of commerce is at present conducting a study of the State's commercial potentials in plastics, air conditioners and coastal Bermuda grass.

"Now that we've seen what can be done," says Massey, "we won't relax until we make our State the industrial leader of the South." He and his fellow citizens mean business when they utter these familiar Georgia parting words: Come see us, now.

International Student Exchange

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 28, 1959

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, 10 years ago the University of Arkansas formed a committee for Foreign Exchange Students. The results of the work of this committee in the last decade are summarized in an article in the Arkansas Alumnus magazine for March 1959.

This article furnishes a good explanation of how foreign students are received in a college community, and an indication of typical student reaction to their new educational environment. It also explains how local citizens have contributed so unselfishly of their time and money to support the students during their stay and make the program a success. I think that this example is typical of what has happened at hundreds of other colleges and universities throughout the country which participate in the exchange program.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix, and I recommend it for the reading of all Senators.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARKANSAS INTERNATIONAL STUDENT EXCHANGE

Foreign students brought to the University of Arkansas by the Foundation for the International Exchange of Students are goodwill ambassadors for our country and State when they return to their homes. Also, they enrich the lives and outlook of those with whom they come in contact both at the university and throughout the State.

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-NINE: TENTH ANNIVERSARY FOR FOREIGN STUDENTS

Exactly 10 years ago this month a group of faculty and students at the university got together to form the Committee for Foreign Exchange Students.

It was a movement that the charter members felt particularly appropriate, since it would bring foreign students to the alma mater of Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, whose legislation was to make the whole thing possible. The Fulbright Act for educational exchange has since been described as the most fabulously profitable investment ever authorized by Congress.

The university has profited from it—and from the other exchange arrangements that have come in its wake—by acquiring a continuing group of international students. From all over the world they have come and gone, leaving behind a little more understanding of the world's peoples, and taking with them a little more understanding of the United States.

In the words of Gisela Gherri, a 1956–57 student from Switzerland, "One should never think 'Fayetteville is such a little place, what can I learn here?' Fayetteville is the United States just as well as are New York or Hollywood. Every minute should be lived full of consciousness. I mean that every minute one should be aware of what privilege it is to be able to study in the United States."

Since that first year, when two came from France and one from Germany, from 10 to 20 foreign students have been aided financially each year by the international foundation, and several hundred others have come to the campus through financial arrangements of their own. The Arkansas Foundation for the International Exchange of Students, to give the complete title, grew out of the original 1949 committee, and was incorporated under the laws of Arkansas in 1951 as an educational association.

At present there are about 50 international students on campus—all sponsored by the foundation—from the Latin American countries, the Far East, Europe, the Middle East, and Canada. Men outnumber women three to one.

This proportion of men to women is fairly typical of foreign students on American campuses. However, at most universities the largest percentage are from the Far East, while at Arkansas the largest number come from the Latin American countries. Many come from Panama to study agriculture.

Only last fall did the international foundation offer "sponsorship" to all foreign students meaning that through the foundation a member of the community serves as a friend who helps with any everyday living problems and a faculty advisor helps with academic guidance. These services are in addition to the foundation's scholarship aid for a smaller number of students.

Because the Fulbright Act, and some of the other programs of the United States or foreign governments, do not provide all the money necessary for a year's study at the University, the International Foundation must raise funds annually. The number of foundation students receiving financial aid thus varies with the amount of support given on the campus and in the State.

The international foundation usually must find funds for board and room, books, and tuition. Because it is a State institution, the university cannot give tuition scholarships to foreign students. It does give the foundation the right to award 15 waivers of out-of-State tuition, which amounts to $100 a semester.

Money has come from individuals, including the faculty and the undergraduates, and from groups over the State. The Arkansas Federation of Women's Clubs, for example, each year provides $600 for the room and board of one woman in a dormitory. The men's civic clubs—especially the Rotary Clubs of Springdale, Rogers, and Fayetteville, which contribute from $100 to $250—give continuing support.

The American Association of University Women has for many years sold tickets to a special film series, with proceeds going to the international foundation. Cookbooks containing recipes collected from foreign students were published by the World Affairs group in Fayetteville in 1955 and are still selling.

Several fraternities and sororities have participated in the program during the past 10 years by giving board and room to one foreign student in their houses, or meals only if there is no space to spare.

How much financial support the students will need is known before they arrive. Every foreign student who applies for a grant or scholarship in an American university is screened by the institute of international education of New York. Then the local foundation selects from the applications available the ones they think will work out in the University of Arkansas community.

They don't always work out. Although as a rule they are good scholars, one will occasionally have insurmountable language difficulties or cannot adjust to such a different culture, and return home before the year is over.

"Our lost foreign students are rare," according to Mrs. Jessie O'Kelly of the English department, who has worked with the program since its inception and who teaches a special English course for them each year. "But since we know it can happen, we plan ahead by providing sponsors and by arranging social activities that will help them get adjusted early."

SOCIAL EVENTS ARE VARIED

One social event last fall was a get-acquainted reception held in the Fine Arts Center for the international students and those who support the foundation.

The students are often guests in Fayetteville homes—alumnus Harmon Remmel (B.S., B.A., 1941) has entertained them frequently. Also, by personally contacting other alumni in different parts of the State, Harmon has made it possible for groups of foreign students to visit more of Arkansas than just Fayetteville.

It has been the custom for several to tour the State, usually at Easter, making speeches to civic clubs, church groups, or anybody else who would like to have them. In 1955 the

foreign students made more than 600 speeches in Arkansas communities.

Frequently University of Arkansas students will invite a foreign student home for Thanksgiving or Christmas. The foreign students who can manage it financially sometimes take advantage of the holidays to see New Orleans or Texas or St. Louis.

On the campus an activity available to all is the International Club, which also includes American students. The club usually starts the year with "orientation meetings" so that the newcomers can learn about dating customs, American money, or whatever is puzzling them.

Last year was an especially active one for the International Club, for they had folk dancing classes, and an international weekend in March. About 250 persons turned out for the supper of foreign dishes that was part of the weekend celebration; the students also held a dance and played a soccer match.

OPINIONS OF STUDENTS

Out of all this social activity, plus the contacts made in the classroom, comes a view common among foreign students. Americans are friendly. And apparently the more friends they make, the more likely they are to spend a happy year.

That year sometimes stretches into several, if the student has the means. Some go on to do graduate work elsewhere; some stay at the university. Take the case of Alex Poularikas, who appears on the cover of the Alumnus. He first came as a Fulbright scholar in 1956, expects to earn a degree in electrical engineering and then will work toward a master's. He has a job teaching physics labs, and works on nuclear research in connection with the ion accelerator.

"When I came, I did not expect so many good people to help me," Alex said. He believes that foreign students find such big differences in American life that it is difficult for them to evaluate their experience until after the first year or after they return home.

Scholastically, the exchange students notice a big difference, especially on the freshman and sophomore level. They often feel both the method of teaching and the subject matter are like high school or its equivalent abroad. They are accustomed to being responsible for independent study. But, as Alex has found, if they do advanced work they discover that the teaching and their fellow students are equal to what they can find in their own countries.

Socially, they often find American students too little concerned about getting an education, and too much concerned with dating and extracurricular activities. But with time even these criticisms fade.

The foundation has found this to be true generally. Mrs. Marie Lavallard, editor of agricultural publications, who puts out a newsletter twice yearly for former foundation students, often receives letters like the one from Eugenio Schieber. Eugenio, a 1953–54 student from Guatemala now at the University of Wisconsin, wrote about his experience in Fayetteville: "All of the wonderful memories of the place where I saw the first snow in my life * * * where I learned about American living, where I could get a better understanding of fellowship and organization through the fraternity Sigma Alpha Epsilon * * * where I gathered knowledge for my future life, and where I learned a new language after counting the steps of the monumental Old Main."

These "foreign alumni" who return to their countries all over the world are America's ambassadors—and Arkansas' ambassadors. The adverse publicity that Arkansas has received abroad caused some uneasiness among the students who came last fall. But many now have the attitude of Denmark's Annette Lendal Connaway (she added the last name in February when she married Jim Connaway, president of the Associated Students), who said, "I don't say I share it, but I now understand the southern point of view. The social problem is more complex than I had realized."

A large percentage of the alumni abroad have kept in touch with old friends on the campus and in the State. A few have kept in touch with each other; they have held four alumni reunions in Europe, three in Heidelberg, and one in Paris. Like all alumni at a reunion, they shared memories of the university.

Senator Humphrey, of Minnesota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 28, 1959

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the April 25, 1959, issue of the Saturday Evening Post there appears an article about our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. The article draws a warm and interesting portrait of an outstanding leader of the Democratic Party. It shows the Senator from Minnesota as we know he is—as a man of exceptional and articulate intelligence, of great political creativeness, and of tremendous energy. It shows him as a man with a firm grasp of the international and domestic problems of the Nation and a deep understanding of the human needs of the American people.

I am delighted that the article on Senator HUMPHREY will make clear to millions of Americans what Members of the Senate have long known, and I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

HUSTLING HUBERT MAKES HIS BID

(By Walter T. Ridder)

If HUBERT HORATIO HUMPHREY were inclined to bitterness, he would broodingly remember the 1956 Democratic National Convention as ample demonstration of man's perfidiousness to man. The Minnesota Senator had sought nomination as Adlai E. Stevenson's vice presidential running mate. His attempt had been publicly and humiliatingly rebuffed. The convention chose ESTES KEFAUVER by the narrowest margin over JOHN F. KENNEDY. HUMPHREY, deserted by all on whom he had counted for support, viewed the wreckage of his candidacy and muttered, "They've stolen all my clothes."

Yet the man who then stood naked before his adversaries is today one of the four major contenders for the 1960 Democratic presidential nomination. Kennedy, Stevenson, Senator Stuart Symington, and Humphrey stand out most clearly on the Democratic political horizon. That HUMPHREY could so rapidly graduate from passed over vice presidential candidate to seriously considered presidential prospect is proof of his recuperative powers and ability to learn lessons from defeat.

In pursuit of the top nomination HUMPHREY will use his tongue, his imagination and his inexhaustible energy, all of which have been his most potent assets and at the same time his gravest handicaps. Particularly his tongue. Words come to HUMPHREY as easily as water flows over Niagara Falls. They come in staccato bursts, more like the chatter of a Gatling gun than the weighed pronouncements of a statesman. Many first-time listeners wonder whether they have been victims of a verbal shell game. His readiness to voice opinions and the speed with which the words cascade create an illusion of mere glibness. In reality, HUMPHREY's mind moves as rapidly as his tongue; behind the facade of words lies a brain continually in motion.

"That so-and-so," said a nonadmirer admiringly, "is always thinking." Ideas come to HUMPHREY in such profusion that his office staff is hard put to keep up with them. "He drives to work in the morning," explained a Humphrey aid, "and he has nothing to do for 25 minutes. When he gets here, he's had a thousand ideas and expects us to go to work on them immediately."

His interests are as varied as the work of the Senate. In the course of 10 days during the last session of Congress, HUMPHREY proposed legislation on such diverse matters as establishment of an international health year, creation of a Youth Conservation Corps, expansion of export of American dairy products, retention of the phrase "civil defense" in a new agency, loans for increased college and university construction, more aid for small business, denunciation of Russian barbarism in Hungary, and insistence that the United States give backing to international action on human rights.

He also offered a 4-point international works for peace program, a 6-point program to make disarmament inspection feasible, a 13-point program for an American trade fair in Moscow, a 5-point program for revitalizing northeastern Minnesota, and an 11-point program for challenging the Soviet economic offensive. He deplored the Russian lead in outer space and demanded more support for the Coast and Geodetic Survey because "we are badly lagging in our knowledge of the ocean depths."

The range and multiplicity of HUMPHREY's ideas have propelled him from pharmacist in Huron, S. Dak., to the Senate. As with his eloquence, the ideas themselves are not an unmixed blessing. He has been charged with mental shallowness and going off half-cocked. But those who have challenged him in debate have learned to their dismay that the Senator from Minnesota does his homework. Opponents may not agree with his conclusions, but they rarely best him on qustions of fact.

He does, too often, go off halfcocked. There are few topics on which he does not have immediate, readymade opinions—some of which he is later forced to change. For every problem, HUMPHREY proposes a multipoint solution which sometimes contains more points than practicality. His speeches are needlessy long. "You don't have to be eternal to be immortal, HUBERT," a dinner chairman once scribbled to him. Listening to him reel off a speech in which he was solving many of the world's ills, a friend remarked, "The trouble with HUBERT is that he should be an entertainer." For the sake of audience reaction, he tends to quip and sometimes sacrifices dignity for a laugh.

HUMPHREY's mind drives his body at a pace which men of lesser energy find intolerable. "Keeping up with HUBERT is impossible," another friend reported disconsolately after a tour. "Every morning we were up at four to shake farmers' hands and we were on the move until midnight. I'd flop into bed, but HUBERT invariably found friends and would stay up talking. The next morning he'd be out there as bright and fresh as ever." The man-killing schedule is not confined to campaigns. He tries to cram more activity into his Senate day than his time will permit. As a result he usually is seen racing from one appointment to another, which contrib-

utes to his reputation as a young man in a hurry.

He moves with grace and ease. Washington ladies rate him as one of the Capital's better dancers. His figure appears slight, but it is a solid 170 pounds. He seems smaller than his 5 feet 11 inches, an optical illusion created by his aura of frenzied activity. People reason that nothing large could move so fast. His face, though broadening, is essentially boyish. His features are extraordinarily mobile and seem to reflect the passage of his thoughts. This supports the belief that HUMPHREY "thinks too fast." The sum total of HUMPHREY's physical characteristics adds up to something quite different from the popular image of a President. He just doesn't look like a President. This is a public relations problem which will give HUMPHREY much concern in the months to come.

HUMPHREY is acutely aware of this problem. Much as Averell Harriman sought to overcome his public image as an inarticulate individual so HUMPHREY must erase from public mind the vision of a brash, young buttinsky. He will do this by pausing deliberately before answering a question, by limiting the number of topics per day on which he is willing to make a speech, by slowing the pace of his oratory and by directing his energy to topics of prime national and international import. There will be no "new" HUMPHREY; there will simply be a toned-down version of the old. For instance, when asked for his reaction to President Eisenhower's 1959 state of the Union message, HUMPHREY astonished reporters by replying, "No comment"—a phrase which has been conspicuously absent from his vocabulary in the past.

Ingratiating qualities of the gentleman from Minnesota are his ready sense of humor and his ability to laugh at himself. When it was suggested that HUMPHREY had made a mistake in a recent course of action, the Senator soberly agreed, "Yes." Then, rolling his eyes heavenward, HUMPHREY threw back his head and raucously laughed. "Mistakes? Man, I invented 'em." Humorous self-appraisal is a refreshing habit of HUMPHREY, just as it is of Adlai Stevenson.

HUMPHREY's humor is in the Mark Twain tradition—earthy, explosive, exaggerated, in the style of the American frontier. It contrasts sharply with Stevenson's urbane, intellectual wit. HUMPHREY makes use of the pungent phrase, the unexpected and incongruous. He astounded a staid diplomatic dinner at the British Embassy by suddenly blurting out, as he described a heated Senate debate, "Oh, boy, and then did the manure hit the fan." HUMPHREY since has learned that such colorful expressions are received in diplomatic circles with highly arched eyebrows. Today he undoubtedly would substitute, "We had a hot discussion."

The frontier molded HUMPHREY's personality in many ways and has strongly influenced his political thinking. In his philosophy, he is a direct descendant of Andrew Jackson and the later Populist movement. The mark of the frontier and of the Populist had not yet vanished from South Dakota, when HUMPHREY was a youth there. His liberalism is rooted in the troubled political soil of agricultural reform, fed and nurtured by Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal. He is a liberal in the classic American tradition. That liberalism calls for a man to help himself insofar as he is able, but for Government action to meet problems insoluble by the individual. It is the liberalism of Roosevelt, George W. Norris, and Bob La Follette.

Senator HUMPHREY's political thought is a natural outgrowth of his background. His father, a druggist by trade and a Wilsonian Democrat in politics, raised HUBERT on an intellectual diet of Thomas Jefferson and Thomas Paine. The elder Humphrey owned drugstores in several South Dakota towns before settling in Huron, and his arrival there raised no cheers among the druggists already established in the small city. In fact, they enlisted the local chamber of commerce in a fight against their new competitor. Druggist Humphrey won the ensuing brawl, but the fight made a deep impression on his son, who since that day has viewed chambers of commerce with a certain distrust. HUBERT was brought up in economic tranquillity until the twin calamities of the depression and the drought of the thirties overwhelmed South Dakota. HUBERT had to leave the University of Minnesota in his sophomore year. He helped his father in the drugstore, then compressed into 6 months a 2-year course at the Denver College of Pharmacy. Father and son working together weathered the storm, and by 1937 HUBERT was back at the University of Minnesota with a wife, Muriel Buck, of Huron, whom he had courted while filling prescriptions. He also took with him a lasting memory of leathery faces of farmers gazing hopelessly at the swirling dust storms which were carrying away their farms. He made top grades and was entitled to wear a Phi Beta Kappa key when he received his B.A. degree and diploma in 1939.

The studious HUMPHREY then took a teaching fellowship at Louisiana State University, where he made an enduring friendship with RUSSELL LONG, now the junior Senator from Louisiana. He hastened back to Minnesota to hold a multitude of jobs, many of them at the same time. He was variously an instructor in political science at the University of Minnesota, an official of the WPA program in his State, and assistant regional director of the War Manpower Commission.

In 1943 he sandwiched between other activities his first run for mayor of Minneapolis. In a field of 10, the unknown HUMPHREY ran second and lost the runoff by only 4,900 votes. This taught him that in Minnesota running as a Democrat wasn't enough. He needed the support of the Farmer-Laborites, then an independent party. He hammered together a Democratic-Farmer-Labor coalition and in 1945 was elected mayor of the city.

These political maneuvers were carried on during World War II. They stimulate his political opponents to ask: "Why wasn't HUMPHREY in the service?" HUMPHREY answers the question in considerable detail. "I was first classified 3-B," he says, "because I was married and had three children. I had a job with the Army Air Corps, teaching world politics and government. In the spring of 1944 I volunteered for the Navy, but was turned down because of physical disability. In 1945 I took an Army physical which showed a double hernia and calcification of the shoulder. I was reclassified 1-B (limited service). I offered to sign waivers, but the request was denied. Before further action was taken, the war ended." HUMPHREY heatedly denies that he used political influence to avoid induction. "I told the draft board that I was politically vulnerable and they should put my name at the head of the list. Ask them why they didn't do so."

As mayor of an industrial city in the heart of the farm belt, HUMPHREY had opportunity to woo the two constituencies which still form the bulk of his support—farmers and labor. His record as mayor was a good one. Both farm and labor interests encouraged him to run for the Minnesota Senate seat held by Joseph H. Ball, in the 1948 election.

HUMPHREY propelled himself into national prominence at the 1948 Democratic National Convention—at an incalculable price to the party, some of his enemies believe. It happened when the convention was debating a proposed civil-rights resolution. The night before, HUMPHREY had agreed to support a compromise civil-rights plank, but now he took the rostrum to oppose it. He blew the convention apart with the stirring climax to his oration: "It is now time for the Democratic Party to get out of the shadow of States rights and walk forthrightly in the bright sunshine of human rights." His action brought bitter remarks of "double-crosser" and "publicity seeker" from party chieftains who had so painstakingly constructed the compromise, but HUMPHREY asserted then, and still does, that grave political and philosophical doubts prompted his change of mind. At any rate, his propsed substitute plank passed over the vociferous opposition of the South, elements of which ultimately took a walk from the convention, mutterly darkly about "that radical mayor of Minneapolis."

There isn't any question that the civil rights speech helped HUMPHREY defeat Ball in the 1948 election. The farm revolt which toppled Thomas E. Dewey from his premature Presidency also aided HUMPHREY. The Taft-Hartley bill, which Ball favored, also figured heavily in a campaign noted for the number of eggs and tomatoes besplattering the Republican and for the number and variety of speeches given by HUMPHREY.

Early in his first term as Senator, HUMEHREY learned the hard way—but quickly—that speeches which go over big at the Minneapolis Labor Temple receive short shrift under the dome of the Capitol. Freshman Senators are expected to be seen, not heard. In definance of this unspoken edict, HUMPHREY challenged the essentiality of Senator HARRY F. BYRD's committee on nonessential Federal expenditures. In attacking BYRD, HUMPHREY was smiting a prominent member of the "the club," that informal, potent coterie of Senators who dominate the upper Chamber. While HUMPHREY made his speech aaginst the Byrd committee, other Senators on the floor turned their backs, then one by one retired to the Senate cloakrooms. The freshman Senator completed his speech in pointed isolation. He took the rebuke to heart and didn't repeat the offense; today he is an accepted and influential member of the club.

A capacity to understand and to learn has been HUMPHREY's sturdiest asset. His national fame may rest upon his gift for words, but his influence in the Senate stems from his grasp of complicated issues. "That mind of HUBERT's is so fast," said one colleague, "that you haven't begun to explain a problem to him before he has explored its ramifications and has suggested solutions to a problem you haven't stated." When the ex-freshman, on whom his associates once turned their backs, now speaks on farm or foreign policy, other Senators are inclined to listen. Before making up their minds, some of his colleagues now telephone him and ask, "HUBERT, what do you think?"

HUMPHREY has pursued assiduously his self-appointed role as spokesman for the embattled farmers. He has fought a protracted running battle with Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson, whom he has called "the worst Agriculture Secretary in history." He regularly demands Benson's dismissal, a demand up to now unheeded by President Eisenhower. HUMPHREY's own proposed solutions for the farm-surplus problem have ranged from higher price supports to conversion of wheat into a ricelike gruel, as practiced in Old Testament days, for export to Asiatic countries.

His influence in foreign affairs is no accident. It is the result of methodical and determined self-schooling in international relations. A man of HUMPHREY's energy and mental capabilities was not likely to sit idly by while other men debated the all-important questions of foreign policy. By careful reading of the newspapers, by interviews with State Department officials, talks with foreign ambassadors and by studious

homework, HUMPHREY became one of the most effective of the Capitol's voices on foreign policy. The present administration has frequently requested the Minnesota Democrat to perform legislative chores in behalf of its diplomacy—tasks which HUMPHREY has willingly executed. However, his cooperation has not stilled his demands for the resignation of John Foster Dulles, demands as unheeded as his cries for removal of Benson.

Humphrey has parlayed his native intelligence, wide curiosity, astute political mind and power to learn into imposing credentials for the 1960 Democratic nomination. Whether he will win the nomination depends upon the political climate of the country, the future face of the Democratic Party, convention in-fighting, and the inexplicable roll of the dice, which so often determines a convention's choice.

He meets the tacit requirements which American politicians generally, but not always, seek in presidential candidates. His life has been free from scandal, he is a Protestant, and he possesses a photogenic family of four children, Nancy, 20, Hubert, Jr., 16, Robert, 14, and Douglas, 10. His wife, who regards her husband with bemused admiration, would do well as First Lady. His name is nationally known and, at 48, he has reached political maturity.

Among the paradoxes of HUMPHREY's candidacy is the undebatable fact that he is a politician. By instinct, training, and desire he is a political animal. When Nikita Khrushchev told HUMPHREY he had won a recent Kremlin battle, despite being outnumbered, he described his opponents as being good mathematicians, but bad politicians. He was talking HUMPHREY's language, for the man from Minnesota is constantly aware of the advantages accruing to those who know the art of politics. HUMPHREY's difficulty lies in the widely held view that he is too obviously a politician. In his personal relations he often has tried to be all things to all men. After the debacle in the 1956 convention, HUMPHREY uttered not one word of criticism of those who had abandoned him. He refrained partially because, as a politician, he recognized and was sympathetic to their motives. HUMPHREY knew that he might someday need them again. No need to antagonize through useless recrimination.

The cry of opportunism frequently has been raised against him. Despite HUMPHREY's long record of opposition to Wisconsin's Senator Joseph McCarthy, liberals declare he was riding the wave of McCarthyism when he introduced a bill to outlaw the Communist Party, a bill which, in greatly amended form, was overwhelmingly passed by the Congress. "Not at all," replied HUMPHREY. "The Communist Party is a conspiracy to overthrow the Government of the United States, and the people have a right to protect themselves against that conspiracy." Conservatives have likewise labeled him opportunistic in his civil rights program, pointing out that in HUMPHREY's Minnesota, civil rights are no problem at all. This charge is unfair, but the politicians' mantle—loud and ostentatious—which cloaks HUMPHREY, makes people suspicious of his sincerity. Such reactions will militate against his presidential try.

HUMPHREY is the spiritual heir of the New Deal-Fair Deal. With the outstanding exception of Stevenson, HUMPHREY is the natural candidate for the northern liberals who dominate the Democratic Party. In fact, many New Deal Democrats have already started beating the drums for the Minnesotan. Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, whose word is not without influence in the party, recently told a TV audience that HUMPHREY has within him "a spark of greatness." A number of wealthy eastern Democrats upon whom the party depends in some measure for financial support have quietly declared they are interested in HUMPHREY. The big labor organizations, a major strut in the Democratic edifice, look sympathetically upon him, while important segments of Democratic agriculture will give him enthusiastic support. Some of his Democratic colleagues favor him as the party's 1960 choice because, as one of them explained, "HUBERT is the only campaigner we've got who can put DICK NIXON through the meat grinder." However, the assumption that NIXON will necessarily be their opponent is no longer accepted by most Democrats.

Thus, HUMPHREY has a large reservoir of potential support. But he will have problems in the months ahead as he tries to solidify his strength and to prod favorable forces into open and partisan activity. In seeking to energize those forces, HUMPHREY will be kept off balance by the enigmatic role of Adlai Stevenson, for much of HUMPHREY's latent strength is what the politicians call second choice. Large numbers of those who might support HUMPHREY are committed, either by personal attachment, impersonal admiration or sheer force of habit, to Stevenson. Unless and until Adlai definitely removes himself from consideration, this potential HUMPHREY strength will lie inert.

HUMPHREY, too, has observed the traditional amenities by stating that 1960 will see him run only for reelection as Senator. Yet, HUMPHREY obviously is running for the presidential nomination and to reach his goal must indulge in some rather intricate political footwork. He must wean away strength from Stevenson. He must do this while maintaining a public mien of sober, reflective statesmanship—a facade at variance with the popular concept of HUBERT HUMPHREY.

It was no accident that HUMPHREY's footsteps led him last winter to the inner sanctum of the Kremlin, where he chatted for 8 hours with Nikita Khrushchev. He has deliberately chosen foreign affairs as a vehicle to establish his qualifications for the Presidency. In these days of summit conferences and personal diplomacy it does little harm to be seen in the presence of the international guests. HUMPHREY's decision to identify himself with foreign policy also was grounded in the hard realities of American politics.

He recognizes that the archenemy of the White House-bent Senator is the White House-bent governor. Usually the governor has won. The governors' triumphs have been due to a number of political factors, the most outstanding being the ability of the governors to take cover on many touchy national issues upon which the Senators must cast votes. The governors, too, can point to their administrative experience—a qualification thought to be of prime import to a would-be President. According to HUMPHREY's law, the Senator must seek to offset the governor's advantages by appearing preeminent in fields not available to a State executive. Foreign policy is a Senator's logical preserve. Thus, HUMPHREY has staked out claims on such vital foreign-policy matters as disarmament and Government operations abroad. One of his chief rivals for the nomination, Senator KENNEDY, is equally aware of the potentialities of the Senator as a statesman. KENNEDY regularly enunciates a program for Algeria or a program for India or a program for anything which is beyond the continental limits of the United States.

In assessing HUMPHREY's chances for the 1960 nomination, one must recall the events of the last, hectic 24 hours of the 1956 Democratic Convention. The story starts a month and a half earlier on a hot July evening in Washington, where the leading Democrats had gathered to honor Senator Walter F. George. After the speechmaking, HUMPHREY and Adlai Stevenson huddled in a hotel room. They talked of potential vice presidents, should Stevenson win the nomination. HUMPHREY, elated, left the room. He had the firm impression that Stevenson looked most favorably upon him as running mate—that if normal convention procedures were followed, Stevenson would designate him as first choice. The story told by Stevenson forces is slightly different. They maintain Stevenson declared his willingness to accept HUMPHREY, but deny that Adlai indicated a preference for the Minnesotan or that he pointed his finger and said, "You are my boy."

When the convention opened in Chicago, HUMPHREY was optimistic. He worked hard for Stevenson, in part to offset the defeat Stevenson had suffered in the Minnesota primary earlier that year. HUMPHREY had forgone a "favorite son" candidacy and had plunked for Stevenson. In a major political upset, KEFAUVER had won the primary. The failure of HUMPHREY's Minnesota organization had hurt his political prestige and was being used as an argument against his vice-presidential try.

As expected, the convention nominated Stevenson. HUMPHREY awaited the next step nervously; he was expecting Stevenson to tell Democratic leaders, in a series of hotel-room conferences, that HUMPHREY was his personal choice for the No. 2 spot on the ticket. In at least one meeting, Stevenson asked prominent Democrats a question: Should he designate his choice or leave it to the convention? The answer was a unanimous "Pick him yourself." This encouraged HUMPHREY to believe his hour was at hand.

HUMPHREY's flanks were well protected, he thought. His friendship with LYNDON JOHNSON, of Texas, had ripened over the years and seemed about to pay off. JOHNSON wielded great influence among Southern delegates; he could help HUMPHREY where the Minnesotan was weakest. HUMPHREY expected the heartiest endorsement from labor. He had every reason to count upon agriculture. It remained only for Stevenson to speak the word and the convention would swing behind HUMPHREY.

But Stevenson did not speak the word. Instead, the appalled HUMPHREY watched and listened at a television set while Stevenson told the delegates that they, not he, should pick the vice presidential candidate. It was every man for himself. Of all the major contenders, HUMPHREY was the least prepared for jungle warfare. KEFAUVER had the organization he had built during his presidential try; JACK KENNEDY had been standing ready should the opportunity come. HUMPHREY had staked his all on Stevenson's backing—and that had not materialized.

In the ensuing sleepless, phrenetic hours, HUMPHREY learned some of the most galling lessons of bigtime politics.

Lesson No. 1: Political leaders must oftimes follow, not lead. The southern votes, over which JOHNSON was to pass his magic wand, bolted. Waving HUMPHREY a limp and apologetic farewell, JOHNSON followed his flock into the KENNEDY camp.

Lesson No. 2: Never count on those you have supported. At a postmidnight press conference, HUMPHREY was asked if he expected the help of labor. "I certainly do," he answered with emphasis. "I don't know of anyone who deserves it more." But the votes don't always go to the deserving. Walter Reuther wished HUMPHREY well and delivered his votes to ESTES KEFAUVER.

Lesson No. 3: Bloc-voting groups hold together only when backing an apparent winner. Despite the efforts of some farm leaders to hold the line for HUMPHREY, the individual farm delegates split their votes between HUMPHREY's rivals. Within less than 24 hours the HUMPHREY structure crumbled. When the rollcall of States was completed, HUMPHREY finished a bad third.

The lessons will not be forgotten. "I know now," said HUMPHREY shortly after the defeat, "where the pressure points in a convention are." He emerged from the ordeal vowing that never again would he lose a convention fight. Better not to enter the fray than to be beaten under the watching eyes of delegates, newspapermen, and the millions of TV viewers.

During the next few months, HUMPHREY will roam the country taking political soundings. The ostensible excuse for the trips will be lecture tours. He makes speeches at fees ranging from $1,000 to nothing—a sliding scale somewhat associated with ability to pay and the political importance of the prospective audience. A man of modest means, HUMPHREY finds his speechmaking tours a source of substantial income. They have the corollary advantage of bringing the personality of HUBERT HUMPHREY to the attention of those who otherwise might never have heard of him. His travels around the country will help HUMPHREY decide how seriously he should go about the task of lining up 1960 convention delegates.

Although HUMPHREY may find that he can count on the active or tacit support of labor, agriculture, the eggheads, and northern liberals, he still faces his greatest problem in the South. Below the Mason-Dixon line his firm stand on civil rights is received with downright hostility. His civil-rights speech at the 1948 convention is still remembered. In 1952, he joined the "young Turks" of the Democratic Party in attempting to stuff a loyalty oath down the throat of a reluctant South. The young Turks lost their fight, but the name of HUBERT HUMPHREY had again been unfavorably impressed upon the collective mind of the South.

It is possible, of course, that HUMPHREY'S well-publicized forays into the civil rights field will work to his political advantage. With its eyes fastened on the large minority voting blocs of the industrial North, the Democratic Party might simply override the desires of the South. In such a case, HUMPHREY would be a logical candidate. If, however, the convention should try to compromise the differences between its widely divergent factions, the Minnesotan's chances will fade. Said a southern Senator recently, "The leaders of the South know that HUBERT has come a long way from his wild-eyed days, but do the southern people?"

Throughout his life HUBERT HUMPHREY has suffered from appearing too small for each job as he approached it. There were those who scoffed at his ability to be mayor of Minneapolis, but he made a good mayor. When he ran for the Senate, his opponents said he wasn't big enough for the job—but even his detractors admit he has performed well. Minnesota businessmen as a group do not admire and do not vote for HUMPHREY, but long ago they learned that if they need something done in Washington, HUBERT will do it.

At a Washington meeting of Minnesota chambers of commerce, the chairman introduced HUMPHREY, waggled a finger in warning and said, "Remember, if you speak for more than 5 minutes, you'll lose every vote in the room."

Casting his eyes at the assemblage, HUMPHREY replied, "I haven't got a vote in this room anyway," and proceeded to talk as long as he pleased, delighting his audience.

It is safe to assume that HUMPHREY delighted Khrushchev as easily as he did the businessmen. It probably was Khrushchev's first long exposure to an articulate, well-informed, assertive product of America's Main Street. Khrushchev may have been as saddened as was HUMPHREY that the talk produced such few areas of agreement. Even the bouncingly optimistic HUMPHREY came out of the shadows of the Kremlin mourning the vast gap which separates Russia from America on so many issues. But, as is the nature of the man, HUMPHREY found something at which to take heart. Khruschev had agreed to extend fuller cooperation in the mutual search for health improvement, and HUMPHREY immediately called for action to take advantage of Khruschev's offer.

In a way, that keys the man, HUMPHREY has an instinctive belief that any idea is better than no idea at all. He can always see a ray of light in an otherwise dark situation; he has a compulsive drive to use his imagination to seek solutions to problems.

There are certain predictions that are easy to make, should HUBERT HUMPHREY become President of the United States. His administration would be zestful, imaginative, politically oriented and intensely partisan. It would possess motion and flexibility. There would be little doubt on which side of an issue the White House stood. Friends would be rewarded; enemies punished. It would be an administration in which presidential ideas would be forcefully articulated and energetically pushed.

A woman who knows him well was asked what she thought about HUMPHREY as President. She mulled the question, then her face brightened and she replied, "I can tell you one thing. With HUBERT in the White House, living in this country would be a lot of fun."

Our Foreign Trade Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, although there is no foreign trade bill actively under discussion before the Congress, a great deal of thinking is being done by Americans with regard to the consequences of our present trade policy. It is my understanding that the U.S. Chamber of Commerce has had this matter under consideration for some time.

I would like to point out that there are many thinking people who believe that a policy of dropping trade barriers is unwise, unsound and contrary to the best interests of many Americans. Such is the stand which has been taken by the Chamber of Commerce of Zanesville, Ohio, and I would like to present for the perusal of my colleagues a resolution of the Zanesville Chamber adopted several weeks ago. The resolution is as follows:

Whereas the U.S. Chamber of Commerce has announced to its membership and to the Zanesville Chamber of Commerce, its proposed policy declarations to be voted on at the 47th annual meeting to be held in Washington, D.C., April 26–29, 1959; and

Whereas said policy declarations covers the subject of foreign commerce on pages 16, 17, and 18 thereof and, in effect, supports the reciprocal trade agreements and the legislation in connection therewith; and

Whereas the Zanesville Chamber of Commerce deems such support by the U.S. Chamber to be unwise and unsound and contrary to the best interests of its members; and

Whereas the policy of reciprocal trade has done and will do further serious damage to the economy of the United States at large and to this geographical area in particular; and

Whereas said policy declaration ignores such facts as—

(a) That 73 percent of all our exports are paid for with dollars earned from tourists, GI's, transportation, and investment; furthermore, that of the remaining 22 percent many of these dollars come from agricultural exports and areas of trade where tariff is not even a factor; and

(b) That despite the Reciprocal Trade Acts which have been in effect since 1934 and despite our heavy economic military shipments abroad, American exports have only averaged 4.5 percent of our gross national product, whereas in the decade after World War I it equalled 5.4 percent of our national product; and

(c) That the dollar credits of foreign nations in the United States have risen to where they hold over $12 billion of the total of $22 billion gold bullion reserve of the United States and furthermore according to the U.S. Department of Commerce the current increase in the gold reserves of the foreign countries is at the rate of $1.7 billion annually, thereby demonstrating ample funds to purchase American products. This demonstrates that it is not the lack of funds that has reduced foreign purchases in the United States, but rather the fact that our inflationary policy and continuous wage increases have priced us out of large segments of the foreign market.

(d) That the strength of America is its free enterprise system. This system, however, can only work within the realm of its domestic market with manufacturers subject to the same minimum wage laws and other social costs. Even the wage differentials between New England and the Southern States has been the source of controversy and has thrown many American employees out of work when the plants have moved to the South. The Reciprocal Trade Act accomplishes the identical result only on an international scale. In American industry average rates exceed $2 an hour, and in foreign industries they are frequently less than $2 a day.

With American money and American know-how, foreign industries are becoming just as efficient as American industries and with the low wage scale can completely ruin the business enterprises upon which American workers depend for their employment. Since 1950, American productivity has risen 12 percent, Sweden 15 percent, Belgium 23 percent, Netherlands 24 percent, France 33 percent, West Germany 35 percent, and Italy 44 percent. This demonstrates that the gap between productivity of the U.S. worker and the worker abroad is closing much faster than the wage gap.

(e) That because of the foregoing situation, American industry is being seriously hurt. The mere mention of textiles, pottery, watches, and plywood paints a picture of dying industries. Now some of the giants are being hurt, such as General Electric, Pittsburgh Plate Glass, United States Steel. Already German barbed wire is being sold in Cleveland at jobber prices of $40 a spool less than wire made by United States Steel. This is even before completion of the St. Lawrence Seaway where it can be delivered in Cleveland by ship direct from Germany.

(f) That other nations continuously protect themselves with tariffs, import quotas and currency restrictions. Today the United States is one of the lowest tariff countries in the world; we rank eighth from the bottom among the 36 trading nations; only such small countries as the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Brazil, Benelux, Denmark, etc., have lower tariffs than the United States.

(g) That the impact of inflation and rising wages and additional costs in American industry as contrasted with the low wage costs in foreign countries, is an open invitation for American industry to build plants abroad. Many are already doing this, such

as IBM, Burroughs, Royal-McBee, Remington-Rand, Underwood, etc. It is gradually becoming a situation where American companies would be better off to close their American plants and sell them and throw the workmen out of jobs simultaneously making purchases from foreign countries of their product using their U.S. distributive system to sell and distribute these products.

(h) That for every dollar of foreign products purchased in the United States, the American people and its Government spend $14. This American market is dependent upon American wages to create American purchasing power; when American industries die their ability to pay taxes to the U.S. Treasury is lost; American employees lose their jobs and American purchasing power is thereby reduced. The foregoing recited facts clearly deter American industry from further expanding and spending money for new plants and capital improvements; yet this is what American industry is being urged to do by its Government. One of the great contributors to the economic periods of well being in American economy is when there is a great capital goods market. The policy of reciprocal trade and its consequences as outlined discourage the capital goods expansion of American industry.

Because of the foregoing, reciprocal trade is actually contrary to our basic national policy of supporting wage increases and supporting the labor unions who asked for them and on the productivity theory provide for the mass American purchasing power in the American market: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the firm conviction of the Zanesville Chamber of Commerce and its membership that the basic provisions of the proposed policy declarations relating to foreign commerce should be opposed and that the U.S. Chamber of Commerce at its national meeting be urged to vote down any such policy declarations;

Resolved, further, That from said policy declarations the entire paragraph shown on page 17 immediately following "International Trade Policy" and entitled "Increased Import" and reading as follows should be deleted from said policy declaration:

"A consistent and continuous large export surplus, financed out of the tax revenue, is neither economic nor in keeping with the position of the United States as a creditor nation. Our industrial machine and our national security require raw and semimanufactured goods for production and stockpiling. These imports alone, however, are not sufficient to supply this Nation's foreign customers with sufficient dollars to maintain beneficial U.S. exports at a level commensurate with the importance of the export industry to the total U.S. economy. Therefore, for the benefit of the economy of the Nation as a whole, business and government should encourage increased imports into the United States."

Resolved further, That the statement on page 17 on "Trade agreements" be deleted and revoked and that in lieu thereof the following paragraph be inserted in said policy declaration as representing the policy of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce:

"Trade agreements: The chamber supports a trade agreements program for the selective adjustment of tariffs and the gradual reduction of other barriers to world trade, on the condition that the supporting legislation (1) provides safeguards for interested parties to be heard in support of, or in opposition to, contemplated and publicly announced negotiations, and (2) that it provides an effective escape clause permitting modification or withdrawal of concessions if imports seriously injure domestic producers, in accordance with findings of the U.S. Tariff Commission, and in conformity with the publicly avowed policy repeatedly affirmed during the past 25 years by the Chief Executive and the Secretaries of State that no domestic industry would be injured seriously by the trade agreements program."

Resolved further, That the following statement under "Governmental restrictions on international trade" appearing on page 17 of the policy declaration, be deleted:

"The continuance of legislative riders and other devices commonly called the buy-American legislation is opposed as contrary to public interest and as being relics of depression psychology."

The same being contrary to the best interests of the American economy. The ease with which foreign firms can underbid domestic firms because of the lower wages prevailing in other countries, gives such firms a tremendous advantage and only a buy American policy can be used to offset such an advantage. Foreign bidders are not subject to the Walsh-Healy Act, the Wage and Hour Act, and others that raised domestic costs of production.

Resolved further, That the first paragraph at the top of page 18 of the policy declarations should be amended by eliminating that part of the paragraph beginning with the words "and declare itself." This is merely a statement that the Government would carry out its own policy by its own special interpretation.

Resolved further, That the statements of policy with relation to unreasonable forms of trade discrimination, exchange controls, quotas, preferential discriminatory treatment, monopolies, bilateral trade and exchange agreements, express merely pious platitudes which the United States has been following, whereas all the foreign countries discourage and prohibit imports that compete with domestic industry. They only permit tariff reductions where the imports are complementary to their own domestic industry.

Resolved further, That the basic philosophy of the policy set forth in proposed policy declarations can only function when the entire world follows a free-trade policy without any barriers or restrictions and, furthermore, when the entire world has uni- from social security and minimum wage laws, etc.

Unanimously adopted by the board of directors of the Zanesville Chamber of Commerce, April 10, 1959.

The Late James G. Polk, of Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1959

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, the passing of our friend and colleague, JAMES G. POLK, leaves us in a state of profound sadness.

JIM POLK was one of the most beloved Members of this body. He was possessed of an unusually sweet disposition. He was a man of tenderness. He was kind, courteous, and good. In the many years I have been privileged to serve here with JIM POLK, I never once heard him make an unkind or uncomplimentary remark of anyone; nor was such made of him. He was loved and respected by all on both sides of the aisle.

It was my good fortune to have been quite close to JIM. For years we served together on the same committee, the Committee on Agriculture. We also worked together on several subcommittees. To have been so closely associated with this fine man was a rewarding experience, one I shall always cherish and remember.

JIM POLK was a good Congressman. He was unbiased. He was loyal and conscientious. In his daily living he was always mindful of his duty as a public servant. He put the people first, himself second. In this connection I am reminded of something which happened about 10 days ago. Although a very sick man, something which he undoubtedly knew, he called from his hospital bed of pain and discussed with me a matter pending in our committee. He was thinking of a commitment he had made to some people about committee hearings on a pending legislation. He wanted us to know of his commitment and expressed the hope that some of us could pick up where he had been forced to leave off. Although the very sick man that he was, he was still thinking of his duties as a servant of man. As was typical of JIM, he was putting the people first, himself second.

This incident so clearly illustrates his devotion to duty and the way he lived. Yes, indeed, JIM POLK lived a good life, one that all who follow would do well to emulate.

I join with the distinguished delegation from the great State of Ohio in mouring the passing of our friend and colleague, JAMES G. POLK. And to he bereaved widow and family, I extend my profound sympathy.

Cold War in the Land of the Camel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. CARLTON LOSER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1959

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including the first of three articles on Afghanistan written by the distinguished editor of the Nashville Tennessean, who is on a world tour.

In this article Mr. Coleman Harwell gives a background picture of the country, its political importance to both Russia and the western world, the economy, and the press. I believe you will find it of particular interest. It follows:

COLD WAR IN LAND OF THE CAMEL—IT'S VERY POLITE BUT VERY REAL IN "NEUTRAL" AFGHANISTAN

(By Coleman Harwell)

KABUL, AFGHANISTAN.—The cold war here is very polite but it is very, very real.

You see it often, hear it many times a day, feel its presence continuously.

If you look at the map as you approach the capital city of Kabul (pronounced Kahble, with accent on the first syllable) you see that the 1,400 mile long Afghan-Russian border is less than 200 miles away.

And you recognize that the spine-tingling, snow-clad peaks of the Hindu Kush mountains have lost the defensive value they had

back in 1220 A.D., when it took the genius of a man like bloody Genghis Khan to send his armies over them.

Today hundreds of Russians, maybe more, are in Afghanistan. Without firing a shot, they have won power, how much is anyone's guess, by becoming advisors to the Afghan army and by equipping it with Russian arms and planes.

When you eat bread here, you may be eating Russian wheat or American wheat, but you have the feeling it is Russian because the bakery is Russian-financed and the big white Russian silo dominates the skyline on the city's western border. Nearly everybody points it out as you drive by.

RUSSIAN CONTRIBUTION

When you drive your car or camel over one of the half dozen oil streets in Kabul, you are enjoying a Russian contribution. The major military road from the south, going near the spectacular Khyber Pass is Russian built.

The 100-bed hospital and the gasoline storage tanks—Russia, Russian.

And so, by the way, is more than $300 million in debt.

You ask, of course, why all this feverish activity in small, backward Afghanistan, on the part of huge Russia, which certainly could use the skill and equipment to improve the lot of its own people. The answer is readily available. There are more than 500 Americans in Afghanistan.

And these Americans are doing things. Such as helping create a school system, an airline, an agricultural program, an efficient fiscal setup, and a big reclamation project.

INTERESTED IN ALL

Why should the Russians be concerned about these things, 10,000 miles from America? Well, regardless of why, the Russians are interested in everything we do.

When Dean Kenneth Olson and I held a session with newspapermen in the U.S. Information Service auditorium, three Russians were present. One was the correspondent of Russia's Tass News Agency, the only foreign newsman in Afghanistan. The other two were from the Embassy staff. All three took copious notes.

I can't imagine what they noted that could be of interest in Moscow. We discussed press influence and the views we expressed are readily available in a number of places, including the Nashville Tennessean. It was interesting, however, that very few questions were asked that night, whereas in our subsequent meetings, the questions were many and well put. Actually, I don't think there's any connection in the Russian's presence. But, following the example of the Tass correspondent, I'll note the fact.

And, in an effort to see the picture as the Russians may see it, consider these things:

Afghanistan is a buffer between Russia and India, Pakistan, and Iran.

HATRED OF RUSSIA?

The Afghans do not trust Russia. Some people feel this amounts to hatred. Regardless, Afghans have reason to be wary of anyone from that region, from which marauders have invaded their land for centuries. If Russia should stand by idly, therefore, Afghanistan might become westernized, develop a strong economy and free institutions, and thus become a very embarrassing neighbor. Russia has not tolerated such a development elsewhere.

Now, looking from another direction, Afghanistan has its attraction for America, too.

And our policy is this: To keep the bear on the other side of the Oxus River, to encourage a neutral position by the Government, and to help develop an economy oriented toward the communized, she could be very bothersome to our friend, Pakistan, and to neutral India. Her rulers seem to welcome our friendship, whether because they'd like to become westernized or just to benefit from our aid.

So we have come out here west.

Can we make good on this policy? Take it by points:

1. Russia could take over Afghanistan any day. But she would gain world enmity and a police state over some rugged types who are unpleasant when they choose to be, and they often do so choose.

2. For us to be encouraging neutrality is rather amusing in view of some of the things our administration has said about neutrals. But that is beside the point now. The point is that we've decided neutrality is important to us, and, furthermore, we have reason to believe the Government wants just that. King Zahir Shah and his cousin, Prime Minister Daud, want to maintain their authority. To do so, they recognize they must provide progress, including more and better education in a country where illiteracy is at least 90 percent. Their chances to achieve these things would seem to be much greater with us.

3. Orienting the economy toward the West means creating some private enterprise where little exists today. In this field we have produced our best gimmicks, including the airline. More of that later.

And here are some things to consider in all of this:

GOVERNMENTAL PRESS

The press here is of course a strictly governmental operation. But the press department president and his assistants sound convincing when they say they are encouraging the three papers in Kabul and the smaller provincial ones to try their wings. They say further that when and if the papers become self-supporting, through advertising and circulation revenue, individuals, including present editors, will have an opportunity to buy them.

There is some solid, local reporting in them and occassionally a dig at governmental weakness, such as streets or schools. And there is a hint from time to time that social progress must be made, including removal of the veil from Afghan women.

We recognize that this may be just window dressing. We do know, however, that in a week of lectures and discussions, we plugged the free press as strongly as we would anywhere in the free world. And we heard the Russians complained of our presence. But here we were.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, May 3 of this year marks the 168th anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution. On this anniversary of Poland's Constitution Day, as on similar anniversaries in past years, our minds and thoughts once again turn to the beleaguered Polish people suffering under Communist domination.

Today, as we express our feelings and our hopes for Poland's early liberation, we again underscore our warm friendship for the Polish people. That relationship between our two peoples is traditional and historical, and no efforts on the part of the Communists will erase it. The people of Poland have always manifested a strong attachment to the Western World, particularly to America, because our democratic way of life is also their way.

The American people have always supported the struggle for a free and independent Polish nation, and they will continue to do so in the future. For a time during and immediately after the Polish Revolution of October 1956 we had hoped that a new and promising era would ensue and that Poland would somehow succeed in breaking away from the grip of Soviet tyranny.

Unfortunately, it has not worked out that way. The promising new era was short lived. Freedom of religion is again being suppressed. The collective farms are being reinstated. There is no freedom of press or opinion. Basic human rights are being denied or violated. The whole pattern of communism in its worst phases has been reestablished as before.

Nevertheless, we must not be discouraged. We must continue to give the Polish people our fullest measure of moral support, as well as other aid and encouragement to show our solidarity with them. On this anniversary we pay our tribute to the gallant Polish people and express our fervent hope for the early realization of Poland's goal of national freedom and independence.

In connection with the anniversary of Polish Constitution Day, I wish to insert into the RECORD a very fine and timely article on the subject by Prof. Eugene Kusielewicz, of St. John's University in Brooklyn. Professor Kusielewicz is an executive member of the John Smolenski Democratic Organization in Greenpoint, Brooklyn, a part of my district which I am proud to represent in Congress. He is also an associate editor of the Polish-American World, a weekly newspaper printed in New York, which published Professor Kusielewicz' article in its current issue.

I share in the hope and prayers expressed by this esteemed scholar that Poland may again be a free country and that the Polish people will again enjoy the freedom enunciated in their hallowed constitution of May 3, 1791. The article by Professor Kusielewicz reads as follows:

THE MEANING OF THE 3D OF MAY

For almost 150 years the people of Poland have celebrated the 3d of May as their national holiday in much the same manner as we in America celebrate July the Fourth. In America we commemorate the Declaration of Independence, our determination to prevent England's interference in our affairs. The people of Poland commemorate the constitution of the 3d of May, which, in part, was an expression of their determination to be rid of Russia's interference in their affairs.

When Poland again fell under the tyranny of Russia's heel at the end of World War II, it became obvious that the celebration of the 3d of May would not be tolerated. This date recalled Russia's previous oppression of Poland. Today the Poles cannot celebrate this day as they would choose, for their Government has decreed that July 22d, Liberation Day, should now and henceforth be their national fete.

Who then will celebrate the 3d of May?

It will be celebrated, as it should be, and as it is, by those Poles and by those of Polish extraction living beyond the borders of

Poland in the lands where freedom still prevails. Actually we, and all those who are dedicated to the cause of freedom and justice will join in this celebration which the people of Poland can commemorate only in their hearts.

The constitution of the 3d of May, 1791, was an attempt on the part of Poland's leaders to give their people those rights and freedoms which the Americans had outlined in their Constitution and which the French then had recently stated in their "declaration of the rights of man." It abolished certain weaknesses which had until then paralyzed their state, particularly the liberum veto which permitted Catherine the Great of Russia to bribe one or two nobles and thus to prevent Poland from opposing the aggressive designs which have always characterized the history of Russia. It made the monarchy a hereditary one, subject to the will of a national legislative body, in this manner attempting to prevent the civil wars and foreign intrigues which often accompanied the royal elections. Religious freedom, the very marrow of Poland's historic tradition, was to be restored to all. So great was the import of this document that news of its promulgation spread like wildfire throughout the world. Upon hearing of its adoption the great English political philosopher Edmund Burke called it one of the foremost political achievements of his age.

Following are some excerpts from the constitution of May 3, 1791:

"Valuing above life and personal happiness the political existence, external independence and internal freedom of the Nation we have resolved upon the present Constitution. * * *

"We recognize all royal cities in the lands of the Commonwealth as free.

"We allow to the citizens of such cities the hereditary possession of the land in the cities inhabited by them, of their houses, villages and territories wherever such now legally belong to the cities.

"Guided by justice, humanity and Christian duties, as well as by our own best interests, we take the peasants, whose labor is the most abundant source of the national wealth, who constitute the largest segment of the population and therefore the country's greatest strength, under the protection of the law and of the national government, resolving that from now on any liberties, grants or contracts whatsoever authentically upon by the landlord with the peasants of his estates, whether these grants and contracts be made with the communities or with each village inhabitant individually, shall constitute a common and mutual obligation, in accordance with the true meaning of the terms and the description contained in such grants and contracts, and shall be protected by the national government. * * *

"In human society all authority originates from the will of the people. In order therefore that the integrity of the country, civil liberties and the order of society may be forever equally maintained, three posers should, and by virtue of the present law shall forever, constitute the government of the Polish nation: these are, the legislative power vested in the assembled estates, the supreme executive authority vested in the King and the Council of Ministers, and the judicial power vested in the jurisdictions established or to be established for that purpose.

"The happiness of people depends upon just laws; the effects of laws depend on their execution. * * * Having therefore insured to the free Polish nation the power of making laws for itself and watching over all executive power, as well as of electing officers to the magistracies, we entrust the supreme power of the enforcement of the laws to the King and his Council. * * *

"The judicial power shall be exercised neither by the legislative power nor by the King, but by the magistracies established and elected for that purpose. * * *

"The nation must act in its own defense and for the preservation of its integrity. Therefore all citizens are defenders of the integrity and liberties of the nation. The army is nothing but the defensive power selected and organized from the general strength of the nation. The nation owes to its army a debt of respect for its complete devotion to the defense of the nation. The army owes to the nation the defense of its frontiers and of the general peace; in a word it must be the nation's most powerful shield."

What then is the meaning of the 3d of May?

On the surface it would appear to be simply a political document embodying the noblest aspects of a republican government—a free people governed by a representative assembly, guaranteed by a system of checks and balances, not unlike our own, and defended by the army of its citizenry. This alone should be the cause of celebration and commemoration.

But the 3d of May means more. It means fulfillment. The fulfillment of the dream of a nation unified; united in the determination to overcome its own weaknesses and to rise by its own bootstraps to the defense of its ancient freedom. But it means a frustrated fulfillment. For no sooner did it achieve its century old ambition than the tyrannical despots who enslaved its neighbors determined to stamp out this outpost of freedom and enslave the Polish people. Kosciuszko fell and freedom shrieked. And Poland was no more.

Since then the 3d of May has meant hope; hope that the people of Poland could once again lift themselves by their own energies to achieve that freedom and fulfillment which they enjoyed on the 3d of May.

Today Poland hopes that once again it may be free. We share that hope. And in this small way we commemorate that hope, that 3d of May. We hope, indeed we pray, that Poland, and all the nations of the world might enjoy that freedom and liberty which was, and is, the spirit of that noble, hallowed day, the 3d of May.

CBR: A Power for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues a speech delivered by Maj. Gen. Marshall Stubbs, Army chief chemical officer, before the Wilmington Chapter, Armed Forces Chemical Association, at Wilmington, Del., on April 14, 1959. I feel that this speech on the subject of "CBR: A Power for Peace" carries an important message for the Congress and for the public. I submit it for printing in the RECORD. The speech follows:

CBR: A POWER FOR PEACE

(Speech by Maj. Gen. Marshall Stubbs, Army chief chemical officer, before Wilmington Chapter, Armed Forces Chemical Association, Wilmington, Del., April 14, 1959)

In our justifiable concern with the increasing missile and nuclear threat that this Nation faces, I am deeply disturbed that we have been and are neglecting an equal risk in the possibility of the use by an enemy of chemical and biological warfare. The danger to this country from such an attack, while of the same order of magnitude as nuclear, generally has not been so recognized or appreciated. We have not taken full cognizance of the advantage to a potential enemy of the combined use of nuclear and chemical and biological weapons. We recognize the threat of intercontinental ballistic missiles armed with nuclear warheads. Those same missiles that can deliver nuclear weapons can in turn deliver on target chemical and biological agents.

The world today accepts atomic power as a weapon for the deterrence of war. Prior to World War II the American people or the world knew little or nothing about its capabilities or effects. The bomb that fell on Hiroshima fell on America too. It fell on no city, reduced no man to his atomic elements, but it fell and shook the land. Its repercussion jarred our Nation into the realization of the destructive might of atomic warfare. May we not have to have a chemical and biological Hiroshima on one of our own cities to shake us out of our apathy to chemical and biological warfare?

Since toxic chemical warfare has not been used since World War I, this generation is is not so well informed on its capabilities and consequently is apathetic as to its combat effectiveness. Coupled with this is the widespread belief left over from the first World War that its use is cruel and unethical. People fear what they do not understand. We can render a great service to our country by removing the cloak of doubt and suspicion surrounding the use of chemical and biological agents in war. We as a nation must realize that a potential enemy would not hesitate for a moment to employ these weapons if it would be to his advantage.

In his first annual address to Congress Washington said, "To be prepared for war is one of the most effectual means of preserving peace," a quotation that he had translated from Horace. That quotation holds as true today, but I should like to go one step further and add that not only must we be prepared for war, but we must know the state of preparedness of a possible enemy. For in that knowledge we can know how to best assemble our forces and utilize our strength.

Our greatest threat of another war, be it limited or general, lies in the rapidly growing threat of Communist aggression. A total of 18 examples of the use of force have arisen since 1945 varying in degree from guerrilla operations in Greece and Malaya to the North Korean aggression. There is no evidence that these will not continue to occur, and that the rate of occurrence may not increase. The Soviet Union has clearly demonstrated an increased belligerence in each succeeding crisis as in the recent Lebanon situation and the Taiwan Straits incident. The Soviet pressure on Berlin is the most recent example of that increased pressure. Since the Communists are well aware that both they and the free world have atomic capabilities, it is reasonable to assume that they will be prepared to use all weapons in any future war, including chemical and biological munitions.

We have good reason to believe that Russia's heavy concentration on increased military capability includes the field of chemical and biological warfare.

In May of last year NATO published a memorandum warning the West Foreign Ministers that the Soviet Union was ready for instant atomic warfare, backed by fully tested missiles and was growing militarily stronger daily. It went on further to state that the Soviet rulers may be tempted to use their expanding war machine if they feel that they are losing the cold war. The possibility included germ warfare and gas.

The newsletter said bluntly that the Soviet aim is to establish throughout the world Communist regimes directed from Moscow.

Progress 58, a recent Department of the Army report, devoted two pages to our assets and liabilities. It gives a balance sheet of Communist versus U.S. military strength. First item on the balance sheet is our 1958 Army of less than 900,000 men compared to 8 million in the Sino-Soviet bloc. In this Communist bloc are 400 ground divisions compared to our 15. We have about 37 combat divisions in reserve while the Soviets alone could expand their present force to 300 divisions in 30 days and 500 divisions within a year.

Within these Soviet divisions is an organization devoted to the field of chemical warfare. Chemical troops are assigned to all echelons down to battalion. Statements by Soviet military leaders on the role of chemical and biological warfare in any future war are positive and are indicative of Soviet preparation to use, if they see fit, all weapons including toxic munitions.

Soviet chemical weapons are modern and effective and probably include all types of chemical munitions known to the West, in addition to several dissemination devices peculiar to the Russians. Their ground forces are equipped with a variety of protective chemical equipment and they are prepared to participate in large scale gas warfare. They have a complete line of protective clothing which will provide protection in any gas situation and a large variety of decontaminating equipment.

Much of their hardware is relatively simple in design and operations are often multipurpose. For example, flamethrowers may be used for the dissemination of other incendiary materials or persistent agents. Converted artillery shells, incendiary bombs, and rotational scattering aircraft bombs are used for chemical warfare purposes.

We can assume from available knowledge that they are equally capable in biological warfare. The mass of medical and technical reports published recently by their scientists indicates increased activity in this area. Soviet microbiologists and military authorities have conducted biological warfare tests at an isolated location over a long period of time.

It is also known that the Communists have conducted research and development leading to the large scale production and storage of disease producing and toxic agents.

Maj. Gen. Yu. V. Drugov, of the Military Medical Service, Red Army, stated on the 40th anniversary of the great October revolution that their scientists regard research on the action of poisons and on the developments of antidotes to be their patriotic duty. He attached special interest to the so-called psychic poisons (mescaline, methedrine, lysergic acid derivatives), insecticides (organophosphorus compounds) and poisons of animal origin.

Along with the stepped-up military and scientific program it appears that the deep interest of the Soviets can mean only one thing, that they have the capability of initiating chemical and biological warfare. I cannot believe that they would expend their critical resources to produce quantities of chemical agents for any other purpose.

An intensive program of mass education in civil defense against chemical and biological warfare has been in progress since World War II, and has received continued emphasis in recent years. A quasi-military organization called DOSAAF (Voluntary Society for Cooperation with the Army, Navy, and Air Force) consisting of more than 30 million members, is the Soviet agency responsible for the widespread program. The organization extends to the smallest outlying village and insures adequate instruction in practical defense against chemical and biological agents.

While the picture I have painted you as to the preparedness of the Soviets in CBR is not a detailed one due to security limitations, I believe that I have given you enough to make you aware that they pose a threat to the free nations of the world. Coupled with that is the fact that their leaders have stated openly that future wars will be characterized by "various means of mass destruction, such as atomic, hydrogen, chemical and bacteriological weapons."

We are, and rightly so, spending large sums to provide a defense against surprise attacks by land, air, or sea, but at the same time we must guard against a covert chemical warfare-biological warfare attack that could so readily happen. Chemical warfare and biological warfare weapons are equally suited for unconventional warfare. We must expect such type of operation in substantial amounts, because of the greater ability of the enemy to infiltrate our dispersed positions in atomic warfare, as well as the ease with which these materials may be used in subversive activities. Enemy agents could simultaneously deliver crippling blows to our critical installations, virtually neutralizing us to an open full scale massive attack. Let us consider for a moment the possibilities open to an enemy using biological agents. He can preselect the results he desires to achieve. That is, he can choose from diseases ranging in effect from the mildly incapacitating, which would make one severely ill for several days, to prolonged incapacitation with few fatalities, up to those which result in high death rates.

Unlike some of the gases of World War I, germs can't be seen or tasted; they can't be felt and have no odor. The quantity required to produce results is exceedingly small, thus making it possible for effective attack of very large areas, with relatively small logistical effort.

Tests on a number of representative large-size office buildings have shown that many of our installations are critically vulnerable. The effort required, the equipment involved, and the training necessary for effective biological warfare attack are amazingly small.

One such test involved the use of a portable generator disguised in a brief case and placed near a ventilator in a building; another, a cloud of particles sent out from an apparently innocent-looking vehicle on a road several hundred yards from a building. If actual disease producing organisms had been used in these tests by an enemy agent most of the people in the buildings would have been casualties.

The proven effectiveness of biological warfare attack over large areas has also been confirmed by a number of field trials. Test attacks have been made both from ships lying offshore and from planes flying over the continental United States. These tests, in which a harmless tracer material was used, proved that coverage up to several thousand square miles could be achieved, with the population being wholly unaware that the attack had occurred. It should not require much imagination on your part for those of you who remember the influenza epidemics of World War I, and the recent incapacitating Asian flu epidemic, both of which were spread by natural means, to visualize the potential dangers from a deliberate enemy attack in this manner.

Thus far, I have devoted the major portion of my talk to the potentials of our possible enemy. Time and security will not permit me to go into detail as to our own strength and readiness position. You have been told many times of our mission and developments, but I do want to mention one program that I feel sure will be of interest to you. We know that the Soviets are showing a marked interest in the incapaciting agents. In order for us to be prepared to defend ourselves against their use, we must know the effects they produce on people and countermeasures that can be taken. The Chemical Corps has been studying these psychochemicals for some time.

These agents have the ability to upset the behavior pattern, thus reducing a soldier's will to fight. Let me give you a few examples of how an enemy might employ these against us. A well-organized enemy inspired effort, by use of these agents among our troops, could disrupt and slow down normal thought processes and make radical changes in behavior. For instance, combat-indoctrinated soldiers are trained to fight as a unit and obey orders in defense of a position. If subjected to one of these agents, they would lose the ability to work together and would probably think the entire situation hilariously funny.

An individual under the influence of one of these agents would become temporarily deranged and his reactions would probably be completely opposite from normal. In other words, an aggressive, outgoing person might want to run and hide even from his fellow soldiers. Courageous people are apt to become timid, timid people become belligerent.

We know that the degree of incapacitation can be varied. Some of these can cause temporary blindness, or other physical or motor abnormalities, while still others could cause mental stupefaction or irrationality. We know that an aggressor would have a choice of delivery of these agents by aerial bombs, artillery, and other means.

I would like to touch on some problem areas at this point which I feel you and groups such as you need to be made aware of and suggest ways in which you can help us. First, let's take a look at the thinking of the American people and, as a matter of fact, the entire free world. I want to discuss two phases of thinking—inaccurate thinking and creative thinking.

We must do all we can to set the minds of our people straight as to the possible use by an enemy of chemical and biological warfare. The hazy and incorrect attitudes toward the use of these weapons are a hangover from World War I. This generation has accepted them and passed them on much as old wives' tales have been handed down one generation to another. I believe that these fallacies can be corrected. Certainly the public must realize that other nations have a strong CBR capability and that we must be prepared to defend ourselves with any weapon they might choose to use. Surely an enemy would be unwise were he to rely on one weapons system alone or to ignore any chink that we might have in our armor.

The public must understand that a potential enemy would consider chemical and biological agents ideal for offensive use. They are ideal in that first, they are search weapons. They will seek out and reduce troops over a widely dispersed area, going deep into emplacements that standard munitions would not reach. Second, they are capable of achieving their mission without the destruction of property. An invader would want left intact the industries, buildings and equipment for his own occupational use. And last, chemical and biological weapons could be used to soften up an enemy prior to an all-out nuclear attack. Our Nation must be awakened to this threat. People must be taught how to quickly identify a CBR attack and how to protect themselves.

Recently within the Corps, we have accelerated our information program. I am determined that our Nation shall be told all that we can, within the limits of security. I have asked our personnel to contribute stories and articles about their work that would be of general interest. I am encouraging them to speak to groups about the Chemical Corps. There is much that we are doing through our research and development program that is contributing to the

health, safety and well being of our Nation. These are things people should know along with our military accomplishments. Each of you here has wide personal contacts among your friends and associates. Informed groups such as this can do much to contribute to a more realistic public attitude about CBR.

As to creative thinking, I believe that we have within our corps a team of military and civilian personnel who are outstanding in the amount and nature of the creative work they perform. However, we still need help from outside. As I mentioned earlier, scientists in Russia consider it their patriotic duty to do research that will benefit the military strength. While we certainly cannot advocate that in this country all research should be slanted toward the military, we do need the benefit of the most creative thinking by our scientists and engineers that can be applied to defense problems.

The present and probable increase in scientific advances of an aggressor country demands that we have the benefit of a constant flow of new ideas and concepts if we expect to keep ahead of them. Ideas that today may seem out of this world might be an actuality tomorrow. Space ships and guided missiles that a few years ago were seemingly only a figment of the imagination of the cartoon comic artist, today are becoming a reality.

We have had in the past, and still have, an active industrial liaison program with approximately 450 industries participating. Through them we receive ideas, and compounds for screening for possible use by us. Often civilian laboratories have discovered some formula or process that while it is of no value to them, it may have great military possibilities. Because of budget limitations, our working staff in this program is small. I feel that the number of participating industries can be increased. Perhaps you can help us. You are in daily contact with people whose ideas and concepts we want. No matter how far-fetched an idea or concept may seem we would like to know about them. The panel that we have appointed to screen these ideas does so with an open mind and all interests are fully protected. Your help can be invaluable to us in our search for more creative thinking in the area of chemical and biological warfare.

Let me give you an example of one of the ideas for which we are looking. Some of you may have run across a formula or a process that might help us arrive at a solution to this problem. We, in conjunction with the Quartermaster Corps and the Signal Corps are interested in designing an integrated combat suit that the soldier would wear constantly. We would like it to have the following qualities: it must be light in weight, and easy to wear. It must have its own built-in communications system; it must be flame and flash proof and must include some body armor, and most important to the Chemical Corps, it must be impervious to chemicals. Wars of tomorrow will require protection of this sort for our soldiers. You may think that my description sounds like a space suit of a man from Mars, and perhaps it does. I realize that it is a large order and I know that we won't accomplish this immediately. It is a project that I would like to ask you to give thought to, for I feel sure that with the help of people like you we can arrive at a solution to our problem much sooner. I will welcome your ideas.

To sum up, I have expressed my concern that national opinion has not recognized the threat that we face the possibility of a chemical and biological attack by an enemy. I have told you that the Soviets are not neglecting CBR warfare in their own military structure and that they have the capability to use it. I have cited examples of ways an aggressor might use chemical and biological warfare against us either covertly or openly. I hope that I have made you realize that we, as a nation, must overcome any impression that we can respond with a big bomb and little else. I have asked your help in creating a more informed public attitude toward the use of CBR and in stimulating creative thinking that will benefit our defense posture. For, to preserve the peace we must be prepared for war. In the words of General Taylor, "We must make crystal clear to both friend and foe alike that we can respond promptly with proper weapons and proper forces to any challenge."

Poison in Your Water—No. 68

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 28, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Florence (S.C.) News of June 22, 1958, entitled "Black Creek Pollution Deeper Problem Than Immediate Case":

BLACK CREEK POLLUTION DEEPER PROBLEM THAN IMMEDIATE CASE

For a good many years the pollution of Black Creek has been a concern of the residents of this area. This stream, one of ancient, unspoiled beauty, is close to the hearts of all who live along its run and all who have ever fished along its banks.

In recent days, the pollution question has come up again with the discovery of hundreds of dead fish, a reported scum along the banks where the water had fallen, reports from swimmers who said it was necessary to take a bath following a swim to remove an oily substance from their bodies, and general concern for the health of those who use the creek for swimming.

Following a confused start, responsible authorities, including the county health department and the State water pollution, are now acting to take such steps as are necessary to protect public health from the hazards of using the creek for swimming.

We think it wiser that necessary precautionary measures be taken pending ascertaining the facts. Certainly, the discovery of dead fish and the other reports coming from responsible persons are indication enough that the stream is polluted. Would it not be better to ban the stream for swimming first until such time as the necessary studies are made to determine what the answer is?

But there's a larger question to this matter than swimming and fishing. It concerns the source of the pollution and what can be done about it.

It's an old question that has become acute again. For a good many years, it has been generally agreed that releasing of chemicals in the stream by Hartsville manufacturing interests has been the chief trouble. It is known that the Sonoco people have been concerned about this matter and have gone to great expense in an effort to correct it. But an old-time resident of the Black Creek community yesterday reported that the condition is worse than he has ever known it in his 70 years of intimate knowledge of the stream.

This is a startling and disturbing statement. It suggests that all efforts and expense to date have not corrected a condition which is becoming intolerable to a great many people—so intolerable, in fact, that court relief is being considered.

We are neither capitalists nor chemists and don't know the answer. But we hope that present conditions will cause efforts to be redoubled to prevent pollution of this stream which represents so much wealth and pleasure to the people of this area.

Tragedy of the Steamship "Carl II Bradley"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include a letter of unusual interest from Harry E. O'Reilly, executive secretary of the maritime trades department of AFL–CIO, and a statement by O'Reilly on the tragedy of the steamship *Carl II Bradley*. The letter follows:

MR. O'REILLY'S LETTER

I am enclosing herewith a brief report entitled "Safety at Sea on the Great Lakes," which calls attention to a critical and desperate situation crying for remedy. The report points up the inadequacy of existing rescue personnel and facilities on the Great Lakes, notwithstanding that the seaway will open April 25, and thereby expand incalculably this segment of the maritime industry.

This is the story of the Bradley disaster, in which 33 seamens' lives were lost, of which 15 bodies remain unrecovered.

Let me call your attention to a unique situation: because the U.S. Coast Guard is unable to provide either equipment or personnel to make an underwater survey of the Bradley, the Great Lakes District of the Seafarers' International Union of the AFL–CIO has made a contract with Aquatic Development and Engineering Co. to find the ship, make an underwater survey, and endeavor to recover the lost bodies. The union is furnishing all necessary funds and experienced personnel. The search will be made by two catamans especially equipped for this particular survey for the location, salvage and recovering operations under the immediate supervision of Mr. James Sawtelle and the direction of Capt. Walter Blake, U.S. Navy, retired.

All discoveries, photographs, evidence and data of every kind revealed by the survey will be made available to any interested Government agency, including the Congress, interested parties and the public.

The union is underwriting this expedition in the hope that it will stimulate public and governmental interest in the hazards inherent in Great Lakes maritime operations, and that it will encourage the Government to provide the facilities and personnel which are so sorely needed to prevent and alleviate Great Lakes disasters and their immeasurable cost in human lives and property.

The heroism of the Bradley crew will have served a useful purpose if it has this desirable result, and if it can focus attention upon this almost forgotten segment of the maritime industry.

These 33 seamen then will not have given up their lives in vain.

SAFETY AT SEA ON THE GREAT LAKES

(By Harry E. O'Reilly)

On November 18, 1958, shortly after 5:30 p.m., the steamship *Carl D. Bradley*, while lying 12 miles west southwest of Gull Island, 8½ hours out of its home port at Rogers City, Mich., broke in two and sank. The *Bradley* was a bulk carrier, built in 1927, of 10,028 gross tons, 14,000 deadweight tons, with a speed of 14 knots, and a draft of 22 feet 6½ inches.[1] She was owned by Bradley Transportation Line, which in turn is owned by United States Steel Corp. She was a 639-foot limestone carrier, returning empty from Gary, Ind., travelling in the winter's worst storm: The U.S. Coast Guard was warning of whole gale winds, 60 miles an hour, with gusts reaching hurricane velocity. Her crew of 35 was completing its 45th trip of the year. She was sturdily riding 20-foot waves. At 5:31 p.m. her Captain Bryan and First Mate Elmer Fleming heard a thud. They saw the ship's aft section pull upward slightly. The captain stopped the engines. Twenty seconds later a second thud came, and the ship hogged upward slightly. The captain ordered the first mate to send distress signals. After a third thud, the ship sagged and the captain gave the abandonship signal. After a fourth thud, the ship sagged, and then suddenly split in half. Of the 35 crewmen, 33 died, and there were two survivors: Elmer Fleming, the first mate, and Frank Mays. Fifteen bodies were not recovered.

Seconds after the *Bradley* distress signal was sent, a frantic search commenced. Twelve miles away the German freighter steamship *Christian Sartori* started for Gull Island. Three other nearby steamers started for the disaster area. A Coast Guard cutter, *Hollyhock*, set out immediately from Sturgeon Bay, Wis., a distance of about 88 miles from the wreck; another Coast Guard cutter, the *Sundew*, set off from Charlevoix, Mich., a distance of about 44 miles. The *Hollyhock* is stationed at Milwaukee and assigned to buoy tender service. It is a 175-foot vessel, powered by a diesel-reduction gear engine of 1,350 horsepower, capable of a maximum speed of 12 knots an hour. It was constructed in 1937. The *Sundew* is stationed at Sturgeon Bay and is also assigned to buoy tender service. It is a 180-foot vessel, powered by a diesel-electric engine of 1,800 horsepower, capable of a maximum speed of 12 knots an hour. It was constructed in 1944. A Coast Guard plane took off from Traverse City, Mich., approximately 72 miles away. About an hour later the *Sartori* reached the area of the sinking, but found no survivors. The Coast Guard plane found the *Sartori*, dropped flares, but could see no survivors. It must have taken the *Hollyhock* between 7 and 8 hours, and the *Sundew* about 4 hours to reach the scene, and they searched through the night.

At dawn a Coast Guard helicopter spotted a lifeboat, but saw no survivors. A few minutes later, the helicopter spotted a raft with two men aboard. At 9:07 a.m., the *Sundew* sent word it had picked up two survivors on a raft 5.25 miles from Gull Island. Later, the survivors reported that, after they had reached the raft, they picked up Crewman Gary Strzelecki, and somewhat later another crew member, Dennis Meredith. About 75 minutes after the *Bradley* had sunk, they sighted the *Sartori*. The men had found five flares and a sea anchor. Four flares were used to try to attract the attention of the *Sartori*, but the fifth would not ignite, and the *Sartori* moved out of the area. In the course of the night, waves washed the men off the raft several times, and first Meredith, then Strzelecki, were lost. When light broke, Fleming thought he saw a plane. At 8 a.m., 14 hours after the sinking, the men saw High Island. An hour and 7 minutes later, as noted above, the *Sundew* found the two survivors. By then they had been in the icy water more than 15 hours.

The Coast Guard established a board of inquiry to ascertain the cause of the disaster. It is headed by Rear Adm. Joseph Kerrins, who is also commander of the Ninth Coast Guard District, with headquarters at Cleveland. The board of inquiry has not yet submitted its report, but it has been rumored that it will do so in the near future.

In order to ascertain the nature and scope of the investigation, Victor G. Hanson, general counsel of Seafarers' International Union, Great Lakes district, and Ray R. Murdock, Washington counsel, Seafarers' International Union, met with Coast Guard officials on March 10, 1959. The Coast Guard officials present were Capt. Claude H. Broach, Chief of the Merchant Vessel Inspection Division, Comdr. R. Y. Edwards, Assistant Chief of the Merchant Vessel Inspection Division, and Comdr. J. H. Hawley, Chief of the Casualty Review Section of the Merchant Vessel Inspection Division. The SIU spokesmen were particularly interested in learning whether or not the Coast Guard planned an underwater survey of the sunken ship, and any effort to recover the 15 bodies which are still lost.

The Coast Guard officials stated that the board of inquiry has made no recommendation that an underwater survey be undertaken or that the vessel itself be studied. Furthermore, if such recommendation were made, they stated that they had no equipment available in the area for such a survey. On being questioned as to the advisability of examining the wrecked ship, the Coast Guard officials stated that they had no funds available for such an examination, and had never felt the need to request appropriations for underwater surveys, or inspection of sunken ships. They also stated that they had neither the legal responsibility, authority, funds or equipment available for recovery of the lost bodies.

It should be noted that about an hour after the wreck, the *Sartori* was in the area, and was sighted by the survivors on the raft. At that time there were four men alive, two of whom were lost during the night. Presumably, the *Sartori* did not have men specially trained for rescue, nor special equipment for that purpose. It seems most probable that, if a Coast Guard cutter had reached the wreck area as soon as the *Sartori*, all four of the men could have been rescued, and undoubtedly others could have been found in the area.

The foregoing account points up two alarming facts: (1) At least on the Great Lakes, the U.S. Coast Guard does not have available adequate personnel or facilities for the accomplishment of rescue; and (2) a Coast Guard investigation of a disaster is not adequate to determine, with any degree of certainty, the approximate cause. In this connection, it should be remembered that in the case of airplane crashes, the Civil Aeronautics Authority makes every effort to locate the wrecked plane, and if successful examines it in minute detail to determine the cause of the crash. This is also true in connection with railroad wrecks, and even traffic accidents, when police officials examine the machines involved and take many photographs from many different angles to help establish the cause.

The St. Lawrence Seaway will be opened this spring. Even before the opening of the Seaway, maritime traffic on the Great Lakes has increased phenomenally. As of December 31, 1957,[2] there were 367 U.S.-flag ships of 1,000 gross tons and over operating on the Great Lakes. They represented a gross tonnage of approximately 2.4 million, and a deadweight tonnage of approximately 3.7 million. The fleet consisted of 5 combination passenger and cargo ships, 7 freighters, 329 bulk carriers, and 26 tankers. The Canadian-flag fleet on the Great Lakes consisted of 271 vessels of 1,000 gross tons and over, with 5 combination ships, 21 freighters, 204 bulk carriers, and 41 tankers. The Bradley Transportation Line, owned by United States Steel Corp., operates eight bulk carriers on the lakes, nine with the lost *Bradley*. The *John G. Munson*, which was built in 1952, and has a speed of 16 knots, is the newest ship. The oldest ship in the *Bradley* fleet is the *Calcite*, built in 1912, with a speed of 11 knots, and a gross tonnage of about 4,000 tons; and, prior to the launching of the *Munson*, the newest ship was the *Myron C. Taylor*, built in 1929, with a speed of 12 knots, and a gross tonnage of 8,233.[3]

In 1950, there were imported through Great Lakes ports 5.6 million short tons; in 1957 this figure had increased to 10.1 million tons. In 1950, exports from Great Lakes ports amounted to 23.4 million, and in 1957 to 24.2 million short tons.[4] In 1950, the gross tonnage received in the Duluth-Superior port, the largest on the Great Lakes, was about 10 million tons; in 1956, the tonnage had risen to 51.6 million tons, and in 1955 it had been 61.2 million tons.[5] By comparison, in 1956, the gross tonnage of imports in New York Harbor was 31.7 million tons, and the exports 9.2 million tons. Coastwise receipts in New York Harbor for the same year amounted to 44.9 million tons, and shipments to 11.4 million tons.[6] Thus, even before the opening of the seaway, Duluth-Superior is the second largest American port. In addition to the foregoing, in 1958, there were approximately 116 foreign-owned ships operating on the Great Lakes, and they made about 306 round trips. All of the ships, as above defined, operating on our inland waterways, in 1956, totaled 220 billion ton miles, of which the Great Lakes portion was slightly more than half, or 110.7 billion tons.[7] It is clear that the Great Lakes area promises, within a few years, to become the largest segment of our maritime industry. The *Bradley* disaster, and the condition of our merchant fleets on the Great Lakes, emphasize the inadequacy of our Coast Guard facilities in that area, for the present, and more particularly for the future. The Maritime Trades Department believes that the appropriate committee of Congress should make an investigation of our Coast Guard facilities in the Great Lakes area, with a view to preparing for the tremendous potential of that area in the maritime field.

HARRY E. O'REILLY,
Executive Secretary-Treasurer, Maritime Trades Department, AFL–CIO.

[1] United States and Canadian Great Lakes Fleets, issued by U.S. Department of Commerce, Maritime Administration, as of December 31, 1957, p. 3.

[2] Ibid, pp. 18–21.

[3] The above statement of facts is based upon a statement which appeared in Life magazine.

[4] Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1958, table No. 754, p. 584.

[5] Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1958, table No. 760, p. 589.

[6] Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1958, table No. 759, p. 588.

[7] Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1958, table No. 761, p. 589.

Mutual Security: Pro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 28, 1959

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, the mutual security bill will soon be before the House. The Committee on Foreign Affairs has heard testimony from all areas of our economy, both pro and con. None has been more positive, interesting, and constructive than that of Gen. William H. Draper, Jr., Chairman of the President's Committee to Study the U.S. Military Assistance Program.

This morning, Mr. Speaker, General Draper addressed the Chamber of Commerce of the United States in convention in Washington. His dynamic speech in support of the mutual security program followed the remarks of Walter Harnischfeger, chairman of the Citizens Foreign Aid Committee. This latter committee has recommended a $2 billion reduction in this year's foreign aid appropriation with a liquidating period of the balance of foreign aid in 3 years.

In his speech, General Draper characterizes this so-called fortress-America concept as a hurried retreat back into our own hemisphere, or the idea that America's safety lies in isolation.

Believing General Draper's statement before the chamber of commerce will be helpful to us all. Under unanimous consent, I include his speech with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

MUTUAL SECURITY: PRO

(By William H. Draper, Jr., chairman of the board, Mexican Light & Power Co., Mexico City, and Chairman, the President's Committee To Study the United States Military Assistance Program)

You here this morning, and all of the American people, are being asked by the committee headed by your other speaker to "take our first stand in the last ditch."

You are being asked to embrace the fortress-America concept—the idea that America's safety lies in isolation, lies in a hurried retreat back into our own hemisphere.

This committee boldly tells us to take our troops out of Europe, to cut the aid program in half, to end it in 3 years.

They would coldbloodedly let our friends and allies fend for themselves against the Communist menace.

The Kremlin would be overjoyed, exultant, and would soon be on the march.

In fact, the Kremlin, which has demanded that our forces leave Taiwan and the Western Pacific and that our troops be pulled out of Berlin, would warmly endorse every recommendation made by this other committee.

But by posing starkly for you this policy of hurried retreat, this isolationist committee has performed a real public service.

It has highlighted dramatically the two alternatives before us:

Do we, the richest and most powerful Nation in the world, help to defend the free world and thus defend ourselves?

Or do we default our responsibility—default the leadership we have inherited—abandon the rest of the world to Communist conquest and in effect accept worldwide defeat?

Just suppose that this isolationist committee's recommendations were accepted, and it were announced that all foreign military and economic assistance were to be ended in 3 years.

How many countries of the free world would still remain free 3 years from now?

And just what do you think our own situation would be right here in America in 1962?

I speak today as the chairman of the nonpartisan committee appointed by the President of the United States to study the military and economic assistance programs.

Thus I speak in the light of the committee's unanimous findings and conclusions sent to the White House a few weeks ago.

We believe that the plain issue is whether our country intends to seek survival in isolation, a state of siege in fortress America, or whether we intend to combine our military and economic resources with those of other nations and together build a common defense against the common threat.

Nikita Khrushchev summarized the threat for us. He said: "We will bury you."

Khrushchev also repeated in Leipzig last month Lenin's prediction that communism some day would rule the world.

But he said that the world war that Lenin predicted to signal the death throes of capitalism might not occur. I quote Khrushchev's words:

"War is no longer inevitable. This is so not because the imperialists have become better, but because they have become weaker. The forces of peace are stronger than ever before."

Khrushchev's "forces of peace" obviously are the forces of communism, and, unfortunately, his statement is correct that they are stronger than ever before.

Russia's conventional forces of 175 active ground divisions and more than 20,000 combat planes now are being greatly strengthened with nuclear weapons and with intermediate and long-range ballistic missiles.

And to those forces the manpower of Communist China now is joined to face the free world with the greatest military threat in history.

At the same time, Russian industrial production has been forging ahead at a pace faster than our own.

And China's industrial surge, her so-called great leap forward, claims greatly increased agricultural production and a steel production that surpasses that of Great Britain.

Fortunately for us, the Soviet and Chinese factories are still far behind ours, but they are moving forward at a rate that does not allow us to relax—that has serious implications for our future.

The Kremlin already has put the increased production of these factories to work in the cold war—in the stepped-up distribution of arms, and of economic assistance and technicians to selected countries.

This is a relatively new weapon for the Kremlin, this economic offensive.

So it is with this background, and in the context of this growing military, political, and economic threat to the free world that we must view the approaching crisis in Berlin.

And it is in this same context of open threats of war and open threats of nuclear destruction over Berlin that we must consider the necessity and the scope of our mutual security program.

Last November President Eisenhower appointed our Committee to consider this necessity and this scope.

The Committee has 10 members, 3 of them retired professional military men:

Admiral Radford, former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff;

General Gruenther, former commander of NATO; and

General McNarney, former commander of the European theater.

It includes seven civilians, two of them former budget directors:

Joseph Dodge, a Republican who under General MacArthur balanced postwar Japan's budget and started that nation on the road to recovery; and

James Webb, a Democrat who served also as Under Secretary of State.

The others are:

John McCloy, Assistant Secretary of War during World War II and later high commissioner of Germany;

George McGhee, former Assistant Secretary of State and Ambassador to Turkey under President Truman;

Dillon Anderson, former Director of the National Security Council staff; and

Marx Leva, former Assistant Secretary of Defense.

The President asked our Committee to evaluate the military assistance program on an independent, objective, and nonpartisan basis.

And he asked us to study the relative emphasis which should be given to military and economic programs, particularly in the less developed areas, and to recommend the most suitable means whereby the free world's defenses may be insured.

We discussed these problems with the responsible and informed officials in Washington.

We studied the relevant national security policies of our Government, and the secret reports and policy papers of the Department of State and the Department of Defense.

We 10 formed into subcommittees, and then with small staffs visited all of the areas and most of the counties where important military and economic assistance has been strengthening our friends and allies. We were accompanied by senior retired military military advisers.

We consulted our unified commanders in Europe and in the Pacific.

We consulted our ambassadors and the economic and military officers assigned there—we visited with officials and private citizens of the countries concerned.

Several university groups and others expert on mutual assistance made special studies for our use.

After all of this, and after long committee discussions, our interim findings and recommendations were agreed and delivered to the President. They were unanimous. I can summarize them for you this way:

We are convinced that the Communist military, economic, and political threat is greater than ever.

We found that deliveries of weapons and military equipment to our friends and allies, averaging $2.4 billion annually, have been maintained at this necessary rate in recent years by heavy drawdowns on the large pipeline of unexpended appropriations built up during the Korean war. At one time it was over $8 billion.

This pipeline has been reduced to the point—it will be 2½ billion this June, barely enough for necessary contract and production lead time—where it cannot be counted on to supplement the current lower appropriations to any substantial degree.

Unless we start now appropriating funds each year about equal to the value of annual deliveries required, within a year or two the weapons we furnish our friends and allies will be reduced by about one-third.

Therefore, we recommend that an additional amount of about $400 million should be made available for the military assistance program for the coming year, primarily to supply advanced weapons to the NATO countries.

We believe that any other course would involve an unacceptable risk to our own security.

If this additional amount is appropriated to contract for the missiles, nuclear weap-

ons and modern planes needed to strengthen the NATO buildup, it will not significantly increase actual expenditures in 1960, because of the year or two needed to produce them.

We found that in view of the precarious economic situations in many of the less-developed and newly independent countries, and the need for sound progress in these countries for our own security, the requested level of economic assistance for 1960 is the minimum required, and that increased economic development assistance probably will be needed in the years ahead.

The free world's far-flung defense perimeter is manned jointly by allied and U.S. forces.

It extends through the NATO area in central Europe, through the Middle East and around the rim of Asia to the northern Pacific.

The weapons for the allied forces defending this perimeter have been furnished very largely by our military assistance program.

The economic support needed by many of the countries concerned has been supplied through the economic aid program.

It is a very wide area important to our security; the nations of this area cannot defend it without our help.

Together we do have the strength.

Within this perimeter are the homelands of our friends and allies and the means by which together we can maintain mutual bases, room for maneuver, defense in depth, and unrestricted use of the seas.

If strong and well-armed forces hold these perimeter positions, then in the event of local aggression our friends and allies and we ourselves gain time for reinforcement.

Equally important, we gain time for political action.

These forces in being give the free world advantages should war come.

But more importantly, they represent a major deterrent to aggression and an opportunity through negotiation to avoid war itself.

The capacity of these forward allied forces to meet limited attack, greatly strengthened by our weapons in their hands, provides another and much more acceptable alternative than surrender or resort to atomic warfare.

This was demonstrated for all of us recently at Quemoy.

I was impressed by certain things Ambassador Tran Van Chuong, of Vietnam, said in a recent speech. I quote excerpts:

"We have lulled ourselves into half-consciousness and half-action by calling it the cold war, but during these last 14 years this cold war has almost always been hot for some people or other of the free world.

"It was hot for the Chinese mainland for 4 years, from 1945 to 1949 during the Chinese civil war.

"It was hot for the Vietnamese and the French for 8 years, during the Indochinese war.

"It was hot for Korea, for the United Nations and the United States itself for 3 years, during the Korean war.

"It was hot for Hungary in 1956.

"It was hot for Quemoy, Matsu and Nationalist China yesterday.

"It is hot for Tibet now.

"It may be hot for all of us tomorrow."

He added, "Most of the time, all the Communists had to do was to divide and conquer, and the cold war has been cold only when the Reds were digesting their victims."

All of us realize that the military and economic assistance programs have been subject to criticisms.

We on the committee found that some of these criticisms were justified, and we propose in our final report to deal with the major mistakes of the past and to suggest some corrective measures and organizational improvements for the future.

Our committee concluded, however, that the mutual security program is and will continue to be an effective and essential tool to carry out our national security interests and to promote free world defense.

To abandon the program, for errors in execution or for any other reason, would be to abandon the free world and to lose the cold war.

We commented, and I quote:

"In our fascination with our own mistakes, and the constant use of foreign aid as a whipping boy, we may be gradually choking this vital feature of our national security to death."

Any fair-minded appraisal of the mutual security program cannot fail to conclude that the results have contributed immeasurably to our strength and security.

Had it not been for the Marshall plan, there is little doubt that the dramatic recovery of Western Europe would have been impossible.

Had it not been for the NATO alliance, there is little doubt that some of the free countries of Europe would, like Czechoslovakia, have long since been dragged behind the Iron Curtain.

Think about that for a moment—of even more of Western Europe blotted off the map of the free world.

I went to the Far East on the work of our committee.

I was in Taiwan shortly after the Republic of China forces had successfully repulsed the Red Chinese attempts to engulf Quemoy and Matsu.

Without our military and economic assistance, this victory of our Chinese allies would have been impossible.

We furnished the artillery and the ammunition that in the hands of Chinese gunners fought the Communists to a standstill.

We had furnished the F86's and trained the Chinese pilots who knocked 31 Communist MIG 17's out of the air with a loss of only 2 or 3 planes.

I saw the actual movies of these aerial dog fights, taken from the firing gun positions in the F86's.

They were terrific and at the same time inspiring.

For they illustrated graphically just how our military assistance prevents defeat for our allies and for ourselves, and at the same time it helps to prevent local conflicts from spreading—possibly to world war proportions.

Thus this Communist punch was thrown back by those directly attacked without involving America's own forces in battle, which would have dangerously threatened war between ourselves and Communist China, and perhaps with Russia as well.

Yesterday you heard President Eisenhower strongly support the mutual security program as an integral part of our own defense—of our own security.

You well remember the Truman doctrine which saved Greece and Turkey from communism. President Truman not only initiated the concept of mutual security—he gave it every support.

The Congress, whether controlled by Democrats or Republicans, has consistently approved this principle and voted the necessary funds.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff have given it unwavering support.

The National Security Council, at the very highest level, repeatedly has endorsed collective security, as vital to the United States.

Representatives of some 70 national private organizations from labor, from business, from industry, from agriculture, have regularly testified before congressional committees in support of some or all of our military and economic assistance programs.

It is not a sectional program.

It is not a partisan program.

It is a program on which all Americans can unite in the interest of our own security and that of the entire free world.

Our Committee is convinced that it is necessary and that we can afford it. What we cannot afford are the costs and the risks involved in abandoning or emasculating the mutual security program.

Our Committee is convinced that it should be recognized by the Congress and by the public alike as a long-range program that must continue so long as the Communist threat endangers our survival.

Your great organization, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, for years has encouraged and supported the mutual security program as a firm plank in its policy of national security.

The chamber's support has been vitally important as an expression of the considered judgment of the business interests of the United States.

Today the people of Berlin are again bravely facing a direct Communist threat, just as they did 10 years ago.

The principle of collective security to which the NATO alliance is pledged, as well as its moral and physical strength, will save them today just as the airlift did a decade ago.

We must stand shoulder to shoulder.

We must keep the faith.

We must maintain the mutual security program.

The continued support of your great chamber is needed by the administration, by the Congress, by the American people, and by the entire free world.

I know you will not fail them.

Somebody's Kidding the Consumer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial appearing in the Pittsfield (Mass.) Berkshire-Eagle on March 31 of this year.

That excellent newspaper sets forth some additional reasons why fair-trade legislation is not in the public interest and should be defeated.

It is extremely interesting to note that not a single piece of editorial comment outside of the trade publications of the proponents has had one good word to say for the principle of fair trade:

SOMEBODY'S KIDDING THE CONSUMER

When General Electric last year abandoned the attempt to enforce retail prices through fair trade agreements, the news was greated with huzzas by most believers in a free economy. Coming in the wake of many similar abandonments by lesser companies, not to mention a spate of anti-fair-trade decisions by State courts, the event was widely described as marking the virtual demise of legalized price fixing.

But apparently (to paraphrase Mr. Clemens) the reports of fair trade's death were greatly exaggerated. A bill to revive it in a

new and more virulent form is being vigorously pushed in Congress. And in the absence of any adequate consumers' lobby on Capitol Hill, the bill has at least an even chance for enactment.

The difference between the new approach and the old one requires some explaining. In the past, fair trade legislation has been left to the States, with Congress participating in the process only to the extent of giving such laws a blanket exemption from the provisions of the Sherman antitrust law, which specifically forbids price rigging. Armed with this special dispensation, 44 States have enacted fair trade laws in the past two decades; but because of adverse court decisions plus the difficulty of uniform policing policies, the laws have proved generally ineffective.

The bill now before Congress seeks to get around this difficulty by making fair trade a matter of Federal rather than State jurisdiction. It does this by providing that any manufacturer who does any interstate business can fix the retail prices of his products simply by so notifying his distributors. Anyone retailing his products below the fixed price would then become subject to legal action.

Perhaps the most annoying thing about this frontal assault on the principles of free competition is the fact that its proponents profess to be protecting the consumer. If price cutting is permitted to go unchecked, they argue, the big stores and the chains will force smaller competitors out of business. This supposedly, will further monopoly and hence will eventually produce higher prices to the consumer's detriment.

At hearings before the House Commerce Committee last week, a spokesman of the U.S. Justice Department pretty well demolished this sophistry by citing a recent Federal study of the effects of fair trade laws on prices. For a large group of fair traded items selected at random, the prices averaged 20 percent higher in cities that are covered by fair trade laws than in cities that are not.

Stripped of its pious claims, the real purpose of fair trade legislation, whether State or Federal, is to frustrate the price competition of a free marketplace—or, in the words of the Wall Street Journal, to "keep prices stable and high." It only adds insult to injury when the promoters of such legislation claim to be acting in the consumer's behalf.

Best Loved Ornaments Adorn Body of Chief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 28, 1959

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, 104-year-old Tommy Kuni Thompson, last of the great Columbia River chiefs, recently passed away on the banks of the Columbia adjacent to the once mighty Celilo Falls he loved so much. The following article from the Portland Oregonian describing the last rites of Chief Tommy deserve a place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

BEST LOVED ORNAMENTS ADORN BODY OF CHIEF

CELILO FALLS.—Tired old Tommy Kuni Thompson, last of the great Columbia River chiefs, lay quiet in death on the earthen floor of his own Long House Wednesday and early Thursday before his burial in midmorning. Indian and white man alike gathered to pay homage to him throughout the day and the long night.

Silently they came, from Yakima and Portland, automobile load after automobile load, and up the steep railroad crossing to all that remains of the once bustling Celilo fishing village, drowned by the lake of The Dalles Dam.

The eastern Oregon wind whined through the wires and whipped the tattered scarlet and white of the American flag at half staff on Chief Tommy's own prayer pole.

POLE GIFT OF ENGINEERS

The pole, made from a flag pole which once marked The Dalles-Celilo Canal, was a gift to the centennarian chief from U.S. Army Engineers. It stands in front of the only entrance to the big Long House, a rickety building of unpainted boards which is approximately 50 to 100 feet.

The 104-year-old chief's body was kept in the house of his widow, Flora, about 60, Tuesday night. Wednesday morning it was swathed in a dozen brilliant wool blankets, vivid coloring of which was in marked contrast to the grayness of the earthen floor and the interior to the Long House.

It was then placed in the handmade coffin he had requested. The great cedar box came from Warm Springs Indian Reservation.

In attendance all night Wednesday were Flora, Tommy's wife of 10 years; his son Henry, the sub chief, who in respectful time will probably assume the chieftainship of the Wy-Ams; his daughter, Ida Wynookie; six grandchildren and many other assorted relatives and friends. It is believed that the chief was married three or four times in his long life.

Chief Tommy Thompson, loved patriarch of the Wy-Ams, in death wore the clothes and the ornaments he loved best Wednesday as he received the last homage of his people before starting up the long trail to join his forefathers.

The body of the old chief was dressed in plain, white, new buckskins. At his throat was an expensive and favorite old double necklace of wampum he had worn often on ceremonial occasions. On it was a large shell medallion, held by a thong in a hole at one side. In his hand was single eagle feather, symbol of his chieftainship.

Over his face, which lay head back, chin up, were two, new, silk scarves, topped by a soft square of white buckskin. The multilayers of blankets went over all this.

In the Long House the chief's oversized coffin was blocked upon a piece of 4 by 4 and assorted other pieces of wood, all placed on top of a tule mat. Chief Tommy's moccasin-clay feet pointed to the east. On the ground at the head of the coffin lay a simple floral piece of evergreen and flowering Oregon grape on which was mounted a large, golden bas relief of an eagle, wings outstretched.

Indian drums hung at the far end of the Long House, outer perimeter of which was lined by rugs, mats, blankets and mattresses.

As evening wore on it became more and more crowded with Indians as more arrived to pay ritualistic reverence to him throughout the long, cold night. The chants of men and women alike echoed mournfully, and the drums kept solemn cadence. Occasionally a small jingling bell frightened evil spirits.

Among the many persons who paid respects to the old chief during the day were a number of white men and women, some of whom delivered eulogies as they stood facing the east where the messenger bird, atop the prayer pole, could carry them to the beyond.

As new groups of Indians arrived, they walked slowly around the Long House, counter clockwise, softly touching right hand to right hand in respect and greeting to all those before them.

They later went counterclockwise, as they told their own words of appreciation for Kuni "he who is full of knowledge."

Heart of the Shrine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 28, 1959

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to present for insertion in the RECORD the address by Imperial Sir George E. Stringfellow, imperial potentate, AAONMS, before the annual meeting of the Shrine Directors Association, held in Shreveport, La., April 9, 1959. Shreveport is my hometown and we were honored to have the imperial potentate and the directors of the Shrine as our guests.

Imperial Potentate Stringfellow, who was born in Virginia, is vice president of Thomas A. Edison Industries of the McGraw-Edison Co. This responsible position, however, has not prevented his working for the good of his fellow man and these endeavors have been recognized. He has received honorary degrees as doctor of fine arts, doctor of laws, and doctor of humanities from well-known colleges, has received the 1958 Academy of Medicine of New Jersey annual citizen's award and many other awards too numerous to outline here.

His speech needs no introduction. It will warm the hearts of all of us who are interested in the children of our Nation and the care and comfort given to them through the Shrine hospitals across the country. It is as follows:

Good morning directors, illustrious sirs, imperial sirs, and nobles, I bring you the greetings of the imperial divan of the Ancient Arabic Order of the Nobles of the Mystic Shrine, of the board of trustees of the Shriners Hospitals for Crippled Children, and of the 830,000 Shriners in North America.

I thank you for your generous introduction and I thank you for the warmth of your reception.

El Karubah Temple, her able and forthright illustrious potentate, Illustrious Sir Reginald Poe, his elective and appointive divans, past potentates, heads of units and presidents of Shrine clubs have entertained the Shrine Directors Association, I am sure as they have never been entertained before, and this association, I assure you, has experienced hospitality all over North America. However, the people of Louisiana, especially Shreveport, have created an atmosphere that's conducive to good will, gracious living and a successful convention. I am awfully glad you held this convention here and it is a source of satisfaction to be invited to attend.

Your directors have been defined as the heart of the Shrine and the hospitals as its soul. Our hearts circulate the blood that keeps our bodies alive. Directors inject new life into an otherwise drab ceremonial and thus keep our temples moving.

Director James McGee, the 26th Shriner in history said that the Shrine was formed by Dr. Walter M. Fleming as a sort of "re-

lax" from the more serious work of the advanced degrees of Masonry. And once those early Shriners began the presentation of the ritual, it was the director's section that created much of the interest. Your current directors are of course the result of that feeble beginning.

So far as I have been able to learn, the first presentation of the ritual was made by Damascus Temple in Rochester, N.Y. The records of that temple show that Damascus performed the ritual in the old Concert Hall in Rochester, on the afternoon of October 12, 1875 in the presence of Dr. Fleming, who wrote it and W. S. Paterson, the first recorder of Mecca Temple. There is some evidence that Billy Florence was present.

The Rochester performance was before the founding of the Imperial Council in 1876. It was before Fleming got around to equipping Mecca Temple with robes and other paraphernalia for presentation of the full ritual. Cleveland's Al Koran Temple did the second performance of the ritual and from that time each presentation became more elaborate.

The directors are important to the Shrine and its future. Therefore, to be a director is a personal tribute to any man. To be a good director one must have imagination, inventiveness and a willingness to labor long hours in bringing sunshine to the lives of his fellowmen.

Your directors would of course be the first to admit that the second section is not the only ray of sunshine in the Shrine. Here in Shreveport is where the first of 17 giant rays was provided for our crippled children.

It was here, almost 37 years ago, that our first hospital opened. That hospital, now refurbished in the most modern fashion, is still efficiently serving the little folk who need our love and help. I hope that everyone of you will visit this hospital while you are here.

Faces have changed in those 37 years, but each Shriner, doctor and nurse has contributed in a full measure their share of devotion which has brought us a heritage that is rich in tradition and service. It is a heritage of which each Shriner should be proud. It is a heritage that each of us will pass on to those who follow, improved by us as it has been by those who have gone before us.

The Shrine is a great organization. It enlivens our mind, improves our personality and enriches our soul.

Fair Trade by Fixing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 28, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial appearing in the Cincinnati (Ohio) Post on March 24, 1959. That editorial calls fair trade precisely what it is, price fixing.

This, if no other reason, is a sufficient basis for defeat of H.R. 1253 and similar measures.

An additional reason for the defeat of these measures is the fact that they will not do one thing to save the small merchant and to the contrary will actually make it much more difficult for him to compete with his large opponents by marrying him to a series of fixed prices on most of the products on which he must rely for his sales.

He will be unable to compete with his competitors who are recipients of dumped and distressed goods and will be absolutely unable to compete with those who have their own private brand merchandise. The editorial follows:

FAIR TRADE BY FIXING

Washington fines adding up to $107,750 have been imposed on 27 auto and accessory dealers. The charge: Conspiring to fix prices.

At the same time, in the Nation's Capitol a few blocks from the courthouse the lobbies are busy trying to push through Congress the misnamed fair trade law—a bill to permit manufacturers to fix prices.

The Government has spent millions of taxpayer dollars fighting trust cases. It has blocked many a corporation merger on the ground that the consolidation would reduce competition and that the public subsequently would suffer—by paying higher prices.

Even as the House Commerce Committee has been holding hearings on the new fair trade measure, other committees of Congress have been busy checking enforcement of the antitrust laws.

Yet this new price-fixing bill is rated a fair chance to pass. And it goes further than any similar bill, passed by Congress or any State. If it should become law, the manufacturer of any product could fix the resale price simply by decree—without agreement from the retailer who bought the product.

In 17 States, fair trade laws have been declared unconstitutional by State courts. This bill certainly can be no less objectionable.

If the lobbies plugging for this bill suddenly were told by the Government that any of their products had to be sold at a specific price, no more and no less, the outraged screams would rock the Capitol dome. Price fixing by any other name is no less odious.

College Cooperative Housing Deserves and Needs Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 28, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, S. 57 as reported by the House Banking and Currency Committee has as one of its provisions the authorization of Government loans to student cooperatives. I intend to support the housing bill and believe this part to be an important feature.

I have had a number of letters from student cooperatives at the University of Oregon concerning this problem, and under a previous consent I include them here:

CO-ED HOUSING, INC.
UNIVERSITY OF OREGON,
UNIVERSITY HOUSE.
Eugene, Oreg., April 11, 1959.

Representative CHARLES O. PORTER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PORTER: It has been brought to our attention that there is currently a bill before the House, the Rains bill, H.R. 2357, which would authorize low interest Government loans to students cooperatives under the College Housing Act.

We would like to express our hope that you will give this bill your wholehearted support.

The women's cooperatives at the University of Oregon date from 1936. At present we number more than 80 girls in three living units. These houses are all old, and increasingly expensive to maintain, thus we face quite a problem in merely maintaining our current low cost housing. In addition to this, there are many more girls seeking cooperative housing each year than can be accommodated. The areas around the campus have been scoured each year for houses suitable for group living and none are to be had. Thus the only hope for expansion, or indeed, maintaining our current membership, is to build new units which could be run cooperatively. There have been tentative suggestions that the university would make land available to us if we were ever in a position to build.

We feel cooperatives have an important place on the Oregon campus. Our board and room fee this spring term is $124.50, approximately half of what it costs to live in university dormitories, and undergraduate women are not allowed to live off campus. A large percentage of our members are financing their own college education, working while attending school to do this. Many of us would be unable to attend college were it not for the low cost housing provided by the cooperatives.

In addition to furnishing low cost housing, the cooperatives practice open membership to all races and creeds, promote responsibility and high scholastic standards. You may be interested in knowing that University House had the highest scholastic standing of women's living organizations on campus fall term.

We know you will give this matter your careful consideration.

Respectfully,

Members, University House: M. Jill Hopkins, Kathryn B. Niece, Donna Horn, Ruby F. Wells, Janice Buhmann, Beverly Lloyd, Carol L. Porter, Maxine C. Ferris, Jeanette Buhmann, Mary Alice Letts, Marylin Thompson, Bernice Bigham, Sharon Ellison, Vida Jane Garrett, Margaret Lance, Elizabeth A. Merrill, Kay Anderson, Betty Lou Janes, Arleen An, Sonya Meyers, June H. Wastel, Janet Messal, June Kozanoglie, Janice Frampton, Susan Huk, Gloria Knaupp, Helena Uunila, Karen Bedl, Betty Lou Burt, Sherril Moody, Margaret Swan, Doreen Meaden, Glenda Kay Gibson.

CO-ED HOUSING, INC.,
Eugene, Oreg., April 13, 1959.

Representative PORTER,
Capitol Building, Washington, D.C.

MR. PORTER: Rebec House, a womens' cooperative living organization at the University of Oregon needs your support. We urge you to vote in favor of the College Housing Act, Rains 2357.

Sherrill Kronsteiner, Ellen Marie Bassett, Marilyn Tollefson, Terry Sylvester, Hidiko Lakiguchi, Arlene Mellin, Edith Nichols, Mary Bryant, June Spencer, Carol Sturtevant, Ann F. Templeton, Roberta Clemmens, Helene Yamashiro, Margie Woodhouse, Jill Hall, Lillian Krog, Janet McMaster, Darlene Attebery, Agnes Bryson, Susan Latta, Hester Wolgamott.

CO-ED HOUSING, INC.,
UNIVERSITY OF OREGON,
Eugene, Oreg.

Representative CHARLES PORTER,
Capitol Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: In the past we have noted your vivid interest in the affairs of Oregonians, no matter how small, as far as bills before Congress are concerned. Again Oregonians solicit your aid, this time the representation being college students.

We noted in a recent cooperative housing national bulletin that the current session of Congress is again considering cooperative housing legislation (in the House this is known as the Rains bill, H.R. 2357). This would authorize Government loans to student cooperatives under the College Housing Act.

You are already probably aware that the purpose of cooperative living is to furnish room and board at such a reasonable rate that it enables students to attend college who could not otherwise afford the expense. The low-cost housing is achieved by buying food wholesale, hiring as little help as possible, and working together to maintain the houses in running order.

Here at the University of Oregon the women's co-ops yearly turn away enough students to fill another house and the present three houses are in need of much expensive repair. Much time has been spent considering building new houses (a dormitory-type system) since we do have a great need to expand and because of the poor condition of the now existing houses, but lack of finances prevent this. Also, the university has been cooperating beautifully but the plain truth is, we're at the point of either erecting a new building or having nothing; there just aren't any available houses near the campus to accommodate group living.

Therefore, if this bill were passed, we could plan in terms of a Government loan.

Thank you very much for your valuable time spent with this letter.

Respectfully,

Members of Highland House: President, Annelle Davenport; Vice President, Erna Wiessner; Secretary, Celeste Hennies; Treasurer, Lois Ashley; House Manager, Marie Longfellow; Social Chairman, Kathleen Quinn; Scholarship Chairman, Marlene Walker; Tiiu Sillamaa, Janice K. Lear, Alice Eugenio, Betty Brandt, Joyce Peterson, Hille Sillamaa, Billie Davis, Dolly Kominek, Jacqueline Hackett, Joan M. Gross, Virginia Wilson.

CO-ED HOUSING, INC.,
UNIVERSITY OF OREGON,
Eugene, Oregon, April 12, 1959.

Representative CHARLES O. PORTER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PORTER: As a member of a cooperative and as president of Co-Ed Housing, Inc., the organization of the women's cooperative living units on the University of Oregon campus, I wish to express concern for and interest in the Rains bill (H.R. 2357).

At the present time, provision for expansion is the greatest problem that confronts our cooperative movement here on this campus. We have three women's cooperatives that house approximately 80 coeds. At the time school began last fall, enough applications for cooperative housing were turned down to fill another house had it been available.

The buildings which house the three groups are all old single-family houses that have been made over for group living. The corporation owns one of the houses which was a donation, and the other two are university-owned and for which we pay rent. All of these houses are quite old buildings and are requiring more and more expensive repairs. The newest of the houses is located in that area that is planned for a new football stadium in the university's 10-year expansion plans. During the last few years, quite an extensive search has been made for large houses in the area that could be converted into accommodations for group living. Nothing satisfactory resulted. Inquiries into future plans for provision for expansion of the university as a whole, seem to show no provision for the student cooperatives.

We feel that the student cooperatives have a very definite place on the university campus; and, had it not been for them, many of us would not be able to attend college. We have been willing to do all that we can in an effort to provide for the continuation and expansion of cooperatives, but we feel that such a large project is very difficult for a group of students to accomplish. It seems that the only possibility is to build; and, unless we have some outside help, even this will be impossible.

I hope this has conveyed to you somewhat of the need on this campus for such a measure as is now before the House of Representatives. Any support that you can give this bill would be greatly appreciated.

Respectfully,

DONNA HORN, *President.*

The Rural Electrification Program in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1959

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, the President's veto of S. 144, which would compel review of loan decisions made by the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration has stirred the Congress and may cause a breakdown of the administration of the rural electrification program.

During my recent trip to Puerto Rico with Representative H. CARL ANDERSEN, of Minnesota, we attended a seminar on rural electrification, at which the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, Mr. David A. Hamil, spoke. I was very much impressed by Mr. Hamil's dedication, sense of judgment, and administration.

Mr. Hamil has been the Administrator since 1956. He was formerly a rancher engaged in the cattle-feeding business in Logan County, Colo. He and his brother operate two ranches consisting of 4,000 acres of land in the county.

At the time of his appointment Mr. Hamil was speaker of the Colorado House of Representatives, a position he had held since 1951. He was first elected to the Colorado General Assembly in 1938, and with exception of a 2-year term in 1948–49 had served in it continuously.

Mr. Hamil became active in the rural electrification program in 1939, when he helped sign up members and organize a section of the Highline Electric Association of Holyoke, Colo. He served as a director of the association for 5 years. When the cooperative started operation, it served about 180 consumer-members. Today it serves more than 4,200.

The REA Administrator is a graduate of Hastings College at Hastings, Nebr. He was graduated from that college in 1930 with a bachelor of arts degree.

He is the sixth Administrator of REA since the Agency was established in 1935.

The speech which Mr. Hamil delivered at the seminar held at La Parguera in Puerto Rico on April 14, 1959, I believe, will prove as informative to the readers as it was to me. The following are his remarks:

A generation is a brief span of time in the history of a national program. Yet in slightly more than a generation rural electrification in the United States has become a reality. It is indeed one of the outstanding social and economic developments in American agriculture of the 20th century. Together with farm mechanization employing tractors and other machines, and the agricultural sciences, rural electrification has brought about profound changes in farm living and in the productive capacity of the American farm.

Mechanization and electrification have come so swiftly that many do not realize how great a change has come about. It is by no means a stretch of the imagination to say that electricity and mechanization mean as much to rural areas as the assembly line, production control, and automation mean to industry.

A visitor to the United States is usually impressed by the distances between farms. These distances were for many years barriers to electrified farming, for they meant a correspondingly high investment in electric facilities. The size of that investment discouraged many existing power suppliers from extending service into the countryside.

Largely for this reason, most early rural electric lines in the United States were extensions of urban systems, reaching out for a few miles from the cities and larger towns. Consequently, as late as 1935, electricity had been brought to only about 1 farm in 10. This compared unfavorably with some other parts of the world, even after allowing for the great distances between our farms.

In the depression year of 1935, our Federal Government became interested in rural electrification as a means of stimulating employment and providing a useful public service. Unserved farmers and other rural people, of course, supplied the impetus. After much discussion of various ways of inaugurating such a program within the framework of our system of free enterprise, it was decided that a Federal loan program was the most acceptable and promised the best results. The decision was followed by an Executive order creating the Rural Electrification Administration in May 1935. The following year the Congress of the United States enacted the Rural Electrification Act, which gave statutory status to the new agency.

That act is the foundation of the rural electrification program of the United States as it is today. Under this act, the Federal Government, acting through the Rural Electrification Administration, makes long-term, self-liquidating loans available to farmer-owned cooperatives, to electric companies and to public agencies. They, in turn, construct and operate the rural distribution facilities.

When this program first began, it was believed that existing suppliers would outnumber other participants. However, as it turned out, farmer-owned cooperatives make up the bulk of REA electric borrowers. The cooperative emerged as a local answer to a tough local situation—the lack of electric power and the lack of interest on the part of existing power suppliers in providing it. Farmer joined with farmer specifically for the purpose of organizing a cooperative. They did this in the face of the fact that many power suppliers at that time deemed the risks too high to justify any considerable extensions of their lines into outlying rural regions.

Many people still believe that because the Federal Government is the lender, it also operates the rural electric facilities it finances. This may seem like a logical conclusion. However, it is not so in actual practice. Electric cooperatives are privately

owned enterprises organized under applicable State laws. So far as the Federal Government is concerned they are subject only to such controls as are designed to protect the security of the Government loan. The cooperatives make their own operating decisions and hire their own managers and other employees. The rural people taking part in this program point to their systems as examples of a highly successful combination of Federal activity and free private enterprise. Independence is a virtue of farmers everywhere. The American farmer is no exception. The farmers who organized and operate the REA-financed systems are proud of the independence of their systems. I can assure you that they want no undue interference in the affairs of their organizations.

This joint effort by private enterprise and the Government has proved to be highly successful. Whereas only 10.9 percent of our farms were electrified in 1935, about 96 percent are electrified today. REA-financed systems serve slightly more than 50 percent of these electrified farms. The electric companies serve the bulk of the remainder, and some are served by municipalities and other public bodies.

When REA was established, many predicted that the farmer would use electricity only sparingly—to light his home and barn and to run a few household appliances. How wrong they were. Farmers are using electricity in more than 400 different ways, and new uses are being discovered every day. Farm consumption has risen year by year. During the past decade it more than doubled. The average farm on REA-financed lines consumed about 318-kilowatt hours a month in 1958.

This high consumption did not occur overnight. Farm use of electricity rose slowly during the early years of the program. The American farmer and his family were not familiar with electric power. This early period served to introduce electricity to the farmer. They were feeling their way at first. Gradually, as they learned how to apply electricity to more and more farm tasks, their consumption of power began to rise. After this tryout period, the demand for power on the farm rose sharply year by year.

As a Colorado rancher, I am always interested in the stories of farmers all over the country, what they are doing with electricity on their farms, and what it means to them. Such stories come into the Rural Electrification Administration by the score.

An Iowa farmer tells us that electricity makes it possible for two men on his farm to do what four used to do—and with a reduction in operating costs. His corn averages around 100 bushels to the acre and requires a lot of handling. A 50-foot grain elevator powered by a five-horsepower motor gets it into the bin without manual labor. One day he moved 400 bushels of grain from one bin to another, cleaned the grain and filled the first bin. It took 20 minutes—and cost him a nickel.

With infrared heat lamps available for pig brooding, it is possible to have pigs farrowed earlier—while the weather is still cold—and to cut pig losses, which is another step toward greater efficiency and considerably lower per unit costs.

Electricity is an important ingredient in one Pennsylvania grower's production of certified seed. He uses 50 electric motors, ranging from 1/12 to 7½ horsepower, in drying, handling, cleaning, treating and bagging his valuable crop. During 1956 this farmer averaged 2,500 kilowatt-hours per month for farm and home jobs.

Electricity costing $56 enables a Kentucky farmer to pump irrigation water that increases his income from corn, tobacco, and beans by $1,000 a year.

The all-electric farmhouse also has made its appearance, in which the cooking is electric, the refrigeration is electric, and even heating is electric. You know, in most of the continental United States we do have to provide our own heat.

In some types of agriculture, notably stock feeding, dairying, and poultry raising, electricity has taken over so many manual chores that the operation has been called "push-button" farming by the magazine editors. We feel, however, that the application of electricity to farm chores has just begun.

Since 1935, REA has made loans to 1,050 organizations for the provision of electric service in rural areas. The loans amount to $3.8 billion. Of the borrowers, 950 are the farmer-owned type; 76 are the public-owned type; and 24 are electric power companies. The loans were made to finance service for more than 5 million consumers from 1.4 million miles of line. The typical REA electric borrower serves about 3,700 consumers and operates approximately 1,300 miles of line. It has received $2.9 million in loans.

REA makes loans for generating plants and transmission systems in instances where it can be shown that either a power shortage exists or a more economical operation will result. At present, 76 borrowers generate all or part of their power requirements. They operate 150 generating plants with a name-plate capacity of 1,013,115 kilowatts. However, borrowers generate only about 15 percent of their power needs. They buy 51 percent of their power from commercial utilities and the remainder is purchased from Federal and other public agencies.

Borrowers are paying an average price of 7.1 mills a kilowatt-hour for their power at wholesale. Rural consumers on REA-financed lines paid an average of 2.6 cents a kilowatt-hour. Both prices are the lowest since REA was established.

An important development of the past few years in connection with generation and transmission is the growth of interconnection and integration of various power systems involving various types of ownership.

For a number of years, the electric companies of the United States have been engaged in varying degrees in joint planning for interchange of power. All of these arrangements had as their objective to improve service and reduce costs for the consumer. This is brought about by several factors—reduced investment in generation and transmission facilities, including especially the smaller percentage invested instandby equipment; reduced operating costs by better utilization of more efficient units and cheaper fuel; and reduced demand requirements due to diversity of daily and seasonal peaks of rural and other loads.

To an ever-increasing extent, the REA-financed systems are participating in such arrangements—with each other, with the Federal hydroelectric facilities and with the electric companies. Through such arrangements, we get maximum value out of our hydro delevolpments because they are firmed up with the steam plants of the REA borrowers or the companies. Also, the rural systems have a market for their surplus power at off-peak times and can readily get peaking power through interchange.

Among requirements of the loan agreement between the Government and the systems are that loan funds be used for the purpose intended; that construction meet acceptable standards; that rates be such as to pay all costs of operation and provide funds to meet payments of principal and interest as they fall due; and that service be extended to all in the area who want it where it is economically feasible. This latter is the area coverage principle, one of the cornerstones of rural electrification in the United States. Under this principle, the test is not whether an individual line or section will be self-supporting but whether the entire system is feasible as a whole.

REA borrowers have established a repayment record that has few equals in the history of American banking. They have returned to the Government $1.1 billion in principal and interest, including over $140 million in advance of due dates. Only 1 of our 986 active electric borrowers is overdue more than 30 days in payments amounting to $91,102. This excellent record is a high tribute to the integrity and efficiency of the people who organized and operate the REA-financed systems.

The rural electrification program has passed through what can be called its first stage. The goal of this stage was to make electric power available to unserved rural persons. It is now available; the backbone of a vast electric system to serve rural America is constructed. The unelectrified farm is very much in the minority today in the United States—a minority of about 4 percent. We shall continue to make every effort to get electricity to these still unserved farms. Many of them are located in remote places and present a hard problem. I am confident, however, that farms of this type in areas served by REA borrowers will be reached.

The end of the pioneering stage brought about a sharp shift in emphasis. Today the big task facing our rural systems is to provide enough power to meet a constantly rising rural demand and to operate their facilities on an efficient basis. As a consequence, a larger portion of REA loan funds has, in recent years, been going to finance facilities to increase the capacity of existing systems and to provide new power sources. The year 1958 is a good example of this trend. In that year, more than 55 percent of our loans went to finance system improvements and new distribution facilities. About 43 percent went for new generation and transmission facilities. The remainder financed consumer facilities.

Characteristics of the rural electric system in the United States are changing. This is reflected in the increasing number of nonfarm consumers being connected. Although in numbers of consumers, the program is still a farm program, the percentage of nonfarm consumers is rising. Last year the rural systems served about 2.5 million farms and an estimated 2 million nonfarm establishments. The latter included nonfarm residences and commercial and industrial enterprises. The systems are adding new consumers at the rate of about 120,000 a year, and about 75 percent of these new consumers are nonfarm establishments. It is anticipated that the number of nonfarm consumers on REA-financed lines will outnumber farm consumers within the next 5 to 10 years. Already the nonfarm consumers account for more than half of the total powerload on the systems and they will undoubtedly account for a larger proportion of total power sales in the future.

In the United States many people are leaving the cities to live in the country. Modern highways have brought the rural countryside and the cities closer together. A new type of rural consumer, the wage earner who commutes daily to a job in a nearby town or city, has become a familiar figure in many areas served by REA borrowers.

The future of rural electrification gives promise of great opportunities ahead for REA borrowers, but it poses serious challenges, too. As the number of consumers climb and as they demand better and better service, rural utilities must supply the kind of professional management that a modern utility requires. Their engineering plans must look far into the future, for they must have the plant that it takes to supply consumers with all the electricity they want, no matter how high that demand climbs.

Based on their fine record of accomplishment over the past 24 years, we are confident that the REA borrowers will meet these challenges and make the most of the new opportunities for service.

Outlawing Competition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 28, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial appearing in the Montgomery (Ala.) Advertiser on March 28, 1959. This excellent editorial sets out some of the many compelling reasons why the fair trade bill, H.R. 1253, now pending before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce should be defeated:

OUTLAWING COMPETITION

Normally, we would consider the proposal to set up still another permanent congressional expense as just another case of duplication and bureaucracy. But Congressman ZABLOCKI, of Wisconsin, has an attractive idea: a permanent congressional committee on consumers' interests.

The people who testify before congressional committees (the congressman said) in the great majority of cases represent producers and distributors—the automobile manufacturers, the meatpackers, the various wholesalers and so on. The voice of the consumer—the people who buy those goods—is heard very seldom.

A good beginning for the consumer interests committee would be the proposed Federal fair trade bill, as raw an attempt to outlaw competition in this country as has been attempted in many a year.

Of course it's labeled as being in the public interest; such swindle bills always are. The National Association of Retail Druggists, one of the principal proponents of the price-fixing bill, has assured the public that "price-cutting" really costs the consumer money in the long run.

At the very worst, the association says, fair trade couldn't cost any more. As exhibit "A" in this absurd contention, the Association offers a survey alleging that consumers in non-fair trade areas paid just about the same prices as consumers in areas where fair trade prices were enforced.

In the first place this just isn't true, if it were, there wouldn't be any movement to pass a federal law. A Department of Justice survey, not subject to the same figure juggling as the Association's, found that of 119 items available in eight cities where there were no fair trade laws to keep prices jacked up, 77 sold below the prices fixed for other areas. If a consumer bought all 77, he would pay 27 percent less than the fair trade price. This was the average for the eight cities; in some, consumers would have saved almost one-third of the fair trade price.

The fair traders want a Federal law enforcing prices at a fixed high level. This is obviously a collusion of the sort that the antitrust laws were enacted to prevent. But the law, if enacted, would exempt the price fixers from antitrust prosecution.

State fair trade laws were enacted, for the most part, during the depression. Some States have subsequently repealed them and in more than a dozen others they have been declared unconstitutional. In still other States, retailers have simply refused to abide by them, aware that they are unworkable and that price flexibility is, after all, the retailer's best friend. Faced with this situation, many of the larger manufacturers abandoned price fixing. Thus the effort to pass a Federal law covering the whole country.

The fair traders, whatever their public argument, are really just lazy and greedy. They want an assured markup without sweat and without competition. Edward Wimmer, of the National Federation of Independent Business, confesses that if the law is passed, as he hopes it will be, "There will not be any price competition and there should not be."

In the absence of a consumers' interest committee to dispute this, America's breadwinners can only hope Congress will listen to Chairman John Gwynne of the Federal Trade Commission, who has said of the proposed law: "The fixing of retail prices is inconsistent with the American system of free competitive enterprise and is contrary to the public interest as expressed in the antitrust laws since 1890."

The Chemical Corps' Role in National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues a speech delivered by Maj. Gen. Marshall Stubbs, Army chief chemical officer, before the Midwest Chapter, Armed Forces Chemical Association, in Chicago, Ill., on April 23, 1959. General Stubbs' speech on the subject of "The Chemical Corps' Role in National Defense," I feel, carries an important message for the Congress and for the public and I submit it for printing in the RECORD. The speech follows:

THE CHEMICAL CORPS ROLE IN NATIONAL DEFENSE

(Speech by Maj. Gen. Marshall Stubbs, Army Chief Chemical Officer, before the Midwest Chapter, Armed Forces Chemical Association, Chicago, Ill., April 23, 1959)

The following is a direct quote from a Russian publication written by Col. Prof. Dr. Adam Milkovitch. While I do not agree with these statements, nevertheless the Russian viewpoint emphasizes the need for us to be alert to what they have in mind. I quote:

"Since biological weapons are regarded today as more dangerous not only than conventional weapons but also more dangerous than chemical and atomic weapons, we believe that at least the same attention should be given to this question as to chemical and atomic weapons. From results of comparative studies of losses of life from conventional weapons, war poisons, and atomic energy, on one side, and losses from biological weapons on the other side, it is believed today that a biological war would have the greatest effect of all.

"Those who favor the view that biological warfare can be employed with complete success base their opinion on the fact that for war purposes all fields of science are used today, including, therefore, those pertaining to various types of biological agents. Moreover, the experience from recent wars showed that one can hardly give any significance to international resolutions outlawing certain types of weapons, especially when these decisions could be by-passed in biological warfare, when the preparation of biological agents can always be covered by humanitarian purposes so that it can be put under control."

Not only has the Soviet government indicated interest in biologicals, but recent statements by its officials show that it has a marked interest in the field of chemicals as well. Maj. Gen. Yu V. Drugov of the Military Medical Service, Red army, stated on the 49th anniversary of the great October revolution: "Special interest attaches to the so-called psychic poisons (mescaline, methedrine, lysergic acid derivatives) which are now used for simulation of mental diseases." He further stated, that "In response to state demands * * * considerable efforts were directed toward studies of military poisons."

It appears that the deep interest of the Soviets can mean only one thing, that they will take the initiative in waging chemical and biological warfare if they deem it to their military advantage. It has been reported that they are devoting a substantial percentage of their military spending to chemical warfare and biological warfare. I cannot believe that they would expend this amount of money and large quantities of resources to produce these agents if they did not fully recognize the potency of such a weapons system.

I will limit my discussion to three points, first, evidences of increased Soviet emphasis on chemical warfare, biological warfare; second, examples of how chemical and biological attacks could be employed against us by an aggressor nation and last, the defensive posture of this country against such an attack.

The Sino-Soviet bloc now has a military force of over 8 million men including about 400 ground divisions and the Soviets alone could expand their present force by 300 divisions in 30 days and 500 divisions within a year, according to reports.

Within these Soviet divisions is a specific organization devoted to the field of chemical warfare. Chemical troops are assigned to all echelons down to battalion.

Soviet chemical weapons are modern and effective and probably include all types of chemical munitions known to the West, as well as devices exclusive to themselves. They have an excellent variety of protective equipment and are prepared to participate in large-scale gas warfare.

Much of their hardware is multi-purpose and the conventional artillery shells, incendiary bombs and rotational scattering aircraft bombs can be readily converted for chemical warfare purposes.

Medical and technical reports which have been published indicate that they are equally well versed in biological warfare. Soviet microbiologists have conducted biological warfare tests at an isolated location over a long period of time.

Based on my opening remarks concerning the Soviet interest in chemicals and biologicals, it is evident that they are not overlooking this weapons system. This being true, we certainly cannot close our eyes to the possibility that we may be confronted with these weapons, lest we, like Achilles, have a vulnerable spot.

I am firmly convinced that a strong deterrent force which includes chemicals and biologicals can be a strong defense. For surely, an enemy convinced that our chemical warfare and biological warfare capability is as effective as the rest of our weapons systems, would hesitate to launch a chemical warfare and biological warfare attack.

Let us look for a moment at means with which an enemy might employ chemicals and biologicals against us, both conventionally or unconventionally so that we may better know how to marshal our chemical warfare, biological warfare defenses.

Based on their reported capabilities, we can assume that they not only have the toxic munitions, but the hardware for their delivery. They have a flexible choice of delivery. In an all-out or general war chemi-

cal warfare and biological warfare might well be used in conjunction with a nuclear attack with the hopes of destroying our ability to retaliate.

Recently, there have been news reports on the apparently stepped-up Soviet submarine activities. It is possible that chemical warfare-biological warfare attacks could be launched against our coastlines with missiles fired from submarines.

Raymond Gorthoff, who for the past 10 years has made an intensive study of Soviet strategy, says in his book "Soviet Strategy in the Nuclear Age" that: "A fourth element of strategic deterrance will probably be advanced 'ABC weapons'. Such (Soviet) weapons exist today, but will surely be more potent and more readily deliverable in military significant doses by 1970. They can, for example, also be released from suboceanic containers in the Pacific to 'ride' the prevailing winds covering the United States."

An enemy might also launch an attack of chemicals or biologicals from the air. Since it is difficult to detect and rapidly identify an airborne biological attack, an off-target attack with subsequent cloud travel to cover the target is a possibility to be guarded against. It would be most difficult to distinguish such an attack from a naturally occurring epidemic.

Defensive studies in which a harmless tracer material was used, have shown that coverage up to several thousand square miles could be achieved by aircraft without the population being aware that an attack had occurred.

We must not neglect the possibility of the covert use by an enemy of chemicals or biologicals against both military and civilian personnel. It has been said many times and it bears repeating, that a future war will not be fought on the battlefield alone but will involve civilians working in industries and other defense establishments. An enemy is wise enough to know that if the resistance of the mass of civilians that are necessary to maintain our fighting forces is broken down, so will our line of defense suffer.

The importance of food, especially during wartime, needs no emphasis. In all wars military efforts have been devoted to the destruction of an enemy's food supplies; the scorched earth policy of Napoleon, for instance.

Even though this country is in a favorable defensive position due to our diversified crop programs, we must not overlook the possibility of an attempt to destroy our crops by the use of chemical and biological agents, as for example, against our vast wheatlands of the Midwest. While we probably could maintain an adequate supply for our own consumption, our export of grain would be curtailed, thereby depriving our allies of this kind of assistance from us.

Food processing plants in this country have not generally been considered war targets, and therefore are not usually protected against trespassers who might wish to use CBR agents. If a saboteur had access to a food plant with wide distribution of its products, he could easily conceal a sufficient quantity of the toxic material upon his person to poison enough food in 1 day's work to seriously incapacitate half a million people.

Our architectural wonders present a vulnerable target in their air-conditioning and ventilating systems. A small portable generator placed in a briefcase could effectively contaminate a large office building or factory with a chemical warfare-biological warfare aerosol.

Were I to end my discussion here, you would probably go away with the thought in mind that we have little or nothing in the way of defense against the covert or overt use of CBR against us. For, thus far, the picture I have painted you as to the possibility of a chemical warfare-biological warfare attack against us and our vulnerability to it has not been an encouraging one. I have not, in my estimation, overemphasized the seriousness of this nor have I credited an aggressor with capabilities it does not now possess.

I have given you these facts for two reasons: First, because there are many who believe that should war come, there is nothing they can do about it. They are not facing the problem realistically and preparing themselves to minimize the hazards of war. Second, because there is a widespread lack of awareness of the seriousness of a CBR attack. The public must be brought to realize that other nations have a strong CBR capability and that we must be prepared to defend ourselves against any type of weapon they might choose to use. It must also be aware that chemical and biological agents are not the cruel weapons of total destruction as they have been branded by many writers. I must add—that nothing about war is pleasant. The U.S.S.R. has been the strongest in branding C and B horrible, as for example, during Korea. Nothing would suit them better than for us to consider them bad to the point of doing nothing about them, thereby making ourselves vulnerable to their attack.

What then would be our best line of defense for the protection of our national community against a CBR attack? There appear to be three possibilities, first, elimination of the risk of an attack by way of effective international agreements. This solution seems highly remote in the light of current world tensions. Second, effective interception of attacking forces by means of early warning systems and a strong retaliatory position. In view of the highly clandestine potential of CBR weapons, this can only be accomplished through the joint efforts of all military services both within this country and among our allies. Third, we must maintain a strong civil defense capability. Civil defense measures designed to control or limit the results of a CBR attack must protect man and his living resources. In this connection we must constantly pursue an information program designed to reduce fear and to provide instruction on first aid and personal defense.

The Chemical Corps in conjunction with other military and civilian agencies has the job of establishing a CBR defensive which will be second to none. However, in this age of increasing momentum in world tensions and rapid technological advances, time is a controlling factor. We must constantly forge ahead in all our research and development if we wish to maintain world leadership.

Our basic problem is to provide the individual fighting man with adequate protection against chemicals and biologicals without overburdening him to the point that his combat capability is severely affected. In line with this I am pleased to report that our new canisterless protective mask has been fully field tested and standardized and should soon be in production. It will provide the soldier with a more effective and comfortable means of protection. A civilian counterpart has been developed and turned over to civil defense.

We, in conjunction with the Army Quartermaster are giving high priority to developing a three-way permeable system which will make general issue clothing self-indicating to the presence of chemical agents and self-decontaminating and at the same time prevent the penetration of them through the fabric.

Defense against infectious disease is a well-known and age-old endeavor by the medical profession. The problem here is not of preparing to meet something new, but to meet a familiar enemy in overwhelming numbers as could occur in a biological warfare attack. The current immunization program for the military personnel will assist in protecting the soldier from biological warfare. Effective use of newly developed vaccines promises useful protection for military personnel, but the immunization of the entire population of our country against all the diseases which might conceivably be used for a biological warfare attack would not be so easy to perform.

For the great majority of known infectious diseases which are strong candidates for use as enemy biological agents, intensive treatment with one of the broad spectrum antibiotics such as terramycin and aureomycin may abort the infection or limit the illness to 1 or 2 days of mild incapacitation with rapid return to duty. This is with the provision, of course, that such antibiotics are available in sufficient quantities to take care of large numbers of people.

The area of early warning and rapid detection of an approaching CBR attack is of vital importance. Though our coastlines are vast, the Armed Forces are constantly maintaining surveillance against approaching enemy aircraft or ships. The same planes and ships that could carry atomic weapons would also have the ability to dispatch CBR weapons.

In regard to the vulnerability of the food industries to chemical, biological, and radiological warfare agents, a meeting between representatives of the Government and representatives of the Institute of Food Technologists was held in January of this year. It was agreed that though the threat of nuclear weapons is serious, the threat of chemical and biological agents must not be overlooked. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has requested additional funds for further research, training, and educational material. This group reiterated that the defense of the United States depends on three major elements: diplomacy, military defense, and nonmilitary defense.

Some of you here are associated with the food industry in some capacity. I am sure you are aware of the great distrust that can be caused when contaminated foods get on the market and illness and death occur. As an illustration, recently a small lot of contaminated fish was shipped out of Philadelphia. A number of people became ill and three died. The alarm went out to cities on the east coast and for the next few days the market was glutted with fish because people were afraid to buy it. This happened, incidentally, in the height of the Lenten season. Imagine the havoc that would be created if saboteurs deliberately contaminated packaged goods and caused a full-scale epidemic. At present, no feasible method is available to rapidly measure and identify chemical warfare and biological warfare contaminants in foodstuffs. Chemical poisons can be detected in approximately 24 hours by injecting the substance in mice. In the case of biological warfare agents, the vast majority of these would not be revealed in the mouse test. The research being done in your laboratories in early detection of contaminants in foods would be of great value to us in developing a more rapid system of detecting chemicals or biologicals. We must pool our resources so that we can make the most rapid gains possible. I ask you to give this special consideration. I am confident that you have the technological know-how to assist us in developing a more rapid early detection of chemical and biological agents. You will be doing a great service, not only to the Chemical Corps, but to the entire national defense program.

I have touched only a few phases of our chemical and biological defenses and some of the problem areas in which I feel you can be of assistance. Our problems are your problems.

The greatest deterrent to war is to have such a capability that an enemy would refrain from attacking for fear of our retalia-

tory measures. We, in the Chemical Corps, are not neglecting this area.

Time will not permit me to go into detail about our most recent developments. Rather, I would like to show you a film that will soon be released over nationwide television that will give you a good idea of the overall work of the Chemical Corps.

Meyer London

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1959

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have recorded the event that took place in my congressional district the other night in connection with the dedication of the Meyer London Public School and request the following news item that appeared in the Jewish Daily Forward for March 10, 1959, together with the statements made at the dedication by a distinguished labor leader of my State, David Dubinsky, president of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, and the Honorable Charles H. Silver, president of the Board of Education of the City of New York, be included in the RECORD:

[From the Jewish Daily Forward, Mar. 10, 1959]

A GREAT MEYER LONDON HOLIDAY THIS EVENING ON THE EAST SIDE

This evening a special holiday will be celebrated in New York on the East Side: a new public school, which was until now identified only with a number "Public School No. 2" will be crowned with the name "Meyer London School," in memory of the beloved, unforgettable socialist leader of workers, Meyer London.

The name "Meyer London" is bound up with the finest traditions of the Jewish East Side, with the Jewish immigration of the '90's and later, which made its home on the East Side, with the young Jewish socialist and trade union movement, which conducted its ideological and economic battles on the East Side. Here were built the first unions; here the great strikes were led; and in all those movements and struggles the great figure of Meyer London shone as leader, teacher, shining orator, and lawyer. Meyer London was the lawyer of the Cloakmakers' Union and of the ILGWU, for which he laid a healthy basis till the present day.

His great accomplishments as a popular leader and the boundless love that he inspired in the hearts of the Jewish masses are seen most clearly in the fact that he was elected as Congressman (three terms) and was the first Socialist Congressman from the East Side. From Congress in Washington his name became well known throughout the entire country. And when Meyer London lost his life in a tragic way, New York turned out for one of the largest funerals that the city had ever seen.

Today, 30 years later, the city of New York agreed to commemorate the memory of one of her greatest sons by naming a children's school after him, in order to educate and inspire the new generations with the ideals of peace, social progress and general progress, to which he dedicated his life and his talents.

But by honoring the name of Meyer London, not only Meyer London himself is being honored but the whole Jewish East Side for which he was such a shining representative. And everybody is therefore invited to come tonight to the celebration and increase the significance of the holiday.

First of all should come the members of the Cloakmakers' Union and of the International, everybody who knew Meyer London personally, and also all who even just heard of his name, because today there is no one in New York, Jew or non-Jew, who does not benefit from the accomplishments and advances which Meyer London devoted his life to achieve.

ADDRESS BY DAVID DUBINSKY

In the early days of our union, we were blessed with such leaders as Meyer London—men whose hearts were with the workers in the dark and disease-ridden sweatshops, men who put their own hearts and minds to work fighting the industrial evils of their day.

It is a measure of their success, though they themselves didn't live to see it, that for the most part those evils have been wiped out.

It is a measure of how far the world can be moved by men with ideals that we are gathered here to honor a leader of workers who, in his time, put their hopes, their dreams, their great hunger for a life of dignity and security into ringing words, words that stirred this very same East Side so that out of its poverty and dirt, its hunger and its hopes, they build their unions and turned those dreams into living reality.

Now we are gathered here, in the heart of his East Side, to participate in the naming of a public school for him; on the East Side where he imbued the immigrant with the spirit and true meaning of being an American; where he implored them not only to get from this country all it had to offer but also to give it the best of themselves.

He would have loved such a fitting tribute.

Meyer London was our lawyer—but he was more than a professional adviser. He was a guide and a counselor to us. He shared not only our problems, our headaches and heartaches; he shared our pain and our suffering in those grueling days when we first fought for the elementary right to have a union, when we fought to get rid of the firetraps and the sweatshops.

He was one of those rare, selfless spirits who lived mainly for the ideas in which he deeply believed. Instead of sending the union bills for his services he sent it contributions out of his own meager funds to help meet its expenses in those days when our union was struggling to stay alive.

He was tireless in advising us in our negotiations with employers, in mapping our strategy, in formulating our policies, in coping with legal problems. At the same time, he had the great gift of the orator. He could arouse the masses of the garment workers at a great rally with his passionate voice and win their confidence.

He was elected to Congress on the ticket of the Socialist Party in 1914, in 1916, and in 1920 from a district on the eastside populated with refugees from Czarism. There he regarded himself not merely as a spokesman for a party but as a champion of all the working people in the Nation.

What a strange kind of Congressman he made. He rose in the Congress to plead for laws to limit the length of the work day, to put a floor under wages, to provide unemployment insurance, to pay pensions to aged workers.

To his colleagues in the Congress these were strange, disturbing demands—bound to be defeated. Impractical. Utopian. Impossible. Dreams.

Yes, Meyer London, in his day, was the great champion of lost causes. Thanks to him, thanks to his vision, thanks to his refusal to believe that America could not provide these humane benefits, his lost causes are now, 46 years later, the very blood and bones of our American way of life.

He had a particular identification with newcomers to this country. The east side of his day was the landing point for millions of immigrants:

I think he would have found a warm satisfaction in the fact that it still is. The poor and the puzzled, the disfranchised and the newcomer—these were his constituents.

Were he still with us, this same east side—with its new people, the new faces, the sounds other than Yiddish—could still be home to him.

More than 40 years ago, he rose in Congress to make an eloquent, impassioned, although hopeless defense of the people of Puerto Rico. He pleaded for the full right of every Puerto Rican to vote because, as he said in words that have not lost their full meaning: "Where men are deprived of the opportunity to give expression to their views through the use of the ballot, they have to use other means."

For 2 weeks of debate, he refused to back down—even when the Congressman from Tennessee cried out: "I wish I could make a motion to expel him from this House."

He argued for the right of Puerto Rican workers to organize.

He asked for serious limitation of Puerto Rican child labor.

He condemned a proposed $3 vote tax which would disenfranchise most of the islanders.

"I challenge your right," he cried to the Congress, "to endow property with the franchise which you deny to man."

On every single amendment that he offered, he lost. But he was not defeated.

Today, Puerto Rico is a Commonwealth within the framework of our United States and we are proud of our efforts to help raise the living standards of our fellow citizens on that island. However, how many people today realize that it was Congressman Meyer London who, about 40 years ago, was among the first to speak up on behalf of the then downtrodden and oppressed people of Puerto Rico. Today, many of the children of those people will be attending the public school named for Meyer London.

There was really no injustice in our country or anywhere in the world which Meyer London did not make his own cause, for his cause was the cause of the plain people everywhere.

When, on June 6, 1926, he was struck down on the streets of New York by a passing car, a great and noble life came to an end.

His service to the garment workers, to working people, to mankind, to democracy is his monument.

His memory lives today not only in his works and as an inscription on this school. It will always live in the hearts of the garment workers, the members of our union who love and revere him. We will always remain grateful to him for his imperishable contribution, in making our ILGWU what it has become today. If it is esteemed and respected today for its accomplishments, this is in no small measure because it was fortunate to come under the influence in its early years of men of the stature of Meyer London.

This school which bears his name will be physical evidence and a constant reminder to all of us today and those who are to come after us tomorrow, of Meyer London's great work. The young people who come here for their schooling are bound to ask who this man was and to learn of his noble life and work right here on the East Side and to take inspiration from his example.

The board of education is to be congratulated for recognizing the meaning and importance of Meyer London and particularly the special meaning which his name bears in

the locality of this very school. Therefore, its choice of name is singularly appropriate.

By giving this school the name of such a great idealist, a champion of justice, and an outstanding American, the board of education has breathed into the brick and mortar of this fine edifice a deep spiritual meaning.

ADDRESS BY HON. CHARLES H. SILVER

Some of you may have heard a fairly popular piece of music known as the "Tenement Symphony"—and, if you lived on the lower East Side, as I once did, you were struck by the title even more than the melody.

For this is a section of our vast city rich in sights and sounds. It is a tremendous orchestra of human emotions, a melting pot of many colors, creeds, and racial strains, a symphony, indeed, that sings of the greatness of America.

Out of these crowded streets rose a multitude of voices that spoke for mankind's conscience, for human dignity, for liberty, and equality: Lillian Wald, Jacob Riis, Al Smith, and so many more.

And a voice that soared as high as any in its devotion to struggling, downtrodden, impoverished humanity belonged to the great social leader and champion of the rights of the people whose memory we celebrate tonight.

I knew Meyer London. I heard him speak on street corners not far from here when he made his bid for a seat in Congress and became the first member of the Socialist Party to serve in the House of Representatives. Children paused in their play; mothers sat on their stoops feeding their babies; tired men on their way home from work stopped to listen and had their hearts lifted by his words.

"My friends," he would begin, "for a little while, forget the things you have come from. Think only of those things we are doing now or what we plan to do in the future. Put the problems of yesterday and the troubles of even an hour ago out of your mind. For, if they remain in your mind, you may leave too little room for the more important thoughts of the present—and of the better future we can build together."

That is where the hopes and vision of Meyer London were fixed; not on the past, but—even then—on today and tomorrow. He was a socialist, burning with a resolve to improve the lot of the working classes, to wipe out the steaming sweatshops and shameful slums. He was a socialist, but his brand of socialism and the reforms he fought for have been woven into the fabric of our democracy.

He had come to this country at the age of 20. His father was a rabbi who earned his living by publishing a small Yiddish newspaper on an old-fashioned hand printing press. Meyer earned his own living by teaching—tutoring children in their cramped homes and lecturing at the old Hebrew Institute, which later became the educational alliance. He worked all day and studied law, like an East Side Lincoln, late into the night.

And all the while he looked around him at the people of this new land of promise who had not found the streets paved with the gold they had come to seek.

And he listened to the heartbreak of the toilers at the sewing machines and cutting tables, the peddlers and small store keepers, whose daily striving for existence began before sunrise and continued until long after dark.

Meyer London did not like what he saw and heard. His heart bled for the child whose hours were spent in a factory instead of a classroom. His sense of justice smarted at the plight of the stalwart immigrant who earned $2 for a day and a half of backbreaking, nerve-racking labor. His soul was sick at the sight of a dozen men, women, and children working in a single, airless loft to the light of a small gas mantle. I know, I was one of them.

Then because he did not like what he saw and heard, because he was angry and determined to do something about it, Meyer London lifted his great voice in the Halls of Congress. He changed the face of the East Side. He changed the thinking of the Nation. He altered the attitude of the world, and won a new respect for the importance and dignity of labor.

In his wake came the Dubinskys and the Stolbergs, the Potofskys and the Naglers. In his image were the Hillmans, the Gompers, the Zangwills—children of the ghetto, they showed the way to a life without ghettos, to labor without degradation.

The legacy of Meyer London has been realized in wide, sunlit factories, in sensibly planned housing projects, and in bright, gleaming, inspiring schools like this one.

Meyer London would have loved this school. He would have proudly inspected its magnificent auditorium, its impressive classrooms and spacious recreational areas—and he would have been proud that it bore his name.

I don't think he would have listened to the penny-pinching advocates of four bare walls and a blackboard. He would not have condoned any corner-cutting cutrate school construction. Rather, I feel certain he would have championed the cause of the best possible educational facilities for the children of New York. And he would not have hesitated to point out that the only schools good enough for those children are the very best we can build, and they are worth every cent they cost.

For that is the philosophy of our distinguished mayor, the best friend that the children of New York ever had. I am proud and grateful that he is here on this platform to participate in this dedication as he has in so many others over the years.

However, he is not only on hand when a school is completed and in use but frequently in the course of its construction. I have known him to accompany me many times in the early hours of the coldest mornings on inspection tours of schools.

I salute you, Mr. Mayor, for talking of bigger and better schools, and knowing the need from first-hand dedicated observation.

I know that I can make the same expression of appreciation for our energetic president of Manhattan, Hulan Jack, a tireless champion of education and a man dedicated to the best interests of the people of Manhattan.

This beautiful school is a symbol of the enlightened age for which Meyer London worked and fought. Fine labor organizations have followed in the footsteps of his crusade. Our workers of today know the fruits of leisure as well as toil. The doors have been flung wide to education and culture. The windows of a better world are open to health and happiness, not only here on the East Side, but wherever people strive together for the improvement of their community.

This is the heritage of those fortunate young people who will study within these walls. May they be spurred on by the memory of his courage and foresight.

As I dedicate this school, on behalf of our entire board of education, in reverent memory of this beloved man of the East Side, I feel that his great spirit is among us, an invisible guest of honor at these ceremonies. Words are too feeble to express what is in our hearts as we recall this man who walked these streets, upright and without reproach. His name is cherished not only by those of us who walked here with him, but by generations yet unborn—the people he served so well, the multitudes he freed from slavery of mind and body.

Educator, emancipator, champion of the least of men, he spoke with the voice of a prophet:

"Put the problems of yesterday out of your mind. Leave room for the better future we can build together."

That is the credo I give to the parents and the teachers and the children of this school who must guard the glory of its name—because it is named for Meyer London.

The Lawyer and the New Dimension of Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD a significant address on the international control of outer space, delivered on April 14, 1959, at the Inter-American Bar Conference in Miami, Fla., by a distinguished Washington attorney, Ralph E. Becker. I also wish to include an editorial on Mr. Becker's speech, published in the St. Petersburg (Fla.) Times.

Mr. Becker suggests that agreement on the use of outer space among the nations of the Western Hemisphere may serve to remind world opinion that the peace of the world demands Soviet cooperation and would give the free world the advantage of bargaining from prior established positions.

Mr. Becker brings to this subject the experience of his service on the space law committee of the American Bar Association and as chairman of the interplanetary space committee of the Inter-American Bar Association. I commend his analysis and proposals to all who are interested in the resolution of these difficult problems:

THE LAWYER AND THE NEW DIMENSION OF SPACE

(By Ralph E. Becker)

Unskilled in the physical sciences, the lawyer stands in awe and wonder at the recent extensions of man beyond this terrestrial globe. Largely unfamiliar with the principles and applications of astronautics and missilery we lawyers are, in a sense, mere spectators of the scientific wonders now evolving as outer space is conquered.

However, appreciating that new physical achievements cannot serve man's best interest until circumscribed and directed by sensible rules and regulations, the lawyer has for some time realized the need for applying his specialized talents to the problem of space exploration and control. Many astute lawyers have already grappled with various facets of this task. The names of John Cobb Cooper, Charles S. Rhyne, David F. Maxwell, Andrew G. Haley, Rear Adm. Chester C. Ward, Arnold Knauth, Myres S. McDougal, Leon Lipson, Eugene Pepin, Loftus Becker, Spencer Beresford, George Feldman, and John Johnson come readily to mind. The International Law Association, the American Bar Association, the American Society of International Law, the Federal Bar Association—our own Inter-American Bar Association—and several State bars have either established permanent committees or are

undertaking special projects for the study of space law. In the educational field, the Universities of Oklahoma, Virginia, Georgetown, and McGill have initiated, or are initiating space law departments. My associate, Prof. Leo A. Huard, of Georgetown University Law Center, is one of the pioneering academicians in this movement. To all, and in particular to the U.S. lawyers, I commend Professor Huard's recent speech before the March conference of the American Rocket Society in New York, entitled "The Impact of Space Exploration on the American Lawyer." Therein Professor Huard dealt with some very practical aspects of the relationship of space to domestic U.S. law as opposed to the international problems.

It is into this latter more explored field of multinational space problems that I dare to tread again today.[1] While the focus of attention has been on the actions and attitudes of the two countries in the avant garde of space exploration, the United States and the Soviet Union, all nations should have a present interest, and most will have a practical part, in the harnessing of outer space movement. You cannot judge your own nation's prospects of contributions to space conquest by its size, military importance, or relative material well-being. A recent report by the Select Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration of the U.S. House of Representatives states that a great number of nations are likely to acquire the capability of using space at an early date. The report goes on to indicate that although many of these nations would be numbered along the less substantial military powers, their contribution might make possible a balance in the power politics of the major nations. As a parallel by which to gage the probability of a country's participation in space, we need only recall that the two-nation monopoly of the atom, which at first seemed unbreakable, is now shared by an ever-increasing number of countries.

Independent of any consideration of national participation in space exploration, there are overall problems which demand the consideration of all lawyers and of the organized bar of the Western Hemisphere. For example, every country should be immediately concerned with the problems of liability attending the return to earth of "hardware" sent into outer space. There are solid indications that the heavier pieces of hardware which reportedly burned up in space did not entirely disintegrate and that some chunks are still in orbit. Of more practical significance, we can recall the documented incident in which an Air Force Snark missile fired from Cape Canaveral went out of control and was lost somewhere over the interior of Brazil. As ever increasing launchings are made, we must face not only the problem of regulating traffic but of fixing liability for accidental injury. This legal problem is compounded by the divergent systems of jurisprudence existing in the various nations of the world. Not only does the Anglo-American concept of liability differ from that of the Communist countries, but under the Napoleonic Code, which has exerted a strong influence on Germanic and Latin American jurisprudence, liability without direct fault is not, as in the United States, looked on favorably. These are but a few indications that legal control of outer space is of immediate concern to every country represented here. Further evidence is shown by the fact that the United Nations ad hoc committee on the peaceful uses of space, consists of representatives of four countries in this hemisphere, namely Argentina, Brazil, Mexico, and the United States.

I would like to applaud the action of the officers and membership of this association for their initiative in establishing a special committee devoted solely to the study of space law. The remainder of my remarks will be directed to suggesting possible areas of space law and regulation which the special committee and the entire membership of this association might wish to study.

Underlying the entire problem is the question of whether or not it is now timely to attempt the establishment of a meaningful and comprehensive plan for space control. Many experts oppose the hasty creation of rules of space control because they believe that we do not as yet have sufficient knowledge of the physical nature of space to draft intelligent and meaningful norms. These men believe that uninformed rule making could prove more injurious to international peace than no rules at all. Their belief is predicated on the assumption that more sophisticated means of space exploration might outdistance and make obsolete regulations formulated too early to anticipate later developments. The contrary school of thought argues that any movement is more susceptible to control and compromise in its infancy than at a later date when accepted modes of operation have become entrenched in the policy of any given country. As an analogy we need only to view the controversy in the Antarctic where, because of long standing claims and physical encampment, we have reached an impasse in resolving conflicting contentions.

I am a proponent of the view that to delay the establishment of international rules will make later efforts to draft such rules more difficult. Particularly do I believe this a sound position when we consider that, as in so many other areas, the resolution of this problem demands an accord not so much between individual countries, but between the two major forces of the world, the free nations and the Communist bloc. We have learned, all too well, that it is impossible to strike a bargain with the Communists unless it is done before they can negotiate from a position of established strength. If the Soviets believe that, at this point in time, they cannot completely control their own destiny in space, they may be willing to join in concerted action with other countries. By so doing, the Soviets could perhaps proceed in an unimpeded manner to advance their own knowledge and operations in space without interference from competing powers. However, such rules and regulations drafted by many nations in concert might well provide safeguards against the Soviet use of space for other than peaceful purposes. If a complete safeguard could not be arrived at because of Soviet objection, still a warning and identification system to mitigate any military advantage of space flight might well be agreed upon. If the Soviet then outstrips the compass of early space rules, the free world would have the advantage of bargaining from prior established agreements. If such bargaining proved unsuccessful, we would still have the weight of world public opinion as a lever to ensure that the Reds continue to honor a pact implying an agreement to agree to multinational space control.

This problem of achieving space control accord with the Communists has direct bearing on our uppermost consideration, the security of the Western Hemisphere. There does exist a possibility of nuclear ballistic warfare in the immediate future during a period when it is admitted that neither the United States nor the Communists are in complete control of the hardware they launch. Even if missiles are directed at the United States only over the top of the world, it is not inconceivable that one or more could find its final resting place in the Caribbean or South America. In a higher order of probability is the firing of missiles from submarines to the east, west, or south of the United States. Any miscalculation from these areas could very well result in damage to Central and South American countries. Of course it hardly needs to be said that even without physical damage to your own countries, any injury which seriously incapacitated the productivity of the United States would greatly reduce the security of this entire hemisphere.

Military implications aside, there is the very immediate danger of reconnaissance satellites invading our sovereign privacy. It appears certain that both the United States and the Soviet Union will very shortly launch satellites with effective electronic and photographic means of surveillance. We do not want nor can we afford to expose our countries to the prying Soviet eye. Another immediate threat is the Soviet use of communications satellites. As recently as last week, a Soviet Ministry of Communications proposed the development of a television-relay satellite as part of the 7-year plan. While we must certainly welcome Soviet utilization of space for such peaceful purposes, I note that in the early sputniks the Soviets utilized radio frequencies which had for many years been in use by commercial radio around the world and by the U.S. weather broadcasts. Indiscriminate and uncontrolled use of radio frequencies might not only prove irritating but could possibly jeopardize our early warning alert system.

An interesting variation on this theme—one which all Western Hemisphere lawyers should note—is provided by the recent U.S. Project Argus tests. In those tests nuclear bombs exploded at 300-mile altitudes seriously interfered with radio communicattions over a substantial segment of the world.

Consideration of the dangers to us of communist use of space at once brings to mind the benefits to the Western Hemisphere which can result from close inter-American cooperation on space. Our so-called talking satellite demonstrated the feasibility of using space vehicles for the furtherance of communicattion. Not only may satellites increase the efficiency of radio, television, and telephone transmission, but it has even been suggested that a "space pony express" system will be devised. The latter project envisages the coding of letters and their relay through a satellite to a decoding and printing station on another continent. This system would not only result in a 1- or 2-day mail system anywhere in the world but would relieve a great deal of the burden on the international airlines which carry most of the mail.

The development of a satellite communication system focuses attention on an important role which the countries of the Western Hemisphere can play in the development of space exploration and utilization. In order to have an effective communications system the orbiting vehicle is but one element necessary for such a project. Regardless of whether your own countries will soon possess the means of orbiting a space vehicle, it will be necessary to construct sending and receiving earth stations as the other essentials ingredients. As I have already noted, space communications have both military and civilian applications. Satellite stations can serve to relay not only defensive alerts but can shrink the time involved in disseminating valuable commercial information. Perhaps, even more importantly, they may serve to acquaint all of our countries with the mores and cultures of their neighbors through the dissemination of live television programs. Every country of the Western Hemisphere must contribute to this mutually advantageous aspect of the space age. It is our duty, as members of a responsible profession, to see to it that action to that

[1] "The Impact of the Atom and the Satellite on the Law and the Lawyer"; speech by Ralph E. Becker at the Inter-American Bar Conference, Buenos Aires, Nov. 15, 1957.

end is quickly undertaken in our respective nations.

We have made an intelligent start toward the exchange of ideas and programs representative of each country's social and cultural achievements. Imagine the great strides to mutual understanding in this hemisphere which would result from being able to view live television transmissions between the various countries of the Americas. There is no more effective media capable of reaching a mass audience than the live television broadcast. We, in the United States, could enjoy the wide panorama of Latin life from the bullfights in Mexico to the opera in Buenos Aires. Similarly, the peoples of Latin America might have a better understanding of the United States from day-to-day exposure to such programs as Meet the Press, the World Series, Wyatt Earp, the Jack Parr Show, the Metropolitan Opera, and the New York Ballet.

Another space development of very practical and immediate consequence is the, soon to be realized, use of satellites for weather information and, perhaps, weather control. If as successful as anticipated, accurate weather information acquired in this way and applied to commercial and agricultural uses might be one of the great economic boons of the 20th century. Accurate, long-range weather forecasts would also be a material aid to aerial and sea navigation and the scheduling of air and sea travel. Needless to say, it would provide ample time to take precautionary measures in advance of a storm so as to minimize damage.

I believe that in thus reducing our thoughts of imaginative space exploits to the day-to-day problem of weather and communications, we come to realize not only the importance and value of international cooperation in this field but also find an answer to those critics who condemn the great expenditures necessary to conquer space. Sir Clement Atlee, former Prime Minister of Great Britain, had an article in the American press last week urging that we divert the great funds now being expended for space exploration to humanistic projects for the betterment of mankind on earth. Sir Clement's praiseworthy argument cites the great poverty which prevails in many parts of the world and urges that economic help to underdeveloped countries will win us more friends than will our most dramatic space exploits. I would like to offer a refutation of that contention by stating that we have pursued, and will continue to pursue, an extensive program of economic and other assistance—a program which far outstrips in scope and magnitude all similar efforts by any other nation, even the efforts of the Soviet Union. We must remember, also, that in this hemisphere the most important thing is not aid but cooperation. We must work together since the security of each nation is dependent on the security of all. Large or small, the primary interest of each nation of the Western Hemisphere in space developments is the security of the whole hemisphere. No nation can guarantee this security alone.

The former Prime Minister seems to overlook the threat posed by Soviet control of outer space and the real benefits to mankind resulting from the peaceful uses of space. I have alluded before to some of the ways in which a conquest of space can aid all mankind. We must always remember that not only does Soviet space activity pose a military threat to the free world, but also that their accomplishments have captured, and are likely to continue to capture, the imagination of the entire world. Inasmuch as we are in an ideological struggle with the Communists, we cannot afford to allow them to steal another march on us in space and thereby leave the impression that the Communist system is more apt to spawn new and imaginative scientific accomplishments. Space advances through inter-American and world cooperation afford the free world an excellent opportunity to devise a means of defense against present and future Soviet military capabilities. Such cooperation also provides a realistic means of breaking down the barriers of misunderstanding between peoples of every degree of political and sociological conviction.

I would like to sound a warning and pose a challenge to the lawyers of this association. The scientific communities of our countries are bursting with new ideas and realizing new scientific breakthroughs weekly and monthly rather than once a decade, or a century, as was the case in the past. Regrettably, only a handful of our lawyers have taken steps to educate themselves in the rapid scientific advances in the area now under discussion. We are catching up, but there is still a great deal of work to be done before space law and space science stand on an equal footing. I caution you gentlemen again that the scientists of your own countries, even without all of the funds available in the United States, may through international exchange of ideas and methods leave the law and the lawyer far behind. Your nations possess daring and resourceful scientists who, I predict, will bring Latin America very soon to an active and meaningful role in the development of outer space. While our major problem, security against Communist threats, demands full cooperation, there will inevitably develop, as in every field of human endeavor, differences between the countries in this hemisphere in the execution of our cooperative space program. We must take care that such differences do not cause the collapse of these cooperative efforts to develop a sensible plan for space control and regulation. It is our obligation as the draftsmen of laws and regulations to ensure that wherever the scientists lead us in space, we shall be prepared to direct their physical achievements to the best interests of our national and international aspirations and welfare. There is today a great deal being done on every frontier of human endeavor to further mutual economic advancement and common understanding. This is a part of the overall effort which we, in the Americas, have always made to preserve human rights and maintain the dignity of man. Cooperation among our countries in space activities should be considered merely as the newest path to this ultimate goal. An intelligent and coordinated approach to the problems of space law promises to further these ends and to advance our cause of real and understanding interdependence among the nations of this hemisphere.

[From the St. Petersburg (Fla.) Times, Apr. 19, 1959]

DAWN OF TOTALLY NEW LEGAL CODE

So far as history records, man has been sufficiently civilized to have some sort of social structure for something like 10,000 years.

In those earliest days, this was merely a simple family tribe, slowly expanding into what historians call a gentile system.

Even in those most primitive organizations there existed law. At first this was nothing more than the rules prescribed and enforced by the patriarch of the tribe. As time passed, however, the rules took on the force of custom, being handed down from generation to generation. And from being simply the dictate of a single leader, new rules were formulated by tribal councils.

These were true law, even though it was many centuries before they were written down, codified, and became a legal system.

Followed then Babylon's Code of Hammurabi, the Mosaic laws of the Hebrews, the Laws of Manu in India. Next came the laws of Solon and Lycurgus of ancient Rome and, in Justinian's time, the great Corpus Juris Civilis.

When our own Anglo-American law began to develop, it stemmed not only from the rules of the "witenagemot," which were the councils of wise men of the tribes of Angles and Saxons, but also, from the Roman invasion of Britain and the triumph of William the Conqueror, it acquired all the great body of law which had sprung up through thousands of years of civilization in the Mediterranean basin.

It is out of this vast warehouse that came the laws we live with today. Our own Constitution of 1789 stemmed directly from these sources.

William Bennet Munro wrote of the delegates at that constitutional convention that "they would no more have dreamed of trying to create a new law than they would have tried to create new skins for themselves." Our Constitution, he said, "was woven on the roaring loom of time."

Therefore, in a very real sense, no man, no group of men who lived at the same time, ever created law. All that Hammurabi did, or Solon—whose name we today use as a common noun in referring to the "solons" of Congress or the legislature—was to clarify and organize the body of law that already existed.

So today it is astonishing and exciting to find that man at last does have an opportunity to create a whole new body of law, for the first time in all history.

The occasion and opportunity? Nothing more than the age of space.

Here, at last, is a field in which absolutely no precedents exist. Here is a physical area, a "piece of geography," where man has never lived, never owned property, never had any rights.

The lawyers of the world—and it must be of the world and not of any nation or group of nations, if utter chaos is to be avoided—have an absolutely blank statute book into which they can start writing.

This challenge has not been overlooked by members of the bar. In last week's Inter-American Bar Conference at Miami this topic was subject of a paper delivered by a Washington attorney, Ralph E. Becker.

Mr. Becker faced the reality of the world as it exists today—and the difficulties which the free West has in dealing with the communistic East—and urged that the bar of our half of the world lose no time in creating a set of international rules governing space so that we shall have something with which to bargain with the Soviet.

There is an infinitude of problems to be considered and dealt with in establishing a body of space law, Mr. Becker pointed out. Even as modest a beginning in the conquest of space as we have already achieved makes some of those problems immediate.

We agree with the assertion of Mr. Becker it is the bar's "obligation as the draftsmen of laws and regulations to insure that wherever the scientists lead us in space, we should be prepared to direct their physical achievements to the best interests of our national and international aspirations and welfare."

Likewise we think it fitting for the lawyers of the Western Hemisphere, as the geographically largest repository of human freedom, to assume the leadership in this vital exploratory work.

But in the long run—and not too long, at that—this is a task that only United Nations is large enough to deal with. There must be only one law for space.

If the members of the Inter-American Bar Association, working through the Organization of American States, which is an arm of United Nations, can lead the way to world-wide agreement in this new concept of law, it will have made a priceless contribution to mankind.

Nixon Champions the Rule of Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 28, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, Vice President NIXON has advocated a world rule of law to replace the rule of force. This idea is of such importance to my colleagues in the Congress and to the American people that I recommend the following editorial of April 27, 1959, in Life magazine to them:

NIXON CHAMPIONS THE RULE OF LAW

An idea championed by Vice President NIXON last week can give new strength to U.S. foreign policy and change the fate of nations. To the Academy of Political Science, NIXON said, "The time has now come to take the initiative in * * * establishment of the rule of law in the world to replace the rule of force." He made two specific recommendations. One, already promised by the President in January, would revitalize the World Court by widening our official view of its jurisdiction. The other would name the Court as umpire of any future agreements between East and West (as for example over Berlin).

These two proposals are signs of a major new administration campaign. Its aim is to hasten the day foreseen by the late Senator Taft, whom NIXON quoted. "I do not see how we can hope to secure permanent peace in the world," said Bob Taft, "except by establishing law between nations and equal justice under law * * * the time will come when public opinion will support the decision of any reasonably impartial tribunal based on justice."

The World Court is certainly a reasonably impartial tribunal, but unfortunately also the idlest bench in the world. It has decided only 10 cases in the last 13 years. A primary reason for its scandalous neglect lies right on the doorstep of the United States.

This reason is the Connally amendent, a reservation to the terms by which we accepted the court's jurisdiction in 1946. The court neither has nor wants jurisdiction over essentially domestic disputes; but the Connally amendment makes the United States sole judge of what is domestic and what is not. This is not only bad law (the American Bar Association has long opposed the Connally amendment) but bad foreign policy, with a built-in boomerang effect against U.S. interests. One example: Panama recently decided that its territorial waters extend 12 miles from shore, thus blanketing the Canal Zone's 3-mile limit. Our natural refusal to recognize this claim should be accompanied by a prompt move to court. But although Panama has no Connally amendment, it can invoke ours if if we are a party to the suit, call the 12-mile limit an internal matter and leave us no legal answer. Until the Connally amendment is changed, as NIXON urges, our bad example will keep the court in idleness and frustrate any U.S. claim to be a champion of law in world affairs.

The State Department has a very long list of cases in which the Communists have violated treaties and agreements. Many of these (one flagrant example: the Polish elections of 1947) would have made good law suits had the legal channels been usable. NIXON's second suggestion would make such channels usable in future agreements. Under it the court would decide cases of legitimate disagreement over the meaning of a treaty; and in cases where the Soviet violation was intentional, it could at least keep the legal record clean.

In his last public speech as Secretary, John Foster Dulles said: "Those nations which do have common standards should, by their conduct and example, advance the rule of law by submitting their disputes" to international tribunals. The cause of law among the nations, like the earlier cause of law on our western frontier, is one which it lies deep in American beliefs and traditions to extend. It is a natural cause for U.S. foreign policy and should have become a bold and prominent part of that policy long ago.

One of the most tireless workers for the cause of law has been Charles Rhyne, past president of the American Bar Association. Said Rhyne last week: "The whole world clearly understands that the Communist peace plan is to make the world 100 percent Communist. But few people can give you a clear statement of the objectives of the free world's peace plan." Arms race, deterrence, NATO, SEATO, mutual aid, etc.—all these defensive necessities are no substitute for a clear and universally shared world goal. The rule of law is such a goal; and NIXON'S timely championship should bring it closer.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer, plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Air Force and the Space Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 29, 1959

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I am pleased that last week the Senate confirmed the nomination of Maj. Gen. Bernard A. Schriever, USAF, to the rank of lieutenant general. I have watched the progress of this brilliant and much-decorated officer of the U.S. Air Force. General Schriever's work, his capability, and his understanding of the complex problems which have faced the Air Force during a time of vast progress, have impressed me.

Early this month, General Schriever spoke before the Seattle Advertising and Sales Club at Seattle, Wash., the State I have the honor to represent in part. He discussed "Your Air Force in the Space Age." Because of the significance and timeliness of the subject, I feel his speech should be brought to the attention of a wide audience. Accordingly, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUR AIR FORCE IN THE SPACE AGE

(Address by Maj. Gen. B. A. Schriever, commander, Air Force Ballistic Missile Division (ARDC), to the Seattle Advertising and Sales Club, Seattle, Wash., April 10, 1959)

It is a pleasure to have this opportunity to talk to you tonight about the Air Force ballistic missile and space program. I have some very fond personal recollections of Seattle, not the least of which is of the wonderful welcome I received here last year when I had the privilege of taking part in your independence day celebration.

In today's tense world situation, it is the obligation of every American citizen to inform himself in depth about the great issues of international relations, economics, and military strategy that confront us. In a democratic society such as ours, we are all participants in the events that shape our national character. We help determine not only our own future, but the future of the entire free world as well.

The cold war, with all its agonizing decisions, is not just the concern of the military alone. It is everybody's business. You who are in the communications profession well know the truth that in our country it is opinions and attitudes, conceptions, and misconceptions, the energy or the apathy of the people that, in the long run, determine how a new idea or method or product will fare in the great American marketplace.

In the field of national defense we are literally involved in a life or death struggle. It is our job—yours and mine—to do everything in our power to place the facts of the cold war squarely before the public. In order to participate intelligently in the events of our challenging times, the American people have an urgent need to know—to know not just isolated facts, but facts with meaning, facts in context.

The people of Seattle have for some time been deeply involved in the development of the Nation's deterrent force. Boeing Aircraft Co., makers of the B–47 medium range jet bomber, the B–52 long-range jet bomber, and the KC–135 jet tanker, is one of the "blue chip" organizations on which the Air Force has come to rely.

Boeing—and all of Seattle, too—entered the missile age a few years ago with their Bomarc interceptor air defense missile. Last year we in the Ballistic Missile Division were pleased to welcome Boeing—and Seattle—into our family of contractors as a member of the Minuteman ICBM team.

The State of Washington is also making valuable contributions to the weapons development program of the Navy at the Bremerton Shipyards and at the Applied Physics Laboratory, and to the atomic energy program at Hanford.

So, in all sincerity, I salute the people of the great Northwest and especially tonight the vital community of Seattle for their contributions to our national security. Now I would like to give you a bird's-eye view of the Air Force ballistic missile and space program.

The development of the Air Force's long-range ballistic missiles—Atlas, Titan, Thor and Minuteman—is the largest technical development program in the Nation's history, exceeding even the Manhattan project of World War II. Expenditures for fiscal year 1960 will approach $2 billion.

Thirty prime contractors are involved in the program along with over 200 major subcontractors and about 200,000 suppliers and vendors. The Nation's leading scientists have served as advisers on technical problems. These elements, along with the military management agencies, constitute the unique government-industry-science team that was organized to develop the long-range ballistic missile from scientific theories to operational weapon systems.

In the past few months, the 4½ years of planning and testing and building have begun to pay off. Here is a brief report on the present status of our major projects:

The ICBM Atlas successfully flew the full 6,000-mile distance several months ahead of its original schedule, it will be ready for operational use at Vandenberg Air Force Base in California this summer. Atlas, an intercontinental range ballistic missile, is one of the so-called heavy class. It is capable of delivering very large warheads at very long ranges.

A second and more advanced heavy-class ICBM, the Titan, has begun its flight test phase at Cape Canaveral, Fla., with three 100 percent successful flights.

These three successful first flights establish a new record in missile testing. They are testimony to the ever-growing confidence we have in our designs and our procedures.

The Titan was designed at the outset to be stationed in underground sites, where it will be able to survive a savage nuclear attack.

I want to emphasize at this point that both of these heavy-class ICBM's, Atlas and Titan, have a tremendous growth potential. Their range can be greatly extended beyond the nominal 6,300 miles that is usually quoted.

What all of these future improvements add up to—and again I stress that they are already scheduled into our program—is the fact that our heavy-class ICBM's can have a long and extremely valuable life in the arsenal of the Strategic Air Command. Probably throughout the 1960's this would be much longer than any modern weapon system to my knowledge.

Our third ICBM project is the Minuteman. The Minuteman will enjoy certain unique advantages: It will use solid propellants. It will be simpler than its forerunners. It will be operated by fewer personnel. Minuteman missiles will be placed in underground shelters and left unattended for long periods of time, but ready to be fired from remote control centers on a moment's notice. As alternate means, Minuteman missiles can be floated on barges or towed on trailers or railroad cars to create a constantly moving, widely dispersed striking force that would be virtually impossible for an enemy to locate.

The Minuteman, moreover, gives promise of being a major economic breakthrough. This missile, we believe, will mark the first case where a more effective weapon will be produced at a lower cost than its immediate predecessors. Good news for taxpayers.

The Thor, an IRBM, is capable of delivering a heavy warhead to intermediate ranges of 350 to over 1,700 miles. The first squadron has already been deployed in the United Kingdom.

Well, there you have a brief status report. Now let me go back and say a few words about our management.

Undoubtedly one of the most challenging aspects of the assignment that was handed to the Ballistic Missile Division when it was formed in 1954 was the conquest of what we call lead-time.

We all know that a central characteristic of new science and technology is the speed with which it makes obsolete both commercial products and military weapons. We often see them becoming obsolete, even while the ink is drying on their design blueprints. This means that we have to find ways and means to shorten drastically the length of time between the idea for a new product or weapon and its delivery to the user. This interval between conception and execution is what we call lead-time. We are learning that the ability to compress or shorten this lead-time today determines, in large measure, the very ability to survive. This applies to a company in the conduct of its business, or to a government in the conduct of its national defense.

This ever increasing importance of lead-time was emphasized in the 1958 Rockefeller Report on National Security from which I quote:

"A nation can achieve a basic advantage if it is able either to develop or to produce weapons more rapidly than its opponents. One of the major weaknesses in our strategic posture has been our exceptionally long lead-time."

To beat the clock, we know we would have to proceed with all aspects of the program concurrently; that is, to move forward simultaneously with research, development, testing, production, the building of missile bases, crew training, and everything else.

Second, we would have to streamline our administrative and control procedures, cut

redtape, and establish a new organization which could centralize and draw upon military, scientific, and technical resources for the analysis and solution of unprecedented problems.

Third, we had to project and build the missile as a whole, not around shelf hardware as it existed in 1954, but as it could be expected to be in 1958. We see, then, that we were everywhere confronted with the necessity to go far beyond the experience of the time.

The more traditional way of developing a new weapon has been to build it piece by piece, in a series of consecutive time-consuming steps. To give you some idea of the complexity and scope of the task facing the Air Force in carrying out its ballistic missile program let me drawn an analogy between our management process of concurrency and the manufacture of an automobile.

Now all of us know how complex the job of an automobile manufacturer is in the design, the production, and the distribution of a new model. This takes a tremendous amount of planning, not just for a year ahead, but for several years. Now just imagine for a moment how much more complex the automobile manufacturer's task would be if, at the same time he was designing and producing his automobile, he also had to lay out and build a network of roads, gas stations, garages, automotive supply houses, and train all mechanics and drivers. Yet, this is just what he would have to do if they did not already exist, i.e., if he wanted to sell cars.

Now this is exactly what we had to do in the ballistic missile program; for, in 1954, nothing existed except the desire.

Our management concept of concurrency—together with management techniques for identifying any delays in the program before they happen—have enabled us to cut in half the time previously required for the development and production of weapon systems far less complicated than the ballistic missile.

In other words, if we had followed the more customary step-by-step sequence of weapon system development and production, it would have taken us some 10 years or more, rather than 5 years, to have our Atlas ICBM where it is now; namely, on the threshold of operational readiness.

Now a word about space. The billions of dollars, about $2 billion per year now, which have gone into the ballistic missile program since 1954 provide the springboard to space. Without it we would be at least a decade behind the Soviets.

Looking to the future, we can safely predict that space vehicles, for both military and civilian purposes, will exert an ever-growing influence upon our lives. The hundreds of millions of dollars appropriated by our Government for the conquest of space since the first sputnik was launched just 18 months ago, dramatically illustrate the revolutionary effect of an onrushing science and technology upon national security and business enterprise.

Within the next 10 years, outer space is going to be a multibillion dollar market. The rewards will go to those managements who prepare themselves to cope with the challenges of the new science and technology in terms of time and of space. Already in prospect are weather satellites, communications satellites, planetary rockets, and manned space ships—all of which will see the rise of entire new industries, and the rise of new lines of defense for freedom against the competitive challenges of communism.

Earth satellites, space probes, and interplanetary vehicles are no longer comic-strip fantasies, but actual hardware. The foundation has already been laid for future developments. The scientific and technical know-how, the facilities, the test stands, and, just as important, the management organizations are in being today to build upon that foundation.

As we move to meet new tests of our national strength and stamina, we should keep in mind the point of view recently voiced by Secretary of Defense McElroy when he said, and I quote:

"We know you can't spend deficit time and you can't borrow minutes. Our potential enemies have exactly the same amount of time we have. He who uses his moments most wisely will be the winner in the cold or hot war of the future."

We can use those moments most wisely only when we constantly reaffirm our faith in freedom. It is the spirit of freedom which has enabled us as a people to have the courage and resourcefulness to constantly adapt ourselves to changing conditions economically, politically, militarily, and psychologically at home and abroad. In terms of the new impact of science and technology, the spirit of freedom demands that we constantly reassess the status and prospects not only of our commercial products and military weapons, but also of our policies, plans, and procedures in business and Government alike.

Now as a final word—our standard of living tends to make us complacent. I can assure you we have a tough adversary. He doesn't sleep and he works and works hard, so did our forefathers. His standard of living is much lower than ours, but it is improving and quite rapidly. Don't sell him short. To win this struggle cold or hot—and individual freedom is at stake, we must not only be prepared to work as hard as they do—we must actually work as hard and we must be prepared to sacrifice. Being both an optimist and a patriot—I am confident that the American people will rise to the challenge.

Splendid Soil Conservation Program in Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 29, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today I am happy to invite attention to the splendid progress in planning and installing soil and water conservation measures in Wisconsin.

During 1958, our Badger farmers set a new annual State record for conservation practices. Our 375 soil conservation district supervisors have reported splendid cooperation by the farmers and the agencies administering these programs.

Today, I received a letter from Mr. M. F. Schweers, State conservationist, Soil Conservation Service, in Madison, pointing out highlights of the outstanding accomplishment in soil and water conservation practices in Wisconsin.

Recognizing that the improvement and further expansion of such practices is necessary to conserve our natural resources, I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts of Mr. Schweers' letter highlighting the fine program in Wisconsin, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE,
Madison, Wis., April 27, 1959.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: • • • Wisconsin farmers set another new annual State record last year in planning and installing soil and water conservation measures through their locally organized and locally operated soil conservation districts. • • •

All district annual reports praised the excellent interagency relationships that exist in Wisconsin. This is a major factor in achieving the fine record made in the State, so they say. The agencies cited were the State soil conservation committee, Agricultural Extension Service, Soil Conservation Service, Wisconsin Conservation Department, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, and the Farmers Home Administration.

Nearly $190,000 of Agricultural Conservation Program Service funds was transferred to the SCS by county ASC committee to reimburse the service for technical assistance in connection with the ACP. Nearly 20,000 referrals were handled by the service under last year's program.

Up to April 15, 1959, five Public Law 566 watershed protection and flood prevention projects were approved for operation. During the past calendar year the first four major structures were installed under this program. These are of the water detention type. About another 14 applications are either approved for planning, are pending action by the State soil conservation committee, or are in the development stage. By the way, all of the projects are located within the two tiers of counties bordering the Mississippi River from Ellsworth on the north to the Wisconsin River on the south.

District supervisors and employees of all agencies recognize that the key conservationists are our progressive, fine farm families. They make the decisions, they determine the rate in which they are going to proceed with the establishment of conservation measures, and they then actually install the planned practices.

The Printed Word: Its Value for Today and Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 29, 1959

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, some excerpts from the speech "The Printed Word: Its Value for Today and Tomorrow," which was delivered Thursday, April 23, 1959 by Arthur B. Langlie, president of McCall Corp., at the Hotel Pierre, New York City.

The occasion was the annual Newcomen Society dinner which this year honored McCall Corp. and its 89 years of leadership.

Mr. President, the Newcomen Society of North America is an offshoot of a British historical organization founded many years ago to pay tribute to pioneer leaders in industry, invention, communications and utilities. Its 77 regional groups in North America comprise a membership of 16,000 men, who regu-

larly hold dinner meetings in various cities throughout the country honoring leaders of industry.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The tremendous torrent of human technology is sweeping all our civilization to an undefined goal.

I am deeply honored by your invitation to address this famous, international association and to ask you to join with me in tribute to the printed word—which inspires, controls and will yet save us from our ever-growing and fantastic powers.

On the printed word depends our entire system of education, government, law and religion. I am proud to be associated with the modern development of print and to render you an account of the stewardship of the publishing venture with which I am associated.

McCall is a family name is every meaning of the word. It is a family of enterprises serving American families. For almost 90 years it paralleled and reflected the creative changes and the healthy growth that so clearly characterize America. McCall's story is a history of machines and distribution, of service and know-how, and of the achievement of mass production while maintaining the highest standards of quality. But most of all, it is a story of dedicated men and women and the living ideas they created.

I do not need to detail for you the growth of McCall's since the turn of the century. It is sufficient to say that from these small beginnings, McCall's has grown to a business doing about $75 million a year and employing 4,631 men and women. The name McCall's has become a symbol of service that is recognized throughout the world. Only six monthly magazines in America sell more than a million copies on the newsstands, and two of these are McCall's and its sister publication Redbook. In total average monthly circulation, McCall's in 1958 topped 5,300,000 and Redbook's exceeded 2,700,000.

Always expanding and keeping step with the latest technological developments, McCall's in 1923 broke ground for its new plant in Dayton, Ohio. After many additions, this is now the largest and finest magazine printing plant in the world. Our presses, and related equipment, now serve our own needs and those of over 40 other magazines.

The built-in strength of the printed word is its permanence. This is time for free and independent thought and we can choose that time as we see fit.

The writer of the printed word must have courage. When the writer finishes his job, he offers something in permanent form. He invites the reader to take a good look and says: "Look as often as you wish. * * * This is what I say and mean, once and for all. * * * Use your own intelligence, your own judgment, your own imagination, and form your own conclusions." Yes, the reading of the printed page is the act of a thinking man. Where else but in our contact with the printed word do we have the time to be our most private, reflective selves? We have time to read and to believe. Yes, the printed word stays with us. When it speaks with courage and skill, with nobility and beauty, it becomes part of our innermost thoughts in a unique way.

The printed word has been employed to propagate religions. It has been used to popularize new political theories. It has been the fleeting thoughts of the poet and scientist, of the philosopher and theologian. The printed word has unlocked the door to adventures, to information, to deep satisfaction.

It is the best vehicle ever conceived by the mind of man for transporting man to areas where he has never before trespassed, for introducing him to the unfading personalities of past and present, for exposing him to experiences infinite and varied, for inspiring him to think.

Dual State Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 29, 1959

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, several hundred thousand New Jersey residents who work in New York have been suffering for many years under a burden of dual taxation. These people are required to pay income taxes to the State of New York, and at the same time the New Jersey residents must pay their full share of New Jersey's State and local governments. The same situation holds true for residents of southern New Jersey who are employed in the city of Philadelphia.

Earlier this month, I wrote to Governor Meyner of New Jersey, proposing that New Jersey levy against nonresidents a tax upon the income earned in New Jersey. I suggested that the new law provide for reciprocal exemptions for residents of those States which provide similar exemptions for residents of New Jersey who work in their States.

So long as New York requires New Jerseyites who work there to pay for the services rendered them by New York, surely it is fair that the 50,000 New York residents who work in New Jersey pay for the services which they receive from New Jersey. The end result of enactment of the law which I have suggested might well be attainment of the desirable situation where each State would limit its taxation to its own residents. Even if this did not occur, the State of New Jersey would at least be better off by the amount of income taxes its collects from New York residents. All New Jerseyites would therefore benefit in the reduction of the amount they would otherwise have to pay for the cost of their State and local governments.

While Governor Meyner has indicated his opposition to my proposal, it is interesting to note that several outstanding newspapers of the State have found merit in my suggestion and have urged its consideration. Since this problem of dual taxation affects other States in addition to my own, I should like to place in the RECORD the full text of three editorials commenting on my proposal.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

[From the Asbury Park (N.J.) Press, Apr. 14, 1959]

FIGHTING TAX INJUSTICE

The income tax imposed by New York State against New Jersey residents working on the other side of the Hudson River has long been a source of irritation. Even worse than the fact that they must pay the tax is the policy under which residents of this State are not allowed deductions available to residents of New York State.

For years the only relief from this injustice seemed to be the adoption of an income tax in New Jersey, applicable against residents of New York working in the State. With such a levy a reciprocal agreement might be developed that would exempt residents of each State from the tax imposed by the other. But New Jersey does not want a personal income tax even were it to collect tax revenue from New Yorkers partly to offset taxes paid by New Jersey residents to New York.

The situation has produced a quandary that has prodded New Jersey leaders into suggesting myriad solutions, some of which are obviously borne of desperation. Senator CASE has proposed a special income tax in this State to apply only against New York residents. Governor Meyner and Senator Dumont, chairman of the New Jersey commission on out-of-State taxation, fear that Senator CASE's proposal would be unconstitutional although it would substitute justice for the present unfair situation.

Now there is also a proposal for a constitutional amendment to restrict a State's income tax to its own residents. Governor Meyner plans to testify in favor of such an amendment before a U.S. Senate committee tomorrow. It is doubtful whether it would be ratified, however, because 33 States now tax workers who live in other States, and that is close to the three-quarters of the States needed to ratify a constitutional amendment.

Faced with a mounting need for additional revenue, New Jersey cannot with equanimity view millions of dollars being collected from its residents in New York State income taxes. And good neighbor that it may try to be, New York is hardly likely voluntarily to forgo this lucrative source of revenue, especially in view of the fact that it is paid by persons who do not vote in New York.

No one has yet offered a satisfactory solution to the problem and we do not presume to pull one out of a hat. But the interest being demonstrated in it should be encouraged. Such proposals as Senator CASE's even though it might be judged unconstitutional as a special tax, are worth considering. For they may lead to a program that would erase the injustice to which New Jersey is being subjected. It would be frivolous at this point to resign ourselves to a situation that needs correction.

[From the Union City (N.J.) Hudson Dispatch, Apr. 17, 1958]

WHY NOT RETALIATORY TAXATION?

Appeals to Congress for the passage of a proposed constitutional amendment to prevent one State taxing the citizens of another, it seems to us, is a waste of time.

We think the more direct way to impress New York State and Philadelphia would be for New Jersey Legislature to pass an income tax bill that would impose levies on New Yorkers and Philadelphians who earn their living in New Jersey.

Even though this procedure suggested by U.S. Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE and turned down by Gov. Robert B. Meyner, would not make New York and Philadelphia stop taxing Jerseyites who work there, it would at least bring in that extra revenue which, apparently, is needed to increase State aid to school districts.

In the Meyner budget for the next fiscal year not a dollar was added for aid to school districts. With the rising costs and increased salaries, it will cost every school district in Hudson and Bergen Counties more to operate their schools systems for the fiscal year beginning July 1 than for this fiscal year ending June 30.

Since the Governor in his "model balanced budget" has allowed no more for school aid, the local taxpayers must pick up the tab in shouldering the difference.

Let's try the retaliatory income tax plan suggested by Senator CASE. It might not only bring in needed revenue, but should make New York and Philadelphia more cautious about increasing the income taxes on New Jersey citizens earning their livelihood in New York State and in the city of "brotherly love."

[From the Bayonne (N.J.) Times, Apr. 17, 1959]

GETTING THE WRONG ALTERNATIVE

There is a parallel between Governor Meyner's singular coldness to a plan proposed by Senator CASE to sting New Yorkers with a dose of their own medicine and the Bayonne City Commission's handling of unified health service. Senator CASE has suggested that New Jersey is entitled to charge New Yorkers who work in this State in exactly the same way that New York charges residents of New Jersey who work in New York. Governor Meyner replies that such a tax would be discriminatory and probably unconstitutional. The Governor instead advocates an amendment to the U.S. Constitution which would restrain States from taxing nonresidents unreasonably.

This is just about as watery as the Bayonne approach to centralizing all health services along lines suggested by a citizens committee that studied the problem long and seriously. The objection is that Bayonne is a commission-governed city, and such cities may not delegate to a board of health responsibilities that ought to be in the board of commissioners. Uh huh. There are two fast answers. One is that health services could be unified within a department of the existing city government. The other is that the city could go ahead and a create a board of health and leave questions of legality and constitutionality to appellate courts which quite commonly split in an unpredictable way on such matters. Bayonne solves the problem by doing nothing.

Similarly with Senator CASE's proposal. The amendment proposed by Governor Meyner hasn't a chance of adoption, since too many States make a good thing of taxing nonresidents. Even if the amendment did have a chance, it would not be a part of the Constitution until Congress and three-quarters of the States acted, or a long time. But New Jersey could levy taxes on New Yorkers at once, and leave it to New York to prove such taxation discriminatory and unconstitutional. Governor Meyner's way leaves New York having everything its own way while New Jersey residents pay. Senator CASE's way puts the heat on New York while New Jersey collects. The citizens committee's way would give Bayonne centralized health services while questions of law were determined—if they ever were raised. The commission's way leaves us in the unsatisfactory situation deplored by the citizens committee.

We sometimes suspect these matters are not being handled in the best possible way.

Hazards of Stream Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 29, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the Astorian Budget is published in a city of my State of Oregon which is the leading commercial fishing center of the Pacific Northwest. This is the historic community of Astoria at the mouth of the Columbia River. Therefore, the editors of the Budget have a special stake in the elimination of sewage from our rivers, because water pollution is perilous to migratory fish. The Budget for April 25, 1959, published an excellent editorial entitled "Federal Aid for Pollution Control," in support of the efforts of my distinguished senior colleague [Mr. MORSE] and the able Representative from Minnesota, Hon. JOHN BLATNIK, to bring about an expanded program of Federal aid to States and localities with which to build treatment plants to dispose of sewage.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL AID FOR POLLUTION CONTROL

Senator WAYNE MORSE and Representative JOHN BLATNIK, of Minnesota, are calling for an increased program of Federal aid to the States to help cities sewage treatment plants.

This newspaper usually finds more cause to criticize than commend MORSE, and usually also finds itself alined against extensions of Federal aid, but in this case MORSE's proposal seems entitled to serious consideration.

Water pollution is more than a local problem; it is more than an internal problem for a State. Rivers flow from city to city and State to State, carrying pollution along with them.

Construction of sewage treatment plants, at present the responsibility of individual cities, is financially burdensome and the city that must build such a plant derives no benefit therefrom.

This problem may provide a proper field for extension of Federal aid. Certainly it is a growing problem that must be solved somehow.

Extra Long Staple Cotton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1959

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, on April 28, 1959, I appeared before the U.S. Tariff Commission in connection with the investigation now being conducted by that agency in regard to the importation of extra long staple cotton.

Several of the New England States, as well as the southern textile manufacturing States, are vitally interested in this matter. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include my statement before the Tariff Commission in the Appendix of the RECORD:

STATEMENT OF HON. BASIL L. WHITENER BEFORE THE U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION ON APRIL 28, 1959, REGARDING EXTRA LONG STAPLE COTTON QUOTA

Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, my name is BASIL L. WHITENER, Member of Congress from the 11th Congressional District of North Carolina. I am appearing before you to voice my strong opposition to any action that might be taken to reduce our present import quota on extra long staple cotton.

I have the honor and privilege to represent in the Congress a district that contains more operating textile plants than any other district in the United States. Thousands of my constituents earn their living in these mills. In addition, my constituents have millions of dollars invested in textile plants and machinery.

The manufacture of textiles is vital to the economy and well-being of my district and to the State of North Carolina. If the cotton mills in North Carolina were to cease operation today there would be wide-spread suffering and economic distress throughout the State. It would result in economic disaster for our people.

Over 227,000 North Carolinians are employed in textile mills. This represents more than half of all persons enployed in manufacturing in North Carolina.

It is generally recognized by those who are familiar with the day-to-day problems of textile manufacturing that the industry is fighting for survival, not only in North Carolina but in other parts of the South and New England. The industry is suffering from inroads being made by foreign textile imports and an unrealistic international trade policy on the part of the Federal Government.

Aside from tariffs and other foreign trade complications, the industry is confronted with numerous other handicaps which affect business substantially but over which it has little or no control. As an example, I might point out that so long as foreign mills can buy American cotton cheaper than American mills and have their machinery and plants financed, in large part, with American dollars, our domestic textile industry will remain in a depressed condition.

I have pointed these factors out in order that we might have a background against which to view the problem before us this morning.

The Presidential proclamation of July 7, 1958, established an import quota on cotton beginning August 1, 1959. From all that I have been able to learn the quota, as originally set up, was generally approved by all of those in the cotton textile trade.

Operating conditions within the textile industry make it almost mandatory that contracts for cotton purchases be made months, and in some cases even a year, in advance of the date the cotton is to be used. In an industry that uses millions of bales of cotton and whose contracts for the sale of finished products must be made well in advance of the manufacturing date, it is apparent that considerable time must be allowed between the purchase and delivery dates of raw cotton.

The information I have indicates that the textile mills in my district, and I am sure the same situation prevails in other parts of the country where mills are located, acted under the Presidential proclamation of July 7, 1958, and purchased considerable amounts of foreign extra long staple cotton. A large part of this cotton was purchased during October, November, and December of last year and during January of this year.

In anticipation of the delivery of the cotton, mills have entered into contracts for the future sale of textile products. It will be apparent, therefore, to everyone that any quota reduction at the present time will bring about a serious condition for the mills and result in economic hardship for all concerned.

One of the most prominent textile manufacturers in my district informed me recently that he has purchased 1,500 bales of foreign extra long staple cotton against which he already has sold goods. It was his opinion, and I certainly share it, that if the quota already approved by the administration can be repudiated in part it will be,

in effect, a repudiation of people like himself holding contracts.

A number of other textile manufacturers advised me to the same effect. In nearly every instance they already have sold textile products against the foreign cotton bought under present quota conditions. There is a feeling that if the quota is reduced it will mean a loss of confidence in Presidential proclamations on the part of the public in general and the business world in particular.

The textile industry, caught as it is between the squeeze of dwindling profits and soaring manufacturing costs, should be permitted to purchase cotton in foreign markets under reasonable and realistic quotas. At least, the industry should not be subjected to the uncertainty involved in arbitrary quota reductions.

We hear so much in Congress these days from responsible Government sources how vital it is to the economy of the United States that we engage in foreign trade, especially with the underdeveloped and highly sensitive nations of north Africa and South America. I cannot understand how it would be in the best interests of the United States to antagonize Peru, the Sudan, and Egypt by further reducing the importation of cotton from these countries.

These nations desperately need American dollars to bolster their economies. We should be anxious to supply these dollars through the accepted avenues of commerce rather than through some of our more unrealistic programs of foreign aid.

The matter before this Commission has far-reaching implications to the people of North Carolina and the textile industry in general. It is my hope that the Tariff Commission will take into consideration and give very careful study to all the statements that will be presented by officials of the textile industry and the cotton trade.

A number of the people who will present these statements are from my congressional district. They are responsible and successful manufacturers and cottonmen and have many years of experience in the textile industry. They are familiar with the conditions confronting their industry and are dedicated American citizens.

I know the information they will give to this Commission will represent their very best judgment of the matter under consideration, and their recommendations deserve the most careful study, as I believe they are the best qualified people in the country with respect to textile problems.

In conclusion I would like to impress upon the Commission the great importance of the matter before us to the economy of my district and North Carolina. It is my hope that the Commission will make no recommendations to the President calling for a reduction in the present import quota of extra long staple cotton.

Resolution in Support of the Un-American Activities Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 29, 1959

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Whereas the California Democratic Club at its Fresno convention voted to abolish the Un-American Activities Committee; and

Whereas they used the name "The Democratic Party" and falsely attempted to be heard as the mouthpiece of the party, while we, in the harbor area, AFL–CIO, and Teamster's Unions, through the Save our State Committee at the last election, did the work of registering the public, door to door canvassing and getting the vote to defeat proposition 18 and support Pat Brown, while the CDC did next to nothing; and

Whereas labor unions desiring to be free of Communist infiltration and Communist domination have no fear of being exposed by the committee, and the only union member so far mentioned was the ILWU and their attorney, and the chairman of the 68th district, CDC, is a member of that union, and we feel he used the club as a retaliation measure: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Maritime Trades Department, Port Council of Southern California, go on record to seek continuation of the Un-American Activities Committee and render it full support; and be it further

Resolved, We notify the Los Angeles County Federation of Labor, AFL–CIO, of our actions; and be it finally

Resolved, A Copy of this resolution be presented to the House Un-American Activities Committee in Washington, D.C., and also a copy be submitted to Pat Brown, Governor of the State of California.

Respectfully submitted.

THOMAS E. IVEY,
President, Cannery Workers Union of the Pacific, SIU–International, AFL–CIO.

Legal Maze Confuses Employment of Retired Military Personnel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. BALDWIN, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 29, 1959

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, at least 35 dual-employment and dual-compensation statutes are now in effect. It is a practical impossibility to administer them, let alone avoid repeated cases of inadvertent hardship and injustice. Legislation, introduced by my colleague, Representative CRAIG HOSMER, California, after careful research and analysis of the legal maze of conflict-of-interest laws, would remove the 1894 bafrier by updating our dual employment and dual-compensation laws, thus taking them out of the "horse and buggy" days and bringing them in line with our jet age.

I call to your attention the following lead editorial concerning Mr. HOSMER's bill appearing in the April 5, 1959, issue of the Army-Navy-Air Force Journal:

ONEROUS RESTRICTIONS DEMAND CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

The firm defense presented by Secretary of Defense McElroy against attacks upon retired officers employed in industry recalls the entire network of onerous restrictions placed upon this group by the existing maze of numerous and ancient laws.

The restrictions upon retired officers employed by firms doing business with the Government is one phase of these laws which seriously hampers the utilization of skilled and experienced personnel. In addition there are more than 35 laws in the so-called dual employment and dual compensation categories which bar the Government itself from making use of this vast pool of valuable manpower.

Representative CRAIG HOSMER, of California, has sought vigorously in the 84th, 85th, and now again in the 86th Congress, to repeal the dual employment statutes and amend the dual compensation laws. Despite strong support from the public and many Government agencies, Mr. HOSMER's bills have never been acted upon by the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, to which they have been referred by the Speaker. In the last Congress, Representative TOM MURRAY, chairman of this committee, was quoted as saying that this problem has been before his group for the past 10 years, a strong reason, it seems to us, why it should be given prompt consideration.

Fortunately, there are some indications that the Post Office and Civil Service Committee may act. We are told that its staff is reviewing and studying these ancient laws and that their conclusions may be presented to the committee. Certainly, all the work that Congressman HOSMER has done in this field (in 1957 he presented an analysis that consumed 18 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD) would supply ample background.

We urge that the Post Office and Civil Service Committee put Mr. HOSMER's bill, H.R. 522, on its calendar for early hearings and consideration.

Inflation: Can It Be Stopped and, if So, How?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 29, 1959

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include a speech delivered before the Public Forum of Spokane and the Inland Empire on April 19 by Mr. Frank Lilly, research statistician of Spokane. I think this speech is thought provoking. A sound currency, based on intrinsic value, is worthy of real study on the part of all of us.

INFLATION: CAN IT BE STOPPED AND, IF SO, HOW?

Ladies and gentlemen of the Spokane public forum, as a base-line, so to speak, for my remarks today, I quote the opening sentence of Abraham Lincoln's address on his nomination to the U.S. Senate:

"If we could first know where we are, and whither we are tending we could better judge what to do and how to do it."

Where we are: Inflation has reduced the purchasing power of our inconvertible currency paper dollar nearly two-thirds, to 34.3 cents, since the gold standard was put on the shelf in 1933. We, the United States, the States and the people, have been and are overspending with the result that our debt is now more than twice the combined total of the rest of the world.

Whither we are tending: Indications are that overspending on national, State, and personal levels will continue because inflation through debt-spending is a narcotic that soothes and exhilarates the average man and woman. Incidentally, a few self-styled economists have contended that a little inflation is a good thing and others who hold that a little socialism is good

despite the fact that socialism is the first step toward communism.

What to do: The The First National City Bank of New York in its current letter concludes its article on "How To Beat Inflation" with this sentence: "The only way to beat inflation is to prevent it and have money people can trust." In other words, the "What to do" is to provide a dollar of 100 cents intrinsic value that people can trust.

How to do it: President Ulysses S. Grant stopped inflation by combining vetoes of proposed overspending bills and the legislation that established gold specie resumption.

"When inflation, at the height of its popularity and frenzy, had swept both Houses of Congress, it was the veto of Grant, which, single and alone overthrew expansion and cleared the way for specie resumption. To him, immeasurably more than to any other man, is due the fact that every paper dollar is at last as good as gold." (Roscoe Conkling.)

Both Democrats and Republicans are committed to provide a full value dollar. President Roosevelt promised such a dollar of unchanging value and the Republicans in their 1952 platform adopted a monetary plank authored by the present Secretary of State, Christian A. Herter, that pledged to provide a dollar fully convertible on a gold basis.

It is to say the least significant that within 10 years after the restoration of gold convertibility in 1879 the national debt was cut in half. And in this connection it is noteworthy that deficits resulting from the War of 1812 and World War I and the panics of 1840 to 1843, 1893 and 1907, during which gold convertibility was maintained, were followed by periods of debt reduction and surpluses that quickly restored fiscal order. In contrast consider what has happened since gold convertibility of the paper currency dollar was shelved in 1933: inflation, debt, taxes, waste, and crime.

It was not by accident that our Founding Fathers, who authored the Constitution, specified that this country's money should have full intrinsic value in giving Congress the power "to coin money". They realized then as we should now that no financial theory and no law can create money with intrinsic value, for it must be dug from the treasure vaults of the earth.

When the money of the Constitution is restored in this country, and not until that time, can inflation and its related evils be overcome. Incidentally, a U.S. paper currency dollar in the hands of a foreigner is fully convertible into U.S. gold, which gives the foreigner's U.S. dollar a purchasing power, in his own and other foreign markets, of 3 to 5 times and upward as much as a similar, but inconvertible dollar, has in this country.

It has been generally overlooked that former Secretary of State Dulles forecast for 1959:

"That as part of the Soviet trade drive, the U.S. expects the U.S.S.R. to announce shortly that the ruble will be backed with gold, moving it into the hard-currency channels of international trade."

In the economic war that the U.S.S.R. has openly declared it will "bury the U.S. economy" the value given to gold in international trade will be the decisive weapon in such a trade war for it goes without saying that the nation that will give the most raw materials and/or manufactured goods per ounce of gold will have the big advantage in trade.

The unexpected leadership that the U.S.S.R. got in space with its sputnik is of little or no real importance but the advantage of the U.S.S.R. would get by giving gold a higher value in world trade than the U.S. pegged price of $35 an ounce could be disastrous to the free-enterprise way of American life. The nation that leads, and that should be the United States, does not wait for some other nation, either friend or foe, to act.

The responsibility for inflation must be shared by the American people who for the most part have been lured into the debt habit and away from the thrift, frugality and efficiency that stifle inflation. The people have also been too complacement about the Government's failure to provide a dollar of 100 cents intrinsic value, which is the only thing along with the elimination of debt-spending that can stop inflation and restore national and personal solvency. And in this connection may I emphasize that time is of the essence.

Will Science Ever Replace God?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 29, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of Saturday, April 25, 1959, written by Mr. Thomas E. Murray, former member of the Atomic Energy Commission and presently a consultant to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy of the U.S. Congress:

WILL SCIENCE EVER REPLACE GOD?

(By Thomas E. Murray)

As a former member of the Atomic Energy Commission, I have had the time to ponder about God and the atom, and how society and our individual lives ought to be ordered in this atomic age.

Science has made magnificent contributions to our way of living. The list of its achievements is endless; and its progress has just begun.

Yet life and culture are larger than this expanding universe of science. This is no reflection on science. It is another way of saying: science is for man, not man for science.

Science can give man mastery over matter. It can fail to give man control over himself. Science has its distinctive method: it involves experiment—with tools, machines, and chemicals. But you cannot, without a kind of sacrilege, experiment with souls, lives, and honor.

However useful science is to investigate the privacy of tiny chambers called atoms, it is all but useless to investigate the inner and higher life of men. You cannot examine free will in a test tube. Yet, much of what man does for good or evil springs from this inner life of free choice. Nuclear energy can explode with uncontrollable force. But the occasion for its explosion is controlled by men—either by evil men or by good men.

Science cannot save men from themselves, any more than society can. Rather, it is individual men who must save science, society, and themselves. If men will not live by virtue, they may have to die by power.

All things are made by God, and so man's attention must never be focused on science so as to neglect religion and philosophy which bring us to God. Only religion and philosophy can direct our lives according to right reason and charity.

EDITOR'S NOTE.—Mr. Murray is consultant to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

To the Hills, REA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 29, 1959

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, we, who live in cities, are wont to forget the fact that many people lack the facilities which city folk enjoy. Mountains are normally resorts where we repair in the summertime. However, hundreds of thousands of people live in the hills, in the mountains, and on the farms throughout the year. Electricity in some of these places is lacking and the concomitant services are practically unknown.

The rural electrification program which was commenced in 1935 has furnished electrification and a better way of life to the people on the farms and in the mountains throughout the United States. A similar program bringing electricity and electrical facilities to the hill folks in Puerto Rico and on the farms is making tremendous strides.

Recently, my colleague, H. CARL ANDERSEN and I, as Members of the Agricultural Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, interested in rural electrification, visited Puerto Rico and saw the tremendous improvement taking place in that beautiful island. While in Puerto Rico, we attended a seminar on rural electrification, where Mr. S. L. Descartes, the executive director of the Puerto Rico Water Resources Authority, which is carrying on a rural electrification program, delivered a talk on this interesting subject.

An economist, Mr. Descartes served as head of the division of agricultural economics of the University of Puerto Rico from 1934 until 1942 when he was appointed chief of the Planning Division of the Land Authority of Puerto Rico. He was head of the Office of Statistics, Office of the Governor of Puerto Rico, from 1942 until 1944; served in the U.S. Army in 1944–45, and then served on the Puerto Rico Planning Board until 1948. He served as Secretary of the Treasury of Puerto Rico from 1949 until 1955 when he assumed his present job. Mr. Descartes received his bachelor's degree from the University of Puerto Rico and his master's degree from Cornell University, where he conducted additional graduate study.

His remarks follow:

It is indeed gratifying to be here to exchange views with those responsible for the development and continued expansion of rural electrification in the United States, Latin America, and Puerto Rico.

The Government of the United States, many years ago, recognized the necessity for an intensified development of rural electrification. During the course of this seminar we will have the privilege to hear the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, the chairman of the National Rural Electrification Cooperatives Association, and other officials who administer or promote rural electrification in the United States. They will explain the law which

created the Rural Electrification Administration, how the Government contributes to this development, the administration of rural electrification and the growth of electric service in the rural areas throughout the United States.

The U.S. Government was one of the first to realize the necessity to provide help for the extension of electric service to the farms and to rural families throughout the Nation as an essential factor to the continued growth of the economy. The results of this foresight are self-evident—with electricity available to over 90 percent of all farms—and the people of the United States have been rewarded manifold.

Puerto Rico also recognized very early the need for electric service in the rural areas. As a matter of fact, the first venture of the Government of this island in the field of electric power generation, distribution and sale, was practically one of rural electrification. One of my predecessors in the office of executive director of the Puerto Rico Water Resources Authority—Mr. Antonio Lucchetti, its first executive director—so classed it in a paper read by him at the Third World Power Conference held in Washington, DC., in 1936.

In 1915 the insular government first appeared on the scene as a producer of electricity. A small hydroelectric plant was built to take advantage of the pressure of the water falling from an irrigation dam built high in the mountains on the southeastern part of the island.

"The earnings derived from the business," Mr. Lucchetti stated in his paper, "made possible a gradual extension of the lines into the poor sections of the rural area," and further on he stated: "A characteristic aspect of the electrification work developed during the last 20 years—this was in 1936—by the insular government is that it has catered principally to rural service and differing from the line of development generally followed by other public service systems which usually grow from densely populated urban centers as a nucleus of business out to the rural areas as a side activity, the Puerto Rican Government's work has accomplished the task of giving birth to and developing an electrical business entirely within a rural environment and to supply rural needs." And he added, "It has been a system entirely given to rural electrification purposes."

Continued emphasis was placed on rural electrification by the Authority since its creation in 1941 and a special 5-year plan was developed in 1947 which at its termination in 1952 had provided electric service for some 18,000 families in rural areas.

In the year 1952, a method was devised which permitted an acceleration of rural electrification and its continuous expansion until final electrification of the whole island is achieved. The program includes financing by the Federal Government for rural electrification expansion through the Rural Electrification Administration and legislative action by the Commonwealth government to guarantee the minimum consumption of electricity needed to economically justify the investment when electric power is sold in the rural areas at the same rates as in the cities.

We believe that this program, well tested and proven, may be of interest to areas trying to promote rural electrification. We wanted to bring down our friends and associates in this venture from the United States so as to make them better acquainted with the program and also to benefit from their observations.

To understand the importance of rural electrification in Puerto Rico it is necessary to review briefly some facts about the island, its population, and its economy.

Puerto Rico is an island in the Caribbean, 35 miles wide and 100 miles long, about 1,000 air miles southeast of Miami and approximately 1,600 air miles from New York City.

The relations between the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the Federal Government are defined by an act of Congress known as the Puerto Rico Federal Relations Act; Public Law 600. The Commonwealth has virtually the same control over its internal affairs as each of the 49 States has over its own. The currency, postal and military services of Puerto Rico are those of the United States.

The island is densely populated with about 2,300,000 inhabitants equivalent to a population density of about 657 persons per square mile. Since the year 1911 to the last census in 1950, its population had been increasing at the rate of approximately 18 percent every 10 years; 40 percent live in the urban zones comprised by 76 cities, towns and small villages, and 60 percent in the rural zones. Since 1950 the population has remained relatively stable or grown at a very low rate due not only to a movement of the population to the mainland, but also basically aided by a reduction in the birth rate from a long range average of 40/1,000 to about 31/1,000.

The island is today at a mixed agricultural-industrial stage. Last year, for the first time, industrial income equaled half the total income of Puerto Rico.

Electric power is produced, distributed and sold throughout the island by the Puerto Rico Water Resources Authority, a public corporation created by law in the year 1941 of which I am its executive director.

As I have already stated, the Government started operations in the electric utility field in the year 1915, when the south coast irrigation system constructed the Carite hydroelectric plant to supply electric power for pumping irrigation waters because no electric service was available from the then existing privately owned electric systems. The excess power from the Carite hydroelectric plant was sold in the rural areas surrounding the irrigation system and soon the power lines extended rapidly along the south coast.

The clamor from the public for low-priced electric service made the Commonwealth government recognize the necessity of creating an agency for the purpose of producing, distributing and selling electric power to those areas not served by the existing utilities. The Utilization of the Water Resources was created in 1925, to develop the water resources available for the production of electric power and to supply electric service to areas where none was available.

In the year 1941, preceded by a historical background of continuous growth and of service at low cost, the Puerto Rico Water Resources Authority was created to own and operate the electric properties of its predecessor agency and to distribute electric power to the entire Island of Puerto Ricq.

The authority now owns and operates 19 hydroelectric stations and 4 steam-electric stations with a total dependable capacity of about 410,000 kilowatts. The generating units are solidly integrated through a 38 kilovolt and 115 kilovolt transmission network of over 1,100 miles of transmission lines which extend throughout the island from which about 225 distribution substations are energized.

The authority now serves about 1,400 million kilowatthours yearly to over 378,000 customers, a consumption which has grown during the last 3 years at an average yearly rate of 18 percent.

Of 328,000 residential customers, 145,000, equivalent to 44.1 percent, are served in the rural zones.

It is the heavy concentration of population in the rural zones and the essentially agricultural economy which makes expansion of electric service throughout the rural areas essential to the welfare of the Commonwealth. The policy of the authority has been to develop rural electrification as fast as financial resources have permitted.

During its initial stages, the authority selected carefully for electrification rural areas with a heavy concentration of population requiring short-line extensions, so as to justify economically the investment made for the extension of rural lines. Construction of such lines was undertaken with this utility's own construction funds. To date the authority has served about 90,000 rural customers financed from the authority's own construction funds. Although substantial progress in rural electrification was achieved, it was foreseen that this method of expansion had its limitations since it had to select rural areas near existing electric lines with sufficient homes to justify the investment in the expansion of the rural lines.

During the depression, part of the funds allocated by the Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration were utilized in the construction of 4 kilovolt trunk feeders along the rural areas from which many additional rural consumers were served and which brought distribution lines much closer to other rural families, thus facilitating additioal expansion in the future with short-line extensions. In other cases an economic study was made to determine the minimum electric consumption required to justify the investment in rural line extensions and electricity was immediately served to those consumers who could afford to pay the established minimum during a period of 5 years.

During fiscal years 1946–47, the Commonwealth legislature, in its continuous effort to accelerate rural electrification, assigned $400,000 yearly for the construction of rural lines in rural sections, where the revenue derived from the sale of electric power did not economically justify the investment, and with these funds matched with $100,000 yearly of the authority's own funds 18,300 customers were served up to 1952–53.

It was not, however, until 1952 that a plan was finally outlined to carry on a rural electrification program designed for continuous expansion until the whole island is covered. In summary, the program is as follows:

(a) The authority will continue to extend its service to rural customers for whom the investment made in line extensions is economically justified; to those who can afford to guarantee a minimum monthly consumption to justify the investment and to those who contribute the proportional part necessary toward construction to make the project economically justified.

(b) Those low income families in the rural areas who are by nature low consumption customers and who cannot afford to pay a guaranteed minimum bill are served by the special rural electrification program. Financing for this group has been obtained since 1952 from the Rural Electrification Administration. For this group, in addition, in order to completely justify the investment, the Commonwealth government guarantees to the authority annual payments equivalent in amount to the difference between the revenue derived from the sale of electric power to these customers and the cost of constructing the lines to serve them.

An accumulation of rural projects to serve at least 30,000 low income rural families a year is always available which makes possible to have a well planned program ahead of time.

The list of projects available is submitted to the Puerto Rico Planning Board who carefully select those to be constructed during each fiscal year.

Since the year 1952 three loans have been obtained from the Rural Electrification Administration for distribution line extensions, in the amount of $22,400,000. The first loan in the amount of $6,376,000 provided funds for the development of the program from 1952–53 to 1954–55, with which about 24,000 rural customers were served. A second loan in the amount of $6,624,000 was made in 1955 to continue the program up to 1957–58. It contemplates serving about 29,000 additional customers. Last year a $9,400,000 loan commitment was obtained to continue the program up to 1961–62.

To June 30, 1958, rural lines had been extended, capable of serving 47,000 rural customers, of which 43,328 were connected.

In the year 1957–58 the Rural Electrification Administration granted a loan to the authority in the amount of $10,900,000 to provide the generation, transmission and distribution substation facilities needed to serve REA beneficiaries. This week we will celebrate the starting up of commercial operations by the 40,000 kilowatt steam-electric unit financed by REA for the 53,000 rural customers served through the first 2 REA loans.

To date, through the special rural electrification program, we have constructed 2,517.4 miles of primary and secondary lines which serve 48,500 rural customers. The existing loan commitments are expected to provide sufficient funds to serve 93,000 rural customers up to 1961–62, essentially low income rural families which could not have otherwise been served.

A survey made last year revealed that there were about 120,000 families in the rural areas without electric service, of which about 100,000 may be served. At the rate of about 16,000 rural customers a year, the authority may essentially complete the rural electrification program in the year 1964.

This has been and is the challenge and the way we are meeting it; the people of Puerto Rico and the authority must recognize that what has been achieved would have not been possible without the effective help of the Rural Electrification Administration of the United States.

The Late Honorable James G. Polk

SPEECH
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 28, 1959

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I join with my colleagues in this testimonial to the fine character of our late friend JAMES G. POLK who has been taken from us after a life that was lived to the fullest in the public service.

It was my privilege to serve with JIM POLK in the Committee on Agriculture and while he was undoubtedly among the best qualified to speak on agricultural subjects by reason of his farming experience he rarely raised his voice to criticize the proposals of his less-informed associates. In the 12 years of our association together I came to appreciate his even temperament and sunny disposition, and the highest accolade I can bestow upon him is to state that I never saw him angry nor do I recall ever meeting him when he did not greet me with a smile.

In my opinion we are too prone to judge a man by his eloquence or his involvement with public matters. The real test, as I see it, is how we handle ourselves in our relationships with those we meet along life's way, and whether we accept the divine suggestion that we are our brother's keeper. A great public servant, a stanch party man, our late lamented colleague was also a Christian gentleman and our faith tells us that he rests from his labors in scenes serene beyond the river. To this bereaved family go our heart-felt condolences and our prayerful solicitation that the Master will have them in His care and keeping.

American Versus Soviet Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 29, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the President of the United States recently addressed the U.S. Chamber of Commerce in support of the foreign-aid program. While I do not agree with President Eisenhower on all issues, I think he is correct in emphasizing that foreign aid is often actually a defense of the United States and our own free way of life. The Astorian Budget, of Astoria, Oreg., on April 25, 1959, published a most effective editorial emphasizing that foreign aid by the United States should be continued because, among other reasons, the Soviet Union has embarked upon its own foreign-aid program in some of the backward and underdeveloped nations.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial, entitled "United States Versus Russian Foreign Aid," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES VERSUS RUSSIAN FOREIGN AID

Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER has sent along some figures gleaned for the New York Times, which compare United States and Russian foreign aid to various nations.

We are spending more in many countries—$431 to $13 million in Turkey, $954 to $304 million in India, $14 to $13 million in Nepal, $58 to $34 million in Burma. But Russia is ahead of us in several others—$195 million to nothing in Syria, $116 to $62 million in Afghanistan, $58 to $32 million in Ceylon, $184 to $134 million in Indonesia, $137 to $10 million in Iraq.

NEUBERGER points out that this list "should refute for all time the notion that Russia is not committing its financial resources in order to raise living standards and arouse gratitude to the Soviet Union in many of the backward nations of the earth."

Apparently many people are unaware that Russia has a foreign-aid program at all, although we all ought to remember the Aswan Dam in Egypt where Communist aid was accepted after we had come to deadlock with the Nasser government over extension of aid.

Testimony of Hon. Chester Bowles, Member of Congress, Before Subcommittee on Public Works of the House Appropriations Committee, April 28, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER BOWLES
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 29, 1959

Mr. BOWLES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my testimony given yesterday before the Subcommittee on Public Works of the House Appropriations Committee concerning several projects of vital significance to my district. My testimony follows:

TESTIMONY OF HON. CHESTER BOWLES, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS OF THE HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE, APRIL 28, 1959

First of all, I would like to thank the committee for this opportunity to appear in connection with several navigation and flood-control projects of special importance to eastern Connecticut.

There are three navigation study projects which have been authorized by Congress and are now awaiting appropriations in order for surveys to begin. I would like to call these to the committee's attention at this time.

1. The first navigation study, at an estimated cost of $10,000, involves the Poquonnock River at Groton. The problem here is one of shoaling. Over a period of years the mouth of the river has filled in to such an extent that it is difficult to enter the river even with a small boat. As a result, the recreational development of the shoreline in the area has been curtailed, and commercial use of the river has been prevented. The opening of the river mouth, in addition to providing a new area of recreational navigation, would also supplement the attraction of a projected State park to be located in this area.

2. The second navigation study, at an estimated cost of $9,500, involves the Thames River between Norwich and New London. This study would determine the feasibility of providing greater depths in the harbor for commercial navigation. In 1957 commercial river traffic amounted to nearly 1,000,000 tons, 96% of which was in coal, petroleum and allied products. If greater depth were provided in the harbor and channel, larger and more efficient fuel transport could be utilized.

3. The third navigation study, at an estimated cost of $7,500, involves the Connecticut River mouth at Essex. The problem here is again one of shoaling. Since the original establishment of the ship channel in the Connecticut River in the early 1930's, constant shoaling of the western shore near my home town of Essex has taken place. The problem now is of immediate concern to the people of Essex, since action on requests to the State for construction of new docks and wharves is being held up pending agreement on a specific plan to correct the deteriorating navigational conditions. In time, the shoaling condition at Essex will affect all river commerce on the Connecticut River. The study of the situation at Essex, if approved and funded, will permit the Corps of Engineers to indicate the basic needs of future navigation in this area.

Mr. Chairman, I urge this committee to include funds for these three study projects as an investment in the commercial and rec-

reational navigation in Eastern Connecticut. According to the Corps of Engineers estimates, the total cost of the three projects is a modest $27,000. These studies are worth it, many times over, in terms of their probable impact on the continued economic growth of this area.

Let us move on, Mr. Chairman, to my second subject—flood control. No one who witnessed the terrible devastation in Connecticut wrought by the tragic floods of August and October 1955, will deny that our Connecticut citizens are entitled to swift completion of the necessary safeguards against any possible repetition of these disasters. Quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, I had hoped that action would have been taken in sufficient time by the Corps of Engineers so that the matter of actual appropriations for flood control dams at Baltic and at West Thompson would be squarely before this committee at this time. Unfortunately, this is not the case. I would like to go on record once more, this time before this committee, on the urgent necessity for these two critically needed flood-control projects. Understandably, I think, the people whose homes and businesses were swept away in 1955 cannot understand the long delay in providing adequate protection against a recurrence of this catastrophe. They feel, and I agree, that 3½ years is long enough to wait.

My distinguished colleague from Massachusetts, Mr. PHILBIN, who spoke to you yesterday on the need for the Westville Dam, has my wholehearted support for that project, as well. Here is another example of discouraging delays in a badly needed project.

The Westville Dam, a key link in an integrated system of flood control for the Quinebaug and French River Valleys in Connecticut and Massachusetts, was originally planned in 1945—14 years ago. Now funds for its construction are denied by the administration on the basis that it is new construction.

Mr. Chairman, to deny funds for the construction of flood control dams at Baltic, West Thompson and Westville is to deny the citizens of eastern Connecticut and Massachusetts adequate flood protection from the only source capable of providing it—the Federal Government. The economy of our region has never fully recovered from the disastrous floods of 1955, with the $581 million in property damage. The loss of 107 lives is irreplaceable. Another such calamity would be catastrophic. I urge the committee to pursue, with every appropriate means at its disposal, the reasons for the redtape, the delays and the administrative technicalities holding up an integrated flood control system for this area. The people of eastern Connecticut and their neighbors clearly need and deserve prompt, constructive action on these projects.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, the last matter I would like to call to the committee's attention is one of hurricane protection.

On April 2, 1959, the Corps of Engineers published an interim report of a hurricane survey of the Pawcatuck River area. This report, now being studied by the appropriate State agencies and the Department of the Interior prior to submission to the Congress, recommends improvements for the prevention of hurricane damages in the Pawcatuck area.

Since 1770, 53 hurricanes have struck this area, 30 of them causing tidal flooding. Studies of the Corps of Engineers indicate that if a repetition of the maximum hurricane tide of 1938 were to occur under present conditions, the resulting damage to the area would amount to $2.6 million. While this project is not now before this committee, there is hope that the final report will be transmitted to the Congress before the end of the session.

The estimated cost to the Government of this project is $409,000. I would like the committee to know of my firm belief in the necessity for this project. I have asked the appropriate State and Federal agencies for speedy action in transmitting this project to the Congress for action, and I would appreciate an opportunity to appear in support of the project when hearings are held on the appropriation for it.

Harry Bridges Hits U.S. Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 29, 1959

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the April 22, 1959, issue of the Spokesman-Review, Spokane, Wash.:

HARRY BRIDGES HITS U.S. POLICY

During its check into the need for new legislation governing the issuance of U.S. passports to suspected subversives, the House Committee on Un-American Activities heard the testimony of Harry Bridges yesterday.

Bridges is head of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, which was expelled by the Congress of Industrial Organizations several years ago on charges of being communist dominated. He returned recently from Europe and was the star performer early this month at the union's convention in Seattle.

Bolstered by the support he received there, Bridges attacked U.S. policy on Red China, and incidentally gave the house committee several reasons why the committee should press for passport law revision.

Among his present aims, Bridges hopes to prevent further American aid going to the Chinese nationalist government on Formosa. He said that our present help there is outrageous.

In this respect it is interesting to note an official policy statement under which our Government is operating its mutual security program during the current fiscal year. This declaration, issued on authority of the Department of State, the Department of Defense, and the International Cooperation Administration, states:

"The continued existence of an independent government of the Republic of China is important to the United States and the free world because that government provides a source of hope to the people of the communist-controlled mainland and a challenge to Communist influence among the 12 million overseas Chinese in southeast Asia.

"The conquest of Formosa by an unfriendly power would * * * adversely affect the security of the United States. Significant military and economic achievements have been made possible in Formosa with U.S. assistance."

Bridges favors aid to Red China rather than Nationalist China. Bridges favors the issuance of American passports to men like himself, so that they can go around the world criticizing the United States and giving aid and comfort to various communistic causes.

The House Committee on Un-American Activities has performed another public service in having Bridges testify and in letting the American people know one continuing source of the undermining still taking place in this country.

Joe Snyder's Tribute to His Father

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. R. HULL, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 29, 1959

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest weekly newspapers it has been my pleasure to read is the Gallatin Democrat, published in Daviess County, Mo., by Joseph R. Snyder. Joe Snyder recently published a unique and touching tribute to his father and under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include this interesting editorial:

Last week was quit an event for my dad, Ralph J. Snyder, of Kansas City. He didn't want to—but plagued by eye trouble and a heart condition, he joined the growing ranks of those whose are retiring on social security.

Dad had been eligible for social security for well over a year and had talked about it quite a lot. Had he been qualified for the maximum payment I rather imagine he would have retired long ago, but his monthly check will not be large and, since mother is younger than he, she will not get an allowance for several years.

That last day at work must be pretty terrifying. We haven't seen Dad since last Tuesday—the last day—but I feel certain that it wasn't too happy an occasion. A few days before, the employees and management of the Burton-Dixie Corp., where he worked, presented him with a fine watch as a gesture of appreciation for his past service. What tickled him even more was the greeting card that accompanied the watch. It had been signed by all his bosses and fellow employees and this meant so much to him. He will treasure it.

Of course I'm prejudiced but I want to say here for the record that they just don't make many workers like my dad any more. As early as I can remember, he was getting up early in the morning to go to work and at the end of the day he would come home all tired out. He was one of those old-fashioned citizens who believed that if the company was paying him for 8 hours—they deserved 8 hours of work—and he worked every minute of every hour.

When I was a little boy Mom and I would often go downtown to meet Dad at work on Saturday when he got off at noon. We would get there a little early and I would get to go up on Dad's floor. He made circus tents and other canvas products in those days and I was quite impressed. After all, I told the kids in the neighborhood, if my dad didn't make the big top, how in the world could you have a circus?

As it turned out, my early philosophy was correct. After they tried to modernize the circus and take the big top away, what they tried to pass off as a circus just didn't click. That's progress for you.

At the plant where Dad worked there was a big circular chute that was used to deliver the tents, traps, and awnings to the shipping dock. As long as I remained small enough for him to lift easy, he would set me in this chute and let me slide down and around a few feet. That was a big thing for me in those days.

Dad had a working career of almost half a century. I hate to think now of the aches and pains, the bruised and mashed fingers—or of the times when he'd run one of the big canvas sewing needles through his hand. I remember, too, the bouts he had with blood poisoning as a result of infection picked up at work. There wasn't any hospitalization

plan to help out then—or any fringe benefits.

The depression hit us hard. Mom and dad lost their new home they had built just 2 or 3 years before. This was a blow from which my folks never fully recovered. I was going to school with peanut butter sandwiches every day. It all seems incredible now. How mom and dad got me through school on so little I'll never know. I hope.

Dad had chances for advancement in his work from time to time. He was well liked but he never felt the urge to push himself forward. He was usually pushing some other guy along. He was content to do the best job he could for his company and to take the best care he could of mom and me. And I guess that's pretty much the story of an average American citizen who works hard, pays their taxes, raises their family and now—thanks to Franklin Roosevelt—can retire on social security before they drop dead. It isn't going to be enough to live on in dad's case—but we'll all manage somehow.

Dad and I haven't been able to do many things together for a long time. I left home when the war came in 1941 and never went back, having set up a home of my own in the meantime. I hope now that he doesn't have to punch a timeclock every day that maybe we can get together more often.

We hope to take a vacation together this summer—the first such trip in many, many years. I have been planning for a long time to take mom and dad on a trip to Colorado. They have never seen the Rockies but they will do so in June as my special guests. I do not intend that they will have to lift a finger or spend one penny on that trip—just devote all their energy soaking up the wonderful mountain scenery and having a good time.

I can't begin, of course, to pay them for all they've done for me, but I can sure make a downpayment on it.

Deferred Maintenance and Repair in Veterans' Administration Hospitals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERWIN MITCHELL
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 29, 1959

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I would like to insert in the RECORD the following report made by the Subcommittee on Hospitals to the full committee. The report cites the need for additional funds for the protection of the Government's investment of some $2.8 billion in Veterans' Administration hospital facilities and also for the comfort and welfare of our hospitalized veterans:

REPORT OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOSPITALS, COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Re deferred maintenance and repair in Veterans' Administration hospitals.

Report by the Honorable JAMES A. HALEY, acting chairman of the Subcommittee on Hospitals, on hearing held April 21, 1959.

The hearing was devoted exclusively to the consideration of deferred maintenance in Veterans' Administration hospitals. In the absence of the Honorable ELIZABETH KEE, chairman of the Subcommittee on Hospitals, Mr. HALEY presided as chairman. Witnesses for the Veterans' Administration were Dr. H. B. Cupp, Deputy Director for Operations; Mr. J. B. Baker, Controller, Department of Medicine and Surgery; Mr. Glen R. Stevens, Director of Engineering.

The Veterans' Administration witnesses testified that the budget for fiscal year 1960 includes $38 million for current and deferred maintenance and repair, $3 million of this is to be earmarked for deferred maintenance items accumulating from previous years, and the remaining $35 million is for current maintenance and repair of the stations during fiscal year 1960.

Summary of deferred maintenance and repair in VA hospitals

VA consolidated list of deferred maintenance and repair compiled for fiscal year 1959 budget	$15,000,000
List reduced by VA Central Office by reclassification and elimination of items to	11,500,000
Included in fiscal year 1959 budget for deferred maintenance and repair items	3,100,000
Carryover of deferred maintenance items to fiscal year 1960	8,400,000
Included in fiscal year 1960 budget for deferred maintenance and repair items	3,100,000
Deferred maintenance and repair items to be carried over to fiscal year 1961 from fiscal year 1959	5,300,000
Deferred maintenance and repair items accumulated each year over and above appropriations for current and deferred maintenance and repair	$3–4 million
Predicted deferred maintenance and repair items at end of fiscal year 1960, if appropriation for fiscal year 1960 for deferred maintenance and repair fund is not increased	$8–9 million

It was the conclusion of the Subcommittee that the Veterans' Administration budget does not contain sufficient funds to take care of the $8 million of deferred maintenance obligation which will exist on July 1, 1959. Continuing delay in making the necessary repairs to the deferred items will result in increased costs. Unless the 1960 budget is substantially increased for deferred maintenance items, the investment of the taxpayers of $2.8 billion in Veterans' Administration hospital facilities will be further depreciated.

The subcommittee voted to make this report to the full committee with the recommendation that the chairman of the full committee present this matter to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices of the House Appropriations Committee, recommending that an additional sum be included in the Veterans Administration appropriation for fiscal year 1960 to clean up the backlog of deferred maintenance. In the event this recommendation is not favorably received by the Independent Offices Appropriations Subcommittee, it is recommended that the chairman offer an amendment to the appropriation bill on the floor to increase the Veterans' Administration appropriation for deferred maintenance and repair items.

The Late Honorable James G. Polk

SPEECH
OF
HON. WALTER H. MOELLER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 28, 1959

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, I, too, join my colleagues from Ohio in paying a few words of tribute to a man whom I have learned to know but a brief time, but a man whom I have learned to know to be a very great man. As a freshman Congressman, I called at his office shortly after my arrival here to have a brief chat with him. The kindly counsel and advice that he gave was the kind that a freshman will want to carry with him and which he so sorely needs. Not only the advice that he had given me caused me to have such great admiration for JIM POLK, but likewise the comments that one would hear from people within his district, which is a neighboring district to mine. People of both Democratic and Republican persuasion would speak words of highest praise of JIM POLK, and primarily because they felt in him they had a man whom they could fully trust. What a wonderful thing it is to hear such fine tributes being paid here on the floor by Members speaking about this man in the vein they do. He was an honorable man, a dedicated man, and I am sure his widow and his survivors will well understand our admiration for him, and to them go our most profound sympathies.

American Bar Association Proposal To Improve Agency Proceedings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OREN HARRIS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 29, 1959

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill based upon recommendations of the American Bar Association which have for their purpose to establish standards of conduct for agency hearings proceedings of record. This proposal was submited to me by the Honorable Donald C. Beelar, chairman of the special committee on Federal Administrative Practice Act of the American Bar Association.

Earlier during this session I introduced a bill, H.R. 4800, which was prepared to carry out the recommendations contained in the final report of the Legislative Oversight Subcommitee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce submitted to the Congress on January 3, 1959. The proposal recommended by the American Bar Association deals with some but not all of the problems with which H.R. 4800 is intended to deal, and the recommendations of the American Bar Association differ in some respect from the recommendations made by the Legislative Oversight Subcommittee as incorporated in H.R. 4800.

I have introduced the proposal of the American Bar Association in order to afford members of Congress and the American public generally, an opportunity to study the proposals of the American Bar Association and to compare them with the proposals contained in H.R. 4800.

It is my hope that by introducing this bill witnesses interested in this subject

will take occasion to study and compare the two bills so that when hearings are held by this committee on both bills they wil be in a better position to testify with regard to the recommendations contained in these bills.

One Hundred and Thirty-seventh Anniversary of the Birth of Gen. Ulysses S. Grant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 29, 1959

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the 27th, at 12 it was my pleasure and honor to attend the memorial observance commemorating the 137th anniversary of the birth of Gen. Ulysses S. Grant at the Grant Memorial, First Street and the Mall, Washington, D.C.

This program was sponsored by the Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic, the Lincoln Group of the District of Columbia, and friends. It was our honor to have on the platform the grandson of Gen. U. S. Grant, Maj. Gen. U. S. Grant III, and Madam Julia Cantacuzene, the granddaughter of Gen. U. S. Grant; and in addition, the granddaughter of Madame Julia Cantacuzene who is a visitor from England and a guest in the homes of Madam Cantacuzene and Gen. U. S. Grant III. Also present were Mrs. Eloise Whitmer, president, the Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic, and Mrs. Anna Hausman, national registrar of the Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic, and chairman of the program.

In addition there were leaders and representatives of several patriotic and veterans' groups present. The committee arranged to have the U.S. Army Band, under the direction of Major Curry, present and they presented an excellent program of appropriate music.

The master of ceremonies of the occasion was Col. Randle Bond Truett, Chief, National Memorials and Historic Sites, National Capital Park Service. He presented the Dr. C. Percy Powell, Research Director, the Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission, who gave a very appropriate invocation. The pledge of allegiance was led by Mrs. Martha Purchase, Dept. Pat. Inst., Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic.

Maj. Gen. U. S. Grant III spoke briefly and made some very suitable observations about the occasion. Then, speaking as president of the Lincoln group, he extended greetings and best wishes of that organization. A very appropriate and erudite address was given by Comdr. John E. Allen, Assistant Director of the Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission. His subject was "The Determination and Will Power of Ulysses Simpson Grant."

Among things he stated so well he pointed out that Ulysses Simpson Grant's great opportunity came after the outbreak of the Civil War. On June 17, 1861, the War Department in Washington appointed him colonel of the 21st Illinois. His advancement to higher rank was natural in view of his military ability. His efforts, which were marked by dogged determination and strong willpower, had become evident and recognized by the summer of 1863 when Vicksburg was captured. His utilization of techniques of joint operations was successfully demonstrated. Naval forces, when required, were integrated with the usual assault forces, and certain of General Grant's plans of overall operations have become recognized as classic examples of joint planning. His will to win, by concentrating on dividing and destroying opposing forces, became a hallmark of his genius. He may be said, also, to have been a pioneer in the successful development of overall strategy in extensive military campaigns.

General Grant was accused of being taciturn or not given to extended conversations. It is noted, however, that President Lincoln had insisted that he was looking for winning generals; that in his view too much talk and too little action had occurred in certain instances. Of General Grant, Lincoln said, "I can't spare him, he fights." Throughout a series of victories which were to occur in the eastern theater, Grant's plan and strategy—in which he was supported by President Lincoln—was often to attack, when others might not have done so. Fortunate it is that he was doggedly determined to obtain victory in the cause of preservation of the American Union.

It is worthy of emphasis that General Grant as 18th President of the United States was twice chosen to lead the Nation in the highest office in the land. It was said of him during his Presidency that he unreasonably favored his friends. The facts do show that he was intensely loyal to his friends, to those who had worked with him and supported him over the years. In July 1849 Abraham Lincoln wrote that—

> The better part of one's life consists of his friendships.

Are we to deny that General Grant was faithful to his friends? I would not deny that, but I believe that you may agree with Lincoln's estimate of the value of one's friendships.

As President, Ulysses S. Grant's tenure extended from March 4, 1869, to March 4, 1877. One of his notable achievements was in the field of foreign affairs; it was in 1871 that he settled the controversy with Great Britain by the Treaty of London. He was ably assisted in that endeavor by his Secretary of State, Hon. Hamilton Fish, of New York. In June 1885 he moved to Mount McGregor, near Saratoga, N.Y. After completing the writing of his memoirs—they are recognized as a historical classic—he died July 23. He was with highest honors buried in the Grant Mausoleum, built by public donations, located on Riverside Drive in New York City.

What were the attributes that enabled this good and great man to achieve tremendous goals? It is my conviction that his dogged determination and strong willpower enabled him to achieve the very highest of aspirations.

Thank you for your kind and thoughtful attention.

Mr. Speaker, I recall how great was what President Lincoln once said of Grant:

> When Grant once gets possession of a place he holds on to it as if he had inherited it.

Then in a telegram to General Grant, Lincoln said:

> I have seen your dispatch expressing your unwillingness to break your hold where you are. Neither am I willing. Hold on with a bulldog grip and chew and choke as much as possible.

Mr. Speaker, this indicates President Lincoln's attitude about Grant. History, of course, records that he was very satisfied with Grant. He had finally found a leader who would fight and had the determination and earnest desire to win and whenever possible he has indicated in the quote above, he encouraged his dogged determination and desire to win. It could well be said just as these were excellent characteristics in that hour of crisis, they are still good for Americans today and let us learn from this example, let us hold on to those great ideals we are pleased to call American and let us do our part individually and collectively to share these ideals with other freedom-loving people and encourage them in their fight to obtain the goals of liberty, freedom, and equality that our forefathers knew so well.

Promoting Industrial Uses of Corn Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 29, 1959

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues all know, corn is grown in every State in the Union. Approximately 85 million acres or a fifth of the cropland is devoted to the production of corn. The value of the crop is almost $5 billion per year. Corn is grown on about 4 million farms or about two-thirds of all farms in the United States.

The income from corn exceeds that of the combined value of the next two most valuable crops which are cotton and wheat. More farmers raise corn than any other crop. Corn directly and indirectly constitutes a larger part of the diet of American people than any other single agricultural crop. This includes corn consumed directly, as milled-corn products, and indirectly in the form of meat, milk, and eggs. Corn is vital to

the basic economy of the United States. Whatever influences corn affects all Americans.

I wish to devote my remarks to the cornstarch research of the Department of Agriculture. This research is being carried out by the Agricultural Research Service at the Northern Utilization Research and Development Division laboratories at Peoria, Ill.

From firsthand knowledge, I can tell you that northern laboratory scientists have been working for some years on several derivatives of cornstarch with important potential industrial uses. They are enthusiastic about their work—for the simple reason they considered it to be promising research important to agriculture.

The continuing research on cornstarch came in for special attention and intensification beginning July 1, 1957. In the following year scientific teams of 30 to 35 members were assigned to this research, requiring an expenditure of about $700,000. In addition, four research contracts, totaling $180,000, were let to bring in the work of industrial scientists.

The Department has advanced this research on cornstarch by a reassignment of regular funds, and with increased allotments for such research provided by the Congress in 1958 and 1959.

They have made startling progress. They have come up with at least two cornstarch derivatives that offer considerable promise for expanding the use of corn in papermaking, and in many industrial areas.

Let me tell you about these two particular products of corn. One of them is called dialdehyde starch. The other is high-amylose starch.

Dialdehyde starch from corn not only may find a substantial market in paper manufacture, but also as a tanning agent, and in the manufacture of plastics. High-amylose starch offers several industrial prospects: As an important component of transparent packaging films, water soluble films, edible films; as a permanent finish on fabrics, and as a constituent of plastics, lacquers—and of paper.

Dialdehyde starch will be available on a semicommercial scale from one industrial company this month. Another company is not far behind in its plans for this same starch.

The first commercial scale farm production of high-amylose corn occurred last year. It has been an essential part of this research program to develop corn hybrids that contain a high percentage of amylose. Two wet corn milling companies harvested 7,000 bushels of corn containing 55 percent amylose starch. From this they have produced 200,000 pounds of high-amylose starch for industrial evaluation.

This should be good news to every one. It is just one more case that supports the Department's broad research approach to agricultural problems.

All of our citizens benefit from these kinds of results. This is the kind of research that is going to help us whip our farm surpluses.

Long Island Railroad, Pioneer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1959

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, on April 24 the Long Island Railroad celebrated its 125th anniversary.

Long Island's phenomenal growth and development have been inseparably linked with the growth and development of the Long Island Railroad, the third oldest railroad in the Nation still operating under its original name.

The Long Island Railroad has been expanding and improving its service and its rehabilitation program, which sets a new pattern of realistic cooperation between Government and railroads to preserve a vital community service, is being held up as a model for other suburban areas that may have transportation problems.

The following article, which appeared in the New York Times on Monday, April 20, is a most interesting history of Long Island's "main line to the mainland":

THE LONG ISLAND RAILROAD IS A SPRIGHTLY 125—BIGGEST COMMUTER LINE IN UNITED STATES SPARKLES AFTER LONG PERIOD IN THE DOLDRUMS—EQUIPMENT IS IMPROVED—EFFICIENCY AND SAFETY HAVE REPLACED ACCIDENTS, BAD JOKES, AND BANKRUPTCY

(By Clarence Dean)

The Long Island Railroad, hardier than changing times, bankruptcy and a generation of bad jokes, will be 125 years old Friday.

People laughed in 1834 when the founders advanced their spectacular plan for running a line to Greenport on the northeasterly tip of the island, carrying passengers to Stonington, Conn., by ferryboat, and thence to Boston on the Old Colony Railroad. The laughter proved justified.

But the prophets of 10 years ago who said the Long Island's woes could never be solved were wrong.

At a time when most railroads are trying to unload their commuters, the Long Island is carrying on the largest rail commuter operation in the country with unmatched efficiency and safety.

LIVELY SYMBOL ABOARD

It is doing the job with a singular appearance of verve. There is nothing moribund about Dashing Dan, and Commuting Man, whose figure in yellow and blue decalcomania rides the battleship-gray passenger coaches.

Throughout the island, the railroad is involved in more civic projects than a chamber of commerce, and the commuters, for their part, speak up in the railroad's affairs about the same way the Parent-Teachers' Association does in school affairs.

Not all this happy state of affairs is the result of management skill. The railroad has the very great advantage that it is operated as a redevelopment corporation, with a moratorium on its heavy debts to the Pennsylvania Railroad and substantial tax foregiveness by State and local governments. Revenue can be—and is being—put back into equipment improvement.

But there is management skill and there is also an incalculable factor—the island's long-established family feeling toward its railroad. This really never quite disappeared, even in the bankruptcy years with all the bad jokes, or at the time of two tragic wrecks in 1950.

Chance injected the railroad into the island's life to a degree that the founders never contemplated.

The grandiose plan for competing with the Long Island steamboats by providing a rail and ferryboat service to Boston lasted for 6 years. From 1844 to 1850, business flourished; the 16-hour running time of the steamboats had been cut in half.

But in 1850 engineers performed the "impossible" feat of extending the Old Colony's trackage along the Connecticut shore to New York, and the Long Island's reason for being vanished.

In the face of this disaster, management ingenuity did not flag. Reasoning that there would be business if the eastern end of the island, then primarily woods and farmland, could be built up, the railroad expanded.

New lines and new stations were built. Resort hotels and other vacation facilities were encouraged. Reduced fares were offered to the more distant points.

The railroad even took to transporting farmers' produce wagons to market on flatcars, with special cars for the horses and men. It was a forerunner of the pickaback transportation now offered by railroads for trailer trucks.

This was the heyday of railroad building. Competitive lines sprang up, some of them in the western part of the island. At one time more than 30 roads were operating. But gradually they were absorbed by the Long Island, and shortly before the turn of the century the railroad's present system had been developed. In 1900 control of the line was acquired by the Pennsylvania Railroad.

The railroad builders were more foresighted than they knew. They had provided the means for the great population surge to the island that began after World War I. And as it came, the nature of the service changed from conventional railroading to rapid mass transit.

FARES FROZEN IN 1918

Business increased steadily, but a series of afflictions came, too. Commutation fares were frozen by the New York Public Service Commission in 1918 and remained static until 1947. Competition came from the expanding subways. Taxes rose—from about $1,500,000 in 1921 to $5,400,000 in 1951.

The Long Island went into the red in 1935 and stayed there, except for 4 years during World War II. The railroad entered bankruptcy in 1949.

During all these financial troubles equipment and service suffered. Late and overcrowded trains became a commonplace. Anything could, and did, happen on the Long Island, the saying went.

It happened in a spectacular way on December 26, 1947, when an expected light snowfall turned into the "big snow," and the Long Island completely broke down. Passengers were stranded in unheated cars for as long as 12 hours.

Then in February 1950 32 passengers were killed in a wreck at Rockville Center. And in November of the same year, another wreck killed 77 persons at Richmond Hill.

A State investigation of the railroad was ordered. Out of it grew the Long Island's present status. It was discharged from bankruptcy and set up as a railroad redevelopment corporation in August 1954. The plan provided for a 12-year $60,300,000 rehabilitation program.

GOODFELLOW BROUGHT IN

To direct the operation, the line imported Thomas M. Goodfellow, a professional third-generation railroader, from the Pennsylva-

nia. With him came James A. Schultz, a former newspaperman and former airline public-relations executive.

Their achievement in these first 4 years is perhaps best indicated by the fact that last year, 98.1 percent of the trains were on time, and jokes about the Long Island were scarce.

Even the chestnuts like this were dying out:

A section hand found a man standing between the tracks with a loaf of bread in his hands. "How come?" the section hand asked.

"Oh," said the man, "my wife has died, I've lost my home, I've lost my money; I want to die."

"But why the loaf of bread?"

"Well," said the man, "the way this railroad runs I might starve to death before a train comes along."

The on-time record, better than that of any other railroad in the metropolitan area, is no small feat in view of the fact that the Long Island is the Nation's busiest passenger railroad. It averages 260,000 passengers a day. Of these, 170,000 are commuters; 85,000 persons making two trips a day each.

Nor is the Long Island unusual in number of passengers alone. It shuffles 680 of its 770 scheduled trains each day through the country's most complex transfer terminal, at Jamaica.

This is necessary, because the railroad has three westerly terminals, Manhattan (Pennsylvania station), Long Island City, and Brooklyn. Eastward from Jamaica, the railroad fans out in eight branches. It would be impractical to send trains to all destinations from each of the three terminals.

TWO HUNDRED AND TWENTY NEW COACHES ADDED

Not only has the railroad's on-time performance improved, but so has its equipment. There are 220 new air-conditioned coaches, and more than 400 of the 700 older cars have been so extensively renovated that they look new.

Safeguarding the Long Island's exceptionally heavy traffic—trains run through Jamaica an average of 30 seconds apart during the rush hours—are some of the most elaborate controls known to railroading.

Seventy-five percent of the trains operate under automatic speed control, a system that halts a train if its engineer fails to conform to speed restrictions. On much of the heavily traveled right-of-way, automatic signal devices make it practically impossible for trains to collide.

All of these happier circumstances have cast some reflection. Long Island's traditional affection toward its railroad seems to have been reinforced.

The stranger is conscious of it as he rides in one of the gleaming new air-conditioned coaches or even in one of the older ones, with the unusual loping gait they derive from the short wheelbase. There is a geniality, an informality not characteristic of most railroads.

"Nice car you got here, Harry," says a passenger to the trainman. "Rides real good. How long you going to keep it?"

Trainmen stand in vestibules as passengers alight. "You better button up that coat," says one to an elderly woman. "It's breezy out there today."

There is a long history of this kind of thing on the Long Island—stories of how trainmen, at the end of their run, have driven home passengers who had taken the wrong train; how they have put out automobile lights left on by mistake in station parking lots.

Once a trainman stamped and mailed a batch of addressed Christmas cards that had been left on a seat. On another occasion, the crew backed up a train to rescue a lady passenger's hat from the tracks. (Such courtesies, however, are not encouraged by the management.)

ON-THE-CUFF SERVICE

The most common incident involves the passenger who has forgotten his wallet. The railroad has a blank form for this, amounting to an emergency charge account. But the practice is for the trainman to pay for the ticket out of his own pocket and advance subway fare. Almost invariably he gets it back the next day—usually with a cigar or two.

Some of this may be attributed to the railroad's unusually high percentage of long-time employees. One-third have at least 25 years of service, and it is not uncommon to find railroaders whose families have been with the Long Island for 3 or 4 generations.

Remarkable things happen on the Long Island during the Christmas season. Communities decorate their stations—the railroad offers prizes for the most impressive results. Local Santa Clauses (through arrangement) step down from the cabs of Long Island locomotives. Train crews deck their coaches.

In one instance, a crew worked late into the night, after the run had been completed, etching reindeer and other jolly symbols into a wax cleaning compound that had been applied to the outside of the car windows.

ALL FOR NAUGHT

In the thin light of early dawn, a cleaning crew spotted the cars with the dirty windows, and—full of the holiday spirit—worked a little overtime to hose them down.

All year long, however, there is something special going on. Two thousand engineers for a day have ridden the cabs. Communities have been invited to select colors when stations were to be repainted. (Bethpage came up with a tie vote, so the railroad put on both colors, half off-white with a black spatter and half brick-red with a gray spatter.

In Hicksville, where 1,000 take the 7:36 each morning, a civic group worked out a queue system to speed the loading, and the 1,000 now get aboard in less than 3 minutes.

The Long Island marks its 125th anniversary with every appearance of vitality. Mr. Goodfellow is confident about the future.

A lean, slightly graying 6-footer, whose father and grandfather were railroad men, he directs the operations from a spacious corner office on the third floor of the Jamaica station. Mr. Goodfellow was trained as a civil engineer, and he talks with the detachment of an engineer.

NO END IN SIGHT

Mr. Goodfellow has no hope that the Long Island, or any commuter railroad, can become a profitable venture. But, he says, "the Long Island is here to stay."

He thinks that, with some lessening of its tax burden and assistance in the form of governmental credit, the railroad's status could be further improved.

He would like to run faster trains. He would like to rebuild the Flatbush Avenue station in Brooklyn, which is not large enough to accommodate the new 85-foot cars. With more signaling equipment the number of expresses could be increased. Diesel locomotives could be adapted to run through the East River tunnels on third-rail power.

Mr. Goodfellow would especially like to increase the number of riders in the nonrush hours. "That's where the money is," he points out.

And this is one of the goals that keep the lights burning late in Mr. Schultz' public relations office next door to Mr. Goodfellow's. The railroad has fostered Ladies Day, with half-price fares; weekend excursions to New York and a profusion of school children's pilgramages to the city. But Mr. Schultz believes the mine has hardly been tapped.

As a matter of fact, he arranged for the railroad to celebrate its birthday next Friday by running a special off-hours train to Riverhead for a house-warming at the new Suffolk County courthouse.

Frederick, Md., and Fort Detrick an Example of Exceptional Civil-Military Cohesiveness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. FOLEY
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 29, 1959

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, during my recent visit to the historic and progressive city of Frederick, Md., I was extremely and pleasantly impressed with the outstanding relationship that exists between the community and the U.S. Army Chemical Corps Biological Warfare Laboratories, Fort Detrick.

Normally, I would have noticed that there might be some sort of a friendly relationship between the citizens and the civilian and military personnel of this important defense installation; however, as I talked to many of the folks in town, I became immediately aware that Fort Detrick and the Federal employees, including the military, are vitally interested and participate in all facets of community life. This to me is important. It was wonderful news, news that caused me to inquire about how such relationships came about. Usually, we hear only unfavorable news.

The answer was given to me very simply. I was told by Fort Detrick people that "we live right and tell others about it." However, it goes deeper than that—and when I learned that the Fort Detrick community relations program prefaced a Department of the Army and U.S. Civil Service pamphlet for use by all Federal agencies, I thought it might be well for the executives in our Government organizations located here in Washington to visit Fort Detrick and see how the commanding officer, Col. Donald G. Grothaus, and his assistant for information and public affairs, Mr. Joseph Schwimer, plan and execute this outstanding program. I congratulate them on their achievements.

On the other side of the fence, I found that the Frederick Chamber of Commerce and the elected and appointed officials of the county and city, work hand in hand with Fort Detrick people—who by the way, do not single themselves out as "Detrick people." They are known as Frederick people. And the two-way communications system operates in top flight fashion—that can only mean one thing—that our Federal employees in the Frederick area have assumed their civic responsibilities. Mr. Joseph F. Rhoderick, executive manager of the chamber of commerce, outlined to me just how the people at Fort Detrick help out in the community. Not only are they generous contributors and workers for all charity and civic drives or campaigns, but Mr. Rhoderick pointed

out that many of the scientific and professional employees from the laboratories pitch in to assist in the scientific and technical courses presented in the county high schools. The commanding officer encourages this and only recently, two scientists substituted for science teachers who were attending a teachers' convention—at no expense to the county. The substitute teachers were given administrative leave.

Mr. Rhoderick strongly emphasized the valuable assistance he receives from the commanding officer and his assistant for public affairs in the preparation of material for use in the community, that is, information material for local consumption. Every quarter, Fort Detrick tells the people, the taxpayers, how much this installation spends within the community for local purchases and services. It amounts to more than a million dollars a year, or about 6 percent of the total operating budget of the post. This is most laudible and I again congratulate the commanding officer for his foresight and resourcefulness.

I was highly pleased when I was shown the Meritorious Civil Service Award which the Frederick Chamber of Commerce was given by the U.S. Civil Service Commission in January, for outstanding cooperation with Federal employees. This award as made as the Commission was concluding its Diamond Jubilee observance, and unless my information is incorrect, the Frederick Chamber of Commerce became the first such organization to be so recognized. I congratulate Mr. Rhoderick and the chamber of commerce for developing this warmth of climate.

It is my pleasure to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two congratulatory letters, one sent to the Frederick Chamber of Commerce by the Secretary of the Army, the Honorable Wilber M. Brucker, and the other to the Chief Chemical Officer, Department of the Army, by Maj. Gen. H. P. Storke, Chief of Public Information, Department of the Army. In each instance, the diamond anniversary award by the U.S. Civil Service Commission to the Frederick Chamber of Commerce, was cited as another example of the continuing excellent relationship existing between the chamber and the people of Fort Detrick—in fact, this was the basis of the award. I know the letters are self-explanatory and submit them herewith:

FEBRUARY 11, 1959.

Mr. JAMES H. GROVE, Jr.,
President, the Frederick Chamber of Commerce, Winchester Hall, Frederick, Md.

DEAR MR. GROVE: It is gratifying to have the word that the Frederick Chamber of Commerce has been awarded the U.S. Civil Service Commission's Diamond Anniversary Meritorious Award. I hasten to express to you and your entire membership my personal congratulations, and those of the members of the U.S. Army.

I am especially proud that the fine relationship between the citizens of Frederick and the Army people at Fort Detrick—as exemplified in the Detrick Appreciation Week of October 1956 and the Diamond Jubilee length of service ceremony of August 1958—afforded the warmth of climate prerequisite to the Civil Service Commission's bestowal of the honor.

At the same time, we particularly appreciate the modesty and thoughtfulness of Mr. Lemuel D. Keller, your retiring president, and Mr. Joseph F. Rhoderick, your executive manager, in graciously deferring to Fort Detrick civilians and military as indispensable partners without whom this distinction could not have been achieved.

I well remember my luncheon with Mr. Keller and Mr. Rhoderick and the members of your official family at the Pentagon in March 1957, and was delighted to confer on the Frederick community the Army's certificate of appreciation. Thus, I am additionally indebted to these spokesmen for their complimentary recollections of this event during the course of your recent anniversary dinner.

Sincerely,

WILBER M. BRUCKER,
Secretary of the Army.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF
OF PUBLIC INFORMATION,
Washington, D.C., February 5, 1959.

Memorandum for the Chief Chemical Officer.
Subject: Diamond Anniversary Award, Frederick, Md.

1. On January 29, the U.S. Civil Service Commission conferred its Diamond Anniversary Meritorious Award on the chamber of commerce of Frederick, Md. Attended by a large assembly of notables and guests and widely publicized through press and radio media, the ceremony focused much attention on a deserving community and its business and official leadership.

2. I am very impressed by the fact that the Civil Service Commission cited the excellent relationship between the chamber and the people of Fort Detrick as a basis for the award. Further, I am told the recipients repeatedly acknowledged the civilian and military of Detrick as their coworkers and partners in achieving the distinction. Whatever the criteria, great credit was reflected on the Army for its official participation in chamber of commerce sponsored Fort Detrick Appreciation Week of October 1956, and the joint Frederick-Detrick-Civil Service Commission Diamond Jubilee ceremonies of August 1958.

3. I am mindful, in this connection, of those on the military side of the fence in Frederick whose efforts have brought about such a warmth of climate and mutual understanding, notably Col. Donald G. Grothaus, the Fort Detrick commander, and his special assistant for public affairs, Mr. Joseph Schwimer. These men are obviously working as a team in rounding out a splendid community-relations balance sheet and recent events in Frederick bespeak their many accomplishments.

4. The Secretary of the Army is expressing his congratulations on the meritorious award in a letter to officials of the Frederick Chamber of Commerce. May I, in turn, express our own compliments to Colonel Grothaus, Mr. Schwimer, and all of the personnel at Fort Detrick. They are doing a fine job in many different ways and they deserve the Army's sincere appreciation.

H. P. STORKE,
Major General, GS, Chief of Public Information.

William A. Hughes, Outstanding Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 29, 1959

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Newark Evening News, Newark, N.J., on April 27, and it is a real privilege for me to call the attention of my colleagues to an honor that has been conferred upon William A. Hughes, chairman of the board of the New Jersey Bell Telephone Co., in being chosen the outstanding citizen of New Jersey for 1958. The sponsoring organization is the Advertising Club of New Jersey.

This is an honor that is very well deserved and those of us who have had the privilege of knowing Mr. Hughes personally can testify to his extraordinary dedication to public service. His partner in life, Mrs. Hughes, in my humble opinion, deserves some of the credit for his great success because of her willingness to allow him to devote himself to the affairs of others and because of her encouragement in the many worthwhile endeavors that he has pursued during his lifetime.

It is good news for me to know that Mr. and Mrs. Hughes have decided to live in the congressional district that I have the honor to represent.

On behalf of all of their friends and admirers I wish for them long life and continued success:

OUTSTANDING CITIZEN

The Advertising Club of New Jersey has chosen William A. Hughes, chairman of the board of the New Jersey Bell Telephone Co. as the State's outstanding citizen for 1958.

It is a happy choice. While carrying for 10 years the burdens of the presidency of a rapidly expanding telephone company, Mr. Hughes took on a host of civic responsibilities. In none of these tasks has he been a letterhead committeeman. To each he has given a full measure of time and effort.

The Advertising Club award is not the climax of a business career which will end with his retirement from the Bell system on September 30. It is, rather, a recognition of public services which will continue. There is no rocking chair in Mr. Hughes' future, no slippered ease or fading into obscurity. He and Mrs. Hughes spent recent vacations exploring the Nation's popular retirement havens. They were impressed by none and Mr. Hughes was appalled by Florida—"shuffleboard 6 hours a day." For retirement they have decided there is no place like New Jersey and are building a new home in Short Hills.

It is the community's good fortune that Mr. Hughes has both physical vigor and civic interest in abundance. He is this year's general chairman of the United Appeals drive. He is chairman of the Founders Fund Committee of Seton Hall's College of Medicine and Dentistry. He plans to widen his activities as a trustee of Drew University, the Newark Museum, and the New Jersey Historical Society.

He expects to be busier than ever, and the community is going to benefit.

Soldiers of the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 29, 1959

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the past Sunday, April 26, was Confederate Memorial Day, a legal holiday in Ala-

bama and all the other States of the Old South.

One of the leading judges of the Alabama circuit courts, Judge Walter B. Jones, of Montgomery, writes a regular column in the Montgomery Advertiser. On Monday morning of this week, April 27, he had published a very interesting article entitled "Soldiers of the South." The article pays tribute to the memory of the soldiers of the South, only one of whom is left, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFF THE BENCH

(By Judge Walter B. Jones)

SOLDIERS OF THE SOUTH

Yesterday was Confederate Memorial Day—a legal holiday in Alabama and all the States of the Old South. For nearly a century we have hallowed this day to honor the memories of the men of the South, who in the trying and tragic days of the sixties wore the gray, fighting long years defending their States and homes from base attack and cruel invasion.

The Confederate soldier has long ago gone down in history as one of the great warriors of all time. The captains courageous who led him in battle rank with the noble and fearless soldiers of the ages. Robert E. Lee, Stonewall Jackson, John B. Gordon, Albert Sidney Johnston, James Longstreet, Nathan Bedford Forrest, Jeb Stuart, Pat Cleburne, Robert E. Rodes, John Pelham, P. G. T. Beauregard and A. P. Hill, to mention a dozen only among hundreds, are names which will never be forgotten.

When I reflect upon the meaning of Confederate Memorial Day there comes to mind the poem written years ago by a loyal son of Alabama and the South, Gustave F. Mertins, "March of the Mystic Men":

"Comes a lilting song of bugles down the
balmy winds of spring,
As my heart calls back its heroes to the
world's bright flowering.
Treading roseate clouds of glory, march
these mystic men in gray,
While I kneel with all the Southland, for today's Memorial Day.
These men sleep no more in valleys, no more
hillsides claim their dust;
No more death and no more anguish;—gone
the canker and the rust.
And the living men, their comrades, lift we
also to those skies,
Where now march the white-souled warriors
in a love that never dies.
All are Lee and all are Jackson, as our brimming eyes behold;
For in love all are commissioned, wearing
each the gray and gold.
Marching, marching, ever marching, come
these heroes without stain
And the Stars and Bar precedes them, never
to be furled again.
Not for wars and not for battles does that
silken banner float;
Not for signal to wild combat comes that
silvery bugle note!
But as symbols of a glory that shall never
fade away.
O my Soul! be at attention! for they pass—
the men in gray."

The characteristics which distinguished the Confederate soldier were love of home, of wife, mother, sister. He loved his community. He respected authority. He was trained both to obey and to command. In the army his company was the representative of his community, and he of his home. He would not sully his own name nor that of his company by any unsoldierly conduct. He would not degrade his wife and mother by insulting the wives and mothers of other men.

He was modest and seldom wrote to the papers of his achievements. He was devoted to his battle flag. Courage, honor, and patience accompanied him in all the hours of the bitter struggle. Small wonder that the Confederate soldier wrote with his sword his name upon that page of glory's deathless muster-roll, gathered from every age.

So, today we remember with all the love and gratitude of our hearts the soldiers of the Southern Cross, those who fought neither for fame nor reward; who sought neither place nor rank; who were not lured by ambition nor goaded by necessity, but who simply obeying the duty that was inbred in them by generations of patriots and fighters, suffered all, sacrificed all they had, dared all—and died for home and people, for the sacred rights of their sovereign States.

May we people of the South, the South that was theirs, be ever worthy of the heritage which is ours and ever emulate the example of that dauntless generation of southerners who stood true and steadfast for the ancient and honorable landmarks of their race. And so we say, as we look upon their quiet graves and recall their glorious deeds:

"Soldier, rest! thy warfare o'er
Dream of fighting fields no more;
Sleep the sleep that knows not breaking,
Morn of toil, nor night of waking.

Strength and Weakness in the Asian Littoral

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 29, 1959

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a condensed version of an article "Strength and Weakness in the Asian Littoral" by Capt. Phillip Barry Brannen, U.S. Naval Reserve and appearing in the December 1958 issue of the U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings. In these times when the Orient looms so large in the East-West conflict, when Asian communism is thrusting outward from its land mass base toward the rimland and fringing islands of the Asian Continent, I consider Captain Brannen's strategic analysis to be one of the most informative yet published on this subject.

Captain Brannen is peculiarly qualified to make such a study and prepare such an article. He is a graduate of the University of California and Harvard Law School and has been an active and distinguished member of the bar in California for over 25 years. After important assignments at sea during World War II, he served as U.S. naval representative on the Allied Control Commission for Rumania. In that position he had a unique opportunity to observe the versatile and ruthless methods of Communist aggression. Subsequently, while still on active duty, he saw duty on assignments by the Office of Naval Intelligence in Egypt, Palestine, India, Indochina, Siam, Malaya, China, and Japan. He is a resident of Beverley Hills and Santa Monica.

Captain Brannen's well-organized analysis of each major area in Pacific Asia is of particular value in that it considers the historic, military, geographic, and socialogical aspects of the problems in each such area. I commend "Strength and Weakness in the Asian Littoral" to the attention of Members of the House of Representatives:

STRENGTH AND WEAKNESS IN THE ASIAN LITTORAL

(By Capt. Phillip Barry Brannen, USNR)

At the end of World War II, we had in the Chinese Government a friend and ally, for whom President Roosevelt felt he could speak with confidence at Yalta. American warships had come to anchor in the river at Shanghai and naval units were being established ashore. China had taken her seat in the Security Council, as one of the great powers, and, under the benign influence of the United Nations sought to reestablish peace and order throughout the Far East. But, in the past 12 years, the Chinese people have been cut off entirely from the West. Their lines of supply reach the Soviet Union and they profess a political philosophy hateful to the free world and alien to themselves. The posture their government presents to the United States is grim and full of menace.

Seaward of China and to the south are the military bastions of the free world. An American Army stands in Korea, supported by highly trained South Korean troops. The 3d Division of U.S. Marines is based on Okinawa. Chiang Kai-shek trains the Nationalist Army, Navy, and Air Force in Taiwan. And protecting that island's communications, the U.S. 7th Fleet patrols the Formosa Strait.

Of course, we know that along the Asian periphery China will attack without warning, whenever the exigencies of her military or political situation require. It is quite possible that her requirements will be met by a limited war, fought in a limited area for limited objectives. In that event, even ordinary prudence will require us to assess beforehand the military and economic capacities of our Asian friends.[1]

I

The year 1956 was the best in Japan's recent economic history. The nation experienced almost unprecedented national prosperity and the high level of exports raised the standard of living throughout the country. All of this was reflected in a new level of investment in industrial plants, equipment, and inventories. Modern techniques were introduced after the war and increased productivity was observed on every hand.

Major business enterprises showed great profits and paid higher dividends to their stockholders. Large year-end bonuses were declared and paid to employees. Unemployment fell sharply, and in October of 1956 it was less than half what it was in the previous March. Stock market prices rose to a new postwar peak and seemed to be justified by higher earnings and dividends. Consumers' income and expenditures increased sharply and so did savings. The output and sale of retail goods reached a record level. Meanwhile, Japan experienced a phenomenal increase in her foreign trade.[2]

---

[1] We have in Asia our SEATO allies: Thailand, New Zealand, Australia, and the Philippines. And we have strong ties with the nations SEATO is pledged to protect: Cambodia, Laos, and South Vietnam. But the emphasis in this paper is on the other countries along the Far East perimeter.

[2] Exports in 1956 were 24.4 percent higher, and imports were 30.7 percent higher, than in 1955.

Nevertheless, by June of 1957, all signs pointed to a flattening out of the curve of business activity. In an attempt to remedy an unfavorable trade balance, the Government took steps to curb excessive investment and reduce the demand for imports. There was little doubt that Japan was influenced, at this stage, by a number of unfavorable trends in the world economy, particularly by a worldwide increase of stockpiles of raw materials and a steady decline in wholesale prices. In the fall, mining and manufacturing production dropped from their postwar peaks and both imports and exports declined. There was a slackening of demand for producers' goods but consumption levels and consumers' prices did not seem to be affected. Since that time, although the trade balance continues unfavorable, the general level of business and industrial activity remains high.

In summary, we may assume that the continuing rise in Japanese economic expansion was checked in 1957. Nevertheless, consumption levels and consumer prices throughout the country have not been affected. Thus, the people of Japan have never been better fed, housed, and clothed than they are today; and they have more of the modern conveniences of life than they ever had before. Nevertheless, there has been a decided disinclination on the part of Japan to channel its industrial efforts into the production of weapons for military purposes. Two reasons may exist for this. The first has to do with the evident apathy, and even distrust, of the Japanese public for all things military, including even the provision of the necessary means of self defense. The second may derive from the dire straits to which Japanese industry was reduced by the war. After the cessation of hostilities, the Japanese economy had to use up virtually everthing it produced, merely to survive. To rebuild their plants, businessmen were required to borrow to the hilt. Inflationary processes were set in motion and high interest rates drove prices up still further. Thus, there seemed to be no place for any industrial effort that did not contribute directly to the economic welfare of the Nation. Accordingly, the Japanese made every effort to direct their economic effort into strictly productive channels.

Of course, this is all to the good as far as it goes; for the United States needs an economically strong ally in the East. But the Japanese economy, as it strengthens, will need protection and prestige and it is difficult to see how either can be provided by a nation without modern weapons or effective military capability.

There may be the feeling in Japan that the military defense of the country is primarily the problem of the United States. And it should be a major policy of our Government to disabuse the minds of the Japanese of any such conceptions. The industrial recovery confirms the fact that Japanese productive capacity, once of a demonstrably high order, is fully restored. And as the economy tends to stabilize itself on its present high level, it may be expected that the protection of their own industrial well-being will become a matter of first importance and urgency for the Japanese. They can provide this protection, in the first instance, by a buildup in the Japanese self-defense forces, of which the nuclei already exist. They can provide it also by utilizing Japan's renascent industrial capacity, to the fullest possible extent, in the support and maintenance of the American Armed Forces in the east.

II

No one can approach a solution of the South Korean dilemma except along the road of paradox. On the one hand, the civil and military leaders appear forceful and determined and the troops, courageous, eager, and well trained. On the other, the Korean Government may not be democratic in its origin or entirely democratic in its practices. The economy presents a picture of sharpest contrasts: there are the extremely rich and the extremely poor; there has been great economic recovery in the large cities since the end of hostilities, but the impression remains that large masses of the people are below the poverty line; there is evidence of the almost $1 billion of aid given the country by the American Government, but there is also such evidence of economic insufficiency as to suggest that the recovery problem is almost insoluble.

Any attempt to understand these difficulties must start with the extraordinary division of the country upon the cessation of hostilities in World War II.

Economically, the aftermath was disastrous. On the one hand, North Korea needed badly the food grown in South Korea. This fact, among many others, has caused the exodus of North Koreans to the crowded cities of Seoul and Pusan. On the other, South Korea needed the coal, iron, and hydroelectric resources of North Korea. It needs them today to support the industries which it has hoped to establish with American aid. To some observers, these economic consequences of the division of Korea are the determinative factors and doom to failure any attempt to assist South Korea, economically, to its feet.

However, no one who knew South Korea at the time of the Armistice can say that the Korean economy has not improved. In Seoul, the hordes of little children have disappeared from the streets. There is still great destitution in the refugee camps outside the city but there has been considerable amelioration of conditions. In Pusan, so much cannot be said. The city's population has increased to well over a million. Included are 150,000 able-bodied men who are seeking work and finding none.

It has been proposed that the efforts of all men and agencies interested in the future welfare of the Korean people should be directed to the eventual reunification of the country. But in the present circumstances country-wide free elections are a dream. And pursuit of this proposal leads, necessarily, to the threshold of the vexed question of force. The redoubtable President of Korea has expressed himself, repeatedly, as favoring a march to the north. Understandably, he does not recognize even that the government of North Korea exists. It is conceivable (although not probable) that he would order the Republic of Korea forces to attack. But the logistical limitations of the Republic of Korea army are many and critical. And if the order were given, and obeyed, it is doubtful that the Republic of Korea forces could support even a limited offensive, without American transport, ammunition and other logistical support.

Conversely, in the present stalemate, there is little expectation that the North Korean forces will attack, although any change in the balance of power in Korea, or any critical Communist development in world politics would present this as an immediate possibility. The North Koreans on the one hand, and the Republic of Korea and American forces on the other, are in approximately equal strength. Under these circumstances, from the tactical point of view, an attack ordinarily would not be expected. However, the Chinese have troops beyond the Yalu which, if employed in conjunction with the North Koreans, would give the attacking army overwhelming force. The Chinese could arrive at the front lines long before comparable U.S. forces could be assembled from Okinawa, or elsewhere. It has been already noted that there are presently no U.S. ground forces in Japan.

I know of no one who pretends to have a clear solution of the many and complex Korean problems. No one can foresee the end because no one can foretell the possible eventualities. It is conceivable that the existing Korean Government will be followed by a Government whose policy will be orientated toward an adjustment of all outstanding problems with the Japanese. It is possible also that either the North or South Koreans may initiate military action. Moreover, the improvement in the economic conditions in South Korea, particularly noticeable during the last 2 years, may continue and it may be hoped that many of the evils of the current period will disappear. For many reasons—some strategic and some moral—a free and united country is a vital issue for South Korea and of vital importance to the Free World. Accordingly, we must expect that Syngman Rhee, and many other devoted South Koreans, will not rest until unification is brought about. To most informed Western observers, the stars that will chart Korea's future have not yet come into view.

III

All Chinese Nationalists in Taiwan hope to return by force of arms to the mainland. But do they actually expect to? On the one hand, the economy of Taiwan is sound and the island can easily maintain them. On the other, the Nationalist government has committed its political existence to a return. One finds this issue debated not only in Taiwan but in all quarters of the free world. The most authoritative answer would seem to be conditional: it depends on what incidents develop in Communist China which the Nationalists are able to exploit. If, for example, rioting should break out in Canton and local authorities should lose control, then the opportunity for armed intervention in the area may be presented.

The problem is not only military but political. Successful intervention would require a lodgment of troops on the continent. But it would also depend on the development of a favorable political consensus among the Chinese people. For in the absence of events which are politically exploitable, the road back to China, however much it beckons, is strewn with fearful blocks and hazards. Not least of these is the fact that Red China has an army of over 2 million and the third largest air force in the world.

The military expectations of the Nationalist Government depends upon the possibility of a swift landing on the continent in division strength. But in any such operation it will need minesweepers, with modern equipment, to clear the approach channels. And it will need escort craft with radar fire control and guns having a range comparable to the range of opposing shore batteries on the mainland. The Nationalists will also need LST's or like transport for use in amphibious operations. Trained Chinese and Taiwanese personnel are already available to man the additional ships. Many of the old Japanese vessels now being operated by the Nationalist Navy are obsolete and should be scrapped; and this in turn would provide additional manpower for the new vessels the navy hopes some day to obtain.

The Nationalist Government will not require, or desire, American soldiers in any adventure it may undertake. Politically, the Nationalists believe that any attack on the Chinese mainland by foreign troops would react against them. But they do hope for both logistical and air support from the United States.

It it not likely that the Communists could effect a successful coup d'etat in Taiwan. The Nationalist police are omnipresent and the possibility of infiltration is fully recog-

nized and guarded against. Currently the Communist threat is directed against the offshore islands of Matsu and Kinmen. For these islands have become a matter of face or prestige for the Nationalist Government and a very considerable part of the Nationalist forces has been committed to their defense. The government has stated that it will not retreat further, or cede additional territory. If it abandoned the islands in the face of a Communist attack, there is a strong feeling in Taipei, that the government itself would fall.

Strategically, the islands do not seem to have the importance given them politically. It is true enough that Nationalist gun emplacements on the islands command Communist air strips on the opposite shore. But it is quite evident that Taiwan is within easy bombing range, in any event, of airfields located far in the interior of China.

Presumably a conflict could develop in the Taiwan area in a number of ways. It could develop if the Chinese Communists made an amphibious attack on the offshore islands. It could also occur if the Communists attempted in Taipei a coup d'etat. The presence of the U.S. 7th Fleet would seem sufficient to rule out the possibility of an amphibious assault on Taiwan itself. But should the fleet be withdrawn, the Nationalist Government would have to prepare for an all-out attack on their positions.

If a condition resembling the spontaneous outbreak in Budapest should occur anywhere on the mainland, the attention of the free world would be focused immediately on China. For the Nationalists have the will and the force to intervene. Their task would be greatly facilitated by the naval craft they hope to secure from the United States; otherwise they are prepared to do with what they have. In the absence of suitable amphibious craft the Chinese will load their troops on merchantmen and junks and cargo craft of every type and kind. They will be greatly outnumbered by the Red military but they will look to the Chinese people for support. And they will hope that it will not be numbers or equipment, but the imponderable factors of esprit de crops and morale that will, in the end, decide the issue.

IV

The returning traveler to Hong Kong receives a number of striking impressions: The extraordinary growth in population during the last 10 years, the extensive modernization of the streets and urban areas, the increased activity, bustle and confusion of the free port and, above all, the amazing complacency of the Hong Kong residents in the face of the towering Communist threat at their borders. The people of Hong Kong have convinced themselves (or else they seek to convince others) that a free Hong Kong is of more importance and benefit to Communist China than a captive and, therefore, that the possibility of Communist occupation of the area is nil.

It is also possible that the Chinese may attempt to infiltrate Hong Kong in large numbers and attempt to subvert the civil administration. But the British seem fully alert to the possibilities in this regard. They react with the greatest rigor to the slightest evidence of espionage or subversion. Suspected fifth columnists are taken into custody and promptly deported across the border. There is presently no requirement that they be brought before a magistrate and nothing about the police action appears in the daily press. It is not unlikely that the British tap telephones, open mail, and otherwise proceed with the greatest vigor. Their police system is experienced and efficient. In an emergency they are able to call upon British troops in the area for support.

Nevertheless, if subversion is difficult, there is little doubt that the Communists have the military means to occupy Hong Kong, and its related areas, whenever their own necessities or related political considerations require. Their huge Army and large Air Force are strategically placed. The question is whether any real attempt to defend the city will be made. For many months the warships in Hong Kong Harbor have been American, not British. And the English Government has recently announced its intention to deactivate its traditional and once most formidable base of the Royal Navy.

In any event, it is clear that if a general war should break out, Hong Kong would be immediately attacked. Short of a general war, Red China may not move in that direction. But China will maintain the capability of doing so and meanwhile, it must be assumed that Great Britain's jurisdiction and control are tenuous. What is lost sight of in Hong Kong is that the considerations prompting Red China to move against the city may have nothing to do with China's economic interests or for that matter with Hong Kong itself but may derive from pressing, and little understood, necessities originating in the remote and labyrinthine passages of the Communist world elsewhere.

V

What has occurred this winter in Indonesia is not a political controversy but a conflict. It is the result of grievances which have been long developing in the provincial regions, against the central administration in Jakarta. To the feeling of the people in the Provinces that they have been neglected and ignored by the Government has been added the fear that renascent Communist influence in the administration poses a threat to their new and hard won liberties. The strong reaction came as no surprise.

In the disaffected outer regions, called daerahs, have been formed dissident councils or dewans. Through the media of the dewans, Indonesians living in the outer islands sought greater representation in the central government and a more equitable allocation of government revenues. Particularly, they sought greater economy in the conduct of public affairs. They contended that broad educational and social changes were called for and that tedious and futile administrative procedures in the central government stultified all attempts at progress. Much more could be accomplished they believed, if greater autonomy were given the provincial regions in the conduct and administration of their own affairs.

What started out as a political movement, with economic implications, developed in intensity as the economic and financial situation of the country deteriorated. It became evident that the provincial regions were losing confidence in the capacity of the central government to solve the country's pressing problems. President Sukarno had returned from a lengthy trip abroad to publicly announce, as a remedy, his concept of a guided democracy. But the people were quick to note that in this democracy the President advocated Communist participation.

The anti-Communist feeling in the daerahs has remained strong. Many of the military commanders in the provinces were participants in the struggle for Indonesian independence. In central and south Sumatra and in eastern Indonesia, these commanders have been accustomed to share with the civil authorities responsibility for the administration of the regions. And they are particularly alive to the nature and compass of the Communist threat.

Sukarno left the country in January of 1958 and was absent for a period of 41 days. Meanwhile the anti-Communist military commanders and civilian leaders met in central Sumatra at Padang. In due course they delivered an ultimatum to acting President Sartono, demanding that a new national government of anti-Communists be formed with Mohammed Hatta at its head and including the much respected Sultan of Djokjakarta. When their ultimatum was ignored the dissidents proclaimed a new revolutionary government and claimed full sovereign rights over all Indonesia. Sjafruddin Prawidanegara, former governor of the Bank of Indonesia, was designated Prime Minister.

Thus the issue was joined. The central administration had a small navy and some tactical aircraft but the revolutionary government did not feel that it was entirely without retaliatory power. For Sumatra is a large exporter of coffee and rubber and in ordinary times would provide almost three quarters of Indonesia's revenues. Java with its teeming population of 54 million must import a part of its food. The new government at once forbade exports of oil to Java or the payment of tax revenues to the central government. In return the central government bombed Padang and landed troops on the east coast of Sumatra. The Communist leader Aidit called for the most repressive measures and, from the north, the Soviet fishermen looked expectantly at the troubled waters.

VI

Modern war is waged without scruple and without compassion. It poses a great number of highly important questions, one of which may be: Where shall we expect to meet the enemy? Those who expect an all-out atomic, or thermonuclear, war tell us he must strike us in our homeland. But there are others who say we will engage him in Korea, in Taiwan, in Indonesia, or, it may be, in Japan. The answer lies in the field of grand strategy and a mistake could be decisive of our lives and liberties and the very existence of our State.

Now there is much sound military judgment that no allout nuclear war impends. It is true that if one belligerent has a thermonuclear weapon (and can deliver it accurately) and the other has not, it is reasonable to assume that the weapon will be put to use. But where both belligerents can deliver so destructive a weapon, the possibility of its use is affected by a number of other considerations. It becomes important to deliver it, not only, but to defend against it. The concept of massive retaliation is not so much a defense as a threat of punishment. So far as this country is concerned, it implies that a strike with special weapons has been made, involving the total destruction of one or more of our cities. But the complete destruction of one of our great industrial centers is hardly an acceptable loss in modern war. Conversely, the retaliatory destruction of one or more of his largest cities could not be an acceptable loss to the enemy. And, where the tactic involves unacceptable consequences as to costs, all military strategy operates to prevent its employment.[2]

We know, of course, that the Soviet Union is controlled by men of no political or moral compunction. But this does not mean they would disregard necessarily all strategical doctrine. And if they would not, we would

[2] In the last war there is no question that Germany during the Battle of Britain, could have killed hundreds of thousands of civilians by using gas as a tactical weapon, i.e., by delivering air-to-surface gas bombs. But there is no question either that, from the beginning, Great Britain possessed a like retaliatory power. It was evident that mass destruction of the civilian population could only be a two-way street. Accordingly, consideration of the consequences as to costs, made the employment of gas a weapon strategically unsound.

then be faced with the possibility of peripherical wars, fought for limited objectives.

In such a war, it would be necessary to formulate our strategy in conjunction with our allies on the perimeter. For we could not expect to employ our own resources only. It is a sound principle of war to know (that is, to recognize and evaluate) your enemy. It is also necessary to know the resources and capabilities of your friends.

The Pitfalls of the Disengagement Concept

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Mr. Brutus Coste, secretary general, Assembly of Captive European Nations, New York City, and two articles on the pitfalls of the disengagement concept by Mr. Willy Bretscher, editor in chief, Neue Zürcher Zeitung, Zurich, Switzerland:

ASSEMBLY OF CAPTIVE EUROPEAN NATIONS,
New York, N.Y., March 26, 1959.

The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE FLOOD: May I express to you, in the name of the Assembly of Captive European Nations, our sincere gratitude for the friendly reception you extended to me and to my colleagues, Dr. Petr Zenkl, and Dr. Laszlo Bartok, during our visit to you last week.

It was gratifying to see that your interest in our part of the world is as active as ever and that our peoples can count on you as a stanch friend in need. We are quite confident that your voice will be raised in behalf of Western proposals for a European peace settlement which would embrace the whole continent and not only the Western part. We are indeed convinced of this, not only because of your interest in Eastern Europe but, above all, because of your awareness that Western Europe will live in perpetual insecurity so long as Soviet power extends as far as the center of the old continent.

In the light of the disturbing press reports concerning the efforts of the British Prime Minister to persuade the U.S. Government that the present Soviet control over central and Eastern Europe should be formally sanctioned, it would seem that your active support is more than ever necessary.

According to the press, the arguments used in favor of a policy of abandonment of Eastern Europe was that, in sanctioning past Soviet conquests, the West can persuade the Soviet Union to halt or even to give up its drive for world domination. This sounds—to say the least—unconvincing. The record proves the very opposite, namely, that every concession the Soviets have been able to wrest from the free world has only served to whet their appetite.

We are, of course, happy to see that the United States has so far reiterated its position and has declined to accept the alleged British thinking on that subject. We are equally glad to note that the French and German Governments remain firmly opposed to the recognition of the status quo. And we are confident that, with the backing of the U.S. Congress the position of your Government, strongly supported by the French and the Germans, will prevail.

I would also like to express to you our appreciation for your kindness in so promptly inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD our memorandum of February 17. We were also gratified at your reaction to our maps on Russian and Soviet expansion, and we hope the Department of State will respond favorably to your suggestion. We can, of course, supply them with as many copies as they would need for distribution among Members of Congress.

We are currently working on the draft of a resolution against the spheres-of-influence concept and attempts to revive it, as recommended by you. I hope to be able to forward it to you within the next few days.

Meanwhile, I take the liberty of enclosing herewith for your information photo-offset copies of two articles by Mr. Willy Bretscher, editor in chief of the Neue Zürcher Zeitung, which I consider to be the best newspaper in Europe. The first of these articles was written recently—in January of this year—while the second was written as long ago as September 1957. Both articles deal with the pitfalls of the disengagement concept. I am certain that these forceful expressions of the views held by a very distinguished European writer will be of interest to you.

With my renewed thanks, and with best regards, I am

Very sincerely yours,

BRUTUS COSTE,
Secretary General.

[From the Neue Zürcher Zeitung, Jan. 1959]

THE GORDIAN KNOT

(By Willy Bretscher, Neue Zürcher Zeitung editor in chief)

The Council of the Liberal World Union, meeting for the second time last year, has concluded the examination of the various proposals for disengagement in Eastern and Central Europe by carrying a resolution which takes an unequivocal stand in this highly controversial matter. Although at the special meeting of the council held in London on December 13 and 14, some spokesmen of the German and Danish liberals and of the Polish exiles persisted in a favorable attitude toward the idea of disengagement, without, however, committing themselves to any definite plan, the great majority of the attendants did not hesitate to express the conviction "that the disengagements proposals so far produced, if implemented would weaken the defense of the West, undermining NATO, and at the same time strengthen the domination of the Soviet Union over the peoples of Eastern Europe and of the Soviet-occupied zone of Germany."

The clear-cut decision of the liberal council was determined by a careful evaluation of the basic elements of the present international situation. Any kind of disengagement which does not take into account the manifest need for an effective provision against surprise attack and for a general agreement on the controlled limitation of all armaments, both nuclear and conventional, is unlikely to contribute to an easing of international tensions. It would imply the creation of new zones of insecurity, be they "disatomized," "demilitarized," or "neutralized," in which the possibilities for incidents, explosions, brush-fire wars and, therefore, the risk of a general conflict following the powder-train of such uncontrollable happenings would be greatly increased. While some people still cling to the belief that disengagement might become the first step toward a change of the frozen status quo in favor of the West by loosening the ties binding the satellite countries to Moscow, this rosy optimism is continually and conclusively refuted by the pertinent facts of the overall political situation, showing clearly the extent to which the Soviet Union is committed to the undiminished preservation of Communist rule—and that means the Kremlin's rule—over the satellite countries. If the precarious balance of military strength in Europe were changed by some kind of disengagement, the change of the status quo thus set in motion would be apt to work in reverse, namely in favor of the Soviet Union, ever ready and eager to step in wherever and whenever a power vacuum occurs, and to fill it with the horrors of a totalitarian system.

In this context the critics and opponents of disengagement pointed to Berlin where just now, according to Khrushchev's plan, some kind of disengagement should take place which would leave West Berlin to the tender or not so tender mercy of the Soviets. As a matter of fact, the Soviet proposal for a withdrawal of both the Western and Russian forces from the city of Berlin is a beautiful illustration of the deeper meaning and far-reaching intentions underlying the Russian concept of disengagement. In this case public opinion in the West for once has been able to penetrate easily the thin disguise of the Soviet trap. It is all the more surprising that in the very moment when the West has to prepare itself for a trial of strength, courage and endurance, the inane talk about the "Maginot line" thinking of Western policy still goes on in some German circles which have not yet become aware of the ludicrous inconsistency of their own attitude, expecting from Mr. Dulles meek surrender in Quemoy and heroic resistance in Berlin.

It was the newly elected president of the Liberal World Union, Giovanni Malagodi, who seized the opportunity of the discussion in London to reveal the fallacy of the distinction between "military" and "political" thinking which has lately become fashionable among Western intellectuals. While it is certainly true that the conflict between East and West has not only a military aspect, but is a moral and spiritual, a political and economic issue as well, the tendency to take military security for granted, to ignore or to depise the intense efforts which have been and which are still necessary to insure the protection of the free world from the heavily armed colossus in the East, is very dangerous and might have the most harmful consequences, if public opinion in the West should thus be misled to assume that any serious preoccupation with the problems of defense had become obsolete. A fair measure of military security is indeed an indispensable factor of success in the fight waged against communism on the other fronts. No amount of profound "political" thinking nor the most impressive economic and social achievements would be of any use, if the West, and especially Western Europe, were to find itself one day in a situation where military threats from Moscow, which have become rather abundant in the recent past, could no longer be disregarded by the peoples up to now protected by the "shield" and "sword" of the Anglo-American powers. Malagodi, supported by Salvador de Madariaga, paid a well-deserved tribute to the United States and to Great Britain for taking such a large share in the defense of Western Europe and of the free world at the cost of sacrifices which are not yet matched by some nations of continental Europe.

As to the maneuver directed against Berlin, island and beacon of freedom in the vast sea of Communist power, the liberal council felt entitled to recall many former exhortations for firmness in negotiation and resistance to threats, when it proclaimed its "wholehearted support of the United States, Great Britain and France in their refusal to submit to Soviet intimidation and to the Soviet Government's repudiation of all engagements regarding free access to West Berlin." If Berlin were to fall before the brutal

and insidious onslaught of the new occupant of Stalin's throne, the moral and political repercussions of a Western defeat of this purport and magnitude would be tremendous and possibly even fatal. Then and then only might the hour for disengagement strike—a disengagement rather different from anything the clever advocates of the various schemes of this kind in the West have imagined, a panicky disengagement of large masses in Germany and elsewhere from the cause of the tottering West, from the cause of European unity and common defense, from the cause of mankind's struggle for the survival of liberty.

An English saying seems to apply in a particularly apt way to the situation in the East-West conflict:

"Faced with the Gordian knot,
Cut it, if you dare,
Undo it, if you can,
If you can do neither, don't despair:
The rope will rot."

There is no doubt that in the time of thermonuclear stalemate the West does not dare to cut the Gordian knot. The big powers may try again and again to undo it, but in these attempts they must never be so foolish as to jeopardize the essential requirements for the security of the free world. If the knot cannot be undone, the West will have to arm itself with the one virtue which is all too rare in modern democracy: patience. This patience, not to be understood as a negative, passive attitude, but as an active, alert willingness to face and to endure all the vicissitudes of a protracted worldwide conflict, may well be sustained by the experience, recurrently and validly demonstrated by the eventual downfall of tyrannies in the course of universal history. The rope will rot.

[From the Neue Zürcher Zeitung, September 1957]

THE DEFENSE OF THE WEST

(By Willy Bretscher)

It is of the utmost importance that we realize one thing clearly: the day of thermonuclear stalemate is drawing near. The moment America's relative invulnerability ends—because not only her advanced air bases will be endangered, but the strategic Air Force of Soviet Russia will also be in a position to reach as far as the cities of America—the nuclear threat will be a reciprocal rather than a unilateral one. Already in the first phase of approaching thermo-nuclear parity in armament, the United States of America will become increasingly cautious in threatening the Soviet Union with atomic retaliation in order to arrest a local conflict. This means—as Raymond Aron has put it in an article in the review "Western World/Occident"—that some vital positions in Western Europe, as for instance, Berlin, will no longer be protected against aggression by the certainty of American reprisals, but rather by the Kremlins' own uncertainty as to what, under certain circumstances, might be the nature of America's reactions.

But the consequences of a thermo-nuclear stalemate between the United States of America or, let us rather say, between the Anglo-Saxon powers and Soviet Russia—whenever it becomes materially or merely psychologically effective—will be more far-reaching still, and will affect the position of all the countries of Western Europe and of Western Europe as a whole. Once thermo-nuclear stalemate is achieved, it may and probably will act as the most powerful "deterrent" to a general war which would amount to mass suicide. But when the thermo-nuclear threat will have ceased to be unilateral it will also cease to act as a "deterrent" to small wars; that is to say, Western Europe will no longer be protected by the atomic shield of America. The former certainty of American reprisal or retaliation in the event of a communist aggression in Western Europe, will first be transformed into uncertainty as to what might be the nature of America's reactions, and at a later stage, into the certainty that there can be no American reprisals because such reprisals would mean mutual annihilation. Soviet Russia, having maintained her superiority in manpower and conventional weapons, will be tempted to advance her positions by exerting to the fullest extent the pressure of her political and military power and by resorting to all the various means, the guises and disguises of aggression at her disposal. Not only the most vulnerable Western positions, such as Berlin, but also the small states immediately bordering on Russia and, finally, all Continental European countries would find themselves exposed to this relentless pressure; as a matter of fact, all these countries may at some time or other find themselves in a situation comparable to that of Eastern Europe from 1946 to 1948, a situation which led to the loss of freedom and independence of the nations now belonging to the satellite empire of Soviet Russia.

Can NATO prevent such a development by replacing the American atomic shield which is gradually becoming less effective? The answer to this question depends on whether NATO will be capable, not only of fighting the opening round of another major European war, but also of taking effective action in the case of local wars, aggressions by proxy, etc., or to put it more explicitly, to act in such a way that the brush fire will be stamped out, the aggression repulsed and the aggressor discouraged from further ventures, without the development of a large, general war from a "small" war. In reference to these cases of "small wars," that is to say, a repetition of Korea, we must clearly recognize the fact that the possibilities of NATO for such effective action are extremely limited as long as it continues to be inferior to Russia in manpower and is, in consequence, forced to depend on the use of atomic weapons to counterbalance this inferiority. These tactical atomic weapons are, of course, highly destructive; the weapons in question are full-grown atom bombs with an effect, varying from one-tenth to ten times the force of the bomb which destroyed Hiroshima; but precisely for this reason it is doubtful, whether and to what extent their use in a local conflict is possible and advisable. Above all it must be remembered that the employment of these tactical atomic weapons against an opponent who has attacked and invaded a NATO state would inevitably be of the gravest consequence to the civilian population; in many cases it will, therefore, be impossible to use this weapon because this kind of "liberation" would defeat its own purpose, as judged by political and humane standards. How, for example, is one to use the atom bomb if West Berlin should suddenly be occupied by troops of the East German People's Army? Furthermore, the use of tactical nuclear weapons automatically includes the danger of causing the development of a local conflict into general war. To be sure, both military experts and statesmen have affirmed that it is perfectly possible to draw a distinction between general atomic warfare including thermo-nuclear arms and the limited use of atomic weapons of a tactical nature. We should like to believe that they are right, but we may be allowed to wonder whether the troops on which atomic bombs of a tactical nature would be dropped, would also be inclined to make this fine distinction. At any rate, there can be no certainty in this matter, for the outcome depends on the enemy's actual reaction to the use of tactical atomic weapons. One cannot ignore the danger that tactics might become strategy and local war might degenerate into general war and mass suicide. The conclusion seems inevitable: NATO in its present state and with its present equipment is ill-fitted if not downright incapable of coping adequately and effectively with a great number of the situations which may arise in a near future, when thermonuclear stalemate has been reached.

A dispassionate analysis of these problems leads to the conclusion that the breathtaking development of the techniques of war and the corresponding changes in strategy considered or already carried out by governments and general staffs, tend to create a situation in which the free world or parts of the free world may sooner or later be faced with the terrible choice between political capitulation and general atomic apocalypse. Is there an answer to this dilemma?

Such an answer is certainly not to be found in the disarmament talks which we have witnessed in the last months. Although, between the thermonuclear powers of today, there should and could be to render this threat 100 percent effective. They would in this way reduce to a minimum the danger of having to make actual use of such arms and would strengthen the possibility of attaining the desired end of security and peace. One may leave the question open as to what practical measures such a policy of rendering the thermonuclear threat 100 percent effective might entail at a given moment, but the possibility and even the necessity should now be envisaged that Western Europe would have to acquire the "deterrent" herself, if and when the United States of America can no longer be expected to risk the destruction of New York and Chicago in order to save a small European country from invasion and occupation.

Secondly—and this is the most important point—NATO will have to make a serious effort to achieve such a measure of military strength in manpower with equipped conventional weapons, as is considered indispensable to the security of Western Europe against all kinds of aggression. According to the latest reports on SHAPE, the Supreme Commander now has instantly available to him a sufficient and even overwhelming nuclear striking force in the U.S. 3d Air Force and in the 6th Fleet, but what he sorely needs are the 15 to 18 divisions which would make up the contingent of the 30 divisions required to cover the central front. In view of the situation which may arise in Western Europe, once nuclear stalemate has been achieved or even before then, especially in regard to the possibility of small wars, aggressions by proxy, new uprisings in the satellite countries, and so forth, it is not surprising that General Norstad is expected to put forward in his next report to the NATO Council the view that sufficient ground forces are needed to counterbalance Russia's superiority in conventional armies and weapons, and that the stopgap measures consisting in the replacement of men by gadgets, as well as the subterfuge of pretending that by changes in organization two men can be as effective as three, must be discarded.

There is no doubt that the demand for a substantial increase in ground forces, such as is needed for the strengthening of the defense of Western Europe, means onerous burdens for all the countries concerned—burdens which the warworn and war-weary peoples will not easily accept and which some statesmen and politicians may not be prepared to advocate as eloquently and unflinchingly as certain other schemes for the fostering of the economic welfare and social progress of the masses. There are indeed

formidable psychological and political obstacles barring the way to a rapid and effective rearmament of Western Europe. Recognition of this fact does not detract from our duty, but makes it still more imperative to tell the unpalatable truth and to disperse the fog of illusions and delusions which veils the vitally important issues in the matter of defense. The truth is this, that materially, such effective action is extremely limited as long as it continues to be inferior to Russia in manpower and is, in consequence, forced to depend on the use of atomic weapons to counterbalance this inferiority. These tactical atomic weapons are, of course, highly destructive; the weapons in question are full-grown atom bombs with an effect, varying from one tenth to ten times the force of the bomb which destroyed Hiroshima; but precisely for this reason it is doubtful, whether and to what extent their use in a local conflict is possible and advisable. Above all it must be remembered that the employment of these tactical atomic weapons against an opponent who has attacked and invaded a NATO state would inevitably be of the gravest consequence to the civilian population; in many cases it will, therefore, be impossible to use this weapon because this kind of "liberation" would defeat its own purpose, as judged by political and humane standards. How, for example, is one to use the atom bomb if West Berlin should suddenly be occupied by troops of the East German People's Army? Furthermore, the use of tactical nuclear weapons automatically includes the danger of causing the development of a local conflict into general war. To be sure, Western Europe would be perfectly able to have a classical armament sufficiently strong to counterbalance the classical armament of the opposing forces of the Eastern bloc, that it has the potential in population, in technology, in industrial output and economic power to match the industrial strength of 200 millions of Russians, who have in their immense empire to care for the defense of a frontier extending three to four times the length of the present frontier of Western Europe from the North Cape to the Maritime Alps. The truth is, too, that not a general economic mobilization, but only a reasonable and reasonably limited effort would be needed to achieve a state of defense in Western Europe which would relieve its peoples of the anxieties and nightmares induced by the present deplorable situation. The truth is, finally, that if Western Europe is satisfied to rely and continues to rely exclusively and indefinitely on the "deterrent" of the thermonuclear threat, she may discover one day, when it is too late to do anything about it, that the "deterrent" has become ineffective and that she is doomed to suffer the fate of beleaguered Byzantium 500 years ago.

Oil Imports and Gravy Trains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1959

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, at the time of the Executive order which restricted the importation oil by the mandatory import program, I issued a press release voicing my concern for the effect of the program upon the eastern seaboard consumers. Soon after the printing of this release, I was pleased to receive from Mr. Harry B. Hilts, secretary of the Empire State Petroleum Association, a letter with some pertinent data which vindicates my position. Mr. Hilts' letter contained an enclosure—a copy of a statement to its shareholders by American Petrofina, Inc., a Belgian controlled corporation which started operation in the U.S. market in October of 1956.

Because I feel, as does Mr. Hilts, that "the eastern seaboard consumers will be required to foot the bill involved in this gravy-train operation," I feel it necessary to bring to the attention of my colleagues, a description of my position, and the information conveyed to me supporting my stand. Consequently, I under unanimous consent, introduce the following material as an extension of remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

First. My press release of March 26, 1959.

Second. Mr. Hilts' letter of April 13, 1959, describing the position of the Empire State Petroleum Association which Mr. Hilts represents.

Third. A statement of March 30, 1959, issued to its stockholders by American Petrofina, Inc.

Fourth. My reply of April 17, 1959, to Mr. Hilts.

Fifth. Mr. Hilts latest communication of April 20, 1959.

McDOWELL ATTACKS PRESIDENT'S DECISION TO CUT OIL IMPORTS

Congressman HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR. Democrat, of Delaware, in a strong indictment of President Eisenhower's move to protect large American oil corporations, made the following statement:

"We have been hearing a lot of talk lately about inflation from the administration. Prevention of inflation seems to have been the main thing on Mr. Eisenhower's mind as we have seen from his policy of a balanced budget and tight money. He has insinuated that the Democratic Congress is composed of nothing but spendthrifts and budget busters who are bent on destroying the economy by producing inflationary conditions.

"And yet, this same President has seen fit to cut the amount of oil which this country can import. This will definitely cause more inflation than any move the Congress could make if it were bent upon producing inflation, and of course, the Congress is not." McDOWELL went on, saying:

"While the Presdeint's order cuts crude oil imports about 25 percent, it slashes the import of gasoline and other refined oil products more drastically. To the ordinary consumer, this means the price of gasoline will go up since with less gasoline on the market, more money is required to buy it. It means the consumer's heating bill will become larger if he heats his home with oil or any oil product.

"To the businessman, this decision means a rise in the cost of manufacturing since he must pay a greater price for oil which he consumes in large quantities. By increasing the cost of doing business, this will increase the cost of buying every article that American business manufactures. Then too, when products of American industry must be sold at a higher price, our domestic manufacturers will be at a disadvantage on the world market since they cannot sell their products as cheaply as other nations with whom they are competing.

"We can easily see that the President's decision is totally inconsistent with his previous demand to eliminate inflationary tendencies from the economy. It is also inconsistent with the President's expressed desire to aid foreign countries and increase our prestige in the international arena. As a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I am deeply concerned with the effect the oil import cut will have upon our relations wtih friendly producer nations. Our good trade relations with Canada essentially will be destroyed, and the damage this decision will do to our already strained relationships with South America and the Middle East will be irreparable. The economic stability of these countries, whose friendship we need so badly, depends to a great extent upon the money they receive from selling oil to the United States. The President's action can do nothing but cause a loss of friendship, and a weakening of these countries' economy, making them even more susceptible to Communist influence and infiltration. This we absolutely cannot afford.

"The President has attempted to give reasons for the decision. He stated that we must cut oil imports and develop America's ability to produce oil so that in the event of a major war, the United States would not have to depend upon foreign markets. This argument is so ill advised that it becomes ridiculous."

Congressman McDOWELL pointed to its weaknesses by stating:

"First of all by cutting off oil imports we may be increasing the American oil industry's capacity to produce more oil by increasing its employees and the size of its production plants, but along with this we are depleting the available supply of domestic oil. Secondly, the United States has sufficient oil-producing capacity right now to fight a big war. Our worry is not whether we have enough oil for war * * * we have that. The real problem is whether or not we have an adequate amount of defense to prevent a major war from starting. Thirdly, in case of a limited war, the United States would not be severed from all foreign oil sources. Oil from Canada is is piped into this country, and consequently would be free from enemy action on the high seas. Fourthly, it is true that some of our foreign sources of oil would be cut off in time of war, but, with this in mind, should we not allow at least part of America's oil to lie underground and should we not take advantage of the opportunity, which may not always be with us, to bring in oil from the Middle East and South America?"

Congressman McDOWELL went on to say: "The President's decision is harmful to every State in this Union which depends upon oil imports. This means that his decision is harmful to all but a handful of western oil-producing States. It is a devastating blow to every consumer in this country, especially those east of the Mississippi River, for both business and consumers in this area depend heavily upon imported oil.

"The only people to benefit from the President's decision are those running our large oil companies and, I might add, it is not only the Democrats who are saying that the President is looking out for the oil interests which are financially well off to start with Senator GEORGE AIKEN, Republican, of Vermont, delivered a scorching criticism of the President's plan."

McDOWELL said, in conclusion: "Although politics is not the reason for criticism of the decision, politics can be the only reason for the President's order. It looks as if there is collusion between certain people in both political parties to protect the oil producers in exchange for their political support. I, for one, however, will voice my disgust when I see politics played to this extent. This decision, by annihilating a major source of oil, the lifeblood of our Nation, can do nothing but cause unjustified hardship to the consumer, weaken our defenses, and decrease our stature in the field of international relations."

EMPIRE STATE PETROLEUM ASSOCIATION, INC.,
New York, N.Y., April 13, 1959.

The Honorable HARRIS B. MCDOWELL, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. MCDOWELL: We are enclosing herewith a copy of a letter sent recently to its shareholders by American Petrofina, Inc., a Belgian-controlled concern which began operating in the U.S. market on October 1, 1956.

We call your attention to the following quotation which we have underlined in the attached letter—

"* * * upon the basis of negotiations just concluded, should result in a substantial improvement in earnings."

Since the refineries owned by this company are located at inland sites, far removed from ports of entry used by oversea tankers, they cannot readily use imported oil in their operations. Thus, we assume that the substantial improvement referred to above will result from the sale of American Petrofina's oil imports under the quota system to refiners whose locations permit them to process imported oil.

So that you may more fully understand the gravy-train aspect of the situation referred to above, we estimate the windfall profit to this company as follows: Based on the going market price for foreign oil brought in under the quota system, when transferred from the quota holder to another refiner in need of the oil, we assume the additional sums accuring to American Petrofina, Inc., will total between $1 and $1.5 million this year.

We have, of course, no bone to pick with American Petrofina per se. We submit their letter only as a typical illustration of how former nonimporting refiners stand to benefit from current import restrictions.

This type of transaction is legal under the quota restrictions, but is assuming all the aspects of a "black market" operation. To substantiate this, the McGraw-Hill Publishing Co.'s daily Oilgram on March 20 pointed out that this traffic will add approximately $30 million to the coffers of formerly nonimporting refiners this year, thereby creating an inflationary impact on consumer oil prices.

We call your attention to the fact that eastern seaboard consumers will be required to foot most of the bill involved in this gravy-train operation.

Sincerely,

HARRY B. HILTS,
Secretary.

AMERICAN PETROFINA, INC.,
New York, N.Y., March 30, 1959.

To the Shareholders:

The mandatory import program recently approved by President Eisenhower, and to which reference was made in the company's 1958 annual report, extends long-awaited benefits to American Petrofino, Inc.

Under the license just received from the Department of the Interior, dated March 11, 1959, the company is authorized to import 4,050 barrels of foreign crude oil per day during the initial quota period. The effect to the company of this allocation is of real significance and, upon the basis of negotiations just concluded, should result in a substantial improvement in earnings.

During 1958, refinery realizations on manufactured products were severely depressed as a result of the availability of low-cost foreign crudes and products to various authorized companies operating under the voluntary import program, as well as to others who elected to ignore the requirements of that plan.

The controls established under the mandatory program should now prevent many of the costly abuses of the past and contribute thereby to an improvement in market conditions.

The prospects for your company for the remainder of the year are brightened by the Government's action, and I thought the information would be interesting and welcome to you.

HARRY A. JACKSON, *President.*

APRIL 17, 1959.

Mr. HARRY B. HILTS
Secretary, Empire State
Petroleum Association, Inc.
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. HILTS: I appreciate your letter and enclosure of April 13 for it gives factual information backing my objections to the mandatory import program. Any further information of this nature, dealing particularly with the effects of this program on the eastern seaboard consumer would be most helpful to me.

It is my feeling that your letter is the type which would be extremely effective as an extension of my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I would like to introduce it with its enclosure as such. I will, however, be guided by your feelings on this proposal and I would appreciate your expressing them to me as quickly as possible.

I truly hope that I may be of assistance to you in finding a remedy to this situation.

Sincerely,

HARRIS B. MCDOWELL, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

EMPIRE STATE PETROLEUM ASSOCIATION,
NEW YORK, N.Y., *April 20, 1959.*

Hon. HARRIS B. MCDOWELL, Jr.
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MCDOWELL: Thank you for your letter of April 17 in which you acknowledge my letter to you of April 13 and its enclosure concerning our objection to the mandatory restrictions on petroleum imports.

I note your suggestion concerning the extension of this letter and its enclosure to your remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and would be very happy to have you use my letter and its enclosure in this way.

Sincerely,

HARRY B. HILTS, *Secretary.*

Crusade Against Obscenity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM MURRAY
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 29, 1959

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, under House Resolution 78 the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is authorized to conduct full and complete investigations and studies with respect to the mailability of articles and printed matters generally, including, among other things, the mailing of obscene matter.

I am most pleased with the efforts put forth by our Subcommittee on Postal Operations under the able chairmanship of Mrs. KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN. I wish to commend Mrs. GRANAHAN and the entire subcommittee for the prompt action they have taken in highlighting the need to eradicate obscene matter from the mail.

At a recent subcommittee hearing, the Postmaster General described mail order obscenity as a $500 million a year business. The Postmaster General and Mrs. GRANAHAN's subcommittee have pointed the way of best combating these merchants of filth by calling for an aroused community to take action. Every community should enlist the support of their newspapers and radio and television stations in a joint crusade to help dry up the flow of obscene matter into the hands of our youth.

As an example of what can be done in such a crusade, I would like to insert in the RECORD an editorial from the April 25, 1959, edition of the Philadelphia Inquirer entitled "Mailed Filth Must Be Wiped Out":

MAILED FILTH MUST BE WIPED OUT

We are in full agreement with Philadelphia Representative KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN that local communities should make every effort to help wipe out the growing traffic in pornography and filth.

Postmaster General Summerfield has described mail order obscenity as a $500-million-a-year business that is increasing in volume because of the tremendous profits involved from little investment and the many slack obscenity laws, loosely interpreted in many courts.

It is obvious that no post office has the men or the facilities to check every piece of mail for questionable content. Nor can the police devote much of their time to thumbing through every magazine, paperback, or doubtful advertisement for potential offerings of filth.

But an aroused community, working with law-enforcement agencies, can accomplish much to stamp out this vile business.

At the heart of the matter is a twofold need: tougher postal laws concerning the mailing of lewd material and stiffer fines and prison sentences for convicted purveyors.

In addition to a promise to work with Congress in writing tighter postal laws, Mr. Summerfield has also wisely suggested that State and local authorities draft legislation along the lines of Federal statutes to make local enforcement against obscenity stronger and more effective.

In dumping unordered, lewd material into mailboxes across the country; in putting into the hands of our children samples of objectionable pictures, films, and related filth, these mail-order merchants of obscenity have not only created one of the Nation's most serious moral and social problems, but also have undoubtedly contributed to the alarming growth of juvenile delinquency.

Present laws on the books are obviously inadequate to prevent or even slow down the trade in pornography. A liberal Supreme Court ruling on the differences between art and obscenity has provided a virtual sanctuary in which sellers of filth can operate almost with impunity in defiance of postal regulations.

Persons convicted under today's obscenity laws generally receive minute fines and short prison sentences which are not in any way commensurate with the enormity of their crime. Of what importance or harm is a $1,000 fine to a convicted purveyor when he can make that much in a day selling filth? Or a 60- to 90-day jail sentence for his damage in kindling an unhealthy pruriency in children?

It is at the local level, in addition to Federal and State enforcement, that much can be done to smash this evil racket. The 50,000-odd complaints a year received by the Post Office Department from outraged parents, religious and civic groups probably represent only a small percent of the total number of people receiving unordered pornography through the mail.

In addition to the efforts of postal authorities to stop this type of mail at the source, citizens everywhere who get notices offering to sell dirty pictures, lewd stories and films or other pornographic material should give prompt notification to the Post Office.

If such filth is offered locally, the police should be informed.

Since these dealers in obscenity aim their wares at children, theirs is more than a wicked crime. They must be caught and punished to the fullest extent of the law. And where the law is weak and ineffective, it must be changed and strengthened.

Every person interested in the welfare and decency of our children can help stop this vicious racket by concerted, vigilant action.

The Man Who Meant It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 29, 1959

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, April 20, Herbert W. Voorhees, of Hopewell, N.J., was killed when his car crashed into the rear of a bus.

Herb Voorhees was president of the New Jersey Farm Bureau and for many years had been a leader in the agricultural activities of our State. The evening of his untimely death, he was returning from an executive board meeting of the Farm Family and Life Insurance Co. in Albany. He had been named president of this company only 3 months ago.

Herb Voorhees was not a theorist—he was a practical farmer who actually ran a farm. He was articulate, courageous, a leader in every true sense of the word and his death deprives our State of one of its most dedicated citizens.

The New Jersey delegation in the Congress has met during recent years at breakfasts with representatives of the New Jersey Farm Bureau. The meetings led by Mr. Voorhees were to the point, no words were minced, and we all benefited from a clear understanding of the positive, constructive program offered by the bureau. It was a real tribute to his leadership that the views of the New Jersey Farm Bureau received full attention and major support from New Jersey Representatives in the Congress.

Herb Voorhees was a good friend. His council and advice will be missed and his place in the community will be difficult to fill.

I am closing my remarks by inserting in the Appendix an editorial from the Bergen Evening Record of Hackensack, N.J., published on April 25, 1959:

THE MAN WHO MEANT IT

There are few enough outspoken rugged individualists left. To see one of them struck down in the prime of his usefulness is doubly shocking.

Herbert W. Voorhees was killed in an automobile accident a few days ago. This State lost one of its most intelligent and devoted citizens. Mr. Voorhees for 17 years was president of the New Jersey Farm Bureau. But he was more. He himself was something of an institution. Whether or not one agreed with him (and it was rare that every one did), every one listened. He made hard sense.

Mr. Voorhees was a farm-bureau official who ran a farm. He knew farmers and farming, and he knew their problems, and he spoke his mind on them. "Professional do-gooders" was his scornful description of those who opposed his plans to liberalize child-labor laws. He was as vehement in his demands for a sales tax as he was in his denunciation of the farmer's dependence on Government. As head of the Highway Users Conference he was a leader in the fight to stop diversion of highway funds.

It is not often these days that a man fights bluntly, intelligently, hard for all of that in which he believes. Every level of government and society would be better off for such fighters. New Jersey is poorer in the loss of Herbert Voorhees.

Inactive Duty Pay for Reserve Officers and Enlisted Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 29, 1959

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, because I feel that there has been an oversight in adequately providing for the pay of Reserve officers and enlisted men while on inactive duty, I wish to take this opportunity, under leave to extend my remarks, to place in the Appendix of the RECORD, a copy of a resolution which was approved at the 31st annual convention of the Iowa Department of the Reserve Officers Association. Congressional action on this resolution would correct the present inequity.

The resolution follows:

"RESOLUTION RELATING TO PAY OF THE ARMED FORCES

"Whereas inactive-duty pay for Reserve training has been, is, and always will be the most effective incentive for increased participation in Reserve training programs; and

"Whereas constructive Reserve training programs in the future will require increased participation by reservists in all categories and classes; and

"Whereas paid training assignments for some individuals and not for others in the same category and class results in unwarranted discrimination, creates a morale factor, detracts from the desirability of continued participation in Reserve training year after year, and contributes to a lowering of training standards and practices: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States be asked to enact into law under the title 'Pay for the Armed Forces' a provision which shall be applicable under all past, present, and future statutes pertaining to pay for the Armed Forces, and which, in effect, shall read:

"'Every Reserve officer and enlisted man on inactive duty who under proper authority participates in an authorized Reserve training program will be paid not less than 1 day's base pay for attendance at each and every authorized training period.'"

The above resolution was approved and adopted on April 18, 1959, by the unanimous vote of the delegates to the 31st annual convention of the Iowa Department, Reserve Officers Association, in convention assembled.

BOB A. JESSUP,
Lieutenant Colonel, Armed Forces
Reserves National Councilman
(For the Department President).

Anti-Inflation Letters Shock Congressmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 29, 1959

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues and other interested persons an article which appeared in the Chicago Tribune on April 26, 1959.

As most Members know, particularly those from the Middle West, the Tribune is conducting a campaign to limit Federal spending and curb inflation. This effort has resulted in a great flood of mail demanding that Congress pursue sound fiscal policies. I doubt that those who have received the bulk of these messages need to be reminded that our people recognize the danger of inflation. My hope is, however, that the results of this campaign will not be lost on the rest of us. It is clear to me that the overwhelming majority of Americans favor a halt in excessive spending. They have seen the purchasing power of their dollars shrink in half over the past two decades and are demanding the maintenance of a stable currency. Surely, we who have the responsibiilty of formulating Federal policies will wish to comply with their wishes.

The article reporting on the campaign and written by Chicago Tribune Correspondent Willard Edwards follows:

[Chicago Sunday Tribune, Apr. 26, 1959]

ANTI-INFLATION LETTERS SHOCK CONGRESSMEN—PRESIDENT PLEASED WITH TRIBUNE CAMPAIGN

(By Willard Edwards)

WASHINGTON, April 25.—In the last 10 days, Congress has been given its greatest shock in many years. It has been shelled with a sudden and unexpected bombardment of mail from protesting citizens.

Although the main targets of fire thus far have been Midwest representatives, the range is gradually being broadened to strike lawmakers from the South, North, East, and Far West. Capitol Hill can talk about nothing else.

The cannonading began without warning the morning of April 15. The two Senators from Illinois, EVERETT DIRKSEN, Republican, and PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat, found passage to their offices blocked by bulging sacks of letters. The count on these messages was to rise to more than 60,000 in a week.

OTHERS RECEIVE SACKS

Eight Senators from the neighboring States of Indiana, Iowa, Wisconsin, and Michigan found their office staffs contemplating with awe thousands of letters from constituents.

In the following week, 72 Representatives from the same 5 States had the same experience; as of this morning, an estimated 120,000 pieces of mail had been delivered in 10 days to the 82 officeholders who represent the 25 million men, women, and children in the Chicagoland area.

Many Members were delighted as they read the contents of this vast outpouring. Others were bewildered. All were deeply impressed. This massive demonstration of public sentiment could not be ignored.

The letters stressed a single theme. They carried the worries and alarms of citizens over inflation and further depreciation in the value of the dollar. They begged the lawmakers to cut down spending.

A THEORY IS UPSET

The phenomenal feature of this tide of protests was not so much its overpowering volume; its singular aspect was the nature of the written complaints. The writers were asking for less, not more. In doing so, they were undermining a theory popular among many Members of Congress that the people have grown accustomed to a welfare state and will not tolerate any lessening of Federal spending which might lose them its benefits.

The letters appealed to Congressmen to vote only for essential expenditures, to oppose waste, and keep the dollar sound.

This was confusing, not to say alarming, to those lawmakers who thought they had received a mandate in last November's elections to spend more money than ever before.

One newspaper was responsible for this public uprising. The Chicago Tribune on April 12 and April 19 called upon its readers to let their Congressmen know how they felt about inflation and printed forms to facilitate the process.

WRITERS TELL OF WOES

A majority of the readers who responded to the appeal used the blanks but about 20 percent added letters in which they noted the personal injuries they had suffered in the form of deflated savings, insurance, pensions, income, and social security.

One of the most interested observers of the anti-inflation campaign was Dwight D. Eisenhower.

The President looked at the Tribune spread with its bold black inquiry at the top: "Are you worried about inflation?" He scanned the display with its printed coupons for mailing protests to Congress and exclaimed:

"I wish every newspaper in the country would do this."

As the days passed, Mr. Eisenhower was kept informed of the response to the campaign and his interest grew as he learned of the swelling tide of letters which poured in upon the Midwest Senators and Representatives.

Last Wednesday, the White House authorized a tribute to a newspaper which has sometimes differed rather strongly with his policies. This was a virtually unprecedented endorsement which stirred the journalistic world. The President of the United States rather rigidly refrains from singling out for praise any individual newspaper in a bitterly competitive business.

James C. Hagerty, White House press secretary, publicly announced the President's delight about the campaign and the public demonstration of support for reduced spending and a balanced budget which he had been urging against heavy pressures in Congress.

PRESIDENT GETS ALLY

"President Eisenhower is watching with great interest the Chicago Tribune's campaign against excessive Government spending and inflation," Hagerty said. "He is delighted with the response and wishes more newspapers would do the same."

The reason for President Eisenhower's happiness over the anti-inflation mail pouring in upon Congress is only too evident. Now he has reason to believe that the public has been alerted and is letting Congress know how it feels.

Up to now, the President has been armed only with a veto power to stop inflationary pressures in Congress. He does not want to use it. No President likes to set up his opinion against that of a majority of Congress.

He may not have to exercise the veto. An aroused public is speeding to Washington tens of thousands of vetoes.

No Politics in REA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1959

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, the subject of rural electrification program presently is being widely discussed in view of the President's veto of S. 144. Many people feel that the wonderful accomplishments of rural electrification should not be interfered with and that there is no place for politics in the administration of the rural electrification program for the folks and the people in the hills.

One of the persons who believes that the rural electrification program should be disassociated from politics is Clyde T. Ellis, general manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. Mr. Ellis has held this position since 1942. He practiced law in Garfield and Bentonville after admission to the Arkansas bar in 1933. His legislative career started with the election to the Arkansas Assembly at the age of 23 and election to the State senate 2 years later. In 1938 he was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives where he served until 1943 when he entered the Navy. While in Congress he was a strong advocate of the rural electrification program and the transmission program necessary to get the power of the dams out to the load centers. Rural electrification and the full development of the country's hydroelectric resources have been his lifetime hobbies.

At a recent seminar at La Parguera, P.R., I listened with interest to a talk delivered by Mr. Ellis, who has an intimate knowledge of the workings of this valuable electrification program. His remarks are pertinent and will prove interesting reading:

I want to thank you, first of all, for the honor you do the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association and me by inviting me to participate in this seminar. We at NRECA have a genuine admiration for the Puerto Rico Water Resources Authority, including the imaginative way you have approached the task of rural electrification. My daughter, Mary, and the NRECA president, Mr. Walter Harrison, join me in thanking you for your wonderful hospitality. It is very inspiring for us to be here and see at first hand, for the first time, the beauty of your island and the great work you are doing.

Mr. Descartes suggested that I tell you something about the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association and its role in the rural electrification program in the United States. This I am happy to do, because I think our organization mirrors the accomplishments, hopes, and objectives of the rural electric cooperatives, public-power districts, and public-utility districts—indeed of all rural people. The growth of NRECA has paralleled the growth of rural electrification itself. Today, our organization represents about 95 percent of the REA borrowers, providing them with services and efficiencies that are available only through their own united efforts.

As I go along, I want to touch on some of these services, because I think they will be of interest to you. Everything we do at NRECA is in response to the needs and requests of our members. Through their own national association, the systems have worked out answers to many of their most vexing problems. In doing so, they have developed some rather ingenious approaches to the broad area of rural electric management.

I do not believe I am presumptuous in saying that the work we do at NRECA has real meaning and value for you here in the Commonwealth. I think we are united with you in the great common goal of producing and delivering an abundance of electric power at the lowest possible cost to the consumer. When a blow is struck anywhere in the country for that cause, I believe the results are beneficial to us all. I know that we on the mainland benefit from your inspired demonstration of how the wise utilization of electric energy can uplift an entire economy. The rural electrification program of the States, I believe, is stronger because you have found a method of electrifying your rural areas here.

And I think it worthy of note that both you and we found the financial help we needed in the Rural Electrification Act of 1936. Had it not been for that act, a large part of rural America would be in darkness tonight—including, no doubt, much of rural Puerto Rico.

THE GREAT SOCIAL INSTRUMENT

So this great social instrument is a sort of rural lifeline that ties our people together in a common quest for a better rural life. But the act itself did not put light in the darkness. The act was a tool, a dream, an inspiration. It remained for men to use the tool, to believe in it and care for it and guard it from privateers, speculators, and exploiters.

Our people have used the act—and used it wisely. On a thousand rural electric systems in every part of the country, men have sweated and sworn and prayed and somehow, almost incredibly, they have built the network of lines that form a power skeleton in rural America. Rural people did this gigantic job themselves. And now that the lines are up, they are learning that an equally difficult task lies ahead. Now they must rebuild and heavy up, and constantly build or find new sources of wholesale supply to meet a power demand that doubles every 5 to 7 years. Now they must master the complex techniques of management so necessary to the successful operation of such dynamic enterprises.

The task of guarding the act, of protecting it and sometimes improving it, has also been performed by the rural electric systems. This is one of the important things they do through NRECA. Every year, it seems, efforts are made in the Congress to cripple the act or destroy the REA borrowers. It used to be that these efforts were made indirectly. Bills would be introduced, for example, to kill off the Federal wholesale power program of the river basins, which is the lifeblood of so many rural electric systems. About half of our systems buy all or part of their wholesale supply from Federal multipurpose dam projects; and a great many systems would not be feasible at all without this source of supply. So our enemies used to think if they could kill off the Federal wholesale power projects, they could do by indirection what they had no chance of doing directly.

THE DIRECT ATTACKS

They're still using that approach, of course, but in the past few years something new has been added. Now the total REA loan program is under direct attack. It is a matter of record that the administration in Washington is dedicated to increasing the interest rate and sending our systems to private lenders for much of their future loan needs. Bills to that effect were sponsored last year by the administration, and

the President has assured everyone that new efforts will be made this year. This is fact, and I would be less than candid if I did not mention it to you this morning. The success of the administration campaign in this effort could, I believe, have a real effect on your own plans here for expanded rural electrification. We do not believe an increased interest rate is justified for this program, and we do not believe our loan needs could be met—at a price we could afford to pay—by the open money market.

We are committed and intend to fight these efforts with every resource at our command; we are convinced we will win, because we believe truth is more powerful than propaganda slogans—and we will find a way to take our case to the people.

In saying these things, I am in no sense attacking the administration. This is the course they have chartered, and they have a right to their own policies and programs. But I promise you that this particular voyage will not be calm and undisturbed. The delegates to our NRECA regional and national meetings have firmly and unanimously gone on record in opposition to these policies, and this opposition will be forcefully expressed—in many ways.

LEGISLATION WE NEED

Now, let us turn briefly to some legislation we need. There are a number of bills in this Congress that we aggressively support. One of them, I think, will be of especial interest to you, because the Puerto Rico Water Resources Authority has been prominently mentioned in hearings this year and last.

HUMPHREY-PRICE BILL

This is the Humphrey-Price bill to restore the full loan-making authority of the REA Administrator. As you may know, early in 1957, the Administrator was ordered to submit loans of more than $500,000, and all applications from new borrowers, to an Agriculture Department official for review, before he signed the loan. The REA Administrator, as you know, is appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. He serves a 10-year term, which means his tenure is not concurrent with any Secretary of Agriculture or any administration. These provisions, of course, were written into the act to remove REA from any hint of political control or influence.

Well, we thought the able REA Administrator thoroughly capable of making loans himself, as the act intended. We did not think he should have to have them "reviewed" by a political appointee in the Department of Agriculture who was not appointed by the President, was not confirmed by the Senate, and had no term of office at all.

So we sponsored the Humphrey-Price bill to remedy this situation. Here's the part I think you will find interesting. During the hearings on the bill last year, and again just recently, the REA loan to finance your new generating unit was discussed at some length. It seems that your loan was one of those which the political appointee—Mr. Kenneth Scott—did not want the Administrator to make. The hearings made it perfectly clear that the only reason you got that loan was because Mr. Hamil went to bat for you.

Let me read you an excerpt from the official record of the Senate hearings last year. I think it clearly demonstrates the philosophical test to which REA loans are now subjected.

This is a colloquy between Senator LAUSCHE of Ohio and Kenneth Scott of Secretary Benson's office.

"Senator LAUSCHE. I put this question to you. In the Puerto Rican loan, if you had been convinced that it was a bad loan and dangerous as a credit risk, would you have considered it your obligation to inform Mr. Benson, the man who was ultimately responsible?

"Mr. SCOTT. Yes, sir.

"Senator LAUSCHE. Why did you not inform him of this loan about which you had a doubt—the Puerto Rican loan?

"Mr. SCOTT. I had no question, Senator, about the repayment of that loan. And I had no question about it having been determined legally that it was within the act. The question that I had and that I discussed with Mr. Hamil was whether or not it was really within the full intent of the law. As I stated here earlier, Senator, it was based upon, first, the very strong financial condition of that borrowing organization, and the fact that they had in the past been able and always had used private money.

"It was a change of purpose, a major change of purpose of their borrowing from REA at a time when money rates were high.

"Senator LAUSCHE. That is, it was finally your conclusion that they were trying to get some cheap money at 2 percent when you believed that with their fiscal standing they probably could have borrowed in the private market.

"Mr. SCOTT. That was my impression, Senator."

What do we have revealed in this colloquy? We have a political appointee, Mr. Scott, arguing against making a loan because he thinks possibly you could have gotten the money from a private lender. He admits that the loan is justified, and meets all the requirements of law. He does not question the competency of the REA staff which has certified that the loan should be made. What he has done is add his own philosophical test, and his own interpretation of the intent of the law.

I think Mr. Scott did not know, or care, about your great struggle here to electrify your rural areas. He did not care that private funds, had they been available at all for this purpose, would have been at a much higher interest rate, and might possibly have doomed this part of your rural electrification expansion.

Our people throughout the United States were shocked by this testimony. They knew it could happen to them if it could happen to you. They wondered if it had happened already.

You got your loan. You got it because Dave Hamil fought for it. But why should these things happen? What if a lesser man were Administrator of REA, a weaker man? What would happen to the loan program then when all the political philosophers were through?

We have high hopes for the Humphrey-Price bill. We've worked awfully hard for it. Extensive hearings have been held on it by the appropriate committees of the Senate and House. Both committees have recommended its passage. The Senate passed it last week. The House, we hope, will act soon. If we succeed, the Administrator will no longer be burdened by this sort of thing.

OUR ATOMIC FUTURE

We're interested in a wide variety of other legislative matters, of course. I won't go into them in detail, except to say again that we're working for an abundance of power at the lowest possible cost. This objective leads us to aggressively support the comprehensive development of our rivers for the benefit of all the people. It leads us to support Federal projects, including Government transmission lines to deliver the power out to major loan centers for sale at wholesale. And it leads us to support a strong forward-looking program for the development of atomic energy.

Sometime in the future, the power of the atom will either destroy mankind or help liberate him. At this moment, for the first time in history, man holds in his hand the power to destroy a civilization. But he also holds the key to an almost undreamed-of plenty. I do not believe that man will destroy himself. With our prayers and our determination, he will find a way to live with himself and his fellows. As dark as some of the days are, I think that never before have so many people worked so desperately for peace.

Less dramatic and threatening, but almost as important, it seems to me, are our policies for developing the atom to serve the peaceful aspirations of mankind. Admiral Lewis Strauss, former Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, once said this, in discussing our atomic future:

"It is not too much to expect that our children will enjoy in their homes electrical energy too cheap to meter; will know of great periodic regional famines in the world today only as matters of history; will travel effortlessly over the seas and under them and through the air with a minimum of danger and at great speed; and will experience a lifespan far longer than ours, as disease yields and man comes to understand what causes him to age. This is the forecast for an age of peace."

In my own opinion, I do not think Admiral Strauss chose to adopt policies that would have led to the achievement of the idea he expressed so well. Before we can make significant progress in these areas, it seems to me that our officials will have to begin thinking more in terms of people than of companies.

One thing is certain: If we allow the commercial power companies to grab a monopoly on atomic power now, while it is in its infancy, electricity will never, in Admiral Strauss' words, be "too cheap to meter." Maybe it won't ever be that cheap anyway—but the people whose taxes in the amount of billions on billions of dollars have been invested in developing atomic science deserve to share in its benefits. For our part, we consider the atom a natural resource that belongs to the people—not to a company or an industry. We believe the Federal Government should build prototype reactors. And we think the power should be marketed in the same manner other Federal power is marketed. i.e., with preference to consumer-owned electric systems. Certainly private industry should be encouraged to participate, and it has been encouraged to do so for many years now under an ultra-generous give-away subsidy program. But surely it is incomprehensible to give the utility companies a monopoly status over the atom.

The atom, then, is another area in which NRECA has a deep legislative interest.

STRENGTH THROUGH UNITY

I would like to tell you briefly about some of our other NRECA services, all of which we consider important in the overall rural electrification picture.

At the national level, our systems have been cooperating in several important activities for some time. Many of these coordinated efforts have been carried on long enough to prove conclusively their efficacy.

First, I should like to mention briefly some of the pooling services that have been organized by NRECA at the request of and for the benefit of our rural electric systems. Then, I will point out some of the activities which are engaged in jointly by the American Public Power Association, NRECA and other organizations.

COOPERATION AMONG RURAL ELECTRIC SYSTEMS

In NRECA we have long recognized that each rural electric system must go beyond the area of internal management to achieve our objective of low-cost service. We recognize the efficiencies of centralized service in those matters that can be handled better by two or more systems, and we have made available to our systems the services of the State and national associations to assist in coordinating those activities.

We have come close to establishing the principle or policy that any group of mem-

bers in more than one State may use the national association—the members and/or the Board concurring—as a vehicle through which to set up and operate any worthwhile service on a self-supporting, cost basis.

Examples of this type of cooperative service include our insurance pool, our retirement and group health programs, our fleet auto purchase program, and other types of purchasing pools. At our national meeting in February in Washington, we launched a centrally-coordinated public relations program.

Management training courses and institutes which are provided the various systems on a pay-as-you-use basis have proved to be invaluable in improving internal management. Our budget for this self-supporting service alone exceeds a quarter million dollars a year.

Safety training courses and power use demonstrations also have been well received by our member systems.

As helpful as these activities are, I feel that we have only scratched the surface of benefits that can be obtained through cooperative effort. Every year, our systems call on us for assistance in setting into motion programs which are too expensive for a single system to launch by itself, or, which, if done piecemeal, lack the efficiency and resultant impact necessary for full effectiveness. Public relations is an example of the latter type of activity.

COOPERATION BETWEEN NRECA, APPA, AND OTHER GROUPS

Coming closer to the area of our present concern, permit me to review some of the ways NRECA and APPA work together for mutual understanding and benefit.

I want to tell you today what I have said many times in the past—that we in NRECA are pleased to have the opportunity of working with the American Public Power Association and its outstanding general manager, Alex Radin, and his able staff.

While the almost constant contact between these two associations in Washington is important to our mutual understanding of public affairs and technical problems, I firmly believe that the combined influence that we exert in the legislation field is of vital importance to all of us here today. Because, in the final analysis, it is on the legislative front where the day-to-day skirmishes culminate in the showdowns that affect the very existence of public power and, therefore, the future of all consumer-owned and operated utilities.

Although the NRECA and the APPA may differ at times on certain points, you can be sure that on the major issues—when the chips are down—we are standing shoulder to shoulder slugging it out with the well-organized private profit power monopolies who have more seemingly unlimited resources at their disposal.

With the struggle continuing unabated, and with victory hanging in the balance, it is imperative that we close ranks on a united front until victory is assured.

A united front means just one thing—it means all of us.

ELECTRIC CONSUMERS INFORMATION COMMITTEE

Cooperation on a broad front is achieved largely through the Electric Consumers Information Committee which has headquarters in Washington. The ECIC, as we call this committee, is sponsored by 23 State and national organizations, including APPA, NRECA, the Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, many labor unions, including the AFL–CIO itself, the National Farmers' Union, the Cooperative League and other consumer groups; among the many services ECLC provides, one of the most important is that which deals with Federal legislation.

Besides cooperating in legislative matters, NRECA and APPA have worked together in other important ways. The ECIC and NRECA and APPA serving as the prime movers organized the research group known as Energy Research Associates, directed by Leland Olds, former Chairman of the Federal Power Commission. This small group, on a limited budget, is providing extremely valuable research on public power that is used by everyone in the field of publicly owned power generation, transmission and distribution.

In 1957, we joined in the sponsorship of management institutes which resulted in untold benefits to participants from both organizations. We have jointly used the consulting services of a sympathetic top New York consulting firm. Several of you officials and key employees of the Puerto Rico Water Resources Authority have attended these institutes. Bob Kabat, who heads up our management training program, said to me when he heard I was coming down here: "That's a fine group. They are very able fellows, well educated and experienced. No group has created a better impression at the management institutes than they." I regard this a high compliment indeed.

In another area, a joint committee of APPA and NRECA has been set up to try to arrive at some formula for resolving territorial disputes.

The Washington staffs of these organizations have joined together in a Credit Union.

NRECA subscribes to APPA's Atomic News Letter for its member systems.

One of the most important features of this kind of cooperation is that the benefits are large and the costs are small. I must admit it has required time and work. But the results make the effort worthwhile.

CONCLUSION

I have attempted to touch on a few of the things which we consider important to the present and future success of the rural electrification program. The key ingredients, it seems to me, are these:

First. The act itself is all-important. It must be kept intact, and it must have sympathetic administration.

Second. The Government must continue to develop to the maximum extent all of our natural resources, including atomic energy.

Third. The rural electric systems must join together to provide themselves with whatever common services can cut their costs or otherwise improve their efficiency and security. Each one is small by itself, but together they are a big industry, and to a degree they can achieve the efficiencies of scale through common services.

Fourth. The rural electric systems must work closely with their natural allies, with other consumer-owned utility systems and consumer-oriented organizations of various kinds. We need, and must have, all the friends we can muster.

If we are successful in holding on to our program, and pushing it forward, the entire Nation will benefit. You will benefit here in Puerto Rico—because I believe in the long run the fate of your rural electrification program on this beautiful island Commonwealth is entwined inevitably with that of the U.S. mainland.

We, who are privileged to participate in this great consumers' power crusade are fortunate, indeed. With perhaps few exceptions, in what nobler cause could we work—work not only for ourselves and those of our time, but for generations to come; for, as poet Will Allen Dromgoole said:

"The traveler raised his old gray head,
'Good friend, in the path I have come,' he said.
There followeth after me today
A youth whose feet must pass this way.
This stream which has been naught to me
To this fair-haired boy may a pitfall be,
He, too, must cross in the twilight dim,
Good friend, I am building this bridge for him."

—*Will Allen Dromgoole.*

DAV Services in Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, an exceptional record of vital rehabilitation services freely extended to thousands of Virginia citizens has recently come to my attention. These splendid humanitarian services are not sufficiently appreciated by those who have benefited thereby, directly and indirectly.

Among the several congressionally chartered veterans' organizations, which have State departments and local chapters in Virginia, is the Disabled American Veterans. The DAV is the only such organization composed exclusively of those Americans who have been either wounded, gassed, injured or disabled by reason of active service in the Armed Forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it, during time of war.

DAV SETUP

Formed in 1920, under the leadership of Judge Robert S. Marx, DAV legislative activities have very substantially benefited every compensated disabled veteran. Its present national commander is another judge, David B. Williams of Concord, Mass. Its national adjutant is John E. Feighner of Cincinnati, Ohio. Its national legislative director is Elmer M. Freudenberger, its national director of claims, Cicero F. Hogan, and its national director of employment relations, John W. Burris—all located at the DAV National Service Headquarters at 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Inasmuch as less than 10 percent of our country's war veterans are receiving monthly disability compensation payments for service-connected disabilities—some 2 million—the DAV can never aspire to become the largest of the several veterans' organizations. Nevertheless, since shortly after its formation in 1920, the DAV National Headquarters, located in Cincinnati, Ohio, has maintained the largest staff, of any veterans' organization, of full-time trained national service officers, 138 of them, who are located in the 63 regional and 3 district offices of the U.S. Veterans' Administration, and in its central office in Washington, D.C.

They there have ready access to the official claim records of those claimants

who have given them their powers of attorney. All of them being war-handicapped veterans themselves, these service officers are sympathetic and alert to the problems of other less well-informed claimants.

DAV SERVICES IN VIRGINIA

The DAV maintains a fulltime national service officer in Virginia. He is Mr. Richard Frazee and his office is located in the VA Regional Office, 211 West Campbell Avenue, Roanoke. The department commander is Charles M. Nightingale, 4301 South Eighth Street, Arlington, and the department adjutant is Arnold H. Sells, 819 South Irving Street, Arlington.

There are three VA hospitals in Virginia in each of which the DAV has a nationally authorized VA voluntary service representative. They are as follows: Dr. Peter Leginus at the 2,000 bed neuropsychiatric hospital at Roanoke; Mr. Garland H. Branch of Ellerson, Va., at the 1,100 bed general and medical hospital at Richmond; and, Mr. Tyler Hatchell of Portsmouth, Va., at the 2,225 bed VA center at Kecoughtan.

During the last fiscal year, the VA paid out $95,396,000 for its veteran program in Virginia, including $24,270,430 disability compensation to its 26,687 service disabled veterans. These Federal expenditure in Virginia furnish substantial purchasing power in all communities. Only about 8 percent, 1,935, are members of the 36 DAV chapters in Virginia.

SERVICE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE DAV

This 8 percent record is strange, in view of the very outstanding record of personalized service activities and accomplishments of the DAV national service officers in behalf of Virginia veterans and dependents during the last 10 fiscal years, as revealed by the following statistics:

Claimants contacted (estimated)	40,793
Claims folders reviewed	33,994
Appearances before rating boards	15,671
Compensation increases obtained	1,894
Service connections obtained	694
Nonservice pensions	457
Death benefits obtained	69
Total monetary benefits obtained	$984,997.17

The above figures do not include the accomplishments of other national service officers on duty in the Central Office of the Veterans' Administration, handling appeals and reviews, or in its three district offices, handling death and insurance cases. Over the last 10 years, they reported 83,611 claims handled in such district offices, resulting in monetary benefits of $20,850,335.32, and in the central office, they handled 58,282 reviews and appeals, resulting in monetary benefits of $5,337,389.05. Proportionate additional benefits were thereby obtained for Virginia veterans, their dependents and their survivors.

SERVICES BEYOND STATISTICS

These figures fail properly to paint the picture of the extent and value of the individualized advice, counsel and assistance extended to all of the claimants who have contacted DAV national service officers in person, by telephone and by letter.

Pertinent advice was furnished to all disabled veterans—only about 10 percent of whom were DAV members—their dependents, and others, in response to their varied claims for service connection, disability compensation, medical treatment, hospitalization, prosthetic appliances, vocational training, insurance, death compensation or pension, VA guaranty loans for homes, farms and businesses, etc. Helpful advice was also given as to counseling and placement into suitable useful employment—to utilize their remaining abilities—Civil Service examinations, appointments, retentions, retirement benefits, and multifarious other problems.

Every claim presents different problems. Too few Americans fully realize that governmental benefits are not automatically awarded to disabled veterans—not given on a silver platter. Frequently, because of lack of official records, death or disappearance of former buddies and associates, lapse of memory with the passage of time, lack of information and experience, proof of the legal service-connection of a disability becomes extremely difficult—too many times impossible.

A VA Claims and Rating Board can obviously not grant favorable action merely based on the opinions, impressions or conclusions of persons who submit notarized affidavits. Specific, detailed, pertinent facts are essential.

The VA, which acts as judge and jury, cannot properly prosecute claims against itself. As the defendant, in effect, the U.S. Veterans' Administration must award the benefits provided under the laws administered by it, only under certain conditions.

A DAV national service officer can and does advise a claimant precisely why his claims may previously have been denied and then specifies what additional evidence is essential. The claimant must necessarily bear the burden of obtaining such fact-giving affidavit evidence. The experienced national service officer, will, of course, advise him as to its possible improvement, before presenting same to the ajudication agency, in the light of all of the circumstances and facts, and of the pertinent laws, precedents, Regulations and Schedule of Disability Ratings. No DAV national service officer, I feel certain, ever uses his skill, except in behalf of worthy claimants, with justifiable claims.

The VA has denied more claims than it has allowed—because most claims are not properly prepared. It is very significant, as pointed out by the DAV acting national director of claims, Chester A. Cash, that a much higher percentage of those claims, which have been prepared and presented with the aid of a DAV national service officer, are eventually favorably acted upon, than is the case as to those claimants who have not given their powers of attorney to any such special advocate.

LOSSES BY REVIEWS

Another fact not generally known is that, under the overall review of claims inaugurated by the VA some 4 years ago, the disability compensation payments of about 37,200 veterans have been discontinued, and reduced as to about 27,300 others at an aggregate loss to them of more than $28 million per pear. About 1 percent of such discontinuances and reductions have probably occurred as to disabled veterans in Virginia with a consequent loss of about $28,000 per year.

Most of these unfortunate claimants were not represented by the DAV or by any other veteran organization. Judging by the past, such unfavorable adjudication will occur as to an additional equal number or more during the next 3 years before such review is completed. I urge every disabled veteran in Virginia to give his power of attorney to the national service officer of the DAV, or of some other veteran organization, or of the American Red Cross, just as a protective measure.

The average claimant who receives helpful advice probably does not realize the background of training and experience of a competent and expert national service officer.

COST OF DAV SERVICES

Measured by the DAV's overall costs of about $12,197,600 during a 10-year period, one would find that it has expended about $3.50 for each claim folder reviewed, or about $8.80 for each rating board appearance, or, again, about $22.70 for each favorable award obtained, or about $123 for each service connection obtained, or about $54 for each compensation increase obtained, and has obtained about $14.10 of direct monetary benefits for claimants for each dollar expended by the DAV for its national service officer setup. Moreover, such benefits will generally continue for many years.

METHODS OF PROVIDING SERVICES

Evidently, most claimants are not aware of the fact that the DAV receives no Government subsidy whatsoever. The DAV is enabled to maintain its nationwide staff of expert national service officers primarily because of income from membership dues collected by its local chapters and from the net income of its Idento-Tag—miniature autombile license tags—project, owned by the DAV and operated by its employees, most of whom are disabled veterans, their wives, or their widows, or other handicapped Americans—a rehabilitation project in thus furnishing them with useful employment. Incidentally, without checking as to whether they had previously made a donation, more than 1,400,000 owners of set of lost keys have received them back from the DAV's Idento-Tag department, 6,571 of whom during the last 8 years were Virginia residents.

Every eligible veteran, by becoming a DAV member, and by explaining these factors to fellow citizens, can help the DAV to procure such much needed public support as will enable it to maintain its invaluable nationwide service setup on a more adequate basis. So much

more could be accomplished for distressed disabled veterans, if the DAV could be enabled, financially, to maintain an expert service officer in every one of the 173 VA hospitals.

MEMORIAL HONOR ROLL

During the last 10 years, the DAV has also relied on appropriations from its separately incorporated trustee, the DAV Service Foundation, aggregating $3,300,000 exclusively for salaries to its national service officers. Its reserves having thus been nearly exhausted, the DAV Service Foundation is therefore very much in need of the generous support of all "serviced" claimants, DAV members and other social-minded Americans—by direct donations, by designations in insurance policies, by bequests in wills, by assignments of stocks and bonds and by establishing special types of trust funds.

A special type of memorial trust fund originated about 3 years ago with concerned disabled veteran members of the DAV chapter in Butte, Mont., which established the first Perpetual Rehabilitation Fund of $1,000 with the DAV Service Foundation to which it recently added another $100. Since then, every DAV unit in that State has established such a special memorial trust fund, ranging from $100 to $1,100, equivalent to about $4 per DAV member—an excellent objective for all other States. Benefactors from 27 States have, up to this time, become enrolled on the memorial honor roll.

Inasmuch as only the interest earnings from special donations will be available for appropriation to the DAV for its use in maintaining its National Service Officer program in the State of residence of each such benefactor, this is an excellent objective also for Virginia. Each such special benefactor is enrolled on a permanent memorial honor roll which, updated, is then included in the annual report of the DAV and of its incorporated trustee, the DAV Service Foundation, to the U.S. Congress.

Each claimant who has received any such free rehabilitation service can help to make it possible for the DAV to continue this excellent rehabilitation service for other distressed disabled veterans and their dependents in Virginia by sending in donations to the DAV Service Foundation, 631 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. Every such serviced claimant who is eligible can and should also become a DAV member, preferably a life member, for which the total fee is $100—$50 to those born before January 1, 1902, or World War I veterans—payable in installments within 2 full fiscal year periods.

Every American can help to make our Government more representative by being a supporting member of at least one organization which reflects his interests and viewpoints—labor unions, trade associations and various religious, fraternal, and civic associations. All of America's veterans ought to be members of one or more of the patriotic, service-giving veterans' organizations. All of America's disabled defenders, who are receiving disability compensation, have greatly benefited by their own official voice—the DAV. I consider it a privilege and an honor to belong to the Disabled American Veterans.

Development Loan Fund

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I was one of the Members of this House who pleaded in the Deficiency Appropriations Subcommittee, the full Appropriations Committee, and on the floor of the House before Easter for at least $100 million appropriation for Development Loan Fund commitments during fiscal 1959. President Eisenhower had requested a $225 million deficiency appropriation and I am pleased to note that the Senate Appropriations Committee has increased the Development Loan Fund item to $200 million for the remainder of this fiscal year.

MILITARY ASSISTANCE SHOULD BE DEEMPHASIZED

However, I am more than pleased to know that the distinguished chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, has offered an amendment that would establish a capital fund for the Development Loan Fund totaling $7.5 billion, or $1.5 billion annually for 5 years. The President has asked for only $700 million for the Development Loan Fund for fiscal 1960. Senator FULBRIGHT pointed out that the emphasis should be on economic foreign aid, rather than military assistance and I agree with him wholeheartedly. The U.S. Government cannot eliminate military assistance and it should not, but it should be deemphasized.

BOLAND COMMENDS SENATOR FULBRIGHT AND CONGRESSMAN BOWLES

My colleague from Connecticut, Congressman CHESTER BOWLES, the former Ambassador to India who served with distinction, made similar observations with respect to our foreign aid program on the floor of this House last week. Both Senator FULBRIGHT and Congressman BOWLES are to be commended for their profound thinking in this very vital field.

The distinguished newspaper columnist, Walter Lippmann, devoted his article of today to the foreign aid program, which, he so truthfully calls, the annual headache of Congress. He then tells why it has become such a headache. Mr. Speaker, I had submitted the Lippmann column with my above remarks yesterday for the RECORD, but the entire text was returned to my office this morning because Senator WAYNE MORSE of Oregon has asked that the Lippmann article be printed with his remarks in the Senate. It was printed on page 6199 of yesterday's RECORD. I now ask that my commentary be included, without Mr. Lippmann's column, of course.

Hiring the Handicapped in Our Town

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 29, 1959

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert a most interesting essay authored by Miss Elizabeth O'Brien, of 416 Washington Street, Somerville, Mass.

Miss O'Brien, a student at St. Joseph High School in Somerville, was the first-place winner of the essay contest conducted by the Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and went on to take second prize in the national essay contest sponsored by the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped.

The subject upon which she speaks is one in which I have always been deeply interested, and I feel that her presentation is both vividly and eloquently expressed. As the Representative in Congress of the district in which Miss O'Brien resides, I am proud and happy to commend the following to the attention of my colleagues:

HIRING THE HANDICAPPED IN OUR TOWN
(By Elizabeth O'Brien)

Welcome to Our Town, United States of America. It is a thriving community with long, wide peaceful streets which are lined with neat ranch-style homes. In the center of the city are the department stores and other retail businesses. In the morning, the streets of Our Town are crowded with cars and people hurrying to work, to the factories along the outskirts of town where walls loom high into the sky. All types of people enter these buildings, shoulder to shoulder; the normal and the handicapped, regardless of race, color or creed, all enter together and work together. This is due to the wisdom of the owners and managers of these industries, who after studying all phases of the question of hiring the handicapped, have found the advantages far outweigh the disadvantages. Let us take a tour through these factories. I will be your guide and as we go I will explain the advantageous features.

Here is a watch factory where the greatest number of handicapped are hired. Many of these employees have suffered leg injuries, but as they work in a sitting position, such an impairment does not interfere with their work. One time in this factory many good workmen were wasted by being assigned unimportant jobs because of their disability. Employers believe them unable to compete with normal workers. But a handicap seemed to have increased their capacity and desire for learning. Managers have found it to their advantage to train handicapped personnel for special jobs because the percent of turnover has been far less than among normal workers. Disabled workers have not felt it a charity job, nor their standing lowered among normal fellow workers in such cases.

Actually, everyone is handicapped in a sense, when it comes to performing a job for which he is neither mentally nor emotionally equipped. So it is that the physically handicapped worker is not really handicapped in a job in which his mind and skill can exercise perfect workmanship.

A few steps away is the factory where our world-famous furniture is produced, and another place where many "handicapped" people are employed. Why, the

head of the furniture design department lost his leg in an accident and many of the workers are partially or completely deaf. But after looking at the furniture produced here, it is easy to believe that when one sense is impaired the other senses are sharpened, for such extremely fine work could only be produced by acute vision. This factory also has a low rate of absenteeism, which shatters the common misconception that disabled workers are frail and will prove a constant drain on the company's compensation and sick pay. Another common error in regard to hiring the handicapped is that it will lead to higher accident insurance rates. This is disproved, first, by the fact that the insurance companies do not require the employer to specify whether or not he hires handicapped workers, and secondly, because of the low rate of accidents among disabled workers. This is because their physical defects make them more cautious than normal workers.

Here, during the slack season, many disabled workers are just as able as normal workers to perform jobs other than their own, but in the same job family. The job family is a group of related jobs which require the same general skill, knowledge and physical activities. This alone shows that the disabled workers are just as able to compete in industry as the normal ones. In fact, this is how all wish to be treated.

Today, because of the numerous rehabilitation centers, many handicapped people redevelop independence and self-reliance. At first, it is true the disabled worker, as the able one, will need help to become acquainted with new ways and new faces. This should be done as unobtrusively as possible.

This plant has solved this problem by having a nonhandicapped, experienced worker act as a sponsor or "Big Brother" to the disabled worker. The handicapped person is more likely to confide his difficulties in another fellow-worker rather than complain to a supervisor. The "Big Brother" will see to it that the difficulties are straightened out so that the handicapped worker will be as comfortable as possible, and also a more efficient worker. The disabled person's dislike of complaining to the supervisor is due to the fact that he feels insecure because of his physical defect. To put the disabled worker more at ease, the foreman notes any good work and is quick to praise the disabled worker, but when criticism is due, the foreman uses a great deal of tact. Some of the foremen here, handicapped themselves, know what it is like and are well able to handle the situation.

Next comes our electrical appliance industry. Here are many handicapped people. Some are mute, others are deaf, and some more have lost a limb. Yet these disabilities do not cut down their productivity rate. The handicapped have great capacities for being valuable workers provided someone is willing to give them a chance to exercise their capabilities. The general public is not aware of this and is incredulous of the fact that at times the productivity rate of a disabled person not only equals, but often surpasses that of normal workers. You may ask just why this happens. Well, psychologists claim that normal people use only about 10 percent of their bodies' potential physical power. Disabled workers are stimulated by their physical defects and so will put forth more effort to show the world that there is not such a wide abyss between them and normal workers.

It is a pity that for centuries society has looked upon the disabled as "chairty cases." even now, in modern times, with careful study and analysis and definite proof such as I have just shown you in these factories, society remains prejudiced about handicapped workers. It has been proven that the disabled are just as able to compete in industry as normal workers. The only only reason that society is sensitive to the physically handicapped is because the handicap is usually noticeable.

There are many people classified as normal workers who labor under more crippling but less noticeable defects. A man's working capacity and ability cannot be judged by the number of limbs he possesses or whether he can see or hear. It depends upon the man's own determination to do his job and to do it well. It depends on a man's character whether or not he will live with his handicap, whatever it may be, and do his best to succeed. It dependts on his personality, his warmth, his ingenuity, his friendliness, and his education. Let us not close our minds to the valuable advantages which hiring the handicapped will give us. Let us not think in terms of charity, because the disabled worker will give back work well done.

In Our Town this system has worked well and has reaped rich harvests for all concerned: for the employer, because he has received excellent work; for the disabled worker, because he has found a rank among normal men; for his fellow workers who have been encouraged by his courage.

So, whoever you are, in whatever part of Our Town, United States of America, you live, follow our pattern and hire the handicapped.

Air Force Firsts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, on February 18, 1959, I submitted an article for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD outlining the work of the U.S. Army in the fields of astronautics and missiles. Since our space program is a joint Army, Navy, Air Force, and civilian venture, I am pleased to submit for my colleagues in Congress and the American people an article describing the outstanding work of the U.S. Air Force in this field.

The article follows:

Now that the House Committee on Science and Astronautics has under consideration the fiscal 1960 budget for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, I feel that it might be well to take a brief look at where this country stands in its national space program. Since the passage of the National Aeronautics Space Act of 1959, and the establishment of NASA in the fall of last year, many important programs have been initiated and many outstanding achievements have been realized. We have sent the first talking satellite into orbit, the Discoverer satellite has achieved a polar orbit and has proven our ability to stabilize a satellite in orbit and we have made increasingly deeper probes into outer space. Obviously a great deal remains to be done and we must maintain a strong sense of urgency in our efforts to explore and ultimately utilize the potential of space. The House Committee on Science and Astronautics in its present consideration of the NASA fiscal 1960 budget and on various other aspects of the national space program is giving careful consideration to what I feel to be the most urgent requirement of our national defense, that of utilizing space to maintain the security of this country. Clearly space offers us the opportunity of performing fundamental military missions in a more effective and efficient manner. I have noticed with great interest the recent hearings conducted by the Subcommittee on Governmental Organization for Space Activities, Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, chaired by the Honorable STUART SYMINGTON. These hearings have brought to light much important testimony which tends to focus the important roles the military departments must play in developing our Nation's capabilities in space. In this connection I would like to briefly review some considerations which are now strongly affecting our military space program.

The last Congress passed the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 with one of the objectives being to preserve the role of the United States as a leader in aeronautical and space science and technology, and in the application thereof to the conduct of peaceful activities within and outside the atmosphere. This objective would, of course, add to our capability for national survival. We knew that by improving our technology we would simultaneously improve our capability to preserve world peace.

Our announced policy is that activities in space should be directed to peaceful purposes for the benefit of all mankind. However, there is no international agreement on this point. The United States, therefore, must prepare its overall defensive plan to include defense against enemy space systems. At the same time we must improve our retaliatory capability and extend this capability into space if the job can be done there in a more effective manner.

Over a year and a half has passed since the world focused its attention on space when the first Russian sputnik was launched. Even with our emphasis on advanced technology, the appointment of a scientific advisor to the President, the organization of the Advanced Research Projects Agency in the Department of Defense and the organization of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, we have not yet placed a larger payload in orbit than the U.S.S.R. We are still behind in this technological race with Russia.

Our only face saving in this race with Russia was the foresight and ingenuity of the military services which provided us with a limited space capability on short notice. Following the organization of the Advanced Research Projects Agency, the Department of Defense stripped the military services of the ability to operate in space. Under the auspices of the Director of ARPA, space developments are assigned to low echelons of the services. But this is for development only. He does not have the authority to designate which service will be the eventual operating agency. The result of these actions is not yet evident as there is a lag of several years between the time of the start of a development to operational use.

In the interim there are problems being generated that may take several more years to correct. The services, not having clear space mission and support assignments, cannot plan for the use and integration of the forthcoming systems into the operational units. Under the present plan when the development is complete ARPA will ask the Joint Chiefs of Staff to assign the system to a service for operation. If the service is other than the developing agency complications will undoubtedly arise which may delay the use of the system for several years. Even under the present concept the services, not knowing if they have the responsibility and authority, will not be prepared to integrate the system at the earliest date. The end result is that the operational system will likely be 1 or 2 years toward obsolescence by the time it is ready for employment.

If the roles and missions for space operations were assigned by the Secretary of Defense along the traditional lines there would be no requirement for the existence of ARPA. The Director of Defense Research and Engineering could then supervise the service's activities in the normal manner.

All services can make use of space. Space is another place for operations. Some missions such as communications, weather observation, and navigation aids will benefit all services and the civilian community. There will be other civilian-military uses of space as developments progress. As long as there is a global military threat our greatest effort in space will be for the development of military systems for many years to come. We must, therefore, apply the greatest amount of our national space budget to the Department of Defense. We must aim our space research to meet the threat from space. We cannot sit back complacently and expect potential enemies to ignore the values of space systems for military offensive and defensive purposes. Global peace and our own national survival is based on our present retaliatory capability. This capability must be extended into space. A strong nation can maintain the peace and if space systems are required we must have them to meet the future threats.

Poison in Your Water—No. 64

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Seattle (Wash.) Times on September 2, 1958, entitled "Bacterial Counts Show Strong Need for Beach Clean-ups":

BACTERIAL COUNTS SHOW STRONG NEED FOR BEACH CLEANUPS

(By E. B. Fussell)

How badly polluted are Puget Sound and lake bathing beaches in the Seattle area? Are they safe or unsafe for wading and swimming?

These are questions more easily asked than answered. It depends upon what the questioner means by safe.

What can be said without fear of contradiction is that safe or unsafe beaches show a high degree of sewage contamination.

Part of the answer as to safety may be found in the fact that a number of beaches definitely are closed. Eight others are listed by the Seattle-King County health department as "not recommended." Still others are reported by that agency as "generally poor" or "fair to poor."

NOTATIONS MADE

Frequently, the healthy department's notation is that raw sewage is being discharged in the vicinity, that bacterial count is high or that "excessive sickness" among bathers has been reported.

The standard measurement for bacterial contamination of water is the coliform count. Over the past several years, a number of agencies have made such counts in water samples taken from Puget Sound and lake beaches in the Seattle area. Most of the counts have been unduly high, in the view of health authorities.

The State pollution control commission has established, as an objective, an average of not more than 240 coliform bacilli in 100 milliliters of water (3.3 ounces, or about two jiggers).

PLANNING SOUGHT

This does not mean that a beach is to be condemned if it shows a count of 250 or even 500 bacilli. The commission believes, however, that sewage disposal should be planned so that the average sample of beach water will show a count within the 240 limit.

Some health authorities believe the 240-count standard is unduly stringent. A 1,000-count is more generally accepted in other parts of the country.

The most comprehensive bacterial study of Seattle area bathing beaches was conducted by the Seattle-King County Health Department in the years 1952 through 1956.

In this study, conditions were checked at 78 public and semipublic beaches and 3,250 samples were taken and analyzed.

These findings, in general, confirmed bacteriological studies made by other investigators in the 1941–52 period.

Physicians and health authorities do not like to draw a hard-and-fast line and say a small degree of contamination is safe and anything above that is unsafe.

Individuals differ in their resistance to disease. A few bacteria might bring on illness in one case. In other cases, a high degree of pollution might have no discernible effect.

A high coliform count, however, is evidence of sewage contamination. And when to that fact is added the presence of intestinal ailments which have been unusually prevalent in the Seattle area this summer, a strong case is made for a general cleanup of lake and sound beach pollution.

DIFFICULT TO PROVE

It should be added that in most cases it is difficult to prove a direct connection between bathing in polluted water and a subsequent illness.

In the case of at least two Seattle area beaches, however, illnesses among swimmers have followed their exposure so quickly that health authorities believe a definite connection has been established.

In other cases, physicians believe a swimmer may have been only slightly affected, but may have transmitted the bacterial or viral infection to another person who became severely ill.

In any event, the health authorities say, bathing in sewage-contaminated water is hardly to be recommended.

The Late Honorable James G. Polk, of Ohio

SPEECH

OF

HON. MERWIN COAD

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1959

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, it was certainly a loss to the entire Nation to lose our colleague JAMES POLK, of Ohio, in death. It was my pleasure to know JIM through our many conversations together and the mutual projects on which we worked. I not only liked JIM POLK but I respected his knowledge. He was possessed with a sense of understanding and courage.

I wish to take this opportunity to express my deep sympathy to the members of Mr. POLK's family in this time of sorrow.

The Economy of Waste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1959

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appearing in yesterday's Wall Street Journal, April 28, brings us once more face to face with the fact that many of our people seem to be under the illusion that in order to defeat Russia we must imitate them.

Fortunately, these people are a minority. The vast majority of our people want to survive as Americans, in the American way, and there is good reason to believe they will do just that. To survive any other way would be nothing but a living death:

THE ECONOMY OF WASTE

A notion gaining increasing currency in this country goes like this: We may have to tighten our belts, do without some of our accustomed comforts, in order not to lose out to Russia in both the military and economic production races.

You hear this reasoning in a variety of guises. Some speak disparagingly of our economy of waste. At least a couple of U.S. Senators say we are spending too much money and resources turning out fancy cars instead of on nobler pursuits. Even Defense Secretary McElroy warned, in a speech the other night, that as defense spending rises over the years we may have to learn to get along with less in current consumption. Otherwise we may come out second best in a competition for which there is no second prize.

Now there is a certain surface plausibility in all this. People look at the Soviet Union and they see a military colossus, second in total power only to the United States. How has it been built? Out of the hides of the people. And it can go on building by the same device of depriving the consumer. So what could be more reasonable than to conclude that we too must have austerity in order to keep ahead?

The trouble with the reasoning, it seems to us, is that it misreads the nature of both the Soviet and the American economic systems.

The remarkable thing is not that the Soviets have been able to build a big industrial-military machine. Any dictator can construct impressive works, given natural resources, slaves, and enough contempt for human life. That's how the Pharaohs built pyramids and obelisks, how Hitler built autobahns and a seemingly invincible military bulldozer. And how the Soviets have been creating their industrial and military power.

Rather, the remarkable thing is the United States, operating in exactly the opposite ways from those of the Pharoahs, the Nazis, and the Soviets. The United States has demonstrated what has been called the utility of freedom. Free men made a society of unrivaled abundance for all, and on top of that they were able to wield the strongest military power on earth.

Indeed, one can go further. The great military strength of the United States de-

rives not just from weapons, but from this so-called economy of waste. The wasteful auto factories of pesce can be war's additional assembly lines for weapons.

The Soviet economy of scarcity is unbalanced, full of serious distortions and dislocations; ours is balanced, abundant, infinitely varied and infinitely adaptable. It shouldn't take too much thought to decide which is better prepared, in the ways that count, for either war or economic competition.

Still, we agree with the voices of austerity on one point. If, as Mr. McElroy suggests, defense spending may have to increase substantially over the years, then there should be belt tightening in nonmilitary areas of Government. For it is Government, either through inflation, exorbitant taxation, excessive economic regulations, or all combined, that keeps the economy from growing as rapidly and fully as it otherwise could, and from which potential growth still greater defense outlays could be safely borne.

And there is plenty of room for austerity in the multitudes of extravagant Federal civilian projects whose cost has been mushrooming in recent years. Here, and not in the productive economic activities of private citizens, is the real economy of waste, the nonproductive activities that add nothing to economic growth but in fact stunt it.

If we misunderstand this, and think we must starve the consumer in order to beat the Russians, we will not merely be imitating the Soviets. We will be in fact denying the all-important difference between the two economic systems and ignoring the plain lessons of each.

And that could be the biggest military mistake we ever made.

High Voltage Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANCHER NELSEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 29, 1959

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend by remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post and Times Herald dated Wednesday, April 29, 1959, dealing with the Presidential veto of the rural electrification bill:

HIGH VOLTAGE VETO

It is doubtful whether there is as much political mileage in baiting Agriculture Secretary Benson as some Senators seem to think. The 64–29 vote of the Senate to override President Eisenhower's veto of the rural electrification bill was very largely a partisan effort to punish Mr. Benson by taking away his authority to review loans approved by the Rural Electrification Administration. We hope that the House will see the mischief of an effort to legislate in terms of personality instead of long-range principle.

The REA program belongs under the Secretary of Agriculture, as Mr. Eisenhower noted in his veto message. The present administrative arrangement dates from 1953 and is based on recommendations of the Hoover Commission as well as on a 1939 governmental reorganization plan. Despite the allegations made by spokesmen for the REA cooperatives that Mr. Benson is trying to short-circuit the REA program, the co-ops seem to be prospering. The REA has loaned the co-ops over $1 billion in the last 6 years and their power sales have more than doubled since 1952. Mr. Benson has not vetoed a single loan approved by the REA administrator and there is no real evidence that the Secretary has misused his authority over the agency.

The Difficult Position of the West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I have noted a lucid statement by C. L. Sulzberger in today's edition of the New York Times with reference to the preliminaries to the forthcoming summit conference.

I request that his remarks be reprinted in the RECORD and invite my colleagues in Congress to reflect on the problems they raise, for example, to what extent have allied disagreements already curtailed our ability to negotiate effectively?

FOREIGN AFFAIRS—THE DIFFICULT POSITION OF THE WEST

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

PARIS, April 28.—Perhaps the weakest and most divided team of Western diplomats since the start of the cold war begin meetings here today in an effort to devise common approaches to a new negotiation with Russia. The atmosphere was not cheerful.

Almost a year has elapsed since similar preparations were made for what was scheduled to be a summit conference, the kind of conference supposedly lying at the end of the present diplomatic road. That summit conference was not held. And, during intervening months, the Allied position has split wide open.

Despite bromidic statements about harmony in viewpoint and a determination to bargain toughly with the Kremlin, the West has yielded in advance of East-West talks one position after another in the face of implacable Soviet diplomacy.

Inside our alliance there is a wide chasm between London's ideas and those of Paris and Bonn. Washington has so far lacked the leadership to bridge the gap. Bonn, whose future is the main matter at hand, is confused by the uncertain status of Chancellor Adenauer. And NATO, the symbol of solidarity, is riven, with Washington hovering between two blocs.

Here in Paris it is hoped that a strong attitude can yet be composed with which to confront the Russians at Geneva. But there is no apparent diplomatic leader to accomplish this necessary process. In each case the foreign minister discussing vital problems is overshadowed by a chief of government absent from these talks. What should have been a Western summit meeting is a conference of puppets. And the puppet masters seem to disagree.

The type of leadership with which we have been familiar is now missing. There is no Marshall, Acheson or Dulles; and Herter has scarcely had the type of sendoff to inspire his partners' confidence. There is no Bevan or Bidault to fill the gap. And the Adenauer who was once his own Talleyrand is playing bowls in Italy.

Indications tonight are that the Western powers are preparing to make an illusory agreement with Russia on Berlin, at the coming Geneva talks, in exchange for concessions on still more vital matters, positions that have not already been given up in advance.

A year ago, before the summit talks that weren't held, we talked of restricting veto powers in the U.N. This has been pigeonholed. A year ago we talked about reunifying Germany by free elections. Now we propose a committee from the Eastern and Western halves to discuss a voting plan. A year ago we were hoping to place on the agenda the Eastern European situation. This has been shelved.

A year ago we were requesting that all manufacture of fissile materials be ceased, concurrently with the ending of nuclear tests. Now, as a result of Moscow's insistence and a void between the British and United States stands, we have abandoned this vital link.

These points have been granted ahead of talks as a consequence of Allied disagreements and the dynamism of Soviet diplomacy. Announcement of a time-bomb ultimatum on Berlin has brought us to the council table at a time of maximum inconvenience.

Dulles made many policy decisions that have been sharply criticized; but at least he led in an alliance looking for leadership from its greatest power. Since his sad illness this leadership has been absent. It will be difficult for Herter to provide a substitute this week.

The chances today appear that for the sake of any face-saving device the Russians may allow us to retain, for the present, seeming to reassure our difficult posture in Berlin, we may concede on other major issues: de facto recognition of East Germany, which would undermine our credit in Bonn; the whole framework of disarmament and disengagement; and the question of all-German unification, which, rightly or wrongly, we chose to make a major stake in the balance of power contest.

And if we yield, the balance of power will change. We may be able to claim for months to come that we kept West Berlin. But surely and predictably Moscow will again turn tight the screws on that essentially untenable position. The best the West can hope for now is that the discordant Allies may at the eleventh hour harmonize their divided views, go to Geneva outwardly united, and postpone the big bargaining until the inevitable summit meeting.

Caribbeans and Castro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 29, 1959

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, after the highly hysterical reception given Mr. Fidel Castro in the United States, a reception that confirms many of our friends in Europe and Latin America in the belief that we are not quite dry behind the ears, it is interesting to read the following article which appeared in the Wall Street Journal of April 28.

Here is an article written in a cool and logical manner, bringing out a few known facts, and they are few indeed, and making the thoughtful citizen realize that we actually know very little about what is going on behind the beard:

CARIBBEANS AND CASTRO—LATINS, BOTH ADMIRING AND FEARFUL, SAY CUBAN IS ANTI-UNITED STATES AND LEFTWARD BOUND

(By Henry Gemmill)

CARACAS.—Fidel Castro has cast a spell on all Latin lands ringing the Caribbean. With mounting excitment they've watched him play the roles of liberator, of executioner, of anticolonialist and most recently of turbulent tourist in the United States.

Nowhere is there much inclination to take seriously his milder attitudes in the United States as an admirer of Thomas Jefferson and a promoter of tourism and trade. He is for these Latins the very symbol of anti-Americanism; it is taken for granted he is headed far to the left in economics and politics; it is accepted his personal ambitions extend well beyond running the island of Cuba.

Nevertheless the Castro spell takes strikingly different forms in these extremely diverse nations—and in some, notably Venezuela, it may be more subtle and serious than is generally understood.

In a number of banana, sugar and coffee republics, of course, the ruling reaction is fear. Fidel, despite protestations about not exporting revolution, is considered overwilling that Cuba be used as a base for revolutionary forces eager to upturn the aging Trujillo tyranny in the Dominican Republic, the prolonged Somoza family rule in Nicaragua, the recent rickety government of Haiti and the De La Guardia regime in Panama. Just this week Panama was rounding up what it said was an armed invasion force of Panamanians and Cubans, and blaming its activities on Castro.

In Colombia, which believes it has reason to understand Castro better than any other of his neighbors, the reaction is disgust.

For Castro, as Colombian newspapers keep repeating, was a revolutionist in Bogota before he ever launched a revolution in his homeland. Almost exactly 11 years ago, but remembered as if it were yesterday, occurred an incident known as the "Bogotazo"—an uprising which began with the assassination of political leader Dr. Jorge Eliecer Gaitan and ended with more killing and the looting and burning of much of the capital.

Still under public investigation is the precise role of Castro. Certain it is he was collared by cops for throwing inflammatory leaflets from the balcony of the opera house. Suggestions have been publicized but not proved that his actions may have been much more sinister. At any rate his reputation in Bogota was unsavory long before he seized power in Havana, and both houses of the Colombian Congress have voted down resolutions of congratulations on his Cuban victory.

CYNICAL COLOMBIANS

Cynical comments on Castro's recent postures in the United States fill the Colombian press. "We are glad he's going to hold elections after he has taught all Cubans how to read and write," comments one leading paper sarcastically. Colombians, more strictly religious than most Latin Americans, scorn continuing executions in Cuba. They pride themselves on having overthrown their own dictator, Gustavo Rojas Pinella nearly 2 years ago, without such reprisals; they've even let him return to the country and done no more than strip away his honors and pensions after an elaborately legal senatorial trial for graft in office. In recent days Colombia's President Alberto Lleras Camargo has pointedly rejected the idea that Latin America has any collective responsibility to oust regimes which Castro dislikes.

It is an entirely different spell which Castro casts here in Venezuela, a nation which, though only half as populous as Colombia, assumes perhaps the most vital significance of any in this region by virtue of its oil and ore.

Certainly Venezuela entertains no fear of invasion from Cuba nor is its vision of Castro one of repugnance. Instead, here is found remarkable popular acceptance of the Cuban as the hero of the Caribbean and increasing impatience to follow in his footsteps.

"Fidel could be elected President of Venezuela tomorrow," is the only slightly exaggerated remark of one foreigner who has studied politics here for years. In another part of town a businessman inclines his head toward a fresh-faced secretary outside his office and tells the visitor, "She worships Castro. To her, he's the greatest of democrats and it doesn't bother her pretty head that he holds no elections. To her, he's the greatest of humanitarians, and she doesn't care that he's bumped off hundreds of people."

Why the difference?

To an important degree Communists are responsible. All over Latin America the Reds have decided to plump 100 percent for Castro. This does not prove the Cuban is a Communist, of course; it is simply that with his anti-imperialist message he has become—as Egypt's Nasser was—a man deemed traveling fast on exactly the road the Reds desire. In Colombia, Communists are as yet few and ineffectual, but here in Venezuela they are numerous and spectacularly influential.

They have eloquent spokesmen in the national legislature and can call out mobs to demonstrate. Even more important, however, is the fact Castro has been one pacesetter for the non-Communist multitudes in Venezuela who are intolerant of the moderation—economic, political, diplomatic—displayed by their own new revolutionary President Romulo Betancourt.

Once Betancourt was as wild a young man as Castro is today; indeed, he is reported to have provided letters of introduction when Fidel went on that mischief-making expedition to Bogota. But Betancourt with the years has changed greatly. When inaugurated as the first elected President since the overthrow early last year of brutal Marcos Perez Jiminez, he attempted to move in calm, majestic statemanship. He established a planning commission which not until July of next year is due to propose a program of fundamental economic improvement for the nation. He shot no political enemies; he even proclaimed himself a firm friend of Americans.

COOL GAZES

The result is that masses of the population now gaze coolly on this bespectacled, middle-aged and rather stout gentleman, wondering how they could have chosen so mild a man. Their hearts go out to that dashing young Cuban whose oratory turns blood to fire and whose actions speak even more eloquently.

Castro fans include many young leaders such as Jose Rafael Munoz within Betancourt's own Democratic Action Party. Other youthful pro-Castro politicians such as Jose Vincente Rangel, are even more powerful in the Union Republica Democracia (URD) Party which now participates in the coalition government but is moving leftward and may soon swing into outright opposition.

Venezuela is a country with little experience in democracy in this century with an adult illiteracy rate that climbed above 50 percent during the Jimenez regime and with much poverty. It is no surprise to find Castro sentiment among the thousands who've poured into Caracas and built squatter shanty towns up the mountainsides, nor to spot a Castro-style beard on a port worker at remote Puerto Ordaz on the wild Orinoco River.

Yet Castroism is by no means confined to the submerged classes. It is rife in flashy University City, where students are ecstatically trying to collect a million Bolivars (1 Bolivar equals about 30 cents) to help finance the overthrow of Trujillo. It is found in the professions; the Caracas Medical Association has invited an appearance by Maj. "Che" Guevara, the Argentinian adventurer who served with Communist militia in Guatemala and later became a top Castro comrade.

And Castro's declaration of independence from the United States has struck a responsive chord among much of the Venezuelan business community. One powerful organization, Asociacion Pro-Venezuela, headed by businessman Alejandro Hernandez, is hounding the government to stop buying supplies abroad and to boost tariffs for protection of domestic industry.

Venezuela's mood of impatience is aggravated by events in which Yankees have played a part—notably Washington's curbs on oil imports, and oil price cuts initiated by British Petroleum in the Middle East but followed by U.S. companies here. But the mood is also irritated by a hundred other matters in which America has played no part—for instance, improvidence in developing water supplies which has left Caracas drought stricken. Thus Venezuela's agitation springs really from its domestic plight; Castro is a lens which brings it into focus.

BOTHERSOME FACTS

A few days ago one of the most important of 40,000 U.S. business folks living in Venezuela, having drawn up a contract to buy a handsome new house, decided not to sign it after all, but to wait and see. More than a dozen American corporations which were planning to open factories or expand existing ones in Venezuela have similarly decided to mark time.

Some veteran observers think Betancourt, if not unsaddled, will sooner or later be forced to move in the direction of Castroism.

One bothersome fact: He has begun deporting political opponents without trial. Others expect that forces of conservatism which have been little heard from will assert themselves. (The Venezuelan armed forces, gravely concerned by Castro's pattern of substituting irregular militia for traditional military services, have reportedly promised to back Betancourt for at least 2 years.)

It may be that men like Jose Figueres, the Costa Rican political leader who turned from friend of Castro to foe, can organize on a regional scale an effective and democratic opposition to the Cuban.

But whether viewed with fear, disdain, or admiration, Fidel Castro at this moment is by far the most colorful figure of the Caribbean, equipped not merely with eloquence but with ruthless willingness on occasion to attempt rather more ambitious ventures than he seemed equipped for.

Custard Stands at Gettysburg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1959

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, once again I would call attention of the Members to the editorial approval of a restoration of funds to the National Park Service for its land acquisition program at Civil War battlefields.

I do not think it necessary to belabor the point, but I am anxious to point out the virtually universal approval that exists in favor of keeping the foot of commercialism off the hallowed ground at Gettysburg. With that in mind I

would ask the Members to read the following editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of April 27, 1959:

CUSTARD STANDS AT GETTYSBURG

President Eisenhower's Representative in Congress, JAMES M. QUIGLEY, of the 19th Pennsylvania District, has appealed to the White House to join in efforts to acquire ground which ought to be added to the National Park Service holdings in the Gettysburg Battlefield area. Congressman QUIGLEY says that unless protective steps are taken, custard stands and beer parlors will soon outnumber the grave markers and the monuments to the men of both the Blue and the Gray who struggled there in early July 1863.

The Representative from the Gettysburg district does not want the land acquired for withdrawal from productive use. On the contrary, he and others who are concerned about the future of the Gettysburg area are eager for the National Park Service to own the land but to lease it for approved cultivation. This is true of much of the area now owned. The famous peach orchard of military history is again a peach orchard. But those who own privately adjacent battlefield areas cannot be expected to decline attractive offers from would-be commercializers. That is why the National Park Service holdings should be increased.

In barely 2 years, the Nation will begin its 4-year observance of the 100th anniversary of the Civil War. Between now and then historic battlefields—Gettysburg, Antietam, Wilson's Creek and others—ought to receive friendly interest and wherever possible increased protection. It would be strange indeed for the centennial to find the foot of the commercial trespasser marring what Lincoln called hallowed ground.

Could This Be Politics?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 29, 1959

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the information of my colleagues an article that appeared in the Washington Post on Tuesday, April 28:

THE STRAUSS MATTER

(By George E. Sokolsky)

Senator MAGNUSON, of Washington, says that it is not unusual to hold up a Presidential nomination for a Cabinet post a long time. President Eisenhower appointed Adm. Lewis L. Strauss to be Secretary of Commerce on October 24, 1958. It is now 6 months since that day. It might be interesting if Senator MAGNUSON, who presides over the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which has to pass on Secretary Strauss' nomination, would have his staff do a research job to show how many Cabinet officers' appointments have been held up for such a long period. Secretary of State Christian Herter was confirmed in 4 hours.

Furthermore, Senator MAGNUSON says that he does all this holding up to give Senator ESTES KEFAUVER and Senator CLINTON ANDERSON, who are not members of this committee, an opportunity to question Secretary Strauss, which they have the right to do, but should that privilege be used to hold up a Presidential nomination as long as they please? I hope that such questioning is in public, on television, so that the entire country can listen to the badgering of a public servant of fine qualifications and a great record of service.

Also, Senator MAGNUSON wants some scientists to have an opportunity to object to Secretary Strauss. It is reported that some scientists object to the way Strauss handled matters involving fallout, clean bombs, weapon testing, and security regulations when he was Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Of course, Admiral Strauss has been pretty tough on such scientists as were pro-Communist or pro-Russian, who while working for the Government of the United States chose to put their private wisdom ahead of the adopted policies of our Government. Do Senators KEFAUVER and ANDERSON want the reputation of running interference for such persons?

It all started with the Oppenheimer case concerning which Strauss took a rather strong stand and Oppenheimer was required to end his work with the Atomic Energy Commission. It was unfortunate that we lost the services of Oppenheimer who has a fine scientific mind but his own testimony convicted him of past Communist associations, of being a blabbermouth and at times, untruthful. Of Oppenheimer it can correctly be said that he convicted himself, that no witness did him in and that Strauss would have been derelict in his duty had he defended Oppenheimer.

The committee hearings to confirm Strauss started on March 17 and nothing has come of them up to the moment of writing this sentence. Meanwhile Strauss acts as Secretary of Commerce without senatorial confirmation.

The scientists, incidentally, ought to have nothing to say except as citizens testifying before a congressional committee under oath on pertinent matters. The question is not whether Admiral Strauss pleased the physicists but where his experience, knowledge, and wisdom justify his appointment as Secretary of Commerce.

We have here a confusion of authority. Although the Constitution provides that a Federal official shall be nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate, it never intended that the Senate should use its confirming power to embarass the President for political reasons, to try to rake up ancient and settled issues, to seek out unfriendly witnesses and to delay action in an outrageous manner. This is precisely what Senator MAGNUSON is doing and it is intolerable from the standpoint of efficient Government.

Political Field Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANCHER NELSEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 29, 1959

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington, D.C., Evening Star dated Wednesday, April 29, 1959, dealing with the Presidential veto of the Humphrey-Price bill:

POLITICAL FIELD DAY

The Senate, bowing at the altar of petty politics, has overridden an Eisenhower veto. And there wasn't even a semblance of good reason for doing it.

Mr. Eisenhower vetoed a bill which would have stripped the Secretary of Agriculture of control over Rural Electrification Administration loans—a control first vested in the Secretary 20 years ago pursuant to a Hoover Commission recommendation. The effect is to leave Mr. Benson with overall responsibility for REA operations, but with no control over its lending activities.

Why did 6 Republicans join 58 Democrats in voting to override the veto of this unsound bill? Here is the answer, as given by Senatr JOHNSTON of South Carolina: "The administration knows the only way it can destroy REA is by turning its purse strings over to the Secretary of Agriculture, who is no friend of the farmers and rural people."

This is a ridiculous statement, and the record proves it. When REA was established only a few farmers enjoyed the benefits of central station electric service. Today about 96 percent of the farmers enjoy this service, and about half of the increase has been provided by REA-financed facilities. Loans of more than a billion dollars have been made during the past 6 years, under Mr. Benson. This is nearly half as much as was loaned by the agency during the previous 17 years of its existence. Furthermore, Mr. Benson has never turned down a loan recommended by the REA Administrator.

This, then, is the record of the manner in which Mr. Benson has sought to destroy REA. Obviously, to explain the Senate vote, one must look deeper than the preposterous explanation offered by the Senator from South Carolina.

The real explanation, one may be sure, is rooted in politics. Mr. Benson has become the whipping boy of the politicians, and few Senators are averse to laying on the lash. Beyond this, the Senate Democrats think, with reason, that they are faced with a series of vetoes if they are going to lock horns with the President. They presumably looked upon the REA veto as a good vehicle for a show of strength. After all, they are not likely to lose votes in the rural areas by baiting Mr. Benson on such an issue as REA loans.

The principle, however, is important. For an element of sound Government is at stake, and the principle will become much more important if the overriding of this veto is a preview of things to come. We hope that the House will refuse to go along with the Senate's game.

Justice Department Opposes Federal Fair Trade Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 29, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial appearing in the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle on March 27, 1959.

This editorial joins unanimous editorial opinion in opposing the various fair trade bills now pending before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

An additional reason why the bill should be defeated appears in the estimate of Mr. Robert A. Bicks, Assistant Attorney General, that such legislation would cost the consumer a minimum of $1 billion a year and possibly much more quoted in the editorial:

JUSTICE DEPARTMENT OPPOSES FEDERAL FAIR TRADE LAW

Fair trade proponents, who have been losing ground rapidly in recent years as State price-fixing laws have been batted down in the courts, are trying to put their program on the Federal level.

And the administration is resisting them in a manner not only to comfort the consumer but also to warm the heart of believers in States' rights.

The first assistant in the Justice Department's Antitrust Division told the House Commerce Committee Monday that the fair trade proposals now before Congress would undercut the antitrust laws and would be an unwarranted invasion of States' rights.

Under present law retail price fixing by manufacturers is permissible only where individual States sanction the practice through legislation.

A few years ago the fair traders had almost put their program over throughout the country. Only Texas and two other States, and the District of Columbia were holdouts against the scheme under which every retailer has to sell articles at the price dictated by their makers.

Some of the hardest-fought battles in the Texas Legislature year after year have been over fair trade.

In recent years price fixing has been losing out. No less than 16 State supreme courts have ruled such laws unconstitutional.

Hence the new effort to put the plan over on a national basis through Federal law. The Justice Department's strong opposition is good news, particularly since it is based upon States' rights as well as the desire to uphold the antitrust laws.

Robert A. Bicks, the Department's spokesman, told the committee that studies have indicated Federal fair-trade legislation would cost consumers a minimum of $1 billion a year, and possibly much more.

Lewis L. Strauss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1959

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, Columnist Gould Lincoln had some nice things to say about the distinguished career of a patriotic and stalwart American in his column in last night's Washington Star. It is as follows:

POLITICS DELAYS STRAUSS CONFIRMATION

(By Gould Lincoln)

A showdown on the nomination of Adm. Lewis L. Strauss to be Secretary of Commerce apparently has been promised. Senator MAGNUSON of Washington, chairman of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee which has had jurisdiction over the nomination since it was sent to the Senate by President Eisenhower on January 17, insists that he and his colleagues are not "stalling" consideration and action. There are some assurances, too, that the Democratic leadership of the Senate is not sympathetic to delay for delay's sake on the Strauss nomination. The committee has set 3 days of hearings this week. So, the word "apparently" is used advisedly when it comes to predicting final action. No one seems willing to predict there will be no further hearings next week or next month, or the month after that.

Politics, plus a fishing expedition to dig up something detrimental to Admiral Strauss and through him to blacken the eye of the Eisenhower administration, has been responsible for this long delay. The record shows that the nomination for Secretary of Commerce has been at the Capitol for 102 days. There have been 13 Secretaries of Commerce since the Department was created, and the total time required for confirmation of them all was 109 days. No nomination for Secretary of Commerce—Democratic or Republican—has ever been rejected. Furthermore, since the days of President Andrew Johnson, only two appointees to a President's Cabinet have been rejected by the Senate—Henry Stanbery, appointed Attorney General by President Johnson and Charles B. Warren, appointed Attorney General by President Coolidge.

The right of a President to select the members of his Cabinet—his intimate official family upon whom he must rely for adivce and administration of the Departments of the Federal Government—has been widely recognized.

APPOINTED LAST FALL

Admiral Strauss has been serving as Secretary of Commerce under a recess appointment which President Eisenhower gave him last fall, soon after the resignation of former Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks. Prior to becoming Secretary of Commerce, Admiral Strauss served as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. It was during his chairmanship of the Commission that Admiral Strauss aroused the enmity of two Democratic Senators—Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, of New Mexico, and Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, both of whom now oppose his confirmation as Secretary of Commerce.

He clashed with Senator ANDERSON, chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, over policy. His readiness to seek privately produced power for the use of the Atomic Energy Commission, instead of getting it from a proposed new plant of the Tennessee Valley Authority brought him into open conflict with Senator KEFAUVER. The Dixon-Yates contract for private power, which later was voided, was assailed as corrupt, and an attempt to place blame on Admiral Strauss was made. The Department of Justice and other Government agencies found no blame attached to Admiral Strauss, despite this effort.

DISTINGUISHED CAREER

Admiral Strauss has a long and distinguished record of public service, dating back to the days of President Woodrow Wilson, when he was secretary and assistant to Herbert Hoover prior to our entry into World War I. He had 32 years as an officer of the U.S. Naval Reserve and was called up for active duty 10 months before Pearl Harbor, had 5 years on active duty and retired with the rank of rear admiral.

In 1946, Admiral Strauss was appointed to the first Atomic Energy Commission by President Truman, serving until 1950. During that period, he proposed and procured the establishment of the system of long-range detection which enabled this country to learn in August 1949, that the Soviet Union had achieved atomic weapon capability. Immediately afterward, Admiral Strauss began the movement for the development of the H-bomb. He had opposition in the Commission, but he had the backing of President Truman, and the early production of that weapon followed. He believes today that this has been responsible for peace in the world.

The Secretary of Commerce—still to be confirmed—was highly successful in the business world, too. When he was appointed by President Truman to the Atomic Energy Commission, he gave up all his business connections and sold his interests.

While it has been denied, a story gained circulation that Admiral Strauss' opponents in the Senate had determined to filibuster in committee and to delay any action on his appointment as Secretary of Commerce until this session of Congress expired. In that event, the President could not again give him a recess appointment and he would be "out." That the Senate will confirm his appointment if and when it gets the chance has been confidently reported. He has many friends and admirers among the Democrats as well as the Republicans in that body.

Admiral Strauss' opponents, by their delaying tactics, are doing the Department of Commerce no good, nor their country either. A shameful operation.

Mr. Dulles' Departure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call the attention of the House to an editorial written in the Arizona Daily Star on Tuesday, April 14, 1959. This editorial, entitled "Mr. Dulles' Departure" recounts the service Mr. Dulles has rendered to his country and to the free world. It is interesting to note that this editorial was written before Mr. Dulles' resignation. The editorial follows:

MR. DULLES' DEPARTURE

The news from Washington that Secretary Dulles appears to be losing his battle against a persistent cancer is sad to recount, yet his very absence makes his prior service to the Nation more valuable than ever before. He provided an indispensable leadership not only for his own country but for its allies, too. This fact has come to light as many of his former critics at home and abroad now lament his absence.

His record as Secretary of State under President Eisenhower is a notable one marked by continuously striving to carry out the original NATO program, and holding the line in the Far East. For this work he had prepared himself well by his services under the Truman and Roosevelt administrations. Thus, before he became Secretary of State, he had had much first-hand experience not only with the vagaries of our allies but with the undependability of the Soviets.

When he assumed his job under President Eisenhower in January 1953, his first task was to bring hostilities in Korea to end, which was a much more difficult job than most people realized. He had to deal with President Rhee of Korea, who was quite willing to continue fighting to the last American and last American dollar. Later he participated and helped prepare the first summit conference, although he was skeptical of its producing any results.

He had to meet the great crisis in Indochina, and, much to his credit, salvaged from French misrule a compromise that seems to be working. It was his heavy task to advise the President to intervene against the Anglo-French-Israel attack on Egypt, yet out of that unpleasant affair he

appears to have brought our allies closer together than before.

His work can be criticized justifiably, but he rates an exceptionally high batting average. What so few people realize is that international relations are highly complicated. There is rarely a clear-cut or simple solution. The best that any Secretary of State can do is do his best under the circumstances. That quality has constantly characterized Mr. Dulles' official work, as well as the vigor with which he carried it out.

He has served his Nation and its allies ably and with distinction. Time will undoubtedly honor his name. He has been one of the few great Secretaries of State. As he lays down his official work, the words of St. Paul to Timothy come to mind:

"For I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand.

"I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith."

A Fine Science Plan, With LSU as a Part

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I present herewith an editorial from a recent issue of the Shreveport Times, Shreveport, La., which praises the program of the National Science Foundation providing special science training for high school students. I feel the editorial and the program are commendable. It is as follows:

A FINE SCIENCE PLAN, WITH LSU AS A PART

The National Science Foundation has taken an excellent step in putting up the money for special science training for high school students starting at the junior year, and it is especially gratifying to find that Louisiana State University has been selected as a sponsor for the program in this State.

The Foundation is supplying $1,600,000 for 112 such programs under direction of 105 colleges, universities, and nonprofit research organizations.

Each operating organization will provide means—through the Foundation's money—for high-ability high school students interested in majoring in science in college to associate with college-level summer programs in science, math, and engineering designed especially for them.

The LSU program specifically will embrace four phases: Instruction in the research areas of science; seminars by leading scientists from both LSU and industry; field trips to research organizations and industries; laboratory experience in actual scientific research.

In this way, students in the upper IQ categories and with genuine interest in science will have instruction in connection with their junior and senior years in high school that will enable them to be certain that they want to go on into science education, and will enable colleges and universities to determine whether such students are capable of handling such courses in college.

In Louisiana, 22 students will be selected for the program by an LSU faculty committee following application by students—with not more than one student from any one high school. The method of selection also is excellent, for it leaves the decision as to college ability of the high schoolers in the hands of college people.

Tribute to Max Abelman by the Honorable A. David Benjamin, Justice of the Supreme Court, State of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 29, 1959

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, 55 years is a short time in the light of history, but appraised in the life of man, it is his entire life span. Thus, when one man has given his talents and efforts for 55 years to community work, he should be given true recognition in a special niche in history. It is for this reason that I desire to pay special tribute to one of the great men of the Borough of Brooklyn, Max Abelman. I submit the following tribute to him by another of Brooklyn's great men, the Honorable A. David Benjamin, Justice of the Supreme Court, of the State of New York:

MAX ABELMAN, BY HON. A. DAVID BENJAMIN, JUSTICE OF SUPREME COURT, SECOND DIVISION

The sociological structure of our economy of free enterprise is dependent upon the social conscience and consciousness of our citizens and their willingness to create and maintain social institutions necessary in a civilized community. We in America are proud of our institutions for the orphans, for the aged, for the sick, our services to our youth, our agencies coping with the problems of delinquency, mental breakdowns, adequate recreational facilities for the young and for the aged, child guidance clinics, family welfare societies, marital guidance and counseling services and the vast totality of services which the complexity of our society makes necessary for the well-being of our citizens. We have the choice in America whether these services shall be provided for by the State, as under a totalitarian system, or by the voluntary participation of the citizens, as we do in our free society. We have elected the choice and through tax structure and the established mores of the community encouraged the creation, development and furtherance of our socio-economy through the financial aid and the personal guidance of free citizens.

For more than 50 years one person has been foremost in the wakening understanding of this social responsibility of all the citizens and in bringing them together so that their personal resources and financial resources might be marshaled in the furtherance of the social needs of the community, as a result of his direction, guidance breath of vision, insight, understanding, and ability to envision far horizons. The petty concepts of charity as known a century ago have given way to the proper concepts of social responsibilities to the full extent of the community's ability to give, which is the pattern of our social agencies of today. No longer do we envision social services as a "dole" or a "handout". Rather today do we envision it as the enlightened acceptance of the golden rule in the implementation of the moral responsibility of all to provide for the needs of all.

Max Abelman is approaching his 72d year of a wonderful life in which he pioneered and led in the furtherance of this philosophy and way of life. Five years ago Governor Dewey, on the occasion of Max Abelman's retirement from the Board of the Jewish Hospital of Brooklyn, said of him: "You unquestionably have earned the title of Doctor of Humanity." For 55 years Max Abelman has given of his great talents and appreciation of humanitarian values so that our city, State, and Nation of the world at large might become a finer place in which to live. It is people such as he who insure the peace of the future. The philosophy which he has engendered is the only antidote to either cold or hot wars and through the spread of this doctrine of peace on earth, goodwill to all men, and acceptance of our responsibility to recognize all children of God as brethren can we hope that our children will have a worthwhile world in which to live.

And so we the Senate, of the State of New York, together with the U.S. Congress, take this occasion to honor and felicitate Max Abelman upon this rich and fruitful life which he has spent in the public interest.

We wish for him many, many more years of good health so that he may continue to serve as an exemplar and bearer of the torch of justice for all mankind to see. His motto: "I shall pass this world but once; any good or kindness I can do, do it now. I may not pass this way again."

Cut Down on Regulation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 29, 1959

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article which appeared in the April 27 issue of Railway Age:

CUT DOWN ON REGULATION

The ICC has asked the eastern railroads to consent to a further suspension for 60 days of these railroads' reduced rates on paint. Naturally, the railroads have agreed.

This is a simple case. The railroads are handling almost no finished paint. They proposed some rates which they proved would be amply profitable; and which, shippers testified, would put a lot of paint traffic on the rails. The truckers objected. The ICC suspended the rates, pending investigation.

That was almost 7 months ago, and the ICC wants 2 more months to ponder the issue.

It seems a safe assumption that the ICC is weighing two questions: Does it any longer have the legal right to force railroads to hold a rate umbrella over the trucks? If it believes it still has this right, should it be exercised in the present case?

No industry except the railroads is made to suffer the delay and expense of a protracted lawsuit practically every time it wants to make important price changes to attract customers. If the aluminum industry wants to reduce its prices to complete with steel and plastics—these competitors have no right to hail the aluminum people into court and have their price changes nullified.

There is constant price competition going on between industries and the customers benefit—from constantly improved products and by having prices held within reason. Only the railroads are restricted in engaging in this economically healthy practice.

The ICC is certainly not deliberately antirailroad. What is wrong is that its regulatory power is so devised that it can operate only against the railroads, never effectively in their favor. The reason is that only one-third of truck traffic and only 10 percent of inland waterway traffic are subjected to regulation—while railroads are 100 percent subjected to it.

The ICC occasionally suspends proposed rates of common carrier trucks and barges—

just as it does proposed railroad rates. But such suspension of truck or barge rates affords the railroads practically no protection. If common carrier truck or barge rates are held by regulation at a level substantially higher than operating costs, the traffic simply moves over to the unregulated carriers by barge and truck.

It is no wonder, given such one-sided treatment, that railroad traffic in 12 years, 1946–57, declined from 66 percent of total ton-miles to 46 percent. And that truck ton-miles rose from 9 percent to 19 percent; and inland waterway ton-miles from 14 percent to 17 percent in the same period. These figures plainly show that barge and truck operators need no protection against the railroads.

Where is the sense in this setup, from the standpoint of the public interest? Why does the practice persist? There are three discernible reasons—none of them good: (1) Barge and truck operators have a vested interest in keeping the railroads impotent in competition, and the regulatory law, as interpreted up to now by the ICC, is often definitely helpful to them; (2) elaborate regulation provides a lot of employment; (3) railroaders and industrial traffic men grew up under regulation and have never known anything else—they are too accustomed to being bossed around to be moved to loud complaint.

Some of the regulatory functions of the ICC serve a useful public purpose—e.g., supervision of accounts accident reporting and finance, prevention of arbitrary discrimination, acting as an arbiter in intra-agency issues. But there is certainly no economic justification for regulation of inter-agency competitive minimum rates, so long as direct costs are covered.

END REGULATION RACKETS

The overelaborate machinery for regulation of interagency competitive rates, in essence, is little better than a legitimized antirailroad racket. It is kept alive through inertia and because it serves a lot of vested interests. It is a reflection on the economic statesmanship of the traffic fraternity that it does not raise more of a clamor than it does to trim rate regulation down to size. If the burden isn't eased soon, a large fraction of the railroad industry is likely to go broke and be nationalized.

Skip the Price Fixing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial appearing in the Fort (Ark.) Times-Record on March 24, 1959. This fine editorial recognizes the fair trade bill, H.R. 1253, and other similar measures as being precisely what they are, price-rigging legislation which would cost consumers countless millions of dollars a year.

Not one editorial comment have I been able to see outside of the trade press of the proponents favors this price-gouging legislation.

The editorial follows:

SKIP THE PRICE FIXING

A Justice Department spokesman was on solid ground, we think, when he declared Monday that so-called fair trade laws—which permit certain groups to set the retail minimum price of an article—would encroach on the spirit of the antitrust laws and probably would cost consumers countless millions of dollars a year.

Certainly, if a Federal law prohibits one group from getting together, we can see no justification for another Federal law permitting another group to do that very thing.

And, we think, all price-fixing laws eventually result in increased costs to the public. So we think there's no doubt that the consumer would suffer tremendously from any such law.

Also, we think a merchant has a basic right to decide his own business policies, including his prices.

And we think every Congressman who believes in a free nation and a free people should be opposed to any such proposal as that for a national fair trade price-setting law.

Monorail Transportation for Seattle's Century 21 Exposition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1959

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, the Seattle Transit Co. announced today that it has signed a contract with the Lockheed Aircraft Corp. to build a $5 million monorail system to serve the Century 21 Exposition in 1961. This is an historic step forward in the field of mass transportation. We are hopeful that this pilot model will prove to be the key to solving the growing problem of commuting to large metropolitan areas for work or shopping.

The first operational monorail line ever installed within a city to help solve mass transportation problems, the Seattle system will whisk exposition visitors from the downtown area to the exposition site a mile away in slightly more than 1 minute. Its radically designed aircars will carry 96 passengers at a time over the top of congested surface traffic.

An estimated 18 million persons are expected to visit the exposition during its 18-month run starting May 10, 1961. This revolutionary new transportation system will help handle this crowd. But of longer lasting importance and of interest to my colleagues is the fact that this system may be the answer to the Nation's commuting problems. I am sure my colleagues from metropolitan centers can visualize how similar systems could be used in their own areas to carry passengers from airports to business districts or from residential areas to shopping centers.

I hope that many of my colleagues will have an opportunity to visit Seattle during the Century 21 Exposition to see this monorail in operation as well as the many scientific and cultural exhibits which are being planned.

Oregon's Centennial Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1959

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to again call to the attention of my colleagues that this is Oregon's centennial birthday. In recognition of this fact, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following article from the Record-Courier of Baker, Oreg., which I am sure will be of interest to the Members:

EXPOSITION, LOCAL SHOWS MARK CENTENNIAL

Oregon, representing the last frontier, is fittingly conducting its 100th birthday party on a grand scale. Observing a century of statehood, residents from the sunny ocean beaches to the snowcapped mountains of the interior are giving a regional atmosphere to every type of celebration.

In Portland, an attendance of 6 to 8 million is forecast for the Centennial Exposition and International Trade Fair which will start June 10 and continue until September 17. The exposition site covers 65 acres, with an 11-acre pavilion as its heart. A 100-acre parking lot is being prepared for 20,000 cars, and 18 acres of the site is being turned into Adventureland, combining historical displays with glimpses into the future.

ATOMIC ENERGY EXHIBIT

An exhibit of atomic energy never before seen in its entirety will share attention with a pioneer village in operation and a re-creation of the village in which Lewis and Clark wintered on the Oregon coast. A logging train salvaged from pioneer equipment will carry visitors around the area while a stagecoach rolls again and a sawmill cuts timber into lumber.

Another 10 acres has been set aside for the International Garden of Tomorrow, with newly developed flowers from all over the world. A floral clock, 30 feet in diameter, will tick off the minutes, and a candle 25 feet tall will burn throughout the 100 days of the exposition, symbolizing hope and prayer for international good will.

DISPLAYS IN GREAT VARIETY

Exhibits and features of the Exposition will provide variety of interests. Among them will be a $250,000 Oregon Forest Products pavilion unlike any building in the world. The structure will demonstrate new uses for wood architecture. Attracting the homeowner will be the Cameo House of Tomorrow, projecting the viewer 10 years into the future with newly developed construction, gadgets, and furnishings.

Many national firms have arranged for exhibits, including General Motors, Westinghouse, Standard Oil, Carter Oil, General Petroleum, The Texas Co., Reynolds Metals, Coca-Cola, New York Life Insurance, and Pacific Telephone & Telegraph.

Among Portland area manufacturers with displays will be the Hyster Co., White Stag, Pendleton Woolen Mills, Jantzen, Inc., Electric Steel Foundry Co., Gunderson Brothers, Tektronix, Mixermobile and Sawyers. In the noncommercial field, 13 Oregon State agencies are cooperating in a $75,000 exhibit. There will also be atomic energy, fine arts, education, fish and wildlife displays.

Spectacular professional entertainment of every type is being billed for the Exposition as well as productions with an authentic

Western flavor. Among attractions will be the Ice Capades and the Art Linkletter show.

TWENTY NATIONS AT TRADE FAIR

More than 20 nations are planning to show and sell their products to Centennial visitors at the International Trade Fair.

Many distinguished foreign visitors and members of the legation staffs from Washington, D.C., will attend. To enhance the foreign exhibits, there will be an international theater for film showings related to handicrafts on display.

Significant as a first in international trade fairs is the collective exhibit being arranged by West Germany, Great Britain, Italy, France, The Netherlands, Belgium, and Luxembourg. This will include displays of everything from industrial products to winter ski equipment.

Also represented in the Fair will be India, Israel, Japan, Austria, China, Dominican Republic, Finland, Ghana, Hong Kong, Korea, Malaya, Mexico, Morocco, Norway, Sweden, Philippine Islands, and the Virgin Islands.

Every city, town, and hamlet in the State is planning special attractions for Oregon's guests. Tourist booths will make available information concerning square dances, fish fries, cattle drives, gold panning, historical pageants, boat trips, scenic drives, fishing excursions and a host of other activities typical of the State's varied interests.

TWO THOUSAND INDIANS IN CAMP

A unique event will be a National Indian encampment at Pendleton July 18–26. More than 2,000 Indians, representing every tribe in the Nation, are expected for the encampment. It will commemorate the signing of a treaty in 1855 between the United States and the Walla Walla and Umatilla Tribes. Visitors will see authentic Indian dances and games and witness tribal customs.

Pony express riders will begin carrying mail June 7 on two trunklines across the State throughout the summer with feeder lines connecting all parts of Oregon. It will be possible to mail a letter anywhere in Oregon and have it actually carried by horsemen to any destination in the State or to the edge of the State for transfer to trains.

Touring the State and stopping at every town of 2,000 or more population is the Centennial Van of History. It carries historical displays that even include the tomahawk that killed Marcus Whitman, early-day missionary.

Oregon's seashores, mountains, inland waters and woods are expected to lure centennial visitors into prolonging their vacations.

Industry, too, as it developed from the fledgling of yesterday into the giant of today, will be graphically depicted.

COVERED WAGONS TO ROLL

To help publicize the centennial celebration throughout the country, a group of space age pioneers in 5 covered wagons will make the 2,000-mile crossing on the old Oregon Trail, starting April 19 from Independence, Mo., and reenacting the 20-mile-a-day trek of their forebears. Gordon (Tex) Serpa, Ashland, Oreg., rancher and movie stunt rider, has been named wagonmaster and former President Harry Truman will be on hand to start off the cavalcade.

Members of the Oregon Ad Club have set out to reclaim the northern part of the old Oregon Territory. Claim signs are being erected at various boundaries and in such strategic spots as Seattle newspapers, the city limits of Yakima, the lobby of the Davenport Hotel in Spokane, and the Canadian border.

How a Spanish-Language Newspaper in New York Helps Its Readers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert a very interesting article which appeared in Editor and Publisher, in its issue of April 18, 1959. The article is entitled "El Diario Assists Spanish Readers," and the author of it is Ray Erwin.

This article presents not only an insight into some of the problems encountered by the Spanish-speaking community of New York, numbering a million people, but tells us what the Spanish-language newspaper El Diario de Nueva York is doing to help these people overcome some of their problems. This newspaper is more than just a newspaper, it is a community guide and a human relations agency combined.

I feel that in reading this article we are better able to understand the Spanish-speaking people and their problems of adjustment under trying circumstances. It is for this reason that I am inserting it into the RECORD:

EL DIARIO ASSISTS SPANISH READERS

(By Ray Erwin)

As many as 700 of the 1 million Spanish-speaking residents of New York City may visit the human relations department of El Diario de Nueva York, Spanish-language morning tabloid newspaper, in a single day to seek and receive advice on personal problems.

The department averages 250 interviews daily and from 600 to 700 on Saturdays. It receives an average of 1,000 letters a day, two employees being required to handle this mail, entirely separate from the newspaper's regular mail.

The heartwarming work of the human relations department is credited in large measure with the rehabilitation of the El Diario.

RAPID GROWTH

When Stanley Ross became editor in chief and associate publisher of El Diario 3 years ago, the paper verged on bankruptcy and had been suspended for 5 weeks by a strike. Mr. Ross and the publisher, Dr. Porfirio Dominici, borrowed 2 weeks' payroll, settled the strike and within 14 hours had the paper back on the streets. The circulation was 21,000. It is now 60,000.

There are only two persons on the circulation staff in New York, as there are only about 550 home subscribers. The remainder of the papers are picked up at the plant at 164 Duane Street, where PM was published before its suspension, by the Metropolitan News Co., which distributes all foreign-language newspapers in New York. Metropolitan makes delivery to 4,000 newsstands daily. The paper maintains one circulation man in Philadelphia and another in Chicago.

The human relations department was modeled on a smaller scale after the extensive public service programs promoted for many years by La Prensa in Buenos Aires, Argentina.

The head of the department, the Reverend Fernando Rivera, assigned to the work by the New York Council of Protestant Churches, asked the visitor to step out into the marble-lined foyer of the building to witness a wedding. A dark-eyed young couple, in Sunday best, nervously made their holy vows. An average of 10 couples are married there each week without charge of any kind. Catholic couples are sent to their respective parish churches.

Two Catholic priests assigned to the work of the department are away, one in Colombia and the other in Central America, but they will return. Miss Felicita Berrios, a Catholic charities trained social worker, works in the human relations department and is paid by the paper.

Housing, welfare, and employment problems constitute the bulk of the work. Hundreds of cases involving installment buying are referred to the State attorney general's office, which has requested a large increase in staff to handle these matters. El Diario formerly had its own clinica legal to provide volunteer lawyers to advise readers but now all such cases are referred to the Legal Aid Society.

One of the workers in the department, Harry Soloway, was on the staff of former Gov. Herbert H. Lehman.

A number of reporters devote almost full-time to the human relations department and its work, much of which produces news pictures and stories. For instance, Jose Lumen Roman, a reporter, gets up at 4 a.m. to televise over NBC channel 4 at 6 a.m. "Aque se Habla Ingles"—"English Is Spoken Here." Then, after his TV English lesson, he goes to the office to devote most of his time to human relations problems.

MISCARRIAGE OF JUSTICE

Another reporter, John I. Ortiz, Jr., has just returned from Poughkeepsie, N.Y., where he helped to rectify an apparent miscarriage of justice involving two young Puerto Rican migrant farm workers.

A man complained to the police that two "dark" men asked him for two cigarettes and when he refused and cursed them, they struck him in the mouth and took two cigarettes, leaving the rest of the pack and his money.

The police found out the two Puerto Ricans had been in town and arrested them. The plaintiff identified them. No interpreter was provided the Spanish-speaking defendants but the court appointed a lawyer. The youths were convicted and sentenced to from 10 to 30 years in the penitentiary.

El Diario found witnesses to back the defendants' story that they were home when the affair occurred, paid for a transcript of the court testimony and got the pair out on $20,000 bail, pending an appeal.

At a Puerto Rican parade on Fifth Avenue last Sunday, Mr. Ross said Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller mentioned to him the possibility of a pardon. The editor told him they did not want a pardon but complete vindication in the courts.

In addition to the reporters, there are a number of volunteer workers in the department, such as Pedro Delgado, president of the Yauco Social Club.

POLITICALLY POWERFUL

El Diario packs a political punch. Its readers, many of whom speak little English, look to it not only to help them solve their many personal problems but to suggest their political preferences.

Even in health matters, many of the newcomers from Latin America hesitate to go to health clinics or hospitals until they are so referred by the newspaper that is quick to champion their rights or advise them. Many

declined to take their children to receive Salk inoculations gainst polio until El Diario began having the shots given at its office. Then they flocked in.

SPORTS SPONSORED

Manolo Rodriguez, sports editor and former Minister of War and police chief in Costa Rica, is commissioner of 30 baseball leagues with 96 teams and approximately 2,000 players, sponsored by the newspaper. His staff also oversees Guants Hispanos, El Diario's golden gloves, for which 2,400 Spanish-speaking boys train for boxing.

Often a visitor to the human relations department has been shunted around to seven or eight city offices about some matter. The newspaper workers send them with a note in English to the correct official.

Many persons sought by the police for questioning surrender to the newspaper. Dr. Dominici, the publisher, is a physician and gives men surrendering a physical examination and tells the police this has been done. This reassures the men that they will not be given third-degree treatment.

A special citation, with high praise from high police officials, recently was made to El Diario by the Schaefer Brewing Co. for its help to the police in recovering a kidnaped baby.

The newspaper boasts of its readers' loyalty to advertisers. The A.&P. stores ran an experimental series of ads in Spanish in the paper and then decided to remain out a few weeks. Mr. Ross advised readers who wished to see the grocery ads continue in their newspaper to write the advertising director of the company and tell him so. Within 2 days, he telephoned El Diario he had received 6,000 letters. The company has run one full page of advertising once a week ever since.

The paper carries about four pages of classified advertising each day, with a big volume of help-wanted ads.

Editor Ross, an ex-Associated Press correspondent, once was editor of El Diario de Puerto Rico, owned by Gov. Muñoz Marin. City Editor Sergio Santelices was in charge of Latin American news for INS for 11 years.

Publisher Dominici, who also owns El Universal, Caracas, Venezuela, and Editor Ross have announced enlargement of the weekend edition (published Saturday with dateline) of El Diario, which has contracted with King Features Syndicate for 8 pages of colored comics. With the issue of April 19, the paper adds two photographers to its staff, bringing the total to 7, and a feature writer, Mrs. Lazara Vega, of Cuba. The paper has sent Ismael Fernandez to Puerto Rico to double its fulltime staff there. The paper has a leased wire to Puerto Rico.

Philip Malkin, director of advertising, says 1 million Spanish-speaking people live in New York, and 675,000 are from Puerto Rico.

Tribute to Rear Admiral Mumma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1959

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, Adm. A. G. Mumma's 4-year tour as Chief of the Bureau of the Ships has been marked by spectacular technological advances in the design and construction of new surface combatant ships and submarines, by the development of improved electronics detection and communications equipment and by the application of effective methods of reducing costs. Four *Forrestal*-type attack aircraft carriers have joined the fleet and the nuclear-powered attack carrier *Enterprise* is taking shape on the building ways. A new fleet of atomic-powered missile-armed ships has come closer to reality. Numerous guided missile frigates and destroyers have been placed under construction. The first of these have already been launched.

The Bureau of Ships, under the guidance of Admiral Mumma, quickly designed a new type of nuclear-powered submarine to carry and launch the fleet ballistic missile, Polaris. Six Polaris submarines are now under construction and three of them are expected to be launched later this year. During the past year a project which Admiral Mumma helped to initiate and foster from the very beginning, the marriage of nuclear power with the revolutionary whale-shaped hull form of the experimental submarine *Albacore*, came into being with phenomenally successful results. The latest Navy submarine to be commissioned, *Skipjack*, is faster and more maneuverable than any other submarine ever built.

With the retirement of Admiral Mumma tomorrow, the Navy will lose an extremely capable and devoted officer. Admiral Mumma has frequently testified before Congress concerning the affairs of the Bureau of Ships. I am sure that his many friends in Congress will miss him and will wish him the best of success in his chosen field of endeavor.

Preserve, Protect, and Defend the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. MOELLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1959

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article prepared by Mr. J. Keller Kirn, Sr., a respected retired banker from my hometown of Lancaster, Ohio. Mr. Kirn is a widely known and valuable member of our community. I am pleased to submit his article, not as an expression of my own views, but to give others an opportunity to be acquainted with Mr. Kirn's thinking:

PRESERVE, PROTECT, AND DEFEND THE CONSTITUTION

Our Constitution was the answer to our forefather's prayer for divine guidance. Abraham Lincoln, said: "The Constitution was adopted to preserve our government, not to act as a protecting screen for those who while claiming its privileges seek to destroy it." William Penn, said: "Men will be governed by God or ruled by tyrants."

According to our Constitution consisting of 3 branches—legislative, judicial and executive, we are governed by those whom we elect.

There is no fourth branch for government ownership or operation of private business, to rule us with rules made by bureaucrat rulers whom we did not elect.

According to our Constitution, government spending is carefully restricted to "the common defense and general welfare of the United States"—not of any other nation or the world at large.

Our Constitution gives power to Congress (1) "to coin money," and (2) "to borrow money on the credit of the United States"—but not to lend money, or to give it away, either at home or abroad.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 21, 1955, page A1919, "42 years ago we did not have a single government lending agency, now 104 with $244 billion of loans."

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 12, 1958, page 7535, Congressman William E. McVey, said: "The pursuance of our present policies must eventually lead to insolvency of our country and the strangulation of our free-enterprise system." Then he listed loans made by our government to 23 other countries, and grants-in-aid, which don't require that they be paid back, to 100 other countries, July 1, 1954, June 30, 1957.

Thailand received $593,205,000 grants-in-aid, and will get $20 million more. We can't buy loyalty, love, or respect. Listen to Fulton Lewis, Jr., and D. Manion.

Instead of government loans and grants-in-aid to other countries, allow other countries to sell their bonds to our citizens without guarantee by our Government.

Allow our citizens to form corporations to take over private businesses operated unconstitutionally by our government bureaucrats. Government employees can be employed by such corporations, invest in them, and be free from fear of changes in administrations. This will reduce our government debt and tax expenses and increase government tax income from such corporations.

President George Washington adopted neutrality by proclamation April 22, 1793 when war broke out between France on the one side and Great Britain, the United Netherlands, Austria, Prussia and Sardinia on the other side.

Emulate Switzerland, at peace with golden rule neutrality instead of war by "lets you and him fight" U.N. interventionists, and prosperous with currency payable in gold coins, since 1815. Restore the gold coin standard, now.

When Congress regulated commerce with foreign nations according to our Constitution, we were protected from the cheap labor of Europe, and the slave labor of Russia. Demand that Congress again regulate commerce with foreign nations.

Financing Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD L. JACKSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1959

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Oakland Tribune, of Oakland, Calif.:

FINANCING COMMUNISTS

For some years, a sturdy piece of legislation known as the Battle Act has stood against those who would scatter the U.S. taxpayer's dollars around the world with indiscriminate judgment in promotion of their role of global dogooders.

Now a new attack has been made upon that barrier which was designed to prevent the funneling of any large share of the American economy into any country that classes our economic system as an enemy to be overcome.

Under a bill offered by Senator JOHN KENNEDY and Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, American economic aid could be sent into Communist satellite countries as a wedge to pry loose Moscow control.

The Battle Act, which specifically forbids aid to any nation controlled or dominated by Communists unless there is a Presidential decision that such aid is merited and can be beneficial to the United States, would be practically destroyed by the Kennedy-Aiken measure.

A similar attempt was defeated in the Senate last year by the slim margin of 43 to 42.

The best argument Senator KENNEDY could bring up in introducing the second attempt Tuesday was that "there is a real opportunity for giving our foreign policy a flexibility which might exploit cracks in the Iron Curtain."

That is as flimsy as it is unrealistic. Hungary stands as an outstanding example of what comes when the people of any satellite state shows opposition to Moscow. Poland is an example of a satellite state that has received U.S. assistance, showing in return only a still closer subjugation to Moscow.

And what have we received in return for the hundreds of millions of dollars sent to Yugoslavia? There has been no evidence of a desire to align foreign policy with that of the West. There has been no departure from communism. There has been nothing at all from Marshal Tito that serves the interests of the United States.

It is particularly unwise at this time to earmark our dollars for any Communist country. Rather than contribute to the economy of any red state now is the time to draw tighter, not loosen, the Treasury.

Democratic Victory in 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1959

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday evening the Young Men's Democratic Society of York County, Pa., held its 67th annual Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner at the Valencia Ballroom in the city of York. The speaker on this occasion was our distinguished colleague from the Fourth District of Alabama, Hon. KENNETH A. ROBERTS. It is a pleasure for me to bring to your attention the speech which Mr. Roberts delivered to his York audience:

It is a great pleasure for me to be here tonight, as I always get a high sense of pleasure in gathering with Democrats anywhere.

I feel at home with Democrats wherever I am, even though I may be in Yankee territory. I'm glad that I am here on friendly terms, because I understand that when I crossed over into York County today I also crossed over what some southerners have called the Smith & Wesson line. I think you call it the Mason-Dixon line.

It is a privilege to be in the 19th Pennsylvania District, which is served so ably by my good friend and your distinguished Congressman, the Honorable JAMES M. QUIGLEY. I could not have said that if I had come before you last year, and I know you share the pride I have in being able to salute your Democratic Congressman tonight.

There may be another reason why I feel at home here tonight. In Washington, you know things can get pretty hot sometimes. I think it should be a source of pride to you to know that when things get heated in the Capitol Building, York air conditioning is helping cool things off.

We are here tonight in a common bond, the Democratic Party.

Through a century and a half of American history, there has been a Democratic Party. And all that time our party has had one guiding principle: the ideal of government for the common man.

Ours is the oldest political party in the world. The exact date of the party's founding is not clear. But it is certain that it gained lifebreath in the fight of Thomas Jefferson for the Bill of Rights. The battle then was what it has always been for the Democratic Party: to preserve individual liberty. In that great fight which put the Democratic Party into the forefront, Thomas Jefferson declared: "A bill of rights is what the people are entitled to against every government on earth, and what no just government should refuse."

Jefferson's party first sought office opposing the aristocratic Federalists of Alexander Hamilton. Jefferson fought the party which believed that the Government could not last unless the wealthy people of the country were given preferential treatment.

Government for the benefit of the privileged few, the autocrats of privilege, has ever been the spirit of the Republican Party.

When the Eisenhower Republican administration came into power in 1953, there was great rejoicing by the men of big business, big finance, and big law. One of General Eisenhower's first actions was to take care of his rich friends. And, right off, he named to his Cabinet nine millionaires and a plumber. The plumber, needless to say, is no longer with him. Under Eisenhower, the Republican Party has run true to form. It has followed the party spirit enunciated by Alexander Hamilton. Hamilton's scheme was to create a permanent class to run the Government of those who held the wealth and capital of the country. It was built for the autocrats of privilege and there was no humanity in it.

Our great Speaker of the House, SAM RAYBURN, has often said that the Democratic Party is the party with humanity in it. Ours is the party with a heart. It was our party that created the ideal of humane government.

You know, the Democratic Party's early role in protecting the immigrant settlers almost has been forgotten. Back in the 1850's, some 600,000 European immigrants were entering this country each year. The Know-Nothing Party came into being for the sole purpose of ending this immigration. Members of the bigoted Know-Nothing movement burned churches and beat up immigrants on the streets. They ran almost unchecked until the Democratic National Convention of 1856 took a strong stand which broke the back of the Know-Nothings. The Democratic belief was put forth in a resolution which showed the common people of Europe that America welcomed them to a new life. Our western lands, then being settled, would have of little use without people to fill them. The Democratic ideal of humane government quickened the movement that built the West.

Thomas Jefferson believed in the fullest possible life for all the people. He believed in the inherent worth of the common man. He was certain that, given the facts, the people would use the right of self-government properly.

Down through 150 years, this has been the line of the Democratic Party. Of course, we have had our ups and our downs. But there have always been men, men of good faith, young men, men ready to fight for good government.

What men we have had.

Thomas Jefferson at 33 drafting the Declaration of Independence.

James Madison at 26 the father of our Constitution.

James Monroe, who formed the basis of American foreign policy which would stand for more than a century.

Andrew Jackson, who after leading the American forces brilliantly in the Battle of New Orleans, went on to become a great President.

One of the finest assertions of basic Democratic principles on record is one delivered by Andrew Jackson while he was President. I would like to quote the words which express clearly our party's beliefs: "Every man is equally entitled to protection by law; but, when the laws undertake to add to those natural and just advantages artificial distinctions, to grant titles, gratuities and exclusive privileges, to make the rich richer and the powerful more potent, the humble members of society—the farmers, mechanics and laborers—who have neither the time nor the means to secure like favors to themselves, have a right to complain of the injustice of their government."

And from here in Pennsylvania there came a man. His name was James Buchanan. As Secretary of State, he wrote the peace treaty with Mexico. As President, he lowered the tariff, and his words on government economy still live in the Democratic 86th Congress. He said, "We ought never to forget that true public economy consists not in withholding the means necessary to accomplish important national objects, but in taking care that the money appropriated for these purposes shall be faithfully and frugally expended."

The Republican Party leadership today delights in calling the Democrats the big spenders. The Republican solution is to ignore crying domestic needs and hang onto a paper budget. They could take a great lesson from James Buchanan of Pennsylvania.

You know, that balanced budget that President Eisenhower has tossed to us in the Congress is one of the big hoaxes of the century. When you try to test the budget by comparing expenditure with revenue, it does not balance. It anticipates revenue which will not be forthcoming. When you try to test the budget by measuring it against the needs of the country, against the suffering of the unemployed, against the demands for better schools, hospitals, and housing, it is far from being a balanced budget.

It is a deficit budget. Deficit in reality and humane ideals.

The Democratic Party is and always has been the party of financial responsibility. The Democratic Party believes, as Grover Cleveland so succinctly put it, "A public office is a public trust."

In the last 4 years of Democratic Congresses, for instance, we have cut $8 billion out of the Republican President's budget. We have done it wisely, responsibly, and we have carried American progress ahead with it.

The Democratic Party has always provided leadership when the country has needed it. In time of crisis, the people historically have turned to the Democratic Party.

During World War I, America looked to Woodrow Wilson. He carried us through, and did not stop there. He devoted his life to a search for peace. Peace among men and among nations.

Woodrow Wilson was a living example of the precept of the Democratic Party which he himself enunciated with these words: "The Democratic Party, and only the Democratic Party, has carried out the policies which the progressive people of this country have desired. * * * I thank God that those who believe in America, who try to serve her people, are likely to be also what America herself from the first hoped and meant to be—the servant of mankind."

In 1929, the people of America had had Republican leadership, or lack of it, for 8 years. They were on the verge of a terrible economic crisis. And it came down like a burst bubble. The great depression. The stock market was at the bottom. There were breadlines in the streets. Thirteen million people were out of work. The Republican President gave them empty words. He said he was opposed to squandering ourselves into prosperity. He said the worst was over, and recovery was assured.

Well, you know the story. In time of crisis, the people turned to the Democratic Party for salvation. They found it in a man named Franklin Delano Roosevelt. F.D.R. told the people there was nothing to fear but fear itself. The people trusted him, and he led them through.

The people grew strong under the Democrats during the next two decades. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman guided America through a great global conflict and made us sound and prosperous.

In 1952, the Hoover years were dimmed in American memories. America thought it wanted a change. I do not have to tell you here tonight that America got a change.

We have had many changes while President Eisenhower was sometimes at the Augusta, Ga., Country Club, sometimes at Camp David, sometimes at the Burning Tree golf course, and sometimes on a fancy farm over in Adams County, Pa.

Our allies have been antagonized, our alliances weakened, our strength weakened, our world prestige undermined.

On the home front, the Republican administration gave America more changes. It gave us the worst recession since World War II, with 5 million unemployed workers, the highest prices and taxes in history, a soaring cost of living.

The great change of 1952 brought to America a rededication to the precepts of Alexander Hamilton, where the rich get richer and the poor get poorer. We have felt the pinch of the high interest rates for the benefit of the bankers and the money lenders. We have seen small business squeezed out, while Republican shoulders shrugged at the big steel and auto manufacturers, food producers and chainstores putting through price increases far out of proportion to labor wage increases. Tax cuts have been reserved for corporations and rich taxpayers.

The workers, consumers, small businessmen, and farmers were neglected while the administration shadow-boxed with inflation.

You are located here in the heart of a great agricultural region. Did you know that the Republicans have driven 4 million people off the farms in 5 years?

Under the great change of 1952, there has come about a heartless and callous slashing of programs vital to the health of the people. There have been giveaways, exploitation of natural resources, minerals, water, power, forestry, and land.

The Republican administration let the Russians get the jump on us in the space race. Down in Alabama, at Redstone Arsenal, we have the world's ablest space scientists. These scientists had a rocket ready to go long before the Russian sputnik zoomed into outer space. America could have beaten sputnik and strengthened its leadership and prestige if President Eisenhower and Charlie Wilson could have made up their minds and given Redstone Arsenal the go-ahead.

Last November, the people of America realized as never before what the great change of 1952 had brought them.

They saw that once again America is facing a time of crisis. Only this time, it is not one crisis, but multiple crises. There is the farm crisis. The arms research and development crisis. The business crisis. The unemployment crisis.

In November, the people once again showed they were ready to let the Democratic Party take over. They showed it in the only way they could. Had it been a presidential election, we would have a Democrat sitting in the White House right now.

But the people will have to wait until 1960 for that.

Last fall, they could only elect Democrats to governorships, to mayorships, to Congress. And they did it overwhelmingly. In all parts of this great land, Democrats were returned to office or sent there for the first time.

Right here in Pennsylvania, in the 19th Congressional District, after he had been on the sidelines for 2 years, you sent a Democrat back to Washington and I congratulate you for it.

Well, what did that great victory in 1958 for the Democratic Party mean? One thing it most certainly meant was that the people do not want more of what they have been getting. Tired of the weak Republican administration, they are concerned over the unanswered needs on the homefront and abroad.

In short, the people are tired of the great change. They want the Democratic Party, the responsible party, the humane party, to make their laws and to give them leadership.

We Democrats feel very strongly the burden of responsibility that has been placed upon us. In the 86th Congress, where the Democratic majority is larger than at any time in the last 20 years, we know that ours is a solemn obligation to continue to fulfill the expectations of the people who have put us there.

In the 86th Congress, we are going to continue in the spirit of the 85th Congress, which the people so loudly have endorsed.

The job has already started. The Hawaiian and Alaskan statehood bills already has passed, and we have extended unemployment benefits. We are on the verge of passing a new airport aid bill, to help us meet the growing demands of safety and necessity in the jet age. We will soon pass an omnibus housing bill, to provide homes for the homeless.

We will enact health legislation and safety legislation. We will enact labor reform legislation, and we will see that adequate funds are provided for home development and defense.

The list will be long when we are through. It will be done for the ideal of government for the comman man, just as it was in the days of Thomas Jefferson. It will be done at times against heavy opposition from the Republican administration.

The voters of America will be watching the 86th Congress. They want to know that their 1958 endorsement of the Democratic Party was justified. I want to tell you that they will not be disappointed. They will be sure in 1960 that the Democratic Party is the party of responsibility.

They will be able to vote in good conscience for the Democratic presidential nominee, confident that their ballot will mean a return to responsible leadership.

America today as never before has need of the Democratic Party. She has need of its spirit of dedication and devotion. She has the need of each of you here tonight, your courage, and devotion, your determination, and vision, your faith in the future.

Monopoly in Milk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include an article by Sherwood Ross in the May number of the Progressive Magazine. Mr. Ross, a constituent of mine, is a distinguished Chicago publicist now serving under Commissioner Jardine in the administration of Mayor Daley, of Chicago. The article follows:

MONOPOLY IN THE MILKSHED
(by Sherwood Ross)

"If, as is sometimes said, the past is prolog, this record, to those who believe that traditional American liberty even yet holds a place in its competitive structure for the individual enterpriser, forewarns of the annihilation of the small businessman in a field of competitive endeavor historically local in nature. The rise of the giant, Foremost Dairies, Inc., characterized by acquisition * * * seemingly without end, is one of the prime examples of the revision of the competitive structure of the dairy products industry in the last quarter century."

This eloquent plea of the public counsel before the hearing examiner of the Federal Trade Commission in the still undecided case against the Foremost Dairies Corp. supplies, in capsule, the reason behind the FTC's bid to prove that Foremost, along with three other corporate giants, has come to dominate the dairy industry. This domination has been achieved by methods allegedly in violation of the Clayton Act, which prohibits corporation mergers that "lessen competition, or tend to create a monopoly," and the Federal Trade Commission Act, which prohibits unfair competitive practices. The results of these FTC complaints, in addition to the probe by an aggressive House Committee on Small Business, has been to keep the big four of dairyland—National Dairy Products (Sealtest), the Borden Co., Foremost, and Beatrice Foods (Meadowgold)—almost constantly on the witness stand.

Much more is at stake than appears on the surface in this legal battle between the Government and the dairy corporations over who controls the American milkshed, and how it is controlled. The congressional investigation and the decisions of the hearing examiner will affect the welfare of our 1,500,000 dairy farmers, the future of hundreds of small, independent milk producers, thousands of small grocers, and the pocketbooks of 170 million Americans.

As a result of the acquisition of small milk producers, virtually in wholesale lots, the Big Four now control 20 percent of all fluid milk sales in the United States. Accordingly, since 1954, the FTC has cited the four for merger practices which "tend to create a monopoly" or "lessen competition." Some idea of the wealth, power, and resources at the disposal of these giant organizations may be gained from examining their corporate records:

National Dairy operates more than 400 concerns, many of which, like Kraft Foods, control subsidiaries of their own. In a pending complaint, the FTC charges that National's sales have increased 39 percent—from $906 million in 1950, to $1,260 million in 1955—as a result of its 40 acquisitions.

Borden's, with hundreds of satellites producing in 48 States and numerous markets overseas, has increased its sales from $613 million in 1950, to $810 million in 1955,

because of its pattern, the FTC claims, of "steady encroachment" in eliminating competitors.

Foremost, which holds the distinction of having led all U.S. corporations in total mergers for the years 1948 through 1954, increased its sales sevenfold during the 1950–54 period because of them, the FTC contends. Foremost sales rose from $52 million to $375 million in that time. The growth of its corporate assets—like those of the other dairy leaders—directly paralleled the rise of its sales. Foremost's assets soared 797 percent between 1950 and 1954.

Beatrice Foods, which operates some 300 enterprises in 29 States, increased its net sales by 58 percent—from $205 million to $325 million—in the 1950–55 period, a consequence of mergers that violate the Clayton Act, the FTC has charged.

As these huge dairy corporations, in their apparently ceaseless cycle of merger, growth, and merger, have enjoyed record sales and profits while farm prices have declined and consumer prices have advanced, it is little short of amazing that so little public outcry has been heard. Editors seem indifferent to the fact that one-third of all American families are dificient in calcium; 2 families in 10 will not purchase a quart of milk this month; and the world's wealthiest Nation languishes in 15th place on the list of world dairy-product consumers.

Some of the reasons for this poor showing are not hard to find. Florida provides a fairly typical example of why dairy products pile up. There, three of the big four—Foremost, Borden's, and National—control 36 percent of milk sales in Miami, 59 percent in Jacksonville, and 60 percent in Tampa, according to figures supplied by the FTC. The housewife has to pay the milkman 28 cents a quart in Miami and Tampa, and 30 cents a quart in Jacksonville. The result has been a surplus of milk on the farms while people in the cities who need it have to go without milk. "Now what could have caused a surplus of milk in Florida?" chided the Dairy Record magazine last summer. "Could it possibly have been prices which, month after month and year after year, with only an occasional exception, are the highest in the Nation?"

But if the breadwinner's wife has been paying gold rush prices for milk, the dairy farmer has seen only the dust and not the nuggets. Representative Department of Agriculture figures for the sale of half-gallon containers (February 1958) prove this rather conclusively:

[In cents]

	Housewife pays	Middleman takes	Farmer gets
New York	49	23	26
Oklahoma City	49	27	22
Louisville	41	22	19
Chicago	41	23	18
Dayton	40	21	19

New York World-Telegram and Sun Reporter Joseph Alvarez, viewing "The Milk Muddle," in September 1957, observed, "Right now, the farmer gets about 9 cents a quart. It retails for 25½ cents. Some economists maintain that the higher prices the farmer needs and the cheaper milk the housewife wants must come out of the 16½ cents in the middle." This is a point of view enthusiastically supported by dairy farmers, many of whom have been driven to desperation by sliding receipts and skyrocketing costs. A few months earlier, 9,000 mid-Atlantic region farmers resorted to milk-dumping, dynamiting, and gunplay in an effort to wring 3 cents more from the middlemen. One spokesman for 3,000 insurgent dairy farmers in that area complained bitterly, "We're losing money on every drop of milk we sell. We can't meet production costs. We'd rather ruin ourselves than have somebody else do it for us." On the highways, milk schooners were flagged down—their tires slashed, headlights broken, cargoes dumped—and the supply of milk to New York City jeopardized.

National farm spokesmen mince no words in pinning the blame for low milk receipts on the middleman. William Waldorf, president of the Dairy Farmers of America, has declared, "We will be orderly but our needs are great. We are an action group. We are in revolt against the domination of the big milk trusts. They must pay more for our milk." It can hardly be maintained that the big milk trusts are incapable of paying more. The net profits of the Big Four—spurred by sales which the FTC says have been the result of mergers—have grown like this:

Net profits

[In millions of dollars]

	1952	1956	1957	1958
National	$27.8	41.7	44.1	45.5
Borden's	17.7	23.6	24.0	24.6
Foremost	1.9	10.1	10.5	------
Beatrice	3.9	6.3	7.5	8.6

It should be noted that the most recent recession, which depleted the ranks of dairy farmers, put no great dent in Big Four profit margins. There are several reasons for this. The business magazine, Barron's, pointed out one of them last year in an article titled "National Dairy—It Manages To Thrive in Good and Bad Times Alike." Explaining why National's profits rose during three recessions, it observed, "Since raw materials are much more sensitive to business conditions than the prices of finished goods, dairy firms such as National usually are able to widen profit margins in times of general economic slackness." Or, to take it out of Wall Street parlance, consumer prices remained high even though farm prices fell and millions of workers were laid off.

A second reason for the sizable profit margins of the Big Four has been the invaluable assistance tendered them by Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson. In February 1958, in the darkest hours of the farmers' general economic slackness, Benson cut dairy supports the full legal limit, to 75 percent. But as one Michigan dairyman told a Farm Journal reporter, "Lowering price supports won't help use up milk. The consumer will never see any of the cut. The processor will just fatten up." It took no Cassandra to make such a prediction. When the Government depressed the market price for the farmer, the dairy giants saw no reason to make any such commensurate reduction of their price at retail. The consumer—wholly unorganized, unprotected, and uninformed—made no protest.

According to the National Milk Producers Federation, the voice of some 30,000 U.S. dairy farmers, consumer prices rose 9.3 percent between April 1954 and January 1958, although the administration cut price supports 13.1 percent. The unkindest cut of all was dealt not by Benson but by President Eisenhower, the campaigner who promised 100 percent parity in 1952. He vetoed a bill sparked by Midwest Democrats which would have frozen dairy supports at 1957 levels—and hundreds of dairy farmers began auctioning their herds. Hugh Moore, professor of agricultural economics at the University of Wisconsin, told the New York Times, "The veto will cost Wisconsin dairy farmers $35 million, and that reduced purchasing power will be reflected in lower income for the people who do business with them."

The plight of the dairy farmer is perhaps equaled only by the death agonies of the small milk manufacturer. Twenty years ago, he knew each farmer who trucked his milk cans to his Main Street door in the early morning hours, and he generally gave him the best price he could and still made a profit. Now, systematically, according to the FTC—this small milk manufacturer is being bought out, sometimes forced to sell his business. The new proprietors are absentee landlords, operating the dairy in Ashtabula or Gainesville from corporate towers in New York and Chicago.

How the small dairy dealer has been driven from the field first came to the attention of Congress several years ago with a flood of protests over price wars and discriminatory practices. The investigation headed by Representtaive WRIGHT PATMAN, chairman of the House Committee on Small Business, produced a fairly comprehensive picture of some of the methods used by the Big Four in pocketing $3.1 billion of the total $8.9 billion spent annually by U.S. housewives on all dairy products.

In Dallas, where a price war had been crushing independent distributors, a Foremost dairy chain official testified that his company was going into the red some three or four thousand dollars each day by selling below cost. Foremost, like the other members of the Big Four, could easily subsidize such operations. It could write off its losses in its battle against the Texas independents with the help of profits siphoned off from its Florida operations.

Another device used by the national chains to undersell the independents is to purchase milk in an area where the price paid to farmers is especially low and then to resell it in an area where the independents buy their milk at higher prices.

The Dairy Record has lashed out at the national dairy chain sales of products below cost as "loss leaders" to draw crowds in the big supermarts. Said the Record: "If permitted to exist, this canker will result in the liquidation of many of our independent dairy concerns. National dairy chains are far from being guiltless and too often are active participants, probably with the idea of weakening or eliminating competition." Of course, while a price war lasts, the housewife is content, but experience shows—and again Florida provides the classic example—that once the independents are bought or knocked out, the dairy captains will raise their prices to whatever the traffic will bear.

The Patman committee also heard evidence which indicated that the dairy chains and the supermarket chains have opened a double-barreled attack against the independent dairyman and the independent grocer. While investigating an unusual price war in Kansas City, where the price of home-delivered milk remained high, committee probers heard a cogent explanation for this phenomenon from Fred Lambert, of the Independent Processors of Missouri: "I believe the large dairies are forcing the price of home-delivered milk up in order that housewives buy all their milk needs at chainstores where the milk of the large dairies is sold. I believe that grocery chainstores do not permit small local dairies to compete with the large dairies on an equal basis. I believe there is a conspiracy between the large grocery chainstores to monopolize the distribution of milk, and that the so-called milk price wars are financed by the large dairies and the large chainstores for this purpose."

Evidently the Government agrees. A recent FTC complaint cites National Dairies for "paying promotional allowances to selected customers, principally to large chains" in violation of the Clayton Act. Practices such as those said to exist by the FTC can only

hasten the mercurial disappearance of the small independent grocers, as well as the dairy independents. The number of independents has already shrunk from 2,427 in 1920 to fewer than 1,500 today; according to Alabama Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, "They are the last of the Mohicans"—the last outpost of free enterprise among small industrialists in this country.

Whether the FTC has made haste to spare our "Mohicans" from an economic massacre is the subject of some controversy. As PATMAN charged, "The great wave of corporate mergers taking place during the past 3 years, and continuing now, has elicited from the Department of Justice and the FTC not even a wholehearted pretense at enforcing the law."

Even if the FTC—which has put only nine lawyers to work on the dairy cases—should overcome the battery of legal talent the Big Four have assembled against it, there is little likelihood that, after years of delay in the merger hearings, the Big Four can now be divested of the hundreds of concerns they have bought out. To divest them of these assets, long since woven into their corporate cloth, would be like unscrambling eggs. Thus, even if the Federal case is upheld, the value of the merger hearings—short of giving the public a breather from further corporate pressure in this field—is rather dubious. If past is prologue, as the FTC thinks, the public may expect more Federal consent decrees, more settlements, more status quo.

Perhaps the most conspicuous administration failure has been on the part of Agriculture Secretary Benson. In addition to his ill-timed slash of price supports, in the throes of recession, he has only once used the authority granted him under the Packers and Stockyards Act to prosecute corporations involved in unfair, unjustly discriminatory practice in commerce. (It has long been established that dairy manufacturers, in the language of this law, are construed to be packers.)

Obviously, the great crusade has bogged down in the milkshed. It now appears that any relief for farmers, housewives, small dairy entrepreneurs and grocer independents will have to wait for a change of administration in 1960. A vigilant Secretary of Agriculture could make the Packers and Stockyards Act a potent weapon for safeguarding the rights of small businessmen. By the same token, an administration with effective leadership could get action from the Attorney General and results from the FTC.

The ground for such an administration can be broken now. This session of Congress should enact new legislation calculated to bring economic justice to the dairy industry. High on the must list is the Page proposal—a suggestion which gets its name from Walter Page, manager of an organization of small dairy processors in Syracuse, N.Y., and a Patman committee witness. His proposal would compel the FTC, if it found substantial cause to issue a discriminatory price complaint after a preliminary hearing, to order the suspected offender to cease and desist from the discriminatory practice pending the final judgment of the hearing examiner.

Congress, if it hopes to reduce growing farm surpluses, should require the big milk trusts to pay farmers a fair price for their milk and keep retail consumption up by ordering retail prices down. America would not lag in fifteenth place on the list of dairy-product consuming nations today if the housewife was not the victim of prices that remained high both in good times and bad. Toward this end, a Department of Consumers—such as the one proposed by Senator ESTES KEFAUVER in the January Progressive—might prove of inestimable value. Unless Congress acts now to restore economic justice, farmers will continue to go broke; farm surpluses will continue to pile up; the "Mohicans" will continue to vanish; the Big Four will continue to extend their domination and influence over the dairy industry; and the housewife may, one day, look back wistfully to the time when the price of milk was only 30 cents a quart.

Statement by Hon. Cornelius E. Gallagher, of New Jersey, in the House of Representatives, Wednesday, April, 29, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1959

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave, I would like to insert in the RECORD the testimony which I gave today before the House Judiciary Committee on my bill H.R. 4193, which would authorize compacts between States, such as New York and New Jersey, to grant uniform tax treatment of out-of-State residents employed in a State:

STATEMENT BY HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER, OF NEW JERSEY, BEFORE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, APRIL 29, 1959

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the district which I am privileged to represent lies just across the Hudson River from New York City. Every working day thousands of the residents of this district and many more thousands in the northern New Jersey area cross under the river into Manhattan where they are employed. A lesser number of New York residents commute from their homes in New York to jobs in New Jersey.

The income of the New Jersey residents employed in New York is taxed by that State, and taxed, it might be noted, at rates somewhat higher than are imposed on the citizens of New York. The income of the New York residents which is derived from their employment in New Jersey is not taxed. And therein lies an inequity which works an increasing economic hardship on the New Jersey residents involved.

It is important to note that this situation exists not only in the northern New Jersey and Metropolitan New York area, but in many other area of New Jersey and in other States, where there is interstate movement of workers.

It is true that a New Jersey resident working in New York benefits from certain community services, such as police and fire protection, in the area of his employment. It may be argued that he should, in all fairness, be taxed, just as the State's own citizens are taxed, for these services. There is grave doubt, however, of the fairness of taxation of the income of an out-of-State employee at the same, or higher rates at which the citizen of the State concerned is taxed. The latter receives the full benefit of all services of his State and community on a 24-hour, 365-days-a-year basis.

The out-of-State employees, on the other hand, receive limited services, certainly nothing so extensive as the schooling of his children, for which he must pay heavily in his own State, and receives these services for only the length of a normal working day—8 hours.

I am aware that this committee is giving most serious attention to the broad aspects of the levy by one State on income earned therein by the resident of another State, and has before it for consideration several proposals. I am, certainly, in agreement with the objectives of the various proposals, for the inequity of such practice is recognized even by those States which derive benefit from it. The Governor of New York, for example, has noted that the taxation of nonresident employees is a matter to which the legislature of that State should give attention.

It is only realistic, and I am sure you will agree, that relief can hardly be expected from the governing body of a State hard-pressed for public funds, and such is the case in most States. If there is to be relief in the foreseeable future, it will come as the result of action by the Congress.

H.R. 4193, which I have introduced and which is cosponsored by other New Jersey Members of the Congress, is designed to grant the consent of the Congress to any two or more States to enter into compacts to grant uniform tax treatment of nonresidents through agreements not to discriminate between residents and nonresidents in the levy and collection of taxes. Such compacts would be subject to ratification by the States involved and approval by the Congress.

The objective of my bill is an immediate solution to the problem in a manner less difficult than seeking a constitutional amendment such as is sought in other proposals. I am confident that the passage of H.R. 4193 will spark action between New York and New Jersey leading to a compact, and that such compact would give relief to the nonresident employees of business firms in that State. This would apply not only to New Jersey residents but to those of other States. I am hopeful that such a compact might be an example for other States concerned with the problem of unfair taxation of nonresident employees.

The complex of the commerce of this Nation is such that there is bound to be an increase in instances where the residents of one State are, of necessity, employed in an adjoining State. Interstate boundaries were never intended to be barriers to employment. Should they become barriers, certainly the development of the Nation's commerce would be impeded.

The bill for which I speak today is merely an authorization for two or more States to act in this matter, to reach agreements which would resolve a tax situation which is generally agreed to be grossly unfair. I urge the favorable consideration of the committee. Thank you.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

Appendix

Importance of the Family-Size Farm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, there are many ways to approach the problem of farm commodity surplus. A good case can be made, in fact, for raising the question of whether we actually do produce a surplus of food and fiber, so long as there are in the world people who are cold and hungry.

Current farm programs have caused the small farmers of our Nation to ask such questions. Sometimes the small farmer feels that current policies are aimed, not so much at eliminating surpluses, as at eliminating small farms.

I do not think there can be too many small farmers. The family-size farm represents a way of life that has been fundamental to the development of our country. I do not want to see that way of life destroyed.

Two recent editorials in the Hallettsville (Tex.) Tribune make good sense in this connection. The editor of the Tribune, my good friend Walter Malec, feels that our current problems began when so many of the small operators were driven off the land. I ask unanimous consent to have these editorials printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A WAY OF LIFE

John Strohm in the current Reader's Digest does not think much of the small farmers. Thirty million of the farm people were driven out in less than 30 years and 2 million farmers more should be helped to find better opportunity on or off the farm.

Strohm is quoting several college authorities fully agreeing with his low opinion of the small farmers. Actually they all show themselves to be victims of blind, but no less destructive fallacies.

Above all, they completely forget the old lesson of history that farm people cannot be driven into the cities without wrecking the whole country.

They also ignore the clear warning of the present depression and unemployment of worse things to come if this revolution in the land goes on.

As to the inefficiency of the small farmers, didn't our small farmers survive even the 5-cent cotton far better than did those efficient ones?

Does not the past prove, there is a no more efficient farm unit then a small farmer with his family doing all the farming?

And were not our communities, towns, and country built up until the land was settled by the small family farmers? Don't they stand or fall with them?

Is there now and any substitute for these farmers?

Can they be driven out without the most serious upheaval in our country, as this depression and unemployment clearly indicates?

Who made them now so inefficient? Was it not the allotments so small that so many could not make a living?

Small farmers never produced any surpluses; yet are they not the chief victims?

Didn't the program intended to help the forgotten men actually make them not only more forgotten, but destroyed millions of them?

Were not these same inefficient farmers reduced far more than the efficient ones since the small farmers needed every acre taken from them?

Wasn't the big farm program right along slanted so as to only help the big farmers who just made a farce of it?

And is not this depression and unemployment a direct result of just such fallacies as presented by John Strohm?

Blame it on the mechanization? Did the machines dictate the farm policies?

Would we have these troubles if the farmers were left free, with subsidy in direct payments?

"Cost to the Government would go up"—would it? Even if $50 per bale would be paid in direct payment and this on 15 million bales. Would it not cost only $750 million—far less than the present cost of storage and price support? Such a plan is already proposed by Senator HERMAN TALMADGE in the Senate, and Congressman W. R. POAGE in the House.

If industry and labor have their tariff, what's wrong with direct payments for the farmers? Or must farmers be doomed to selling cheap and buying at protected prices?

Would not the farmers sell more at the market price, and also be able to produce more? Would not the people buy more at cheaper prices? And is there any more effective and cheaper way to reduce the cost of living and inflation?

Must not the future be restored for the small farmers, or the future of all of us will be threatened? This also with the direct payments limited to so much per farm, for why subsidize the surplus producing commercial farms?

Did not the ruling classes go down under communism chiefly because of too many forgotten people? And does not this idea of no small farmers come from the same source as communism itself?

Could Communists wish anything better on us than this piling up our people in the cities only for more labor and other troubles?

All this because too many like John Strohm in the Reader's Digest, in farming don't think of the farmers—as though the land would be here for machines, not the people, and the farming would be only "agribusiness" not also a way of life.

AN APPEAL FOR LIBERATION

A century ago, it was the slaves that needed liberation.

Today, it's the small farmer.

But in spite of their slavery, the colored people multiplied and many lived long.

In contrast, most of the small farmers are gone, the rest of them are declared as doomed and very few young people stay on the farms—in spite of the 4–H and the Future Farmers Clubs. All in the name of efficiency.

A century ago, it produced a civil war—such was the revolt against slavery. Where is any such aroused feeling about this national disaster of the small farmers?

But this contrast is only on the side of the farmers and the rest of us. Only we lack the interest and action.

Those responsible for this disaster mean exactly what has been going on. It all comes from the communistic idea that the people simply do not count.

The small farmers never have been producing any surpluses. Yet it's argued, there are still too many of them and so at least 2 million more of them should go—beside all those already driven out.

Only the big farms are responsible for our surpluses. Yet they are favored, prospering and multiplying while the small farmers are being destroyed.

This will never be understood unless it is fully realized and felt that this driving of farm people out has been deliberate and inevitable under the plans in force. And the total doom of the small farmers will follow unless this is faced with action in time.

As the slaves a century ago, so the small farmers today need a liberation—this time from the disastrous fallacies—of allotments denying them the right to exist, and of parity prices losing our markets.

The small farmers need to be free again to farm as they want to—free as other people are in making their living.

They also need free markets to sell at the market price to sell more and so our cotton could also compete with other cotton and survive.

So long as industry has tariff and labor its minimum wage law, are not farmers entitled to a subsidy in direct payments on their principal crops?

And should not these payments be limited to so many bales per family farm? Even if 100 bales is a limit and the subsidy 10 cents per pound, would it not be cheaper than the present waste in money and people?

Not some domestic allotment, or a two-price plan—for both of them spell also the allotments, which cannot have any better effect in the future than they did in the past.

Only a complete liberation from the past policies can restore the future to our small farmers—our real strength and safety as free people.

This appeal is not coming from an aroused country. It rises mainly from this national disaster itself. It can be ignored but its consequences cannot be escaped from.

Moving Forces in the History of Mankind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed

in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered before the Sixth National Conference on International Economic and Social Development, at Washington, D.C., on April 30, 1959.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY BEFORE SIXTH NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT, WASHINGTON, D.C., APRIL 30, 1959

What are the moving forces in the history of mankind? Philosophers and historians have long debated this question.

There was a time—and not so very long ago—when history was written in terms of famous men—generals, emperors and presidents. In Shakespeare's plays, for example the common people take the stage only as prosy clowns and buffons; the timeless poetry comes from royal or noble lips.

But more recently history has been written in terms of the changes in methods of production—or even of destruction. The progress from the stone axe to the automated factory—the progress, if one can call it that, from the caveman's club to the intercontinental ballistic missile—each has had great effect.

We are met today to pay tribute to one of those truly great ideas which transforms history—the proposal, put forward in President Truman's inaugural address 10 years ago, that America and the other industrialized nations should, in his words:

"Help the free peoples of the world, through their own efforts, to produce more food, more clothing, more materials for housing, and more mechanical power to lighten their burdens."

This bold new program was the fourth point in President Truman's list of foreign policy objectives for the United States. It is important to note that point 4 was designed to be an integral part of a much broader program. The point 4 program is not a substitute for adequate military defense. It is not a substitute for sound trade policies. It is not a substitute for any other necesary element in our overall foreign policy. But it is a valuable, and, indeed, indispensable, element to any effective foreign policy, specially in the less-developed areas of the world whose future may determine the destiny of all mankind.

Mr. Truman's point 4 captured the minds and hearts of men everywhere, both because it was new and bold and yet drew its inspiration from our heritage. Like all great ideas in history, it did not spring full-grown from the brow of one man. Great ideas emerge from the accumulated wisdom, experience, and aspirations of men, and they have their greatest force when their time has come.

The point 4 idea is rooted in the humanitarian imperative of all great religions—the strong should help the weak, the rich should help the poor—"Do unto others as you would have them do unto you."

Point 4 was really the projection of our unique historical experience—the international application of the lessons that we learned in the development of the American frontier.

In developing the American West, we formulated a new approach to training and education—land-grant colleges, vocational education, the county agents, all the many practices and institutions that were the prototypes for the point 4 projects of recent years.

At the same time, there was strengthened in the American character the qualities of optimism, of confidence, of initiative, and of impatience with obstacles that make up one of our greatest strengths as a nation.

What is needed in our foreign policy more than anything else today is that we draw on this great heritage of ours, this well of national strength, to carry through admittedly difficult and discouraging undertakings.

Much of the force of the point 4 idea was its timeliness. President Truman understood the mighty struggle between totalitarianism and freedom. It was he who launched the Truman doctrine which saved Greece and Turkey from communism. He knew then, as we all know now, that in the many-faceted world struggle the economically underdeveloped and politically unalined nations may well hold the balance of power.

We should be proud of the humanitarian roots of the point 4 idea. We should not be apologetic about the fact that rightly used it can be an instrument of greater peace and stability in the struggle between freedom and totalitarianism. Let us be grateful that there is a program which is humanitarian and politically relevant at the same time—a happy and fortunate combination.

And, speaking of humanitarian values, what is more humanitarian than helping to prevent "darkness at noon" from spreading over areas where new freedom and new hope have just been born?

In retrospect, we can see that "point 4" was long foreshadowed—indeed, was implicit—in the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration and in the Marshall plan. Yet, when President Truman put it forward, it caught even some of his own officials unprepared. As one of them has recalled:

"Messages of surprise and delight poured in from all over the world, and a hurried meeting of department representatives was held to consider the practical problems in meeting the expectations which the President's words had produced overnight. As we gathered in the State Department's conference room, the atmosphere was a curious mixture of excitement and perplexity.

"A senior official of the Department was the first to speak. 'Well, fellows,' he said with a smile, 'what do you suppose he meant?'"

Such was the sweep and the dynamism of the President's idea that even today, after 10 years of living with it and working with it, we are still discovering in it fresh meanings and fresh dimensions.

But an idea is a dazzling, even a blinding, thing—and there is every human tendency to dim it down a bit, so that it is more comfortable to live with.

So, for a while, too many of us put on heavily tinted glasses before we dared look this idea in the face.

First, there was a tendency to "sell it cheap." All we had to do, we assured ourselves, was to pass on to other peoples our so-called know-how and then leave them to their own resources. It was the easiest kind of virtue, costing us little more than words.

Second, when we began to realize that know-how is paralyzed without some material backing—be it something as simple as fertilizer or as elaborate as a hydroelectric project—we felt a need to avoid even the appearance of generosity. So we began calling much of our economic aid "defense support" and applying the label "mutual security program" to the whole enterprise.

Overseas aid suffered—and still suffers—from these heavy military overtones. Too often, we give the impression that our main interest is to "buy allies in the cold war."

Third, we seemed fearful that we might not get full credit for the element of genuine generosity which remained in the program. We wanted the tag, "Made in America," fastened firmly to it.

Although we did join in the U.N. expanded technical assistance program and more recently in the U.N. special fund, we have preferred to keep most of our aid in our own hands.

Unfortunately, this is a game that two can play. Khrushchev does not hesitate to pick up a good idea when he sees one—even from the capitalists he professes to despise. The Russians, it's true were "Ivans-comelately" in this field, but they are catching up fast. Their loans and their technicians are already at work in many crucial areas of the world.

It is a real measure of the basic soundness of the point 4 concept that it has survived 10 years of cold war and worldwide turmoil.

A curious attitude has developed about this whole oversea aid program—a sort of national inferiority complex. We seem to think of Uncle Sam as Uncle Sap, constantly being sold a bill of goods by European, African, and Asian leaders of dubious loyalty to our side. As the Draper report puts it:

"In our fascination with our own mistakes, and the constant use of foreign aid as a whipping boy, we may be gradually choking this vital feature of our national security to death."

Mistakes will be made in any great enterprise, but what bothers me more than the mistakes is the way we dwell upon them—rather than taking them as lessons to be learned while we move forward.

Too often our aid programs have been sold to the American people on the basis of being against communism, rather than being for humanity. They have been considered painful expedients—hopefully short-term—rather than the heart of a constructive American foreign policy designed to build a stable and enduring peace through the conquests of poverty, disease, and suffering.

The motivation for these important and valuable programs should not come from the fear of communism, but rather from the requirements of our political and religious heritage. We must never forget that our true strength lies in the moral and political principles upon which our society is based—the principles of human dignity, equality, and brotherhood. Our own revolution was based upon a belief in the God-given rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. It is these thoughts and these ideals which should motivate us today.

We are indeed our brother's keeper and we must act in that capacity. We are blessed with abundance and we have a moral duty to share it.

Programs and policies that are designed only to resist the evil forces of communism are never as effective as efforts that are made to help humanity. As President Truman said almost 8 years ago: "The only kind of a war we seek is the good old fight against man's ancient enemies—poverty, disease, hunger, and illiteracy."

President Truman knew, as we know, that words, however eloquent, are not enough; nor do good intentions, however generous, suffice. Deeds, not words, are needed. We must be for peace and progress—and not simply against the evil threat of communism.

The real trouble is not so much what the Communists are attempting to do in the world, but how much less we are doing than we can and should do. We can be sure that the Communists will be glad to fill in any gaps we leave.

And we need to recapture the enlightened enthusiasm that guided American policy in the great days of innovation and daring under the Marshall plan and the point 4 programs of President Truman. These early programs were characterized by imagination, vision, substance, and long-term planning.

It is not enough to merely perform the ritual in foreign aid—there must be faith—a faith in the importance and soundness of our policies. We need more than the form—

we need the spirit, if our programs of assistance are going to be genuinely constructive and effective.

And we must recognize the task of helping other nations to help themselves is a continuing task. It will not be finished next year or the year after. Therefore, let us plan ahead. Our struggle against communism and against man's ancient enemies of poverty, disease, and hunger will be a long-drawn out battle.

So let us prepare ourselves accordingly. To be effective our foreign aid programs should be established on a longer term basis, so that both we and those we seek to help can plan ahead and can rely on a sustained effort.

Therefore, we must make at least three major efforts to strengthen the economic and technical assistance programs of the United States:

1. Place our aid programs on a long-term planning basis, in order to provide the assurance of continuity to the leadership of developing nations, and to avoid the tremendous waste of stop-and-go, hot-and-cold programing.

2. Seek to supplement bilateral programs at every opportunity with multilateral approaches, using existing instrumentalities such as the United Nations and its associated agencies.

3. Design the aid programs not in terms of defensive stopgaps, but rather as the affirmative, constructive building blocks of a world free of poverty and suffering.

To carry out this program I have proposed what I like to call the works of peace.

I have recently proposed a food for peace program, which will put to use the God-given abundance of our farms—not haphazardly, not as a veiled device for dumping surpluses, not on a hand-to-mouth, year-to-year basis, but as an integral part of our total foreign policy effort, planned for 5 years ahead.

Together with Senator LISTER HILL, I have proposed a health for peace program, designed to mobilize the medical and scientific resources of America and of all nations for a concerted attack upon the dread diseases which weaken, cripple, and kill millions of persons throughout the world.

I have called, also, for an eduaction for peace program of worldwide educational development and expanded East-West exchanges of scholars—to be financed largely out of the several billion dollars of "soft currencies" or "counterpart funds" being accumulated by the United States in exchange for food shipments or as repayment of loans. We must wage war on illiteracy.

I can evisage a science for peace program, which, among other things, would seek breakthroughs in economic development—such as a practical process for the de-salting of sea water which would make many of earth's deserts bloom.

And, last week, I was happy to join with two esteemed colleagues—Senator FULBRIGHT and Senator KENNEDY—in sponsoring amendments to the Mutual Security Act which will transform it into something much more like the development for peace program we all want.

First, and most important, we are proposing that the Development Loan Fund be financed to the extent of $1.5 billion a year for a period of 5 years—$7.5 billion in all. And we are proposing—as the administration, indeed, proposed 2 years ago—that the Fund be empowered to borrow this money from the Treasury, as the Export-Import Bank already does, so that it will not have to seek fresh appropriations—and risk fresh curtailments—each and every year.

Second, we are proposing to rewrite the preamble and statement of purposes of the act, to brush away the cobwebs that have gathered on it over the years, and put it in language worthy of our best traditions as a liberal and democratic Nation—with emphasis on economic progress and political freedom.

Third, as a step toward decreasing the present heavily military character of the program, we are proposing increased authority for the President to transfer funds originally allocated for "military hardware" to economic purposes. And, for the same reason, we propose increased authority for our Ambassadors to coordinate military aid with economic and political objectives.

We seek to make a clean break with the argument so often used in Congress, that the mere fact that the funds available for a given year are not fully used is a reason for curtailing next year's effort.

N great business enterprise is conducted upon such a hand-to-mouth, ever-bare-cupboard basis.

Instead, we wish to use the availability of adequate funds—and I emphasize the word "availability"—as an inspiration to our friends throughout the world to prepare sound, well-considered programs of economic development—in effect, to set their own national goals.

We are now nearing the end of the era of Western colonialism, and (I wish I could say the same about the new imperialism of the Soviet Union and Red China). The great struggles for independence which have characterized our generation have been, for the peoples involved, a challenging and inspiring experience. They have written a heroic chapter in the world's history.

But, after the fireworks, after the celebrations of independence, there comes the letdown. We knew it ourselves, after the triumph of our own revolution. Then came the equally difficult task of establishing orderly and free government.

Nationalism is a steed you can ride to independence—but, by itself, it does not carry people further than the first Fourth of July. The plain truth is that some of the new nations are floundering badly, and most of them are feeling the chill gray dawn of the morning after.

Political independence must be related to economic interdependence. The passion of nationalism must be translated into hard national goals.

And these goals are incomplete without timetables for achieving them. When I participated as an American delegate at the United Nations, I had occasion to observe how insistent—and rightly so—our Asian and African friends were on timetables for the achievement of political independence.

We need goals for tomorrow's kind of independence—independence from poverty—and we need timetables by which the progress toward these goals can be assessed.

These will vary from country to country. Some countries, like India, have formulated their national purposes, set their goals, and are well on the way to achieving them. We—and I include other industrialized nations such as Britain, France, Canada, Western Germany, and Japan—can and do sit down with the Indian leaders and see how we can move toward these goals in a great partnership of nations.

In other countries, what is needed are the preconditions for establishing such goals. The U.N. Special Fund, under Paul Hoffman's able leadership, is already busy laying the groundwork, making the basic surveys of resources and potentialities which are too often lacking. In many countries it should be possible, after this essential preliminary work has been done, to set both short-term and long-term goals.

There is every reason why some of these goals should be projected on a regional basis. We could take the lead in the Organization of American States, for example, in mounting a 5- or 7-year development plan for Latin America—spelling it out in terms of miles of roads, kilowatts of electricity, and tons of steel. We could do the same with the Colombo plan nations, in cooperation with Japan, and in the Middle East, with its tremendous oil resources—and in emergent Africa, too.

In all these undertakings, we would, of course, look to private investment to do its full share, and I might say that by "full share" I mean substantially more than it is doing now. The conditions suitable for private investment must often be created by public funds. And public-financed projects usually cannot achieve their full potential without private investment. There is no essential conflict between those two complementary sources of development capital.

Thus, we would be building upon the experience of the Marshall plan—the most spectacularly successful example of our postwar economic policy—which succeeded because it had a goal, and because the participating nations, with wise leadership from the United States, set targets for themselves and mobilized their resources to meet them.

I would go further. There will be a summit conference this summer, and I hope that President DeGaulle will have the opportunity to repeat—with his grand command of language—what he said last month:

"In our time, the only quarrel worth while is that of mankind. * * * Why should we not put together a percentage of our raw materials, our manufactured goods, our food products, some of our scientists, technologists, economists, some of our trucks, ships, aircraft, to defeat poverty, develop resources, and help the work of the less developed peoples?

"Let us do this—not that they should be the pawns of our policies, but to improve the chances of life and peace."

Let us always remember, however, what King Hussein of Jordan so wisely said—that the United Nations is the summit conference of the small nations. If only the Big Four could go forward from their own summit to mankind's summit at the United Nations—and could come prepared to work together for the welfare of all humanity. What clouds of frustration and fear would be cleared from our human horizons.

The United Nations represents one of our great hopes for a just and lasting peace. It should be made a more effective instrument. As a step in that direction I have introduced a resolution in this Congress to strengthen the United Nations' International Court of Justice by deleting the so-called Connally amendment from our declaration of acceptance of the Court's jurisdiction. It is for this reason also that I have joined with Senator CLARK and others in sponsoring a resolution recommending that the Charter of the United Nations be reviewed to determine what changes should be made in it to promote peace through the development of enforceable world law.

At the United Nations, the great goals could be formulated—let us call them targets—for the 20th century. And, each year, its proceedings would be dominated, not by bitter harangues, but by sober assessment of the progress of its member nations toward these goals.

This is a bold idea—but no bolder than President Truman's was 10 years ago. For, all too often, we forget this vital passage in his inaugural address:

"We invite other countries to pool their technological resources in this undertaking. Their contributions will be warmly welcomed. This should be a cooperative enterprise in which all nations work together through the United Nations and its specialized agencies, wherever practicable. It must be a worldwide effort for the achievement of peace, plenty, and freedom."

Reviewing U.S. Role on World Stage—Interview With Senator Fulbright

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a capital interview with Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, conducted by Courtney Sheldon, and published in the Christian Science Monitor of April 29, 1959, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I think Mr. Sheldon has done a distinct service in conducting this interview, and that, in turn, the Senator from Arkansas has rendered a service in expressing his views relative to the foreign policy of this country.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REVIEWING U.S. ROLE ON WORLD STAGE—A CAPITAL INTERVIEW WITH SENATOR FULBRIGHT

(By Courtney Sheldon)

WASHINGTON.—Senator JAMES WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, a thoroughgoing scholar on foreign affairs, a persistent critic of the Eisenhower foreign policies, and now in a strategic position as chairman of the influential Senate Foreign Relations Committee, says:

"The more dangerous area to us is in the nonmilitary (when it is a question of the relative importance of military and economic aid).

"The President's requests for foreign aid are very modest relative to the need.

"Our international manners are often atrocious.

"Our whole country has not recognized our proper role.

"I have felt in the past that we [Secretary Herter and I] * * * judge the world and many of our problems in a somewhat similar manner.

"I rather regret the size of the United Nations now. It grew too fast."

Of the numerous East-West differences, Senator FULBRIGHT, are there any you feel could be discussed now at a summit meeting with some hope of accord?

"Well, Mr. Sheldon, I am not particularly optimistic about reaching any solutions in the first, or even the second meeting. My approach is rather that these matters need to be solved, and that we should start talking about them and find out if there is any hope for an adjustment of our differences.

"I would prefer emphasis upon the established diplomatic channels, but the Russians seem disinclined to do that and therefore they wish this procedure. I'm perfectly willing to go along with that."

By regular diplomatic channels you are referring to ambassadorial relations?

"Yes, I would hope that our ambassadors could carry on constant negotiations with the Russians.

"For some reason or other the Russians seem to be extremely reluctant to enter into serious negotiations over the settlement of such things as the Berlin business or the Middle East. It leads one to suspect their motives. And I have grave doubt whether the Russians really want to compose these differences.

"But those doubts, in my opinion, do not justify refusing to enter into summit discussions. Now it may be they only want to make propaganda, but I don't know why we cannot make propaganda the same as they do. On the other hand, they are peculiar people and maybe they will gradually consent to serious negotiations. All I am saying is that we ought to find out what they are doing and pursue opportunities to find out."

When you mentioned regular diplomatic channels were you referring at all to the U.N.?

"Well, it can be used in certain circumstances, but it is a rather awkward organization. It has so many members now. I think it has really gotten too large. I rather regret the size of the U.N. now. It grew too fast in size before we had perfected its procedures and established traditions that would support orderly procedure. I won't wish to abandon it, of course. I think it is still a hopeful organization."

Would you cite some of the specific differences that you feel could be usefully negotiated now?

"Well, the most immediate ones, of course, are the status of West Berlin and Germany and the so-called nuclear ban, at least on the restricted basis that has recently been brought forward as a kind of salvage operation, the one which does not require extensive monitoring within the adversary's country."

The Western proposal for a ban on atmospheric tests only?

"That certainly is a possibility, and the discussion of the Middle East is a possibility. I see no reason to exclude any of our differences. These are discussions in the first instance. I don't think we should expect solutions growing out of a meeting immediately. I think it is more of an exploratory discussion to feel one another out."

You are not at all opposed to what is called an open agenda then?

"No, I think it should be an open agenda. They waste more time trying to decide an agenda than anything else. If they don't wish to talk about anything seriously or relevant, why adjourn. We have at least proved that we are not afraid to sit down and talk. I think this reluctance to have a talk has created the impression we're afraid of them, and that we have no ideas and no policy.

"I realize there has been a very persuasive argument made that they are adept at propaganda, and that they will use a meeting merely to embarrass us. Well that is another way of saying we are so stupid we don't know how to make propaganda or how to combat it. If we are, we had better learn. I think it is that kind of world and we have to accept it."

What do you regard, Senator FULBRIGHT, as the notable successes and failures of the administration on foreign policy in the last 7 years?

"Well, I think the highly unsatisfactory state of our international relations and the tension that exists throughout certainly the Middle East at the moment, and existed only recently in the Far East, would indicate that the successes have not been very great or notable.

"I don't mean to leave the implication that the administration is entirely to blame. I think the people, our whole country, has not recognized our proper role and we have not applied ourselves.

"But to be more specific, as you know I took serious issue with the so-called Eisenhower doctrine. I opposed it, spoke against it, worked against it. I was also highly critical of the decision of the Secretary [Dulles] on the Aswan Dam proposal, that is our relations with Nasser. I think it was poorly handled, and I think his judgment at the time of Russian strength and activity was not based upon realities.

"I suppose you could say our most satisfactory relations at the moment have been with Germany. The preservation, at least, of a fairly high degree of unity among the NATO partners, I believe, would be regarded as the most successful area of activity. The preservation of reasonably good relations with Japan is also a successful area.

"Of course, I think the deterioration of our Latin American relations is another example of failure, largely of neglect. I don't know anything positive that we have done that has alienated them. We just haven't done anything affirmative to conciliate them and make them feel we are interested in them. In this case I think it is not such a material matter. It is an attitude, a matter of good manners. Regarding them as important people, and being courteous to them is very essential. Our international manners are often atrocious."

What would you say has been the trend of American prestige and influence in the world recently?

"I think it has clearly declined. We have presented an image, a picture of indecision, I think, of inconsistency. We talk one way and we act another in many instances, notably in the field of trade and tariffs. I think very often our statements have not been realistic. We have not been able to live up to them. I think we have talked too much and been too brash in some of our statements."

Do you feel that the appointment of Mr. Herter as Secretary of State is going to change this trend?

"I have great respect for Mr. Herter's integrity and his capacity. He has had long experience and I am very pleased with his appointment. I look forward to working with him as closely as I can, and I hope that we continue to agree on many of the basic factors that afflict us. I have felt in the past that we have a good deal in common, that is in our attitudes, that we judge the world and many of our problems in a somewhat similar manner."

On the question of the mutual security program, do you favor giving the President the full amount asked for the program?

"My amendments request a good deal more for the development loan fund than he asked. I think his requests are very modest relative to the need."

This is economic aid you are talking about?

"Yes."

If there were to be a cutback in mutual security, you would prefer it to be in the military rather than the economic?

"I would as a matter of relative threat to our security in coming years, if you have to make a choice. The more dangerous area to us is in the nonmilitary."

Excerpts From Speech of D. Tennant Bryan, President, American Newspaper Publishers Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have

printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, excerpts from an exceedingly able speech made by Mr. D. Tennant Bryan, president, American Newspaper Publishers Association.

Mr. Bryan is one of the outstanding newspaper publishers of Virginia and the Nation; I regard his speech as being so noteworthy as to justify its inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM THE ADDRESS OF D. TENNANT BRYAN, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN NEWSPAPER PUBLISHERS ASSOCIATION, APRIL 22, 1959, NEW YORK CITY

Ladies and gentlemen, fellow members of ANPA, welcome to the 73d annual convention of our association—and a special welcome to those who have joined us since our last convention.

* * * * *

All of us know that ANPA is a trade association, comprising 846 daily newspapers in the United States and Canada which, among them, have more than 90 percent of the daily and Sunday newspaper circulation on this continent. As a trade association we interest ourselves primarily in the business aspects of newspaper publishing. We are concerned with the assurance of an adequate supply of newsprint, with the continuing struggle against restrictive laws, and regulations having the effect of law, at all levels of government, with the unhappily unrewarding effort to free newspapers from the make-work and featherbedding practices which we as individual publishers have allowed, over the years, to creep into our labor contracts, and the running fight with bureaucracy for access to the news—these are the daily concerns of ANPA because they are the daily concern of ANPA members.

At the several sessions on Monday and yesterday, we have discussed many of the problems that plague us today. Most of these are continuing in nature. There is no easing of the cost-price pressure and its correlated evils. We must defend ourselves against insidious attacks by bureaucracy, attacks designed to strangle our revenues and impede our operations. We must constantly fight to open the doors closed by government if we are to get the facts that should be reported to the people.

But rather than to dwell on these challenges, which are well known to all of us, I think it may be more important to reexamine the underlying significance of our work, and the philosophy on which it is predicated. It is in this fundamental area, in which understanding is most vitally needed, that newspapers are most often misunderstood.

An analogy may help to focus this discussion. For nearly 25 centuries the scientific world has built its equations around only three dimensions of physical space. Only in our lifetimes have scientists discovered the need to include in their equations still another dimension—the dimension of time.

Now, there have always been three obvious dimensions in every newspaper: manpower, tools and newsprint. But there is also a fourth dimension, intangible but essential, which we may call ethical purpose. No newspaper worthy of the name can operate without it.

Just as it is impossible to understand the physical universe without the fourth dimension, it is impossible to understand the free newspapers of America without first having a knowledge of their underlying ethical purpose.

This is what makes the newspaper business unlike any other. While newspapers must have profit in order to stay alive and strong, profit is not and cannot be their primary goal.

This paradox bewilders both our friends and foes. To require profit on the one hand, but not to work primarily for profit on the other, is as confusing to the average man as Einstein's famous but cryptical theory.

As practicing members of the profession, we see no inconsistency in this doctrine. In order to do the job that we should do, we must be independent and self-supporting. Profit is our strength; without it, we cannot survive—but profit is not our primary purpose. In the language of the logician, profit is a necessary but not a sufficient condition.

Even if this be understood, both our friends and our enemies are confused about our primary purpose. They look upon the newspaper as a tool—and assume that the owners and managers will, or should, use this tool to achieve their own specific and selfish goals.

Our friends take for granted that we should use our newspaper for the objectives they deem worthy. Our enemies are convinced that we do use it for unworthy purposes. The fact is that both are equally wrong.

This misunderstanding is largely due to the existence of the editorial page on which the publisher and editor do attempt to persuade their readers to their own views in various matters. Many readers simply do not understand the sharp distinction between opinions expressed on the editorial page and news reported in the news columns. They are convinced that the one conditions the other.

We know that they believe this from a survey of our own readers in Virginia. About half of them, both men and women, are quite certain that the newspapers' editorial position influences the presentation of the news. We found this belief rather shocking—but even more shocking was the further fact that the readers didn't seem to care very much one way or the other about what they assumed to be our practice. It had very little effect on their overall image of the newspaper.

In other words, not only do a great many of our readers assume that we color our news to suit our editorial position or the whims of our advertisers, but they consider this a perfectly normal and natural thing for us to do and they see no particular harm in the process.

Our closest friends are often dismayed when we print news which they think should have been suppressed. These are fine people with honorable motives and they find it exceedingly difficult to understand why we are unwilling to implement those motives. For example, some prominent person commits suicide. Doctors and friends urge that the fact of suicide be omitted to spare unnecessary pain to the family and to avoid any encouragement to others who may also be tempted to take their own lives.

Others complain to us about crime reporting in general. They deplore, on sociological grounds, the reporting of gruesome details, insisting that the effect is evil because it may stimulate others to commit similar crimes.

A group of merchants may suggest that we should not accept the advertising of some competitor whom, for reasons of price cutting or the handling of some brand for which he is not the authorized dealer, they regard as a malefactor.

Still others deplore movie advertisements because they are too sexy. Some even object to our church advertising because they consider it to be sectarian. And so on throughout a nearly infinite list.

Our friends who complain about these things usually assume that we are simply guilty of negligence or, at the best, lack of understanding. Our enemies, on the other hand, are convinced that we print such things for reasons of malice, or in order to gain circulation, or advertising revenue.

Both again are equally wrong. They mistake our basic purpose, and the single-minded ethic that must be our guide in all such matters. Both are wrong in thinking of the power of the press as something that can be used by someone, for good or evil, when actually it derives its real power from the fact that it is not used in this fashion. Any such use, in essence, is misuse and will eventually destroy the newspaper that practices it.

The primary purpose of the newspaper is to hold up to the eyes of its readers a mirror of their life and the world in which they live. Our single-minded ethic must be to make that mirror as true and undistorted as black ink on white newsprint will permit.

Whether the reader likes or dislikes, approves or disapproves of what he reads in his newspaper is unimportant. The essential requirement is that he be informed, correctly informed, and fully informed.

In a republic such as that in which we live, the final voice on what sort of life we will have, and what sort of government we will live under, must necessarily be the voice of the people themselves. They and they alone must make the basic decisions. Whether their decisions will be right or wrong, we cannot know. But if we believe that the individual has the basic right of self-determination, in his governmental and social environment, then we must insist that he has an equal right to a full knowledge of that environment, as it exists and as it changes.

To give a man the right of choice, but to withhold knowledge of the alternatives wherein he may choose, is to convert freedom into a meaningless masquerade.

Thus the newspaperman must take as his talisman the right of his readers to know—to know all about their environment, their community and their world—the evil as well as the good. He must remember the words recorded in the Gospel according to St. John, "And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."

It is not the function of the newspaper to decide what news is good and what is bad, to publish the one and withhold the other, to attempt in effect to superimpose its own or any other system of ethics on its readers.

Its sole news function is to inform, to give the reader the raw materials of life from which he may fashion his own system of ethics and resolve, as best he can, the basic issues of the society in which he lives.

This is the philosophy, simple to state yet hard to practice, that must be followed by the custodians of America's free press. We are human, and as humans we sometimes fail. But taken as a whole, it is my opinion that the newspapers of this Nation are discharging their basic responsibility to their readers, and to this Republic, in commendable and adequate measure.

We are penetrating the boundaries of space, but we have not yet overcome our greatest barrier, the boundaries of the human mind and spirit. For this there is but one way to travel, and that is the highway of truth, along which our newspapers must continue to serve as the principal means of transport.

The Late Honorable James G. Polk

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT E. COOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1959

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to join with the other members of the Ohio delegation and the membership of the House in expressing my personal deep-felt sorrow at the pass-

ing of JIM POLK. I, too, am a freshman Member of this House, and as such I have not had the opportunity that many of the other Members have had to have worked with JIM POLK over the years. On the other hand, as a new Member meeting Mr. POLK for the first time, I believe that I really found one of his true qualities, and that was that it was so easy to know JIM POLK. JIM was the type of man that you could meet the first time and feel that you had made at the very beginning a true and trusted friend. Certainly, I shall personally always look back upon the past 3½ months in the sense of a true friendship with a wonderful man. I am sure that the people of his district have lost a great Representative; this House has lost a valuable Member, and each of us has lost a trusted friend. I also extend my deep sympathy to his wife and family.

Will Our Lawyers Make the Supreme Court Behave?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Miss Edith Kermit Roosevelt, which appeared in the Saturday, March 14, 1959, issue of the Tulsa Daily World, entitled "Will Our Lawyers Make the Supreme Court Behave?"

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILL OUR LAWYERS MAKE THE SUPREME COURT BEHAVE?

(By Edith Kermit Roosevelt)

Will the American people at last get the legislation they need to protect them from agents of the Soviet government? In its recent meeting in Chicago, it looked as though they had a powerful ally in the American Bar Association, but any rejoicing may be premature.

An American Bar Association committee report, presented to Bar Association delegates, rapped 24 of the Supreme Court decisions coddling Communists and recommended that Congress correct their effect by appropriate legislation. Yet although the publication of the report has been hailed as a victory, overlooked has been the danger posed by a hard corps of leftist lawyers who are bound that Reds must continue to hide under the cloak of civil liberties.

These men are doing their best in the press releases and on television to nullify the effect of the Bar Association report on Congress and on the public. They are trying to get their local bar associations to pass resolutions condemning the report. They are quick to point out that in truth the bar association delegates never did actually approve the report made by the American Bar Association's Special Committee on Communist tactics, strategy, and objectives. The delegates only approved the recommendations submitted with the report.

Mr. Albert E. Jenner of Chicago, a former president of the Illinois Bar Association, led the fight against approval of the report which is a comprehensive and authoritative exposure of how communism is sapping the strength of our Nation.

Attorneys opposing Mr. Jenner's influence note that the Chicago attorney was a former member of the Lawyers Guild termed by the House Un-American Activities Committee "the foremost bulwark of the Communist Party * * *." The Lawyers Guild has worked actively to force repeal of the statutes protecting us against Communist subversion.

It is strange that while lawyers of Mr. Jenner's sort are forever crying "civil liberties" everytime someone wants to catch a Red, they appear to lack a scrupulous respect for our judicial traditions when it serves their purpose.

Three years ago it was this same Mr. Jenner who gave a letter to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in support of a project directed by Edward H. Levi, dean of the Chicago Law School, to make recordings in jury rooms unbeknownst to the jurors. These shenanigans were so shocking to the majority of fair-minded lawyers that Congress passed a law barring jury tapping.

Leftist lawyers in the American Bar Association continue to be successful in suppressing any information which does not promote their views. For instance, thus far they have succeeded in blocking publication in the American Bar Association Journal of a report by State supreme court justices that warned out security was threatened by the Supreme Court decisions. One wouldn't have to be an editor of that legal magazine to know that this report critical of the highest Court in our land was certainly as newsworthy to lawyers as it was to the American people at large.

Last year, of course, the report of the Special Committee on Communist Tactics, Strategy, and Objectives was mysteriously sidetracked. The 1957 report also warned that Supreme Court decisions affecting Communists were endangering our internal security. It seems likely that New York City Attorney Whitney North Seymour, a member of the American Bar Association's board of governors (chosen American Bar Association president elect at the Chicago meeting) was among the lawyers responsible for quashing the report.

If Mr. Seymour's record over the years is any indication, it is likely that he will oppose any action by the American Bar Association to promote effective laws against subversion. Mr. Seymour has a long record of affiliation with Communist groups.

A radical even in his mature years, the new Bar Association president elect was a director of the American-Russian Institute when he was 37. The American-Russian Institute was twice cited as Communist by Attorney General Tom Clark. Mr. Seymour's fellow directors at that time included Mrs. Kathleen (Mrs. Joseph F.) Barnes, identified in sworn testimony as a Soviet agent, and Mr. Edward C. Carter, who was tied with the Amerasia Soviet spy scandal.

When asked to comment on his record, Mr. Seymour always insists that he has "always been a Republican with fairly conservative views."

The future will tell whether lawyers in the American Bar Assolcation will defer to the fairly conservative views of the Albert Jenners and Whiteney North Seymours or the type of conservatism which means conserving our liberties now threatened by a Supreme Court that allows commies to get off scot-free.

Report on H.R. 2729, a Bill To Amend the Federal Trade Commission Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, in further reference to my bill, H.R. 2729, which would make it unlawful for a manufacturer to sell his products to consumers or to his own consumer outlets at prices consistently lower than the general level of prices charged by other retail outlets or charged other retail outlets, I would like to bring to the attention of the House a copy of the report the chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee received from the Federal Trade Commission. I would also like to include an analysis of this report as made by Mr. George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business:

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., April 20, 1959.

Hon. OREN HARRIS,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your letter of February 9, 1959, requesting a report upon H.R. 2729, 86th Congress, 1st session, a bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act so as to prohibit certain practices in commerce by any manufacturer or producer who distributes his products in commerce through his own retail outlets, direct to consumers and also through other retail outlets.

The bill would amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to declare two types of pricing practices unlawful and unfair methods of competition in commerce and unfair and deceptive acts or practices in commerce within the meaning of section 5 of that act. These practices would be stated in two proposed subsections to a revised section 17 of the Federal Trade Commission Act. In substance, they are:

A. The delivery of a product by a manufacturer or producer to its own retail outlets at a price which consistently is lower than the general level of prices charged by it for such product on direct sales to other retail outlets in the same general market.

B. The delivery of a product on sales directly to consumers by a manufacturer or a producer at a price consistently lower than the general level of prices charged for such product by the manufacturer's or producer's own retail outlets and by other retail outlets in the same general market which acquire such product from said manufacturer or producer.

The proposed legislation would have limited applicability. Only manufacturers or producers may be held to violate its provisions and to do so, under subsection A, they must not only have their own retail outlets, but must also sell directly to other retail outlets. This latter requirement appears manifest in the following language of the bill: "other retail outlets in the same general market which acquire such product from such manufacturer or producer." Under subsection B, the manufacturers or producers must either have their own retail outlets or sell directly to other retail outlets and, in

addition, must sell directly to consumers. Large distributors not engaged in manufacturing would not be covered although engaged in identical practices as here condemned.

There are relatively few manufacturers or producers who maintain their own retail outlets in addition to distributing directly to independent retail outlets. There are even fewer which, in addition, sell directly to consumers other than through retail stores. Some instances of such means of distribution are to be found in the tire, oil, and dairy industries.

An area in which the proposed legislation would be particularly applicable is where there are large commercial consumers for the product involved. For example, in the tire and oil industries direct sales are made to taxicab and trucking companies, usually termed "fleet accounts." To the extent that the purpose behind the bill may be to require this particular market to be serviced by independent retail outlets, the proposal would depart from the principles of our free enterprise system by dictating channels of distribution. The means of forcing the particular channel of distribtuion is inconsistent with the principles of the Clayton Act which permits price discriminations which are cost justified (inasmuch as the present proposal would require a manufacturer or distributor to sell at the same price as a retailer, thus ignoring the economies or cost savings of direct distribution.

This forcing of channels of distribution would, for example, in a situation where a manufacturer of building supplies sells directly to hardware stores and to construction firms, require a large construction firm to buy many of the items used in its construction work from hardware stores which carry small supplies of such products for do-it-yourself customers or to pay the manufacturer the same price charged by hardware stores on their relatively small sales.

H.R. 2729, by allowing retailers to dictate a retail price to manufacturers who sell directly to consumers, would go even further than so-called "fair trade" legislation which would allow resale price maintenance by manufacturers. This bill would prohibit a manufacturer from basing his price upon the economics of the situation, and instead would require him to relate his price to factors outside of his control.

If the bill were enacted, a manufacturer or producer who wished to preserve his right to sell directly to large customers, at a price which he could freely determine, could eliminate direct sales to retail outlets and restrict his sales of products ultimately intended for retailers to his warehouse distributors or wholesalers. Thus, instead of inuring to the benefit of independent retailers, the proposal could have a very detrimental effect by eliminating any cost saving which might presently be available to them by means of their direct purchases.

An essential element upon which enforcement of subsection A depends is the price at which a manufacturer or producer delivers a product to his own retail outlets. As a practical matter, one does not sell to himself. Accordingly, the price at which a manufacturer or producer delivers to his own retail outlets may be an arbitrary or bookkeeping matter and need not control the price at which those outlets resell to the consuming public. Consequently, manufacturers could deliver to their own retail outlets at the same price at which deliveries are made to other retailers, but the manufacturer-owned retail outlets could resell at a low markup which no independent retailer could meet. Indeed, the manufacturer-owned retail outlets could sell at cost or at a loss with respect to the price at which products were delivered to them.

An additional determination essential to be made in ascertaining whether there would be a violation is whether the lower price "consistently is lower than the general level of prices." The phrases "consistently is lower than" and "general level of prices" are so indefinite that much litigation as to their meaning is to be anticipated. But whatever its ultimate interpretation, the phrase "general level of prices" would appear to preclude a manufacturer selling directly to consumers from meeting the price competition of a retailer of his product who consistently sells below the general level of prices in a market area. On the other hand, the phrase "consistently lower than" would apparently allow a manufacturer to alter the price to its own retail outlets on particular shipments earmarked for favored customers, or to sell directly to favored consumers at prices lower than the usual direct price to

Subsection B contains what we think is a conflict in practical concepts. We have reference to sales "direct to consumers" and sales by a manufacturer's "own retail outlets." In our opinion, retail sales by a manufacturer's own retail store are, at law, sales direct to consumers. The distinction contained in the proposed bill casts some doubt in this area and could possibly affect the administration of the Federal Trade Commission Act as well as the Clayton Act.

Subsections A and B differ with respect to their interstate commerce coverage. Subsection A is in terms of a manufacturer or producer who distributes his product in commerce through his own and other retail outlets. Subsection B is in more general terms of a manufacturer or producer who distributes his products in commerce. In addition to this inconsistency between subsections A and B, the bill is not clear as to the interstate coverage intended. It is not certain whether it would be necessary to show that the chalelnged transactions were themselves in commerce, that the transactions took place with respect to products which had been in commerce, or merely that the manufacturer or producer was engaged in commerce in the distribution of products.

For all the reasons stated above, the Commission is of the opinion that enactment of H.R. 2729 would not be in the public interest.

By direction of the Commission.

JOHN W. GWYNNE,
Chairman.

N.B.—Pursuant to regulations, this report was submitted to the Bureau of the Budget on March 27, 1959, and on April 29, 1959, the Commission was advised that there would be no objection to the submission of the report to the committee.

ROBERT M. PARRISH,
Secretary.

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS,
Washington, DC., April 24, 1959.

Hon. ALVIN BENTLEY,
New House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. BENTLEY: I have just finished reading the April 20, 1959, letter written by Federal Trade Commission Chairman John W. Gwynne to the Honorable OREN HARRIS, chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, in opposition to H.R. 2729.

I feel that the reasoning of the Commission, as expressed in opposition to H.R. 2729 in this letter, is very faulty, and that it presents no real argument against the measure. I must say that since so much of the objection voiced is in terms of generalities, it is a little difficult to come to grips with it. However, within the foregoing limits, here are my observations:

1. The point about limited applicability (p. 2, pars. 1 and 2) does not seem particularly valid as an argument against H.R. 2729. In the first place, in its letter the Commission specifies the tire, oil, and dairy industries as those which would be affected. The Commission ignores the paint and glass industries. It ignores also the fact that the type of distribution covered in H.R. 2729 is an expanding threat in the foregoing industries, and that it promises to become a dangerous factor in others. In the second place, the Commission ignores the fact that in one important respect H.R. 2729 is limited because of its very aim: the closing of a loophole in our laws which curb unfair price competition, the use of which is permitting manufacturers engaged in dual distribution to get by with economic murder.

2. The point made about large distributors (p. 2, par. 1) does not seem a valid argument against H.R. 2729, because the bill directs itself toward manufacturer practices, not toward large distributor retailers. This, however, does not give the large distributors any advantage over manufacturers, because as retailers, these large distributors are already subject to the laws which restrain unfair price competition among competing businessmen, while the manufacturers are free of the restraints of these laws, insofar as their factory-direct or factory-store competition with their independent retailers is concerned.

3. The point made about forcing channels of distribution (p. 2, par. 3) is not valid, for reason that H.R. 2729 merely requires manufacturers who compete with their retail dealers to do so on fair price competition basis. There has never been anything beyond this in the minds of the authors of this legislation, and it is, to say the least, ill-advised for the Commission to suggest otherwise. As to the point made in this paragraph that the present proposal would require a manufacturer or distributor to sell at the same price as a retailer, thus ignoring the economies or cost savings of direct distribution, let me make two points:

(a) Subparagraphs A and B of H.R. 2729 both recognize, if only by implication, flexibility in pricing. Both very carefully make it illegal only for a manufacturer to sell at consistently lower prices. This does not imply the rigidity in pricing which the Commission suggests at this point, and in avoiding this implication leaves the way open for some flexibility.

(b) It would seem that the Commission itself recognizes the foregoing fact, because it argues, on page 4, in paragraph 1, that use of the word "consistently" would apparently allow a manufacturer to alter the price to its own retail outlets on particular shipments earmarked for favored customers, or to sell directly to favored consumers at prices lower than the usual direct price to other direct-account consumers.

My only comment on this is that it would seem reasonable for the Commission to have this argument one way or the other, but certainly not both ways.

In this connection, it might be well to think over the possibility of inserting, at the ends of subparagraphs A and B, a repetition of the Robinson-Patman Act cost justification proviso (allowing differences in prices due to savings made possible in the costs of manufacture, sale, or delivery), if this is needed.

4. The point made about dictating a retail price to manufacturers (p. 3, par. 2) is not valid, except if it is argued at the same time that all the antiprice discrimination statutes permit some businessmen to dictate the prices at which other businessmen may sell. For instance, all that H.R. 2729 seeks is to outlaw unfairly discriminatory prices offered by manufacturers to their factory stores and in direct sales to consumers, in

competition with their independent dealers. The bill does not tell manufacturers the prices at which they must sell, and it does allow price flexibility. However, it does forbid them from selling at unfairly discriminatory prices. In somewhat the same way, the Robinson-Patman proviso of the Clayton Act forbids some businessmen from selling at unfairly discriminatory prices. If the former dictates, then the latter must also dictate. If, because of this alleged dictation in H.R. 2729, the Commission opposes this bill, then it would seem logical for the Commission necessarily to oppose the Robinson-Patman Act, which it is sworn to uphold and enforce.

5. The point made on page 3, paragraph 3, is not quite clear. However, allowing, for purposes of discussion, that enactment of H.R. 2729 might, as alleged, prevent some retailers from buying direct from manufacturer, this is in the realm of speculation. It could be equally valid to speculate that there's a distinct possibility that said retailers might be only too happy to trade this particular good for a greater good involved in having on our statute books a law that would prohibit the same manufacturers from coming in to their markets and selling to their own customers at prices below those at which they are able to buy.

6. As to the point made on page 3, paragraph 4: the implication here is that if H.R. 2729 were enacted into law, and if manufacturers affected by this bill were to obey its strictures, it might still be possible for their factory-owned stores to sell at or below cost, since they are part of the manufacturer, and the manufacturer might be content to take only a manufacturer's profit on these sales. This, of course, would be a possibility. How probable it would be would remain for experience to show. But, the fact that a proposed law, any law—take the Harris fair-trade bill, or the quality stabilization bill, or many other bills that become law—might fail is no argument against that law. Perfection is not within the grasp of human beings in their mortal frame.

7. As to the amount of litigation that might be necessary to define the meaning of certain phrases in H.R. 2729 (p. 4, par. 3), beyond doubt considerable litigation could be necessary. However, this bill does not stand alone in this respect. The record shows that considerable litigation is still necessary to interpret laws that have been on the books, and charged to the Commission for enforcement for upwards of 42 years. Certainly I do not contend that the fact that litigation is necessary in connection with laws now on the books is an argument in favor of enactment of other laws that will involve litigation. But at the same time, I do think that it proves that the question of the amount of litigation that might become involved in enforcing H.R. 2729 is not, in itself, a valid argument against the bill.

As to the remark about meeting of competition, it must be remembered that the stricture in H.R. 2729 concerning sales "consistently * * * lower than the general level of prices" refers only to the prices offered to those in any market who are handling or buying direct the manufacturer's products, not to the general level of prices offered by all sellers in that market. If this concern is over a manufacturer's ability to meet the prices offered by one of his own independent outlets, then I point out that there is nothing in H.R. 2729 to prevent a manufacturer from pricing to his stores as low as to his dealers. If this concern is over a manufacturer's inability to meet the prices of some seller of a competitive brand, then it would seem that there's no point to this objection, for lower prices are permitted from time to time.

8. As to the distinction made in H.R. 2729 between direct-to-consumer sales and sales by a manufacturer's own retail outlets, there is no question but that such sales are identical, from the standpoint of both being made to consumers without the intrusion of any independent jobber, wholesaler, or retailer. However, the practical fact is that manufacturers do sell both ways, and the bill recognizes this fact. The Commission takes issue with H.R. 2729 on this basis. In all fairness it should be recognized that even if the bill were to specify only manufacturer sales direct to consumers, someone could ask, with equal justification, whether this meant factory direct sales or factory sales through factory-owned retail stores. The bill attempts to cover both types of sales specifically, to avoid any such later questions.

9. As to the points made on page 4, paragraph 3, subsections A and B do differ with respect to interstate commerce coverage. But, as indicated in my paragraph 8, they differ only in that one complements the other. This type of difference should be no bar to H.R. 2729. As to the charge that the bill is not clear as to the interstate coverage intended, all I ask is whether all legislation now on the books is clear insofar as its exact interstate commerce coverage is concerned. The fact that many such laws are not clear in this respect has not barred them from becoming law. It should not be considered a factor in barring H.R. 2729 from becoming law.

10. I cannot stress too much the danger in the error by the Commission in comparing H.R. 2729 with the various fair-trade bills (p. 3, par. 2). This is about as sound as comparing apples with oranges. The fair-trade bills would permit a manufacturer to set a minimum resale price on his products, which all his retailers would be compelled to observe. On the other hand, all that H.R. 2729 seeks to do is to stop manufacturers from discriminating unfairly in their sales prices to their retailers, who in turn are free to charge whatever resale price they choose to their customers. It is true that H.R. 2729 does contain strictures regarding differentials involved in factory direct sales, but all these strictures do is to prohibit a manufacturer from selling consistently to ultimate consumers at prices below those he charges on sales to his independent retailers. In short, even on these, it allows the manufacturer flexibility, the power to raise or lower these prices from time to time.

Summing up, it does not seem to me that the objections voiced against H.R. 2729 by the Commission in its April 20 letter are, except by stretching the imagination, valid arguments against the bill. In my estimation, these arguments do nothing but reflect the Commission's 18-year-old adamant stand against any course of action, or any law, which might interfere in any way with any manufacturer's power to price as he desires through his stores or in direct to consumer sales, in competition with his independent outlets, no matter the damage this pricing may do from time to time to his independent outlets, no matter how unfair this might be. Effectively, the Commission's position has been, and continues to be, that direct selling manufacturers should be beyond the reach of any and all law that requires fairness in price competition.

Believe me, Congressman BENTLEY, I have the greatest of respect for members of the Federal Trade Commission, today and in years past. They are, and have been, able and sincere men. They have a full right to their own opinions, and must be expected to speak out on the basis of these opinions. However, I have held all along that they have had a blind spot on this problem of manufacturer unfair competition with the manufacturer's independent outlets. And I see nothing to indicate today that this blind spot has disappeared.

Frankly, I feel that the record of independent business experience, as indicated by the testimony before the House Commerce Committee, as indicated in earlier Senate Small Business Committee hearings in the glass industry, and House Small Business Committee in the oil and dairy industries, as well as by the hearings of the Senate Judiciary Committee, the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, and Senate Small Business Committee in the tire industry, all show the need for H.R. 2729. Speaking for our nationwide independent business membership, I hope it secures approval of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Sincerely,

GEORGE J. BURGER,
Vice President.

Robbing Paul To Pay Paul

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on Thursday, April 23, 1959, the Manchester Union Leader, published in my home State of New Hampshire, had a very enlightening editorial entitled "Robbing Paul To Pay Paul," based on a speech which I recently made in the Senate.

I think this editorial deserves the attention of the Members of Congress and the general public, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROBBING PAUL TO PAY PAUL

The danger to the Nation inherent in continued profligate spending and unbalanced budgets was never more effectively portrayed than when Senator BRIDGES recently gave his Senate colleagues several poignant illustrations of what this ominous trend means to his home State.

Pointing out that the Granite State is a "persistent loser in this futile process of robbing Peter to pay Paul" and then "robbing Paul to pay Paul," Senator BRIDGES gave specific examples: "Under one important education proposal, New Hampshire would, in effect, be taxed by about $531,000 per year more than the amount of Federal benefits we would receive.

"Under the depressed areas proposal, we would pay for subsidies designed to lure away our own industries to other areas. * * *

"We have little at stake in urban renewal, slum clearance, or public housing. But with all our sister States we would have to help foot the bill of Federal programs in these and other fields."

Stressing the importance of meeting local problems locally, BRIDGES decried the theory that "the existence of a need automatically produces a responsibility of the Federal Government. * * * The Federal Treasury has no mysterious pipeline to some inexhaustible flow of funds from the moon." BRIDGES might also have stressed the inflationary effect of Federal matching funds on local budgets.

Senator BRIDGES then presented some statistics that should thoroughly alarm even the most complacent of our citizens: In 1935, Federal outlays for welfare programs

amounted to only $2 billion. At the end of World War II, in 1945, annual welfare expenditures amounted to only $2,272 million.

Now, hold onto your hat. By 1950, the welfare budget had soared to nearly $7 billion—nearly tripling in the short space of 5 years. By 1955, we were spending $12 billion on social welfare programs. In the past year, the total rocketed to $18 billion. And, said Senator BRIDGES, "in 1960, according to budget estimates, Federal social welfare spending will top $21 billion."

The tragedy of it all, as BRIDGES so correctly observed, is that this rising tide of social welfare expenditures has occurred in the full prosperity of these postwar years.

Alarming as these statistics are, however, they become even more so in the light of Senator BRIDGES' concluding comments: "If $10 million had been paid out each year from the birth of Christ down through the ages to 1960, less money would have been paid out than will be paid out this year alone. In 1 year, we are spending more on Federal welfare programs than on the purchase of aircraft, missiles, ships, and other military equipment for the Defense Department. We are spending four times as much on the Federal welfare program as we are spending for research and development so vital to our national security and strength."

And this orgy of self-indulgence is occurring at the most crucial period in the history of our Nation, at a time when we should be tightening our belts instead of enlarging the welfare state.

Sever Relations With Soviet Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, the Hamilton County Council of the American Legion at its April 2, 1959, meeting unanimously adopted a resolution entitled "A National Defense Resolution To Sever All Relations With the Soviet Union." This resolution was presented by a special committee consisting of Rabbi Michael Aaronsohn, Michael Golato, and Neil Wetterman, appointed by the Hamilton County commander, Carl C. Hoerth, Jr. The resolution was drafted by one of Cincinnati's leading citizens; a man who lost his sight in one of the great battles of the First World War; a great American, Rabbi Michael Aaronsohn. This resolution documents so well the treachery and perfidy of the conspirators of the Kremlin and makes such a strong case for the severance of our relations with the Soviet Union, that I feel every Member of the Congress should be apprised of its contents.

A NATIONAL DEFENSE RESOLUTION TO SEVER ALL RELATIONS WITH THE SOVIET UNION

Whereas Scriptures reveal: "The wicked are estranged from the womb; they go astray as soon as they are born, speaking lies. Their poison is like the poison of a serpent: they are like the deaf adder that stoppeth her ear; which will not hearken to the voice of charmers, charming never so wisely"; and

Whereas after 41 years, following the violent and bloody overthrow on November 7, 1917, of the first democratic government in Russian history, it has been demonstrated beyond the shadow of a doubt that the Communist program of the ruling circles of both the Soviet Union and Red China is neither a civilized political institution nor a rational economic system, but a foul, criminal conspiracy designed to reduce men, women, and children everywhere throughout the world to the level of barbarous and total slavery; and

Whereas during this period of 41 years, three Presidents of the United States and six United States Secretaries of State have engaged in 19 high level talks with their opposite numbers in the Soviet Government, and out of these conferences have emerged some 40 agreements involving specific Soviet promises, 37 of which have been cynically violated; and

Whereas in the spring of 1955, when a fully documented study of nearly 1,000 Soviet treaties was made public by the United States Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security, it was revealed that the Soviet Union had broken its word to virtually every country to which it ever gave a promise; and

Whereas the pledges of the Soviet Union have been dishonored on an all-embracing scale, and the Soviet Union has aggrandized itself at the expense of entire nations and parts of nations in contempt of the wishes of the peoples concerned, and has imposed governments and social systems of its own choice upon hundreds of millions of Europeans and Asians, and in all the history of humankind it is not easy to find an example of broken promises so immense in scale and so catastrophic in consequences; and

Whereas for almost 40 years the American Legion has never abandoned its absolute abhorrence of the lethal Communist exploitation of man's noblest ideals of democracy, fredom, peace, and prosperity; and

Whereas for 40 years the American Legion has never deviated from its original policy of nonrecognition of Soviet Russia, and on April 18, 1934, at a mass meeting in Washington, D.C., the national commander of the American Legion called upon the people of the United States to voice opposition to President Franklin Delano Roosevelt's shocking and Presidential-shattering precedent of formal recognition of Soviet Russia 5 five months before; and

Whereas when on December 7, 1941, the United States was so nakedly sucked into the maelstrom of war, the American Legion accepted the baleful alliance of the United States with the Soviet Union with grave misgivings; and

Whereas during World War II, while the U.S. Government was pouring billions of dollars of military and nonmilitary supplies into the Soviet Union, the Government of the Soviet Union, in gross violation of all previous agreements with the American military mission in Moscow, subjected American prisoners of war to treatment so barbaric as to provoke stern protest from the President of the United States; and

Whereas while the United States was engaged in a mortal struggle for survival across the world and on the side of an almost vanquished Soviet Union, agents of the Soviet Union in the United States, under the double cloak of diplomatic immunity and war alliance, carried on espionage and conspiratorial activities with startling audacity, penetrating almost every sphere of American life, even into the highest branches of our National Government in the National Capital—all for the unconcealed purpose of national subversion and the eventual violent overthrow of our Republic; and

Whereas since the conclusion of World War II, the diabolic double role taken by the Soviet Union in the United Nations' honorable defense of South Korea; the interminable, unbridled propaganda assaults on the part of the Soviet Union on the United States by forgeries and other sinister methods; the perpetual war of nerves; the corresponding colossal drain and strain on our national resources toward the maintenance of our Armed Forces throughout the world in a time of peace; the kidnapping of American soldiers and civilians; the attack in Venezuela on the person and life of the Vice President of the United States; the destruction on September 2, 1958, of an unarmed American transport plane with its crew of 17 men; the incitement to vandalism on American property in every part of the world; the instigation to riot in various cities of our own country; the fomenting of racial, religious, and class warfare; the relentless, ruthless corrosive campaigns engineered by the Soviet Union and its American tools and dupes against true American patriots and illustrious public servants; the startling victories of the Soviet Union in the decisions handed down by the United States Supreme Court; the stunning warnings so frequently broadcast by the Senate and the House committees on internal security; the travesty of the Geneva Summit Conference of July 1955; and the endless threat by the Soviet Union of the destruction of the American civilization—dispel all hope for honorable, peaceful coexistence with the Soviet Union; and

Whereas since November 16, 1933, the United States Government has extended diplomatic, commercial and cultural privileges to the Soviet Union, the masses of the people of the Soviet Union have never accepted the Communist despotism; civil war still haunts the Soviet Union; and agonized reign of terror still prevails over all Russia and her satellite peoples; and power has been maintainted only through unending mass purges, liquidation, duplicity and assassination on a horrendous scale; and

Whereas about 5 million anarchy-trained followers of Lenin and Stalin have thus enslaved one-third of the world's population and territory; and while few of their own free will have sought residence in the Soviet Union, millions have risked life and torture to escape the Communist tyranny; and

Whereas by the recent Khrushchev confessions, the Soviet Union's grisly record of violence and bloodshed proves that the Soviet Union is unworthy of a seat among the assemblies of civilized nations; that the Soviet Union has sunk to the lowest levels of barbarism and savagery and that its lust for world domination as currently exhibited in the invasion of Iraq and Tibet is as insatiable as the bottomless pit of Hades; and

Whereas at this crucial moment in the history of our country and of the world, 5 days before your special committee was authorized to draw up this solemn resolution, our Nation's ablest political analyst, David Lawrence, in his syndicated column in the Cincinnati Enquirer of March 9, 1959, wrote: "There are steps short of war which can be taken by the West. These could be far more effective than actual threats of war * * * the action could be the cutting off of all diplomatic relations between the West and the East * * * followed by simultaneous discontinuance of all commercial intercourse, as well as other forms of communication by air or by sea": Therefore be it

Resolved, That as a primary measure of national defense, we, the duly appointed delegates of the 50 posts of Hamilton County, Department of Ohio, the American Legion, regularly convened in Cincinnati, Ohio, on April 1, 1959, call upon the American Legion through its national, department, district, county, and local branches, to utilize every available means of communication to urge all patriotic fellow citizens to petition Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States of America, solemnly to consider this resolution, and in the discharge of the

powers and duties of his office, as a vital part of the Nation's comprehensive defense program, to implement the spirit and purpose of this resolution by an immediate severance of all diplomatic, commercial and cultural relations with the Soviet Union and with all the captive satellite countries of the Soviet Union; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be mailed at once by special delivery to Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; to the national commander of the American Legion; the department commander of the Ohio American Legion; the editors of the Cincinnati Enquirer, the Cincinnati Post-Times-Star, the Catholic Telegraph Register, the American Israelite; and to Messrs. David Lawrence, George E. Sokolsky, Forrest Davis, Dean Clarence Manion, Fulton J. Lewis, Jr., and also to U. S. Senators Frank J. Lausche and Stephen M. Young and U.S. Representatives William E. Hess and Gordon H. Scherer.

Respectfully submitted.

MICHAEL AARONSOHN, *Chairman*,
MICHAEL GOLATO,
NEIL WETTERMAN,
Committee.

Rural Development and the New South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the April issue of Southern Planter, one of the South's most respected farm journals, contains an informative and enlightening article entitled, "Rural Development and the New South." This analysis of the rural development program, now going forward in 30 States, makes it very clear that the Southern States especially have a big stake in the success of this new program. As the Southern Planter observes, rural development is right in line with the South's drive to diversify output and promote new crops, new industries, and renewed towns.

I am sure all my coleagues will be interested in this lucid article, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RURAL DEVELOPMENT AND THE NEW SOUTH—LOW-INCOME COMMUNITIES IN THE SOUTH ARE DEVELOPING PROGRAMS TO BUILD INCOME AND EMPLOYMENT THROUGH SELF-HELP

Ask a group of southeastern farmers or businessmen what the rural development program is all about and you're likely to get several different answers.

Yet this new program is tailor made for those rural towns and communities in the South needing more opportunities, both on and off the farm. It's right in line with the South's drive to diversify output and promote new crops, new industries, and renewed towns.

At present, some 30 States in all sections of the country have rural development programs underway. The Southeast is heavily represented, with West Virginia, Maryland, Virginia, North and South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Tennessee, Arkansas and Louisiana participating in the program.

AIM OF THE PROGRAM

Rural development has a simple, straightforward aim: To help folks in rural towns and communities find better ways of meeting the big problems that hobble progress.

The program tries to answer questions like these: How do we put on a drive for more industries? What can we do to help our farmers do a better job of marketing? How can the older folks live better on their small farms? Why are so many of our young people drifting into unskilled work?

State colleges and universities, through the cooperative extension service, plus agencies of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and others back up local rural development programs with specialists and full-time workers. The big responsibility, however, falls squarely on the shoulders of local people, like the farm organization leader, hardware store owner, bank official, school principal, women's club leader.

Agency personnel offer advice, counsel and expert know-how. But local people make the day-to-day decisions.

ACTUAL CASES CITED

How does this new setup work at the grassroots? The best way to answer this is to take a look at a few local programs in South Carolina, North Carolina and Virginia.

Many communities in Berkley County, S.C., suffer from lack of proper drainage. During the rainy season, water covers roads, swamps farmland, and often undermines farm and other buildings.

Berkley's 50-man county rural development committee selected one of the hardest hit communities—dubbed the "41 community" because it's 41 miles from Charleston—and went to work. They contacted farm families in the community, obtaining agreement to cooperate in the project.

The county agent's staff, supplemented by special rural development workers, secured rights-of-way from property owners to permit building road improvements and drainage structures on farmers' property. Soil Conservation Service engineered the structures. South Carolina's Highway Department helped on the project by building special culverts, along with a new road. And the ASC committee upped their payment rate for one-farm drainage.

As a result of the "41" project, drainage has been improved on some 900 acres of land in the community. Farmers can get into the fields earlier this spring, and save crops formerly washed out. A 3-mile, all-weather road now ties the community to the rest of the county.

Rural development isn't all conservation and improved farming, important as these are. New marketing and manufacturing enterprises to build up employment in the area and get more income also have a big place in the program.

THE CASE OF BERTIE COUNTY

Leaders in Bertie County, N.C., proved this by setting up a new produce market, locally financed, expertly managed, and growing every day.

Here's how they did it: Cooperating with businessmen interested in building a market, the Bertie Rural Development Committee sponsored promotional meetings throughout the county attended by about 700 farmers and town businessmen.

Specialists of North Carolina State College and extension agents assigned to rural development worked on technical and marketing details. Businessmen got the enterprise financed by forming a corporation and selling stock.

In its first year of operation, the Bertie Produce Co. handled $170,000 worth of watermelons and yams. This year and thereafter, its managers plan to market a whole range of produce, helping turn Bertie County into a vast garden area.

CUMBERLAND COUNTY ACTIVE

Virginia's Cumberland County, like so many southeastern areas, hasn't enough good opportunities on farms to take care of all its people. As a result, many of the men commute long distances every day to other jobs.

Cumberland County's rural development group, with the assistance of the Virginia Electric & Power Co., are now putting together a long-range plan for industry development.

They've surveyed industrial sites, and interviewed rural workers willing to take jobs. They're publicizing county resources through attractive new brochures, and a 70-page economic study for use of prospective plant locators.

Rural development areas all over the country are showing this kind of stirring about, as program leaders put similar projects into operation.

Of course, this kind of town-country development has been going forward a long time in the South. It's always a tough complex job. And nobody would suggest that the rural development program has suddenly made area improvement an easy job. Far from it.

There's still plenty of "kinks" in the program—as with anything new: Finding able local leaders to keep working at the program. Getting agencies outside the agricultural field to put in resources. Gaining, then holding, the interest of people in the communities.

Anyone working in one of the 100 or so program counties or areas around the country could give you a list of tough problems like these they haven't yet solved.

But the Rural Development Program has already had surprising impact on the thinking and work of leaders in rural areas. And it's produced some solid, concrete results.

What's more important, the program has succeeded in focusing attention on low-income rural families as people needing jobs, or more farm know-how, or better educational opportunities, rather than as economic units producing "X" number of bales or bushels.

A couple of months ago, South Carolina's Governor Ernest F. Hollings, writing in one of the State's papers, discussed "the New South."

He described the vast industrial and power developments that have taken place in South Carolina. "To complement these developments," he said, "our farmers are building a better balanced agriculture with year-round rather than seasonal aspects."

What the Governor was writing about was "rural development." For the South has been rural developing many, many years. National efforts like the new Rural Development Program are a recognition of this. They attempt to get behind the States in pushing forward balanced economic progress, along paths already charted by the States themselves.

Pricing Ourselves Out of Markets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, on last Friday I addressed the State convention

of the Ohio Private Employment Agency Association in Cincinnati, Ohio. This speech discusses the factors which are causing us to price ourselves out of both foreign and domestic markets as a result of the inflationary spiral and our trade policies.

My remarks follow:

They say that one of the ingredients of a successful speech is if the speaker is in a position to discuss a current issue of mutual interest and concern.

Your business is to find jobs and people with the necessary skills to fill those jobs. You are meeting here this week in Cincinnati to discuss new and improved techniques in order that you may do a better job. But no matter how hard you try, your business will not be successful and prosper unless in this country we have a sound and growing economy to provide the generally broad basis for jobs.

We have heard a great deal in the last year about recession and unemployment. Just 3 weeks ago the labor leaders arranged for a march on Washington by the unemployed for the purpose of demonstrating to the Congress and to the President the seriousness of the unemployment situation in this country. So you can see why I say that you and I have something in common.

I along with my colleagues in the Congress have been challenged to provide jobs for the unemployed. However, our task, I am told, is comparatively simple.

All we have to do is to authorize the spending of additional billions and billions of dollars for new and expanded activities of the Federal Government and—presto—the unemployment problem, whatever it might be, is solved. The lobbies and pressure groups behind all of these new-fangled spending programs will then say I am a fine fellow and a good Congressman who is alerted to the needs of the common man.

Furthermore, I will be a much better Joe if I don't even suggest raising taxes to pay for this new spending spree and just quietly pass this bill on to your and my children, as we have been doing regularly during the last two decades.

Of yes, it is the easy and popular way out. Just have Uncle Sam borrow the money, for which he will sign a few more billion I.O.U.'s This will give the employment situation a temporary and exhilarating shot in the arm, and the politicians and labor bosses a chance to take a bow and perhaps win an election or two.

While we are on this lost weekend binge, we can conveniently forget that in doing this we have given the devastating enemy of inflation a potent and permanent upsurge which accelerates pricing ourselves out of our foreign and domestic markets.

You know the result. Instead of more things for more people at lower prices, the cost of everything we buy soars. The American dollar is further eroded not only here but all over the world. Production necessarily declines, and we are again on the toboggon slide of unemployment. The unemployment agencies become unemployed.

Of course, the politicians who took the easy and popular way out should crawl under the table. But they will not worry too much. Some will solve their personal unemployment problems by squeezing relatives on the pubic payroll.

It should not be inferred from anything I have said that I am insensible or unconcerned about the unemployment that exists in the United States. I don't believe, however, that the unemployment situation generally is as bad as represented by some groups.

No one will deny that there are pockets of serious unemployment in the United States, the causes for which I will discuss later. However, these pockets of unemployment in a generally prosperous economy are being used as an excuse and a weapon for the promotion of some harebrained, socialistic, astronomical spending programs.

LYNDON JOHNSON'S Special Commission on Unemployment Problems will soon conduct hearings in these bad areas and, with the help of certain people who have an ax to grind, will exploit before television these truly bad unemployment areas, to make it appear as if the whole country is in a terrible state.

Certain labor bosses and pressure groups will use this cleverly aroused public opinion to clobber Congress into passing these high-cost, ill-conceived, socialistic measures which otherwise would not have a ghost of a chance of adoption. This maneuvering will, of course, distract attention from some of the practices and basic causes of this novel, spotty unemployment dilemma in which we find ourselves.

Of course, government, along with labor and management, should adopt all sound and reasonable measures to wipe out the causes and practices which lead to this unique unemployment situation. The trouble is that today here in America we have developed a mania that the mere spending of more dollars can solve all of our problems.

Let's see if what I have said is not true. We have been trying to buy friends and allies for many years. After Sputnik the answer to curing the deficiencies in our educational system was more money. The current upsurge in juvenile delinquency is attributed to our unwillingness to spend money on a whole variety of programs and panaceas.

I know someone will say—and justifiably so: "Scherer, what do you suggest if you're so smart?"

I am convinced that more profligate, deficit spending by the Federal Government will eventually worsen the situation rather than better it.

I know that at a time when the American dollar is eroding and depreciating all over the world—when credit of the United States is being pushed to the breaking point—when our national debt is $50 billion greater than the total combined debt of all the other nations of the world, such spending is courting disaster, bankruptcy, and the destruction of the economy of the United States. This is exactly what the Soviets want us to do. This is what they have planned for our internal deterioration.

General Claire Chennault, who died last August of cancer, was one of the truly great soldiers of our time. He was the leader of the famous Flying Tigers and later commanded the U.S. Air Force in the Far East. He was a man who understood the Communists because he had fought them for more than 20 years. The Committee on Un-American Activities wanted the American people to have the benefit of his experience and expert knowledge before he died.

General Chennault said in his testimony just a few weeks before he died, and I quote:

"You know that communism is depending on ruining the United States financially, more so than on any military action against the United States * * * Lenin and Stalin both talked about not engaging in war if it can be avoided. Their plan for many years was to ruin the financial structure of the United States.

"I believe that if things go on as they are now, eventually they will achieve that purpose of ruining the United States financially."

In another part of his testimony, he said:

"I believe the Communists will not take over a lot of Asia where they could. They want us to continue pouring aid into those areas * * * year after year, until our currency is no longer of any value. Then they will be ready to take the United States in turn."

For years before I went to Congress, I complained and campaigned against the ever-increasing bureaucracy of the New Deal, the astronomical expenditures of the Federal Government, and the ever-increasing taxload on the American people and American business.

I did not go to Washington to support programs and legislation which augment those evils. I did not go to Washington to participate in the dissolution of the economy or fiscal stability of the United States.

Just remember that we are never going to get tax reductions that are justified and do not adversely affect the economy of the United States until we put a stop to unbridled spending. Tax cuts without spending cuts lead to greater debt, move us closer to fiscal collapse, and, of course, fan the fires of ruinous and uncontrollable inflation.

I have on occasion opposed new and expanded activities for the Federal Government which have merit and are desirable. There are two principal reasons, however, for my opposition:

First, because we cannot afford them. Because these programs would further increase the indebtedness of the Federal Government, the tax burden on our people, and weaken the fiscal structure of the United States.

Second, because I felt that the project or program was one that should be carried on by local or State government.

Let me give you an example:

Those who have opposed various Federal-aid programs for education have been charged with being insensible to the welfare of the children of the country, benefits for teachers, and education generally. Just the opposite, however, is true.

Everyone with a grain of sense knows that eventually any type of Federal-aid program results in Federal interference, domination, and control. To argue differently is to disregard the record completely.

Whenever you pour Federal money into local government, Federal control eventually follows as night follows day. Education is one of the last major activities that we have kept in the hands of the local authorities.

If the Federal Government takes over—and I predict that it will if the present trend continues—you are going to have a department of education filled with thousands of new bureaucrats that will dwarf all other departments of Government with the exception of Defense. Your schools, your children, your teachers, and your curriculums will eventually operate under mandate from Washington.

I believe our school boards, our school administrators, our teachers, and our PTA's can do a better job for our schools with our own tax dollars than can some bureaucrat in Washington, just as I believe that our city councils, our planning commissions, and our citizens' development committees can do better and more economical jobs at urban redevelopment, free from the redtape and dictation of Washington bureaucrats. You know that for every educational and urban redevelopment dollar Ohio sends to the Potomac, it will be lucky if it gets 50 cents back.

I realize that the States and local governments would have an easier time meeting their financial obligations if the Federal Government did not siphon off so much of the tax dollar. That is one reason why the handful of conservatives in the Congress continue to oppose the ever-expanding activities and programs of the Federal Government—so that the Federal Government will not continue to siphon off more and more tax dollars to the detriment of local government.

But let's get back for a few minutes to unemployment. Oh yes, I can hear those who are calling for more Government spending as the panacea to aid unemployment saying that Scherer is unconcerned. That is not true. I am looking for basic causes of unemployment and the employment of measures to remove these causes.

As I have pointed out, the unemployment situation which we are facing at the present time is different and unusual. In most of the country employment is good; in many places it is above average. But there are pockets of unemployment where admittedly the situation is bad. This is an unusual and unique situation, different from what we have ever faced.

I certainly am not an expert in this field. Far from it. But from what I have been able to learn, the problem is acute in those industries and areas where we have priced ourselves out of markets and where we are no longer able to compete with the products of foreign manufacturers.

Charles Lucey, the able writer for Scripps-Howard newspapers, deals with this subject in a recent series of articles. He said: "Evidence grows that domestic United States inflation is shoving up our costs so that overseas nations can undersell us."

There is no question but that he is right. This inflationary spiral in the United States has not only priced us out of foreign markets but out of our domestic markets as well. It is a basic economic fact that every time you raise the price of a television set, a washing machine, a refrigerator, or an automobile by $50, there are thousands fewer families who are able to buy one or more of these items.

Excessive Government spending, especially deficit spending where the Government spends money it has to borrow, as sure as night follows day, lessens the purchasing power of each dollar, and consequently is one of the major factors in the inflationary spiral.

Also making major contributions to the inflationary spiral, the ever increasing cost of living or the declining purchasing power of the dollar are men like Reuther and McDonald and some of the big industrialists who produce basic raw materials.

Over the past decade certain labor leaders in order to maintain their own positions of power within their unions have consistently pushed and pushed for wages that far exceeded the increased cost of living. The industrialists to whom I have referred have readily granted excessive and unwarranted wage increases because these increases offered them an opportunity and an excuse for a price increase which included not only the wage differential but also a substantial and often unjustified profit margin.

As a result, the man on a fixed income, the pensioner, the schoolteacher, and the white-collar worker, whose increases, if any, lag behind have suffered most. In turn, industry loses these people as customers.

Remember our economy today is at a high point largely because of the tremendous expenditure of defense dollars. Markets or production caused by defense spending can in a sense be said to be artifically created. If this cold war should end, and we all pray that it will, defense spending and production will come to a grinding halt. You can readily see how the United States will then need badly every possible market or outlet for its industrial program. One can see how vital it is that we preserve our markets for tomorrow.

As a result of high taxes caused by the Government spending I have been talking about and high production costs, industry after industry in the United States today is establishing plants in foreign countries to take advantage of low labor costs and tax concessions. Now I believe we should invest private American capital abroad, but for other reasons than to avoid taxes and to take advantage of low labor costs.

If we continue to invest capital, as we have in the past few years, at an accelerated rate, for building plants all over the world that would have otherwise been spent for normal plant expansion in the cities of the United States, we are headed for a real hair-curling unemployment one of these days.

We have lost many world markets today simply because we can no longer compete. We are going to continue to lose more and more of these markets, in industry after industry, because daily foreign countries, with our technical help and our money, are entering new fields and are manufacturing commodities with the most advanced mass production machinery available. They are doing it without paying astronomical taxes and with labor costs that are only a fraction of ours.

A Ford assembly-line worker gets a wage, including fringe benefits, of approximately $2.94 per hour, compared with 69 cents in Cologne, Germany. Yet a few weeks ago we reduced tariffs on German cars.

It does not take a genius to see why we are not only losing our European markets but our domestic markets as well.

Some industrialists who 6 years ago, when I first came to Congress, urged me as vehemently as they dared to vote against liberalization of our trade policies, have today reversed their position. They want no tariff barriers or quotas. Why this change? Simply because during these 6 years they have built plants abroad and now want to import their low-cost, foreign-made products into this country without quotas or tariff barriers.

What happens if this flow of American capital abroad for the establishment of plants all over the world continues at the expense of industrial expansion at home? What happens to small business and industry—the backbone of this country—which cannot establish plants in Europe, which, in order to maintain our high standard of living, must continue to pay high labor costs, the 52 percent corporate tax, and even higher personal taxes to sustain this orgy of spending in which we are engaged?

Keeping in mind our unprecedented population growth, what happens to American labor and small business when it will be compelled in the next 2, 5, and 10 years to compete with goods made abroad at an increasing rate and produced at a fraction of the cost of those made here?

President Eisenhower, in his latest economic report to the Congress, said:

"While imports were well maintained, exports declined sharply after 1957. From the first half of 1957 to the first half of 1958, the value of U.S. merchandise exports fell more—in relative as well as in absolute terms—than those of all other countries combined."

In last Sunday's Washington Post the well-known business writer, Bernard D. Nossiter, said this:

"But imports and other purchases abroad ran ahead of exports by $900 million, and in national income bookkeeping this is on the minus side of the ledger."

As I said, we recently reduced the tariff on foreign cars coming into this country by about 8.5 percent. Today most European countries fix quotas on American cars. Only a handful are admitted, and the tariffs are exorbitant. The cheapest kind of Chevrolet or Ford costs $6,500 in France, approximately $8,000 in England, and $10,000 in South America. Is this reciprocal trade?

Automobile imports have increased almost 15 times in the past 5 years—from 29,505 in 1953 to 431,608 in 1958. Export of U.S. cars has decreased from 186,262 in 1953 to 125,834 in 1958.

Let's go from automobiles to a little thing like nails. Imports of nails supply more than one-third of the U.S. market. Imports are more than 50 times as great as exports of nails.

Barbed wire, an American invention, a few years ago came almost solely from U.S. concerns, both big and small. Today more than one out of every two rolls of barbed wire sold in this country is made in foreign mills, using foreign steel.

Imports of barbed wire amount to more than 50 times our exports. Why? Simply because a Dayton, Ohio, jobber can buy a ton of barbed wire made in Germany for $40 less than the same product made in nearby Cleveland, where steel wages are three times as high.

The industry estimates that the excess of imports over exports, in terms of man-hours required to produce the barbed wire, equals about 650 full-time jobs. There is no tariff on imports of barbed wire.

Most of the sewing machine business has gone to foreign factories. The White Co., which was No. 2 in this field, gave up in late 1957 after 80 years of business and now has its machines made in Japan.

In 1956 and 1957 we shipped abroad only 80,000 sewing machines. We imported 2 million.

There are steady increases in imports of portable typewriters and calculating and other types of business machines. One company with an oversea plant makes identical machines in the United States and in Germany. It pays an average of $2.25 per hour to workers in its American plant, less than 60 cents an hour to its workers in Germany. An official of this company recently said: "We are being forced into setting up oversea plants, where labor costs are lower, in order to compete with foreign companies."

In 1957 we exported about 100,000 typewriters and imported 337,000. From January to September of 1958, we shipped only 42,000 typewriters overseas and brought in 280,000.

Last year 800,000 bicycles arrived. Our exports were negligible.

We find that we have similar situations existing with reference to such items as fishing tackle, jeweled watches, clocks, clothespins, woolen gloves, plywood, dinnerware, woolen fabrics, cameras, cotton cloth, and transistor radios.

Insofar as transistor radios are concerned, some U.S. manufacturers, in order to stay in business, have arranged to bring in transistor portables from Japan to sell as part of their own line. Other companies in this field are considering importing sets or parts from Japan.

Now such an arrangement may overcome the companies' current problem of competition, but what happens to the rank and file of American labor that has been making these transistors and parts in U.S. factories?

If one thinks that this problem is confined to small items only, he is sadly mistaken. The Tennessee Valley Authority, after quite a hassle, recently decided to buy a huge steam turbine generator from a British company that underbid U.S. firms by several million dollars.

Let's see how this one purchase affected workers in four cities of the United States. It was Westinghouse and General Electric which were outbid. They have plants which manufacture turbines and turbine parts in East Pittsburgh, Lester, Pa.; Schenectady, N.Y.; and Fitchburg, Mass. All four of these cities are in depressed areas where unemployment is high.

The loss of this contract meant the loss of about 350 full-time jobs for 2 years on direct production and 700 or more other jobs indirectly connected with the project. Again, British wage rates are only 37 percent of those in the United States for similar work.

Here is a headline from Monday's Wall Street Journal: "Producers Spur Imports From Own Oversea Plants, Cite Savings—Harvester Gets First Units."

The news story said: "This week International Harvester Co., the largest manufacturer of farm equipment in the world, imported into the United States the first farm tractors made in Harvester factories overseas."

This week's issue of U.S. News & World Report, in discussing this very subject, says:

"U.S. producers trying to meet this kind of competition have two alternatives if they want to stay in business: Turn to more automation, using fewer people, or shift production overseas."

It has been going overseas at an alarming rate.

As foreign countries take on the manufacture of more and more items which they formerly purchased in this country, they will be able to do some real bargaining under our present trade policies. The prices for commodities made in this country will be so high that under no condition will we be able to compete with their domestic products. They will then be able without fear to remove all tariffs on American-made products because we cannot possibly compete with them in their markets. They will grant tariff concessions to us gladly for similar ones on their products coming into the United States.

So you can readily see what I say is true; namely, that we are losing our European markets and soon, under our present trade policies, will be well on our way to losing our own American markets to foreign-made commodities shipped into this country.

Let me give you an example: The manufacturers of sporting equipment laid on my desk the highest quality baseball gloves, basketballs, footballs, etc., manufactured in this country for many, many years. They placed beside this equipment similar items of exactly the same quality made by the Japanese. It was pointed out that under our foreign-aid program we gave to the Japanese the most modern, scientific, mass-production, leather goods machinery.

The American labor that went into these products averaged $2.50 an hour compared to Japanese labor at 40 cents an hour. Japanese taxes, both business and personal, are considerably lower than ours.

The old argument that American know-how, ingenuity, and mass-production methods can overcome the differential in taxes and labor costs no longer applies. The machinery which the Japanese were given was a later model and more efficient than much of the machinery still used in American plants.

Furthermore, as we all know, the Japanese are a smart and industrious people. Need I point out to you that under these circumstances it is impossible for our manufacturers to compete in our own markets with the Japanese products?

Of course, the free traders will tell you that we must allow a certain number of industries to go by the boards in this country because liberalized trade policies are advantageous to our American exporters. True it is that over the years, the United States being a great industrial country, its exports have exceeded its imports. If they had not, the United States would have been in a bad way. That is what we are complaining about now. The gap between our exports and our imports is closing fast; in fact, too fast.

I am well aware of the Biblical injunction that we must be our brother's keeper, but we can fulfill that injunction only so long as we are able to keep ourselves.

Moravian Missionary Aided the Establishment of Fort Pitt Two Centuries Ago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following historical article from the National News, official newspaper of the National Slovak Society of Pittsburgh, Pa. This article was written by Mr. John C. Sciranka, an editor from Passaic, N.J.:

MORAVIAN MISSIONARY AIDED THE ESTABLISHMENT OF FORT PITT TWO CENTURIES AGO

(By John C. Sciranka)

The Americans of Slavonic extraction of Pittsburgh, Pa., should be doubly preparing for the bicentennial celebration of their city. They have something to boast about because it was one of their own Slavonic pioneers—a simple Moravian missionary—who has contributed very much to the erection of Fort Pitt two centuries ago.

Yes, it was Christian Frederick Post, born in the year of 1710 in Polish Prussia, who as a Moravian missionary and official interpreter of the State of Pennsylvania risked his life to win over the Indian tribes to the British.

Historians tell us that the first settlement of Pittsburgh was a stockade erected in 1753. However, it fell into the hands of the French, who gave it the name of Fort Duquesne. The French abandoned it in 1759. The same year the British erected Fort Pitt whence the city took its name.

Though it sounds simple, yet it needed a lot of scheming and personal sacrifices at the risk of many lives to get rid of the French.

Let's look at the history and the part our humble, nonetheless distinguished compatriot, Christian Frederick Post played two centuries ago.

Post, according to Early Western Travels, 1748–1846, also Journals of Con. Weiser, etc., had prepared two journals on his western travels. One, to the neighborhood of Fort Duquesne, July to September, 1758, the other to the State of Ohio, October 1758, January 1759, which are registered in the Proud's History of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, 1798.

Christian Fred. Post was a simple uneducated missionary of the Moravian Church, according to historians, who say that his chief qualities for the perilous journeys — was his intimate acquaintance with Indian life and character. Further, the belief of the tribesmen in his truthfulness and honesty and his steadfast courage and trust in the protection of a higher power.

Post was born in Polish Prussia in 1710 and came in his early youth under the influence of Moravians, whose missionary movement was just beginning to germinate in his homeland.

The Moravians, or the United Brethren, are the descendants of Bohemian (Czech) Hussites, with episcopal succession from the Waldenses. They were expelled from Bohemia in the Thirty Years' War and found refuge in Moravia, which is now a part of Czechoslovakia. Greater Moravia was at one time an empire, where the apostles Saints Cyril and Methodius brought Christianity in 863.

From Moravia, the Moravians moved in 1722 to Saxony where they found refuge, building Hernnhut (The Lord's Refuge), on the estate of their protector, Count Zinzendorf, who became a bishop.

Their communities spread into Germany, Russia, Scandinavia, Holland, Switzerland and the United States. They were distinguished all over for devotion, education, and good works. Originally they had a communal organization, which in later years was abandoned.

FIRST SETTLED IN GEORGIA

They began mission work in America in 1730, starting first in Georgia to Christianize the American Indians. This is where Christian Post came to about 1735. But because of Spanish hostility, their mission failed in Georgia, and they moved into Pennsylvania in 1739. The city of Bethlehem was established on Christmas Eve. Post came to Bethlehem in 1742 eager to evangelize the Indians. The following year he was sent to assist Missionary Henry Rauch in his mission to the Mohegans and Wampamoags. This mission was established in 1740 by Count Zinzendorf, the great Moravian bishop, who visited the site. Shekomeko (Pine Plains, Dutchess County, N.Y.), where he baptized three Indians as its first fruits. The work spread to the neighboring Indian villages in Connecticut. Post was assigned to work in the Sharon Township (Litchfield County), which consisted of the Indian villages of Pachgatgotch and Wechaaudnach. He married in zeal a converted Indian named Rachel in 1743. Here persecution began of brethren and converts, who were accused of being papists.

It is related that Post on his journey to Iroquois County in 1745 was arrested in Albany and sent to New York City, where he was imprisoned for 7 weeks on trumped-up charges of abetting Indian raids. In 1746 the Shekomeko and Connecticut settlements were broken up. Post and the Indians left New York and Connecticut for Pennsylvania. They were entertained kindly in Bethlehem and built a Gnadenhutten (huts of Grace) at Weisport, Carbon County. While in Bethlehem, Pa., Rachel, Post's wife, died, 1747. Two years later he married a Delaware convert Agnes, who lived only until 1751.

Post as a missionary assistant was sent to Shamokin in 1747 to help a missionary blacksmith established there and to clear and plant more ground.

In 1749 he visited and helped David Bruce to reestablish mission to Pachgotgoch.

SUMMONED TO LABRADOR

Post was summoned 2 years later (1751) to Labrador, where four Moravians were sent out as missionaries to the Eskimos. It is to be noted that the Moravians were the first of all denominations to begin mission work, as stated before, in Georgia. Later they sent missionaries to Greenland, Labrador, Alaska, also among the North American Indians. Also to Nicaragua, Guiana, Cape Colony, East Africa, and Thibet.

Their missionary zeal inspired great missionaries like the famous Bishop Frederick Baraga (1797–1868), a Slovene missionary; Roman Catholic Bishop of Marquette, Mich., educator among the Chippewa Indians, who labored in Michigan and Wisconsin. Baraga was a distinguished lawyer in Vienna, who was attracted to the new world very likely by the missionary zeal of the Moravians. Also, the late Msgr. William Heinen, who labored at Mauch Chunk (Jim Thorpe, Pa.) and who is known as the "Apostle of the Slovaks" in the Philadelphia Archdiocese,

where he mastered their language and founded 16 parishes, confessed that he was attracted to come to work to America among the Indians by the writing of Moravians in the German newspapers, while he was hospitalized as a wounded soldier. Over a century and a quarter ago after Post and the Moravians left Georgia, several Catholic Slovak priests from Pennsylvania and eastern States attempted to colonize their people in Georgia. No doubt, they too were inspired to choose Georgia by the Moravian pioneers.

Post's mission to Labrador was unsuccessful. Owing to an accident, the captain decided to turn the ship back to England. Post returned to Pennsylvania.

HIRED BY QUAKERS

Post was hired by the Friendly Association of Quakers, who admired him for his ways with the Indians. Moravians were familiar with the Quakers, who were established in Slovakia, near the city of Bratislava (Pozsony in Hungarian and Pressburg in German) where the society was known as Habans (Habani). The writer traced some 30 years ago that the Habans, known as Quakers of Slovakia, had families named Hubers and Huvers, who were later assicated with the name of President Herbert Hoover, also a Quaker. The Habans of Slovakia were known for being excellent artisans. The family of Pullmans also originated there. Post was familiar with the Quaker society even in Europe.

After his successful mission for the Quakers, he was hired by the authorities of Pennsylvania to assist them in public affairs. This assignment was to bring him all the way to Pittsburgh. In June 1758 he wrote his report on his journey. He had a shrewd knowledge of Indian customs.

His mission and confidence of Indians in him made the advance of Forbes so much less hazardous than that of Braddock. Post went to Reading, Pa., with two militia officers named Capt. John Bull and Lt. William Hays.

In the opinion of H. H. Whitehead, of McKeesport, Pa., a great admirer of Post, who expressed it recently in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette "at the insistence of Forbes, in July 1758, Post set out from Wyoming, Pa., and with the exception of a few weeks, spent the next 4 months in alienating the Indian allies from their French leaders. For over 3 year, the Indians, chiefly Mingoe-Delaware and Shawnees, were allies of the French, and with them the French had little from the English. Post, at the risk of his life, succeeded in winning the Indians to the side of the English with the result it was Post, who more than all others, made possible the fall of Fort Duquesne and the end of French rule in Pittsburgh."

Post lived among the Indians for over 17 years.

Whitehead proposes the erection of a statue for Christian Frederick Post during the Pittsburgh bicentennial.

Post after accomplishing his mission in Pittsburgh, built a home on the border of Ohio, which was the first home built by a white man there. For 2 years after his adventurous journey, he served as an official messenger and interpreter for the authorities of Pennsylvania. During that period he begged often to be allowed to go to Ohio to preach to the Indians.

The last official act of Governor Denny was the affixing of his signature to a passport for Christian Frederick Post, of whose loyalty, integrity, and prudence he testifies to have had good experience.

In further substantiation of his zeal to evangelize the Indians in 1761 he again showed his desire to begin a mission for the western Indians.

On another occasion he went with his assistant John Heckewelder to Fort Pitt, where he was given a courteous reception by Boquet. Warnings against the storm of fire and blood which was so soon to break over the frontier, placed Post in a most dangerous situation and he barely saved himself during the hostilities. Post was also friendly with Daniel Shamokin, after whom the city was named in Pennsylvania.

We have also learned that the Honorable Charles Thomson, prominent Philadelphia Quaker, later Secretary of the Continental Congress, held Post in high esteem.

Slovaks and Slavs of Wyoming Valley, which embraces Luzerne and Lackawanna Counties in Pennsylvania, will be happy to learn that Post was a frequent visitor and guest among the Indians there. We know that Wyoming Valley was a bone of contention between the Pennsylvania and Connecticut Colonies. Post was active there as a Moravian missionary among the tribe of Nanticoke. Who would have imagined that 175 years later the city of Nanticoke, Pa., would have a mayor, John Paulus; John T. Kmetz, Assistant Secretary of Labor in President Truman's Cabinet; Vice Adm. John Greytak, and other officials, all Americans of Slovakian extraction. Kmetz was born in Lopuchov, Saris County, Slovakia, and was a delegate to the United Nations (International Labor Organization) convention in Geneva in 1947, when he visited his native Slovakia, which he left at the age of 6. He is known as a capable leader in the United Mine Workers of America, and a right hand of John L. Lewis.

Post, toward the end of his life, entered the Protestant Episcopal Church. He died in Germantown, Pa., in 1785.

Post has shown great work among the people of New York, Connecticut, Ohio, but especially among the people in various sections of Pennsylvania. However, Pittsburgh owes him the most for his unselfish services and countless sacrifices, when he risked his life for the establishment of Pittsburgh, where in 1890 the National Slovak Society was founded.

Post was a Slav by birth and a true Christian by deeds with great love for America. Let us cherish and perpetuate his memory.

A Fair Day's Pay for a Fair Day's Work—Gone With the Wind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio news analysis given by CBS Chief Washington Correspondent Eric Sevareid on April 27, 1959:

Good evening, the Senate has passed its highly controverted labor bill; it is designed to eliminate some of the abuses in some labor unions and to protect and extend what ought to be the rights of union members as individuals in a free society. Much as this bill may accomplish to right wrongs from both the social and the union points of view, it is not apt to solve the creeping difficulty that haunts those interested in preserving the numbers and variety of enterprise establishments. That is the problem of costs associated with labor—not merely pay scales to union members for the work they actually do but the added costs of not being able to save money in other directions through work or innovations that unions will not permit to be done or to be fully utilized.

This is by no means a universal difficulty—after all, many institutions have been automated or semiautomated, causing net losses in jobs available. But it is a difficulty now very real and alarming to people who do not wish to see further contraction in the institutions of human communication. In daily newspapers, for example, the cost structure is now so high that new papers are rarely started and existing papers frequently merge or go under. It took only a 19-day strike of deliverymen—and a strike caused chiefly by the union's internal politics—to wipe out last year's profits for some New York newspapers and to bring even the vastly prosperous New York Times to the edge of the red ink column.

Printers now set many fewer lines of type per day for many times more dollars per day than they did a generation ago; the pay has gone 'way up while the production has gone 'way down. Government censorship is by no means the only threat to press freedom as we have know it in this country.

Communication in the form of broadcasting sees something of the same handwriting on its wall; television has had a good deal of margin to work in, because of its newness and its accretion of capital values as the number of television sets rapidly mounted. But if its cost structure continues to climb, real trouble is ahead. In this industry, those who produce the product have been hacking their way through a veritable jungle of union jurisdiction and rules. The jurisdictional dispute that kept some NBC programs off the air today is an example of the gradual shift of the union claim to its inherent right in pay for work done to the claim of inherent right in the total amount of work to be done. The introduction of the miraculous video tape process was regarded as a cost reducing innovation. With tape, for example, programs could be done from and/or about foreign countries without sending American technical crews abroad. But the union at NBC today refused to permit such a program to be put on the air in this country. One great reason more programs have not been done about foreign lands and problems is the great cost of sending crews abroad. If the argument of the union balking today is generally accepted, the advantage of the tape invention is no advantage at all for this kind of purpose.

The principle of overtime pay was originally conceived to be extra compensation for extra effort. But the use of television tape to make late night or weekend programs during the normal working week also meets union objections; union leaders have insisted on continuing the overtime pay even when overtime work is not performed; these are two examples, in one industry, and in the case of one cost-reducing invention, where the promise of the invention fades away under the union claim to vested interest in the pay total and the production total.

In the shipping industry, a new technique for loading cargo was developed in the use of light-metal casings; cargo could be packed in these in, say Indiana, trucked to a New York pier and loaded on a ship in a package. Dock workers unions have objected to this cost-saving development. Their claim is, in effect, that they have an inherent right to compensation for the loading of ships, no mattter who loads them or how they are loaded, whether by their own hands on the dock or by a distant team of men in an inland city. For what others did in Indiana, they want to be paid, themselves.

We have come a very long way from the principle of a fair day's pay for a fair day's

work; and the line between the rights of management and the rights of labor has become a very fine line, almost too fine, at times, to be detected with the naked eye.

This is Eric Sevareid in Washington.

Challenge to American Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I made before the chamber of commerce luncheon on April 27, 1959, entitled "Challenge to American Business."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHALLENGE TO AMERICAN BUSINESS

(Remarks of Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, chamber of commerce luncheon, Washington, D.C., April 27, 1959)

I am grateful for this opportunity to address the business leaders of America and to discuss with you a problem that concerns me deeply.

I refer to a declaration of war Mr. Khrushchev has issued against us—a declaration of economic war.

I need not remind you gentlemen of the all too painful fact of the American recession. I share your rejoicing that we are again on the upgrade; but none of us should ever forget that there is still far too much slack in our economy.

Millions are still jobless. Too many plants are working short workweeks. America is far from hitting on all cylinders.

As you may know, I have recently visited Russia, and I can tell you that the Soviets are pulling out all of the production stops, pressing hard against their full economic capacity, and making great sacrifices to increase that capacity.

Russia is a part of the world where optimism rivals that of America's boldest optimists.

Premier Khrushchev has said that he has declared economic war on us. His aim: to "catch up and surpass America."

The Soviet countryside is strewn with signs bearing these words.

Khrushchev is looking ahead 10 to 20 years. He is using the vast powers of Russia's state machinery to plan and program the great resources of his empire. He has called his first 7-year plan, "Russia's Offensive Opens," and under this plan he has programed vast increases in the capacity of Russia's heavy industries.

By 1965, he aims at adding nearly 30 millions tons of steel capacity; more than 100 million tons of oil production; nearly 300 billion kilowatt-hours of electricity.

And while the emphasis is clearly on capital goods to add to Soviet military and economic power, there are also important planned increases in consumer goods. Meat production is to more than double by 1965; butter production, already almost equal to ours, is to increase by almost 400,000 tons. There are to be more shoes and clothes and the gadgets of life for the Russian people, who, you must remember, know nothing of the rich material life we live here.

We would be foolish indeed to discount these plans and programs, ambitious as they may seem. For the Soviets have made ambitious plans before—and they have made them a reality.

Not only have they achieved economic goals; they have taken giant steps in science and technology as well.

The first man-made earth satellite bears a stamp, "Made in Russia."

The first artificial planet to be placed in our solar system likewise is labeled, "Made in Russia."

And to the struggling nations of the world, this label says more. It says, "Made in Russia—only 40 years ago a primitive, uneducated, rural nation, a nation without science, without technology."

To the Indian or the Egyptian, the Burmese or the Syrian, Russia's meteoric rise from laggard to leader in the world of science and invention has the same inspiration as the rags-to-riches rise of the self-made man of America.

If Russia can do it, they say, why can't we?

And so we would be ill advised to underestimate Russia's progress. More important, we would be foolish to ignore the potent effect of Russia's progress on the rest of the world.

Khrushchev's 7-year plan is not just an economic document; it is a political and psychological document, too. The Russians are using it as a major weapon of foreign policy, and they are getting an interested audience in all those teeming underdeveloped countries of Asia, the Middle East, Africa and even Latin America where people are searching desperately for an escape from a life of abject poverty.

Many leaders in India, Burma, Indonesia, Egypt, Iraq, and elsewhere are fascinated with what is going on in Russia, and it is hardly surprising. Those leaders are not blind to the hideous cost to humanity which the industrial revolution under communism has entailed; but they hope to avoid paying this cost.

At the same time, they know their people will have to make sacrifices if they are to grow in economic strength.

Before these people, the Russian flaunt their 7-year plan, and they get an interested audience.

For what alternative is offered in its place? What is the experience of the prosperous West that seems relevant to their dire problems?

What, they ask us, do you have to offer?

You and I know that we have plenty to offer. But have we been offering it? Have we been sharing our best qualities, our greatest talents as fully as we might have?

I do not think so—and I would like to suggest a way in which American business and American businessmen can help export to other countries one of the most precious commodities we have: managerial know-how.

For it is this talent which has contributed so greatly to America's unprecedented wealth and standard of living.

We need to export this talent because the real determinant of a country's economic progress is people.

Certainly a country with vast natural resources can develop more readily than a country with no natural resources—all other factors being the same. However, there are many examples of countries, like Indonesia, rich in natural resources, which suffer the pangs of abject poverty. Yet other countries, like Switzerland and Belgium, with extremely limited resources, have become highly industrialized and highly productive and their people enjoy high living standards.

Israel and Puerto Rico are dramatic examples of what can be done by energetic people with limited resources.

The key to economic progress is in the know-how, in the talents, in the abilities, in the training, in the experience of the people. But in most of the underdeveloped countries, especially those that have become newly-independent, there is a tragic lack of managers and operators—people who know how to do things, how to get results, how to perform.

It is not that the people of these countries lack inherent ability. There is no country in the world where one cannot find outstanding individuals. The trouble is there are so very few of them.

Training and experience take time. The process of developing know-how is tragically slow.

Under our Point Four program and other public and private efforts, tens of thousands of loyal and dedicated Americans have been living and working as advisors and consultants and teachers overseas, trying to provide the technical assistance which the underdeveloped countries so desperately need.

To these soldiers in the front line of the war against poverty, we all owe a great debt of gratitude.

Where we have failed is in making available in substantial measure America's managerial talents, America's capacity to do, to perform, to get things done.

The greatest reservoir of management talent in the entire world is in American industry. Our corporations have the men and women who know how to organize and get results, how to operate and how to manage. Far too little of this talent has been made available to the underdeveloped countries.

Here lies the greatest challenge to American business in the war against poverty—in the war for free enterprise.

As you well know, managment is not produced by any simple formula. Managers and enterpreneurs are not created ready-made by our universities. No one knows better than you that there is no substitute for practical experience.

It isn't enough for us to send advisors and consultants and experts overseas. Yes, they are tremendously valuable and make a marked contribution, but even more important is the need to make available managerial talent. In this area, only American business can meet the challenge.

Will you meet the challenge and meet it in time?

Many have said that private investment abroad can do the entire job. A combination of American capital and American know-how through private investment is highly desirable and must be given every possible encouragement. But for the long-run good of the underdeveloped countries, is this enough?

The best way to encourage free enterprise is to help build local industries, not merely branches of American firms.

In the long run, the underdeveloped countries will become developed only if their own businesses grow and expand and become stronger.

Only American business can determine whether the United States will help the underdeveloped countries secure the management they need for rapid progress. It would be well if every American corporation were to think seriously how it can contribute to meeting this challenge.

We could achieve spectacular results if we could make available hundreds or thousands of management technician teams who go abroad from 2 to 5 years under management contracts for the purpose of actually running locally owned business. Such a program could result in increasing output, in raising living standards, in brightening American prestige and in thwarting expansion of communism.

Who can doubt that American business can beat the Communists in helping the underdeveloped countries, if it is willing to make the effort?

By making the effort, I do not mean sending only retired people, and adventurous youngsters who have the zeal but not the experience and maturity to be effective. We must make available some of our best people in their most productive years, and they must stay on the scene long enough to show the local business community how to manage and how to run enterprises.

Simultaneously, people from the developing countries must be brought to America and given opportunities to work within our corporations, alongside good management personnel.

Our Government can help induce individuals and companies to participate in such a program. We now provide tax exemption up to $20,000 a year for Americans who are abroad 18 months or more. To lift this upper earnings limit, would be a small price to pay for the certain fruits of lending our managerial talents to those who need them most.

There are other ways our Government might join hands with business in a joint endeavor. Government might make up the difference between what a local enterprise could pay an American executive and the salary he has been getting. Government might also provide technical assistance funds to dollar-starved countries to facilitate the exporting of executives.

Many countries might be induced to provide local tax exemption for such management teams so that there would be opportunities for large personal savings, thus affording attractive financial rewards.

Of course, in order for American corporations to induce their best people to take these assignments, the companies would have to protect seniority rights. But there is nothing novel about this. We did it for the men who went to fight in the hot war after Pearl Harbor. Why shouldn't we do the same for those who are willing to fight in the front lines of a war just as urgent and just as important to our survival: the cold war against communism?

You should not overlook the possibility that your own management people might learn something from working abroad, and be all the more valuable when they return. After all, we do not have all the knowledge, and we can learn as well as teach.

What I am suggesting is that American business create its own point 4 program.

What I am suggesting is that American business get into the business of exporting free enterprise to other countries—in the form of that greatest of American geniuses—our managerial talent.

And I can think of no more fitting organization than your own to take the leadership in implementing this point 4 program for American business.

What I am suggesting makes good humanitarian sense—and that alone is a good reason for undertaking it.

But it also makes good business sense, in the long run, for America.

You, as businessmen, know that good customers mean good business. Our own economy has grown in large measure because we have had expanded purchasing power and larger markets for our goods.

The same is true of the world markets. As we help underdeveloped countries to grow and prosper, they will become not competitors, but customers for American products.

Of course, there will be some added competition. But when world trade expands, America and her business community are bound to benefit. And our world trade will expand as the poor countries, with our help, grow more prosperous.

The matter of lending management to other countries will not be easy. There will be many headaches and heartaches and frustrations. But who here does not know that nothing worthwhile was ever won without sweat, hard work, and frustration?

The fight against poverty and against Communism is not going to be easy in any of its phases. But surely, in America, there are enough companies, and enough individuals, who will be willing to join in a crusade of commercial missionaries.

America must become recognized throughout the world as the leading force in this Twentieth Century war against poverty. This is a popular war. It is a moral war. It is a war that we can win.

And in winning that war for humanity, we increase the chances of winning peace and survival for ourselves, as well as for men and women and children everywhere.

Space and the Radiation Belt: A Tribute to Physicist James Van Allen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, in this week's issue of Time magazine, which reached my desk yesterday, there is an excellent cover article on Dr. James Van Allen, of the State University of Iowa, and his outstanding contribution to our knowledge of outer space.

Because Dr. Van Allen is a constituent of mine and because he serves the country from his headquarters at the State University of Iowa which is noted for its development of research in many fields, I take great pride in calling this article to the attention of all Members.

I am sure that in reading it, you will be impressed with the caliber of the men who are giving as leadership in the great race of the century, and through such men as these, be assured that the outcome of this race is weighed heavily in our favor.

Under unanimous consent, I ask that the entire article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

REACH INTO SPACE

At 6:45 a.m. as usual, 3-year-old Tommy, with whoops and cries of good fellowship, climbed into the bed and began to jump up and down on his father's waking form. "I like to get up early anyway," said Dr. James Alfred Van Allen philosophically, and got up. By 8:30 Dr. Van Allen, a sturdy (5 feet 8 inches, 175 pounds) figure in a sober grey suit, was climbing the steps of the limestone building that houses the physics department of the State University of Iowa in Iowa City. The janitor waved casually, called "Hi, Van." The United State's foremost space scientist waved back and went on to his office and its clutter of models—rockets, satellites, nose cones and other esoteric objects. "I'm here now; you can start paying me," he grinned at his secretary, Agnes Costello, and disappeared into his inner office to prepare for his regular 10:30 lecture.

On his way, he glanced with brief distaste at a specially installed Teletype; at any moment it might clatter out an urgent message—from the Pentagon, summoning him to a conference in Washington; from the National Aeronautics and Space Adminisration, asking his views on the instrumentation of a new moon shoot. But this morning he was not molested; he emerged 2 hours later, notes in hand, and headed for his classroom. For 50 minutes Van Allen lectured to Iowa undergraduates on the theory of transformers, then quipped: "All this is very good in theory, but in practice, you take a piece of iron, wind a wire around it, then plug the wire in. The core gets hot, the wires smoke, and the fuse blows. So you see, there are practical limitations to theory."

TAPES AND PINK SOAP

First chance that offered, Van Allen ducked down to the basement. There, in an area that was originally used for storage, is the most famed space-instrument laboratory in the United States. The walls have turned a dingy yellow; the ceilings and walls are laced with pipes and conduits. In one room were stacks upon stacks of tape recordings of satellite data, neatly sorted according to tracking station—Singapore, Ibadan, Lima, Heidelberg. In another, students pored over the squiggly lines that are man's first clues to the geography of outer space. Other students tested electrical components no bigger than grains of rice, soldering them together with hair-thin wires, and carefully fitting them into assemblies.

In a cluttered room that was once a hallway, Van Allen checked over a tangle of small, glittering electrical parts weighing a pound or so, which might be a transmitter designed to broadcast its voice over thousands of miles of empty space. Near it was what looked like a cylinder of dirty pink soap. It was plastic foam, encasing apparatus that might be destined to orbit the sun until the end of the solar system. Puffing on a battered pipe, Van Allen peered, commented, sketched an idea for a new circuit, then was summoned to take a long-distance call from the Army's rocket lab in Huntsville, Ala. So the day began.

MAJESTIC FEATURE

In the race into space, the Russians can claim bigger satellites and more powerful rockets. If the United States can retort that it has a big lead in scientific achievement, the man most responsible is James Van Allen, whose instruments, designed and largely constructed in his basement laboratory, brought back from space discoveries the Russians never made.

But Van Allen never expected to find himself, at 44, a key figure in the cold war's competition for prestige. He is and always has been, by inclination and intent, a "pure" scientist. His real interest is in cosmic rays. He started being curious about cosmic rays back in the prewar days when they were considered as wildly abstruse and impractical as a study of the mating habits of sea horses or the inner structure of a grasshopper's brain. But today he can tip back his head and look at the sky. Beyond its outermost blue are the world-encompassing belts of fierce radiation that bear his name. No human name has ever been given to a more majectic feature of the planet Earth.

LIFE WITH FATHER

While tops in a science that is thick with foreign accents, Jim Van Allen is about as American as a man can be. Born in 1914 at Mount Pleasant, a county-seat town in southeastern Iowa, he was the second son of a successful lawyer, Alfred Van Allen, whose Dutch ancestors came to the United States soon after the Revolution. His mother was raised on an Iowa farm.

Father Alfred did not believe in play or leisure. He thought that everyone should be

doing something useful every waking hour. Jim was sent to school when he was 4 years old. When not at school, he and his three brothers were set to chopping wood and household chores.

Mealtime conversation was expected to be serious. On winter evenings, Father often read to the family from "The Book of Knowledge." The boys were sometimes allowed to play baseball or football in their own yard, but their father banned their participation in school athletics—"Circus games," snorted Father. After the boys suffered a long series of illnesses, Father took steps. Winter or summer, the windows of the family car were always kept shut to exclude drafts.

Jim was smaller than most boys of his age, and his early sicknesses made him weak and shy. Unable to compete in any physical way, he threw himself into schoolwork with burning enthusiasm, getting top marks in all his subjects. Not eager to let him get too far away, his parents sent him to Iowa Wesleyan, a small college right in Mount Pleasant. There he quickly attracted the attention of Prof. Thomas Poulter, a first-class physicist.

Working eargerly with Professor Poulter, Jim tracked meteors, made a magnetic survey of Mount Pleasant, and measured cosmic rays at ground level. He moved on to the State University of Iowa in nearby Iowa City, to do postgraduate work in nuclear physics. In 1939 he got a job with the Carnegie Institution of Washington.

RADIO FOR CANNON

For a while, he did basic physical research on terrestial magnetism, which influences cosmic rays. But World War II had begun, and weapons came first. Van Allen was put to work on the development of proximity fuses, which called for something almost inconceivable in 1940: a radio transmitter-receiver that could stand being fired out of a cannon in the nose of a shell. At the Johns Hopkins Applied Physics Laboratory in Silver Spring, Md., just outside Washington, Van Allen was a junior scientist in the proximity fuse business, but it made him an expert on how to pack complex circuitry into a small space and make it rugged enough to survive abuse. Working closely with the Navy, Van Allen was commissioned as a lieutenant, junior grade, made two trips to the Pacific to instruct gunnery officers in the use of proximity fuses.

DIRTY LOOKS

Back at Silver Spring he was driving to work one morning when he stopped at a traffic light behind a young woman driver. The light turned green; her car went unexpectedly into reverse. Bumpers met with a small crash. Jim, a noncombative man, pulled around the flustered girl and gave her a slightly disdainful look. A few minutes later, walking into the laboratory, he met the same girl.

"Who do you think you are?" she demanded. "Giving me dirty looks."

Jim blushed and retreated without a word, but he soon found out that her name was Abigail Fithian Halsey II. She worked as a mathematician at the laboratory, lived in Bethesda with four Navy WAVE'S, and would be delighted to go bicycling with him.

"When he came to see me," Abbie Van Allen says now, "he dreaded having to talk to my roommates while he waited for me. He would walk in, look wildly around for a magazine, and bury his face in it just to avoid making small talk. When we finally decided to get married, the girls thought I was crazy. They asked: "How can you marry a guy like that?"

WHITE SANDS

Jim and Abbie were married in the fall of 1945 and settled down in suburban Silver Spring. With war's end, Van Allen had no further interest in fuses or weapons. He wanted to get back to studying cosmic rays. He learned that the U.S. Army had captured nearly 100 German V–2s and was planning to fire them at White Sands Proving Ground, N. Mex., with sand instead of explosives in their warheads. Van Allen, along with several other scientists, was offered the privilege of substituting instruments for the sand.

Until then, cosmic rays had been measured only to 80,000 feet by balloon. The V–2s carried cosmic-ray instruments up 100 miles, measuring cosmic rays and making Van Allen, incidentally, an authority on instrumentation of rockets. They also brought him into close contact with nearly all of the pioneer U.S. rocketmen, especially William Pickering, soon to head the Army's Jet Propulsion Laboratory at Pasadena.

By this time, the sky scientist from Iowa had taken on a deceptive skill in threading his way through Washington's bureaucratic jungles. When the supply of captured V–2s was about to run out, Van Allen proposed and drew specifications for a cheaper rocket—the Aerobee—and headed the committee that talked the Government into getting it produced. Next, he got the Navy to provide him a ship from which he shot Aerobees at cosmic rays from the Magnetic Equator off Peru to the Gulf of Alaska.

PEDIGREED BULL

In 1950 came an event that began small but was to affect the future of Van Allen and all his countrymen. In March, British physicist Sidney Chapman dropped in on Van Allen, remarked that he would like to meet other scientists in the Washington area. Van Allen got on the phone, soon gathered eight or ten top scientists in the living room of his small brick house. "It was what you might call a pedigreed bull session," he says.

The talk turned to geophysics and the two international polar years that had enlisted the world's leading nations to study the Arctice and Antarctic regions in 1882 and 1932. Someone suggested that with the development of new tools such as rockets, radar, and computers, the time was ripe for a worldwide geophysical year. The other men were enthusiastic, and their enthusiasm spread around the world from Washington.

The International Geophysical Year (1957–58) stimulated the U.S. Government to promise earth satellites as geophysical tools. The Soviet Government countered by rushing its sputniks into orbit. The race into space may be said to have started in Van Allen's living room that evening in 1950.

Almost simultaneously, the Applied Physics Laboratory tried to assign Van Allen to something more practical than cosmic rays—such as heading a program to develop a better proximity fuse. Van Allen was not interested. The State University of Iowa offered him a job as head of the physics department. He accepted.

BALLOONS OVER THE STADIUM

Back in Iowa with his wife and two young children, Van Allen was also back on a slim academic budget. With a tiny $4,000 grant from the Research Corp., he set students to launching cheap plastic balloons from the running track in the stadium. After V–2s and Aerobees, it was a sad comedown.

Then he remembered a remark made by Lt. Comdr. Lee Lewis during an Aerobee firing off the coast of Peru. "Wouldn't it be easier," Lewis had asked, "to lift a rocket on a balloon above most of the atmosphere and then fire it?" No one had ever tried it, but after a little figuring, Van Allen decided that the trick should work. He wrangled small, cheap rockets through his friend Pickering at the Jet Propulsion Lab; a balloon-rocket combination to carry an 8-pound payload of instruments 75 miles up was put together for a mere $750.

Van Allen's Rockoons could not be fired in Iowa for fear that the spent rockets would spike an Iowan or his house. Turning his oldtime mesmerism on official Washington, Van Allen found that it still had not lost its effectiveness. The Coast agreed to put him and his Rockoons aboard the icebreaker *Eastwind* bound for Greenland, where cosmic rays are deflected toward the magnetic pole by the earth's magnetic field.

ORANGE-JUICE VICTORY

The first balloon rose properly to 70,000 feet, but the rocket hanging under it did not fire. The second Rockoon behaved in the same maddening way. On the theory that extreme cold at high altitude might have stopped the clockwork supposed to ignite the rockets, Van Allen heated cans of orange juice, snuggled them into the third Rockoon's gondola, and wrapped the whole business in insulation. The rocket fired.

In 1953, Van Allen was temporarily diverted from Rockoons to a project at Princeton University to develop thermonuclear power. But his Iowa graduate students carried on the Rockoon firings off the coast of Newfoundland. One day the students put in an excited call to Van Allen in Princeton. The cosmic rays near Newfoundland, the students reported, seemed to rise to incredibly high intensity above 30 miles.

Obviously, concluded Van Allen, "there was something wild and woolly going on." The aurora borealis is most intense at latitudes north of Newfoundland. It was believed to be caused by charged particles of some sort raining down from space and concentrated around the magnetic North Pole by the earth's magnetic field. Though Van Allen could not guess it then, the cosmic rays detected by his Rockoons were directly related to the northern lights, and were really a fringe of the worldwide radiation belt that he was to discover 5 years later.

SATELLITES NEXT

Rockoons had carried him as high as they could go. Van Allen began to take an interest in satellites. Since his White Sands days, he had kept an eye on U.S. rocketry. His association with the Navy had been long and pleasant, but he became an outspoken advocate of the Army's Jupiter-C, whose high-speed stages had been designed by Pickering's Jet Propulsion Laboratory. "I made rather a pest of myself around Washington about Jupiter," he admits. But the Pentagon shunted Jupiter aside in favor of the Navy's Vanguard.

Despite his candid partisanship, Van Allen's status as the best instrumentator of space was so indisputable by this time that he found himself commissioned to provide Vanguard's instrumentation. He dutifully set to work. But he took the precaution of finding out just what the Army had planned for its banned Explorer I satellite. The Army informed him that it had in mind a cylinder 6 inches in diameter. By no coincidence at all, the instrument package Van Allen produced for the 21-inch Vanguard sphere proved to be cylindrical, and just 5½ inches in diameter.

Actual production was in the hands of husky young (31) George Ludwig, a graduate student who has proved himself a mechanical genius in the painstaking new art of space instrumentation. Each ounce counts, because it costs many thousands of dollars to put each ounce into orbit. The tiny, buglike components must stand enormous "g" forces, vibration and spin, survive violent changes of temperature.

Ludwig sets up a rough, breadboard model of the circuitry with real transistors, resistors, and other components. When the circuits check out, the components are mounted on plastic disks. A typical package may contain several hundred diodes, transistors and resistors. All open space among the spidery components is usually filled with

foamed plastic. Then the whole apparatus is dropped, shaken, bounced, heated, and cooled.

FIRST BEEP

With this work well underway and no satellite launching expected for some time, Van Allen was not a man to sit around idly. He got aboard the Navy icebreaker *Glacier* and headed for Antarctica to measure cosmic rays near the South Magnetic Pole. On October 4, when the *Glacier* was wallowing southward across the Pacific, a report that the Russians had launched a satellite came over the ship's radio. Van Allen went to work on the *Glacier's* 20-mc. receiver, and within half an hour it yielded vigorous beeping sounds. That was Sputnik I. The Russians had won the first heat in the race into space.

The free world was crying for U.S. satellite action. But the Vanguard program still sputtered and faltered. Suddenly, Van Allen got a radio message from Pickering. The Army had at last got permission to try its satellite. He asked if Van Allen would approve transfer of his instruments to Jupiter-C.

Van Allen instantly cabled his approval, wired Ludwig to pack up all his apparatus and rush it to the Jet Propulsion Laboratory at Pasadena. Then he flew back from New Zealand. In Pasadena, he and Pickering decided that the payload—basically a Geiger counter to detect cosmic rays in space and two incredibly light but powerful radio transmitters—would have to be modified in one respect. It contained a miniature tape recorder to record the cosmic-ray data during a trip around the earth and then transmit it quickly when triggered by a coded signal sent up from the ground. Designed for Vanguard, this elegant apparatus would not work in Explorer I, which would spin too fast. So it was removed, requiring Explorer I to broadcast continuously.

MYSTERIOUS SILENCE

On January 31, 1958, a Jupiter-C, fired from Cape Canaveral, put Explorer I into a fine orbit. With two massive sputniks to compete with, the United States pinned its hopes for outdoing the Russians on the superiority of Van Allen's instruments.

Van Allen waited in Iowa City. In a few days, long, wide paper tapes with wiggly red pen lines began to arrive from monitoring stations in the United States. The cosmic-ray count that they showed was not unusual. But after 2 or 3 weeks, tapes begand to dribble in from stations in South America. "As soon as we started looking at them, we saw the most remarkable situation." Over the United States, where the satellite swooped low, the rate was about 40 counts a second. But over the equatorial region, where the satellite was rising to its highest point, the counting rates were much smaller. During some 2-minute stretches there were no counts at all. Says Van Allen: "My first thought was, 'Great guns. Something's gone wrong with the apparatus.' But then we got later North American tapes and everything seemed normal again."

All sorts of suggestions were made to explain the Explorer's peculiar behavior over the equatorial region. Perhaps a weird magnetic field was shunting all cosmic rays away from the equator. Maybe the alternation of sunlight and shade was affecting the Geiger counter. No explanation really worked.

Explorer II splashed into the Atlantic early in March, but Explorer III was launched successfully on March 26. It contained a modified version of Ludwig's tape recorder—an amazing little instrument full of tiny, glittering parts that weighed only 8 ounces. If it worked, it would gush out in 5 seconds all the cosmic-ray data from an entire orbit.

On March 28 Van Allen got the first tape and sat up all night poring over it. The cosmic-ray count seemed reasonable as long as the bird was at low altitude. When it climbed upward, the rate increased rapidly. Then, for some unaccountable reason, the count fell to nothing, stayed at nothing until the bird was back at lower altitude again.

SULKING TUBE

Mystified, Van Allen hurried back to Iowa, where his assistants, Drs. Carl McIlwain and Ernest Ray, were puzzling over a copy of the same tape. The three almost simultaneously hit a solution. The high-flying Geiger tube was being swamped by too heavy a dose of some kind of radiation. This is a weakness of Geiger tubes. If required to count too many times a second, they sulk and do not count at all.

The amazing conclusion: the earth was surrounded by a belt of intense radiation, apparently trapped by earth's magnetic field. It might be deadly enough to interfere seriously with man's attempt to fly out into space.

The announcement caused an embarrassed flurry in high Washington circles. Van Allen learned that, at the suggestion of Physicist Nicholas Christofilos, of Livermore Laboratory, the Department of Defense was planning to launch Project Argus, in which three atom bombs would be rocketed above the atmosphere and exploded (Time, Mar. 30). The high-speed electrons' release were expected to be shunted around the earth by the earth's magnetic field. Van Allen's discovery that nature had already provided such electrons was a considerable shock.

With his fine-honed skill in maneuvering, Van Allen took advantage of Project Argus to advance his own studies. He proposed the launching of a new satellite in a more north-and-south orbit than any of its predecessors. Moving in this way, he explained, it would better observe the results of Project Argus. Incidentally, it would also give him coverage of the natural radiation belt in latitudes that earlier satellites had not reached.

Explorer IV went into a 51° orbit on July 26. It carried sophisticated instruments that Van Allen's laboratory had provided to distinguish between "hard" and "soft" radiation, and shielded Geiger counters designed to count radiation intensity at extremely high levels without blacking out. On August 27 the first Argus shot sent man-made electrons zigzagging around the earth. The satellite cut through them back and forth, making about 250 passes before its batteries were exhausted on September 20.

BEHIND THE NORTHERN LIGHTS

When Van Allen made his first open report on Explorer IV, he had to avoid all mention of Argus because of military security. But he had plenty to tell about the natural radiation. He could say with assurance that a human satellite crew exposed to maximum Van Allen radiation for a few days would surely die. It looked as if the fierce particles, which slam close to the earth in the auroral regions, were the explanation of the ancient mystery of the northern lights.

None of the Russians' three massive sputniks had reported the Van Allen radiation. One theory is that the Russians outsmarted themselves by refusing to tell the outside world how to interpret signals from their satellites. Since only the low parts of the sputnik orbits were over Soviet territory, Russian scientists never got reports from high altitudes. If any of the sputniks carried tape recorders, they apparently did not work.

Another theory is that the sputniks' Geiger tubes were blacked out near apogee by Van Allen radiation, and that the Russian scientists did not know how to interpret this odd behavior. The live dog carried in Sputnik II died in about a week, but the Russians have not told whether it was affected by radiation sickness. Very likely they do not know.

THE SLOT

Van Allen still knew only the lower parts of the overhead radiation. He yearned to go higher still. He began negotiating to get his instruments into the projected moon probes. When in the fall of 1958 Pioneer I rose to 71,000 miles and fell back, Van Allen had his instruments aboard. But for once, they did not work well. Pioneer II flopped, but in December Pioneer III carried his instruments up to 63,000 miles, broadcasting all the way.

From Pioneer III, Van Allen discovered that there are not one but two radiation belts, with a low-intensity slot between them. Studying the tapes, he concluded that the outer belt is made of weaker particles, presumably protons and electrons that come from the sun. At its outer edges, it curves downward in "horns" that hit the atmosphere near the magnetic poles. These horns were what produced the northern lights.

Van Allen's conclusions were confirmed when Pioneer IV soared past the moon and into orbit around the sun. Its tiny, 1-pound radio transmitter, which was followed by Jet Projulsion Laboratory's receiving stations for 400,000 miles, reported that the outer radiation belt does not die off evenly. Beyond it are irregular bursts of radiation that may be clouds of electrons and protons arriving fresh from the sun. Such invisible clouds in space may prove serious hazards for future deep-space voyagers.

Van Allen summed up his conclusions: "Apparently, something happens on the sun. It sends out a burst of gases. The reservoirs above our earth shake like a bowl of jelly. The radiation droozles out at the ends and makes the auroral displays at the North and South Poles."

HOLE IN SPACE

Widely popular in a profession full of jealousies, Van Allen has a cheerful scorn for his new-found importance. Recently, he told a solemn gathering of scientists, he had been asked for a definition of space. "After a vast research program, which depended very heavily upon the use of a number of highspeed computers, I am pleased to offer you the result: 'Space is that in which everything else is.' In other words, 'Space is the hole that we are in.'"

During recurring times of crisis he may reduce his lunch to an apple or skip it altogether, but he still finds time to fly kites with his four children ("a little high-altitude research," he calls it) likes to work in his basement workshop. His most recent achievement: a model covered wagon big enough to hold his 9-year-old daughter and friends. For the brilliant assistants and students who have gathered around him he has full appreciation. "I am a sort of scoutmaster around here," he says mildly.

Among Van Allen's immediate interests is a 20-pound satellite scheduled for launching next fall. If all goes well, it will settle into a slim, elliptical orbit, soaring out 6 earth radii (24,000 miles) at apogee. It should stay up for hundreds of years, and it will have solar batteries to keep its radio voices alive for a long time. Its duty will be to report continuously on the radiation belt, study how it is affected by sunspots and other solar eruptions. Its fluctuations may have important effects on the earth's weather.

NEXT: VENUS

Like most other scientists, Van Allen is in no hurry to put a man into space. "A man is a fabulous nuisance in space right now," he says. "He's not worth all the cost of putting him up there and keeping him comfortable and working. Instruments are lighter, tougher, and less demanding, are senstive to many things that human senses ignore. They

already have memories (tape recorders) and they can carry computers that will permit them to make judgments. An instrument-manned Venus probe should be able to make observations and adjust its course by firing small rockets when it nears its goal. Perhaps it will round Venus and then put itself into a back-to-earth trajectory.

Such a vehicle would have important military connotations. But James Van Allen, a pure scientist turned spaceman, sees such projects in simpler terms. Say he: "The satellite is a natural extension of rockets, which are natural extensions of planes and balloons, which are natural extensions of man's climbing trees and mountains in order to get up higher and thus have a better view."

Liberia Speaks on African Freedom Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following broadcast statement of Dr. William V. S. Tubman, President of Liberia, and the speech of the Honorable J. Rudolph Grimes, Acting Secretary of State, on the first African Freedom Day celebration:

BROADCAST STATEMENT BY PRESIDENT WILLIAM V. S. TUBMAN, OF LIBERIA

Fellow citizens, fellow Africans, 25 years ago there were only two independent countries, run entirely by Africans, on this vast continent of 11,600,000 square miles. Today we heartily rejoice that that number has increased to nine with the happy assurance that still more are coming into independence.

Africa is in the deep agony of travail; for its 220 million indigenous peoples are on the great march toward independence and self-determination. Confident of their native abilities and rich traditions, they are smashing the theory of some early historians that they were created to be the hewers of wood and drawers of water for a more favored race; or the servant of servants to the descendants of Shem and Japheth because they are of the line of Ham, the cursed son of Noah.

The history of this continent contains some dark and dismal chapters. It is basically a history of conquest and exploitation. For centuries its territories were plundered and raided. Its peoples were plucked from their homes, taken in chains to ports of departure, caged like wild animals, carried aboard ships and transported abroad where they were sold as chattels in the slave markets of the world. Meanwhile, here at home, almost our entire continent with its rich, virgin lands and its vast natural resources, was partitioned among the colonizing powers.

Despite these facts, it cannot be denied that Africa is still the home of some of the greatest engineering feats of our time; or that Africa, in all probability, is the cradle of humanity. Its civilization and culture have had an enduring influence on many nations and peoples and its lands are still laden with an astounding portion of the riches of nature. These are some of the powerful factors that have sustained and strengthened us and our brethren in our determined quest for freedom and independence to develop ourselves and our resources for the purpose of contributing substantially toward the peace and prosperity of the world.

To our great delight a new epoch has dawned on this continent. The old concept of divide and rule is rapidly vanishing in the face of the floodtide of nationalism and freedom. New nations are emerging throughout this great and beloved continent. This is indeed gratifying; for we of Liberia are convinced that if world peace and prosperity and brotherhood are to be built upon a solid foundation, Africa cannot continue to remain half slave and half free. Africa must be totally free.

It was because of this firm conviction that Liberia wholeheartedly participated in and fully supported the declaration of the eight independent African states which met in Accra last April to set aside and celebrate April 15 of each year as Africa Freedom Day. In these three words are embodied the history, the aspirations, and the soul of the peoples of this continent. Africa Freedom Day is therefore a glorious day for Africa and Africans everywhere—a day of freedom from the miseries and indignities of the past, a day of blessing for the present, and hope for the future.

Among our people there is concrete evidence of the awareness of our obligations to our fellow Africans who are still laboring under the yoke of social, political, and economic servitude. We are called upon to utilize our finest efforts to relieve them of this unpleasant situation, preferably not by dint of force, but by an insistent and persistent appeal to reason, justice, and decency—an appeal to the god of democracy and human dignity.

Liberia's contributions to the liberation of Africa have been made in numerous forms. Long before the Conference of Independent African States, even in the teeth of bitter opposition by more powerful nations, we upheld the inalienable rights of the peoples of this continent to be free and independent. Even before the present upsurge of African nationalism, Liberia, as a charter member state of the United Nations, supported and in some instances spearheaded every movement to free the whole of Africa from the bond of servitude and the state of dependency.

We have consistently voted for the admission into the United Nations of every independent African state, including Morocco, Tunisia, Libya, The Sudan, Ghana, and Guinea. And we are proud to mention that we have never for one split second regretted our action, because we are now all marking together in one grand phalanx of brotherhood carrying the banner of freedom, justice, and equality to our other African brethren.

On this historic occasion I strongly call upon our sister independent nations of Africa, I call upon those colonial powers still holding possessions on this continent; I call upon those nations and peoples who are ardent advocates and believers in the sacred principles of democracy, freedom, and self-determination to come together around a conference table for the purpose of discussing and ending, once and for all time, the bloodshed, mass destruction, and inhumane practices now being perpetrated in some parts of Africa. I wish to register the following slogan upon the minds of us all: "Let there be no strife between us for we be brethren."

Finally, I revere old mother Africa, long the land of oppression, murder, and enslavement. I salute and glorify her peoples for their undaunted courage, perspicacity, tenacity and endurance; for their onward and courageous march toward freedom and nationhood which is gaining more and more momentum as time marches on. I feel confident that the march of freedom will continue in ever-increasing velocity until, like the other continents and peoples of the earth, we shall enjoy the great blessings of freedom, independence and equality.

SPEECH OF THE HONORABLE J. RUDOLPH GRIMES, ACTING SECRETARY OF STATE, ON THE OCCASION OF THE FIRST AFRICA FREEDOM DAY CELEBRATION

Mr. President, distinguished guests, fellow citizens, fellow Africans, 1 year ago today the Conference of Independent African States was convened in Accra, Ghana. It was the first such conference held in Africa. The occurrence was memorable.

The importance which we, Liberians, and our Government attached to such a significant occasion was evidenced by the fact that the head of state of Liberia was the only head of state among the eight countries which participated to be present at such an auspicious conference.

Many were the subjects of mutual interest which were discussed. One of them was the future of the dependent territories of Africa.

The Conference recognized that the existence of colonialism in any shape or form was a threat to the security and independence of the African States that the problems and future of the dependent territories in Africa are the responsibility of all members of the United Nations and in particular of the Independent African States and the exclusive concern of the Colonial powers and decided, among other things, that the 15th of April every year be celebrated as Africa Freedom Day thereby enabling us to focus the conscience of the world on the plight of our brothers who have not yet been permitted to breathe the air of freedom.

Significantly enough we began the observance of this day with a service of prayer and thanksgiving last Sunday to the God of our fathers, prayer for the condition and the eventual freedom of all Africans, and thanksgiving for Africans who now enjoy the benefits of freedom as well as those who will soon enjoy those benefits. Thus we adhered to the example set for us by our forefathers for, when they declared the independence of Liberia, they made an appeal to the nations of christendom "in the name of the great God, our common creator and our common judge."

Liberia has always maintained that all men have the inherent and natural right to conduct their own affairs. On July 26, 1847, we said in our declaration of independence:

"We recognize in all men certain natural and inalienable rights; among these are life, liberty, and the right to acquire, possess, enjoy, and defend property. By the practice and consent of men in all ages, some system or form of government is proven to be necessary to exercise, enjoy, and secure these rights and every people has a right to institute a government and to choose and adopt that system or form of it, which, in their opinion, will most effectually accomplish these objects, and secure their happiness, which does not interfere with the just rights of others. The right, therefore, to institute government and all the powers necessary to conduct it is an inalienable right, and cannot be resisted without the grossest injustice."

This principle has been a guidepost of Liberian policy until now. On January 7, 1952, it was reaffirmed by President William V. S. Tubman in these words:

"With the firm belief and steadfast faith in the axiom that all men are created free and independent, and therefore entitled to the benefits and privileges of self-determination and the natural right to conduct their own political affairs, we shall seek to cooperate with all democratic and freedom-loving peoples and nations, through the aegis of the United Nations Organization, to adopt and speedily prosecute such adequate and

effective measures whereby the teeming millions of mankind, inhabiting most of the underdeveloped areas of the world may be able to do so in common with us in the shortest possible period of time."

Liberia's position in Africa is unique and peculiar. For over a hundred years it was the only Republic in Africa. It is the only country in Africa that has not had the experience of tutelage. We have preferred the difficult but honorable path of freedom and independence to the advantages of enforced tutelage.

A century ago our forefathers kindled a flame of freedom. Since then we have tried to keep it burning. It is with a great deal of pride and humility that we have watched this flame spread and we feel certain that it cannot now, nor ever will be extinguished on this continent.

During that century we passed through the predatory expansionist period of colonialism inexperienced in Government when we started, lacking the capital necessary to develop our country, unable to provide for all our necessities, we nevertheless stood boldly, preserved courageously and overcame the malicious propaganda and other indignities to which we have been subjected mainly because our very existence was interpreted as a threat to the continued colonial domination of our brethren.

We were deprived of our territories and our race was stigmatized as being incapable of self-government. All over the continent European Powers were seizing various portions of territory and it appeared as if there would not remain a foot of land in Africa that Africans could call their own.

There was then no tribunal nor forum to which we could appeal for redress of our grievances or for the justice of our cause. As a matter of fact when we did make an appeal to the civilized nations of the world on the basis of international justice and morality our appeal fell on deaf ears.

In spite of all these difficulties Liberia dauntlessly maintained her flame of freedom in Africa. The success of our efforts—call it a wonder if you wish—is a great credit to our race and an irrefutable attestation of the fact that the African is capable of governing himself.

Today Africa stands on the verge of a new day. Africa is in labor and free nations are being born.

Liberia, which for more than a century stood alone, which for a long period has borne the brunt of the malicious and slanderous propaganda in the attempt for others to justify the subjugation and domination of our brethren and which has been the popular object of ridicule and villification, is happy that she no longer stands alone. Liberia is pleased that she has kept faith by maintaining and upholding the torch of freedom. She is certain that the new nations of Africa have been given birth in a new age where they can tackle their immediate problems, and declares that she bears no rancor to her former detractors.

Liberia has always been interested in the welfare and well-being of other countries in Africa. Our record speaks for itself. But we have also advocated reasonableness and tolerance to achieve the total liberation of this continent.

This approach, which has sometimes been misunderstood and misinterpreted, is probably due to the fact that during the period of our development, our continued existence has depended not on the strength or potential of our armed might, but on our reliance on divine providence, the justice of our cause and the ingenuity and tact which we used to avoid the pitfalls and traps which were set to carry us into servitude.

The diplomacy of might makes right has not yet become a concept of the past, although we wish that this was so.

In this new day our success in Africa lies in the justice and reasonableness of our cause, in mutual trust and confidence, in mutual respect for each other, in tolerance, in close cooperation with each other and with the most developed peoples and nations in order that our human and natural resources might be developed not only to our own advantage but also to the advantage of the rest of the world.

It is because of our desire to pursue these objectives in an atmosphere of equality that on January 26, 1959, the President announced his views on the manner in which unity in Africa can be created—the Associated States of Africa.

That policy statement indicated a positive approach to the problem of African unity and does not show, as some critics have alleged, that Liberia is dragging its feet on African problems.

Moreover, it is not negative and does not mean that Liberia is opposed to federation. What Liberia says is let us get together and cooperate immediately in those fields where cooperation can be assured now and after this has been accomplished it will be possible to determine whether any other form of union is easily attainable or absolutely necessary.

In addition, we have indicated that we welcome other views on this all important subject and then we will be prepared to discuss all views on African unity and join in developing that in which there is the greater measure of agreement.

But let us turn for a moment to freedom. What is it? It has been defined as absence of restraint and intent to control the means of individual or group advancement. Used in a private context it means an individual right to go to bed when you wish, to get up when you like, to eat and drink and read what you choose, to say across your port or your tea whatever occurs to you at the moment, and to earn your living as best you may. Used in its political context it means liberty—the right of a group of individuals to choose that form of government which they desire, to be free from political servitude or domination by alien groups.

That is the freedom which led Patrick Henry on March 28, 1775, to say before the Virginia Convention of Delegates, "Is life so dear, or peace so sweet as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God. I know not what course others may take; but as for me, give me liberty or give me death."

That is the spirit which has now gripped the Africans and nothing can stop all Africa from becoming free.

The restraint which has been placed on the African in his own home has been unjust. We have been told that this was for the purpose of training the African. All of the schools we have attended have prescribed courses of study which permit entrants to graduate and to go out on their own. But the period of political tutelage has seemed to be endless.

The restraint which was placed on the African has led to the strange form of racism—a racism which cuts deeply into human relations and creates prejudices that make political outlaws of minorities. This is bad enough. But as developed in Africa, it has become even more invidious and iniquitous for the racism in Africa has tended to make political outlaws of the African majorities.

Are Africans in their own homes to be denied the right and privilege of using their own land or of doing the things that they wish, or of having the governments they desire to choose?

It will not be possible for Africans to establish an African state in Europe, America, or Asia, nor will it be possible for Europeans, Americans, or Asians to establish European, American, or Asian states in Africa. This we should bear in mind. Cooperation between all of us is desirable and necessary, but domination by alien minorities in Africa cannot be expected to continue unchallenged.

On the subject of the interdependence of nations, President Tubman, in his acceptance speech before the True Whig Party Convention in Monrovia on January 23, 1959, said the following:

"We need to think and act with calm and poise; not in excitement, anger, hatred, and revenge because Africa and Africans need the friendship, good will, assistance, and help of the peoples of America, Europe, Asia, and of all the isles of the seas. If we are observant we would note from the attitude of the peoples of the other continents that they seem to be seeking our friendship not because they need it any more than we do theirs but because they realize the interdependence of all nations, races, and peoples."

On a day such as this the first celebration of Africa Freedom Day in the history of the world we should seize the occasion to reflect on the blessings and benefits of freedom, resolve to see that they are extended to all Africa as quickly as possible, and pledge ourselves to mutual cooperation with all African states and all states of the world for the promotion of peace and prosperity and better understanding.

Let us, therefore, look to the future of Africa in total freedom with faith, with hope, and with courage. Let us work together to solve the problems which beset us. Let us assume the reponsibilities which are ours. Let us rededicate ourselves to the great and just cause of freedom in Africa.

Tax Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HASTINGS KEITH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, through the efforts of the Greater New Bedford Junior Chamber of Commerce, more than 12,000 persons residing in the Ninth Massachusetts District have spoken with singleness of voice and purpose in an urgent appeal to the Congress to effect a program of tax reform that would stimulate and stabilize the economy of the Nation.

The petition signed by these 12,000 citizens, and the public spirit this monumental task represents, are most laudable, and deserve immediate attention and action. I resolutely endorse the objectives set forth in this petition, and call upon my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to dedicate or rededicate themselves to these objectives.

In order that the Jaycees' case be accurately stated and clearly understood, may I quote the text of this petition:

We, the undersigned, citizens • • • of Massachusetts do hereby petition and recommend to the Congress of the United States and to other appropriate legislative bodies that they recognize the necessity for reducing or removing present obstacles to the expansion and growth of the economy so that new businesses and more jobs will be created which will result in an even higher standard of living and ever greater national abundance. To this end, the burden of Government expenditures should be reduced to the lowest practicable level and a program of tax reform should be instituted which would

result, over a reasonable period of time and on an orderly basis, in a tax rate structure—particularly in regard to the Federal income tax—which would be moderate at all levels and permit the maximum development of the Nation's economic potential.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize that the United States is carrying heavy and necessary commitments in this crucial cold war period, and that we are deep in national debt. It is vitally essential that we continue to meet these obligations and take a more responsible approach to reducing and finally eliminating our national debt.

Nevertheless, there is soundness in the junior chamber of commerce point of view that tax reduction would spur the economy. I salute the Jaycees with the assurance of my continuing support of every reduction and reform in our tax structure that will not impair the economic health of the country. And I would like to single out for special commendation Mr. Charles E. Sharek, a member of the New Bedford Junior Chamber of Commerce, for having been selected Massachusetts' representative to the Jaycees' recent Washington conference on tax reduction. With 12,031 names on the above-quoted petition against wasteful Federal spending, collected in greater New Bedford, Mr. Sharek, chairman of the drive in that area, obtained more signatures than anyone else in the country.

As a prize he won a 3-day expense-paid trip to Washington. If we here heed the Jaycees' message, everybody will be a winner.

Mr. Speaker, this determination of my constituents to move into the arena on the side of a sound fiscal policy against irresponsible and unjustifiable waste in Federal spending is not confined to only one area. At the extreme other end of my district some 240 members of the Women's Republican Club of Norwell, Mass., which this year is celebrating its 35th anniversary, have signed a letter calling on me and other members of the legislative and executive branches of our Government to work with President Eisenhower toward achieving a balanced budget.

These appeals are not idle and meaningless gestures. They are not mere formalities. The citizens, whose chief means of being heard is through their duly elected representatives, are aroused over the trend toward further spending beyond our means. They are, as they have every right to be, insistent that we in Congress run the business of this country on a sound, businesslike basis. We are obligated not to do less.

The Fair Trade Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial appearing in the Columbia (Mo.) Tribune of March 31, 1959. That editorial, like all other editorial comment in the United States, describes fair trade as price-fixing legislation.

It sets forth that if this legislation is enacted the cost of living for the American people will rise as a result.

H.R. 1253 and other similar measures are not in the public interest.

If any of these measures become law citizens of the State of Missouri who have at all times refused through their State legislatures to enact such price gouging legislation will find that they will have to submit to a Federal law raising prices and fixing prices within the borders of their State, regardless of their wishes, and often in defiance of the wishes of the people of that State.

THE FAIR TRADE BILL

Missourians, especially, should welcome the stands which two Federal agencies, the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission, have taken against the proposed so-called Federal fair trade law. A fair trade law, of course, is a statute which permits the manufacturer to fix the retail price at which his product may be sold and makes it a crime for any merchant to sell that product for less than the manufacturer specifies. Many States, but not Missouri, have enacted such statutes, but in at least 16 States the courts have held them unconstitutional, and the whole effort seemed for a while to have collapsed under its own weight. Many big manufacturers, who for years fought valiantly to keep consumer prices high, abandoned the cause, and free competition was restored. Then the drug store organizations and other lobby groups turned to the Congress with the idea of obtaining national legislation upon the subject. That would impose the price regulation not only on the States which have enacted it, but also upon such States as Missouri, which have clung to the free enterprise-free competition doctrine.

Amazingly there seems to be a chance that the legislation, which would stifle competition and assure high prices for the consumer to pay, may pass. It is said to have a good chance at least in the House of Representatives. It seems to be another illustration of the old adage that there are lobbies for everybody but the people, and it would seem to be a good time for Missouri residents who would like to continue doing their buying at competitive prices to tell their Representatives and Senators in Congress how they feel.

The Department of Justice has told the Congress that there is a serious question that such a law would be held constitutional, and it has pointed out the tremendous difficulties of enforcement and the further incursion of government into the control of private business. The Federal Trade Commission calls the proposal inconsistent with the free enterprise system. It would also be another step for the Federal Government into a field traditionally under State jurisdiction. Like the sales tax, the price increases which it would foster would hit the low income groups hardest. Robert A. Bicks, first assistant in the Justice Department's antitrust division, told the House Commerce committee that the proposed legislation would mean a large portion of the country's commerce would be devoid of price competition, "and price competition is the core of that competition essential to a free enterprise economy."

Proponents of the fair trade legislation have insisted that prices are not lower in free trade areas than they are in fair trade areas, but the Justice Department has conducted a survey which punctures that bit of fiddle-faddle. It studied the prices of 119 items which were available in 8 cities not covered by fair trade laws, and found that 77 of the 119, on the average, sold for prices below those imposed in fair trade cities. On those items, the survey said, consumers could effect savings of 27 percent below fair trade values. Kansas City, for instance, had 73 items available at 31 percent below fair trade prices and Dallas had 99 items at savings of 24 percent. When we liken fair trade to the sales tax, the rates of the levy seem pretty high.

The fair trade bill, incidentally, is sponsored by Representative HARRIS of Arkansas. He is the same Representative who is working so tirelessly to keep pay television from getting a trial.

Amending Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act

SPEECH
OF
HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 29, 1959

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5610) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, so as to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes.

Mr. MACDONALD. Actually, Mr. Chairman, I asked for this time to direct a question to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], who spoke of there being no politics in this matter. I see the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS], who represents the Republican policy committee, at this moment leaving. May I direct a question to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS]? Does the gentleman support the position of his leader who states that there is no politics involved in Republican support of this bill?

Mr. ARENDS. Will the gentleman repeat his question?

Mr. MACDONALD. I shall be happy to. I ask if you support the gentleman from Indiana in his statement which he made here in the well of the House that there is no political implication, there are no political overtones, to either the defeat or passage of this bill?

Mr. ARENDS. I did not hear the gentleman from Indiana make the statement, but I would support him in that statement if he made it.

Mr. MACDONALD. Then may I ask you this question: Has the Republican policy committee put out any order about support or passage of this bill?

Mr. ARENDS. No; unfortunately, we cannot order our people around.

Mr. MACDONALD. May I rephrase that and ask if you put out a "quote—confidential—unquote" report which purportedly puts forward the position of the policy committee made on April 22, 1959?

Mr. ARENDS. I do not know if that was put out or not. I did not get one if it was, but if it was an official report, then that is that.

Mr. MACDONALD. Will the gentleman inquire of Mr. HALLECK——

Mr. ARENDS. As I said a moment ago, I will ask him when he comes back.

Mr. MACDONALD. This information is in what purports to be a confidential report dated April 22, 1959.

Mr. ARENDS. Where did the gentleman get it?

Mr. MACDONALD. That I will be happy to tell you. Labeled "Confidential report," dated April 23, 1959, it says:

Policy committee meeting, April 22, 1959.
(1) Report on White House leadership meeting of April 22, 1959:
(2) Railroad retirement and unemployment insurance, H.R. 5610.
Action taken by policy committee:
(1) Railroad retirement and unemployment insurance: Favors H.R. 5610 as reported by committee.

I see the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] is on his feet, and as his name appears on the heading of this document along with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], he probably can furnish me the information.

Mr. ARENDS. We will let the gentleman from Wisconsin answer it, then. Will you tell me just where you got the letter?

Mr. MACDONALD. I will be happy to tell you. Obviously it came from a member of the Republican Party to whom it was sent, and incidentally not a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

James McConville, Essay Winner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT E. COOK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call the attention of the House to an essay written by one of my young constituents, Mr. James McConville, an 11th grade student at the Ravenna High School. Mr. McConville was a winner of this year's essay contest sponsored by the American Legion.

It is edifying to know that young people realize the responsibilities of citizens to our country. The subject of the winning essay written by James McConville is: "Our Liberties Versus Responsibilities in a Free Society", and the content of the essay is as follows:

OUR LIBERTIES VERSUS RESPONSIBILITIES IN A FREE SOCIETY

(By James McConville, Ravenna, Ohio, grade 10)

A free society is one which is created not only for the benefit and well-being of its members, but also for the purpose of bettering all mankind. The foundation of such a society is based on the principles of liberty and responsibility, without which there can can be no free society.

In order for the society to thrive, all its members must make a supreme effort toward the ultimate goal and perfection of the society, by accepting and performing certain responsibilities. As long as man accepts these responsibilities and performs them to the best of his ability, greater is the assurance that he and his descendants will enjoy the freedoms created by the free society.

There have been many free societies in world history, some better than others, but there is no doubt that the United States is the most perfect free society in the world today. This is proven by the fact that we have more liberties than any other civilized people. As a result of having so many liberties, as granted by our early freedom documents, we also have more responsibilities, for the more liberties man has, the more he must work to safeguard them.

Unfortunately, we citizens do not always carry our share of duties. In order for our Nation to continue to be the great Nation she is today, each one of us must perform his duties in his own particular way, i.e. according to the part he plays as a member of the society.

The first and most important duty which looms before us is to our own free society, the United States of America. This does not only mean to our National Government, but to our State and municipal governments as well. We do this by obeying the laws set down by the men whom we choose by our freedom to vote. This, in itself, is good, but it is not enough. Not only must we obey laws, but we must also go beyond this and do things which help our government. Voting is one of these things which all of us, if we are good citizens, will do. We should participate in communal affairs as much as we can, expressing our opinion and making suggestions for the betterment of society.

Another duty which goes hand and hand with our duty to our Government is the duty we have to promote world peace and the organization of other free societies as best we can. The very existence of our Nation depends upon our relation with the rest of the world. By promoting peace we also insure our greatest liberty: freedom from oppression, for this will prevent totalitarianism with its corruption and oppressions from spreading throughout the world.

The third responsibility we have is our duty to God and to man. This Nation was created with the principle that all men are created equal, and are given certain rights which came to man from God himself. Each citizen must always think of each man as being created equal, whether he be rich or poor, black or white. Such mutual respect among all citizens will keep this Nation closely knitted together and intact for as long as it exists.

All citizens should make use of their freedom of religion, to worship a Supreme Being when and where they choose. A Supreme Being created this society, and this same Supreme Being can destroy this society. We therefore should acknowledge His power by giving Him worship and respect, for He is our strongest ally in our continuous struggle over tyranny and atheistic totalitarianism.

Federal School Support Act of 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, during the discussion of the Federal School Support Act of 1959, many of its opponents have argued that Federal aid is not really desired by those responsible for education at the local level. We have heard testimony from many State and local officials disputing this contention. Recently I received a letter from a school superintendent expressing hearty approval by the board of trustees of his district of the provisions of S. 2.

I feel that this letter is indicative of the attitude many local school officials have regarding the need and feasibility of Federal aid as a means of improving current problems of school finance. I ask unanimous consent to have this letter printed in the Appendix of the RECORD as an example of this attitude.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

HILMAR UNIFIED SCHOOLS,
Hilmar, Calif., April 6, 1959.

Senator JAMES E. MURRAY,
Senate Headquarters,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: The board of trustees of the Hilmer Unified School District have gone through your School Support Act of 1959 bill. They are heartily in favor of the passage of this bill and we have so notified Senator ENGLE, who is cosponsor of the bill, Senator KUCHEL, and Representative SISK.

We are very hopeful that a bill of this kind will receive passage because we feel that it is quite possibly the answer to many of our problems. We certainly appreciate the fact that you as a Senator have seen fit to place this bill before the Congress of the United States for consideration. We hope that you will continue to do all in your power for passage of this bill.

We would like to know what we might be able to do that would help to insure the passage of the bill.

Sincerely,

EUGENE R. MCSWEENEY,
Superintendent, Hilmar Unified Schools.

Poison in Your Water—No. 69

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Wichita (Kans.) Eagle of September 4, 1957, entitled "Lack of Adequate Sewage Plant Endangers Health of Wichitans and Nearby Communities:

LACK OF ADEQUATE SEWAGE PLANT ENDANGERS HEALTH OF WICHITANS AND NEARBY COMMUNITIES

Why does Wichita need a secondary sewage treatment plant?

Wichita's citizens will vote September 10 on a proposal to issue $6,660,000 in bonds to build a plant at Grove and 57th Streets South to provide secondary treatment of sewage from Wichita's sewer system—which now receives only primary treatment.

The immediate reasons for this action are:

The State board of health has embarked on a "clean streams for Kansas" policy and has determined that pollution of the Big

Arkansas River by treated sewage from the Wichita plant is in excess of what it should be by recognized health standards.

The board has now ordered Wichita to do something about it. This order of April 19, 1957, blocks the city from building any more main sewers and will levy a fine of $50 a day (or more) if something isn't done by next April 19.

This latter action came after the voters of Wichita on April 2 turned down a proposal to build a secondary sewage plant.

The city commission, after a thorough investigation and study during which some doubting members became convinced of the necessity for action, has unanimously placed the issue again on the ballot.

But aside from these legal and governmental aspects, there are three major reasons why responsible city officials and civic leaders affirm that the sewage treatment plant bonds must be aproved by the electorate:

1. To provide more usable water for cities, industries, and agriculture in the Big Arkansas River Basin.

2. To safeguard the health of cities downstream from Wichita.

3. To safeguard the health of the citizens of Wichita itself and of its surrounding metropolitan area.

No one who has lived in this part of Kansas has to be told that the problem of obtaining sufficient water here is a continuing one.

Water can't be created in the sense that electricity can. You can't just build another plant to forestall a regional water shortage.

But even with water in short supply as it is, literally millions of gallons of water in this watershed are unusable because of pollution. Part of this is natural pollution, where water runs through salty soil.

Much of it, however, is industrial and municipal pollution.

Yet this problem could become a major asset if it were solved. Depollution of the running rivers and creeks in this river basin could add millions of gallons to the available water supply.

Wichita is only one of a number of polluters along the Big and Little Arkansas Rivers. But Wichita is by far the biggest.

And the other polluters—such as Hutchinson and its salt plants on the Big Arkansas and McPherson and its refinery outlets on the Little River—can see no reason why they should go to the expense of cleaning up when Wichita won't.

Until Wichita stops polluting the river for its downstream neighbors, our upstream neighbors are not likely to act.

Water department officials say that if upstream pollution could be curbed it would make more water available to us and cut the cost of treating water before piping it into city water mains.

In short, this region has little enough water without wasting any of it in any way. If Wichita builds a secondary sewage plant to stop its share of the polluting, then the State board of health will be able to gain compliance from other polluters.

And millions of gallons of water will be added to the usable supply.

Wichita's untreated wastes damage the water supply and endanger the health of our neighbor towns downstream.

Oaklawn, Jayhawk Improvement District, Derby, Mulvane, Arkansas City, Oxford, all are affected by our negligence.

(Wichita currently is defending a $389,000 suit in Federal court brought by residents of Oaklawn who say their homes have been damaged by hydrogen sulfide fumes from sewage put into the river by Wichita.)

Not all of this is from the pollution of the river itself, as this tends to diminish considerably the farther the polluted water has flowed. But, as is well known, the Arkansas River Valley is like a big sponge with far more water flowing through underground sands and rock strata than ever appears in the surface stream.

Many of our neighbors tap this underground flow with wells, leaving themselves open to the possibility of withdrawing polluted water from the underground water table.

As a good neighbor and as a natural leader of this trade region, Wichita cannot afford to continue such a practice.

U.S. Surplus Said To Aid the Soviet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOS. E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, for many years I have expressed my concern toward the trend to displace free markets within international commodity agreements and similar devices. I was particularly disturbed by Russian dumping of aluminum and tin which have distorted the world price structure.

Recently Mr. Charles B. Shuman, a longtime friend of the American farmer and president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, presented evidence that the Soviet Union was using wheat, some of which originated on U.S. farms, to continue its destructive economic warfare.

I think these charges are important.

The recent use of agricultural commodities to distort world markets and price levels parallels the procedures that Russia followed in depressing world markets for aluminum and tin.

I believe Mr. Shuman's comments, which appeared in a dispatch to the New York Times from Chicago on March 28, 1959, by Austin C. Wehrwein are of sufficient interest to all of my colleagues, that I ask unanimous consent that this article may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SURPLUS SAID TO AID THE SOVIET—FARM BUREAU CHIEF SAYS RUSSIANS ARE USING IT IN DRIVE TO WIN MARKETS

(By Austin C. Wehrwein)

CHICAGO, MARCH 28.—The president of the American Farm Bureau Federation said this week that he had evidence that the Soviet Union was using cut-price wheat—including some that had originated on U.S. farms—as an economic warfare weapon.

The president, Charles B. Shuman, expressed the fear that the Soviet Union would replace the United States in the western European market. He added that the Russians were using soybeans and cotton for the same purpose, but to a lesser extent.

[In Washington, Department of Agriculture officials said that they had heard similar reports since the surplus disposal law took effect in 1954, but they said that they had been unable to pin down any specific cases of shipments of surplus U.S. commodities having crossed back and forth through the Iron Curtain.]

Mr. Shuman, in an interview in the headquarters of the farm bureau here, said the information had come to him from the farm bureau's new office in Rotterdam.

TO PROMOTE TRADE

The Rotterdam office is designed primarily to promote international trade in American farm products.

Mr. Shuman said that there was the danger of a "flood of Ukrainian wheat into European markets." He also said that already much of the European bakery industry had converted to the flour made from the wheat mixture typical of Soviet exports.

Mr. Shuman also said that there was evidence that American wheat was being used in the mixture.

"I am confident," he said, "that some of the discount sales abroad are coming back to haunt us."

He was referring to wheat sold under the surplus disposal law. Such wheat is drawn from surplus stocks held by the Commodity Credit Corporation. It is sold at bargain prices for local currencies. Under agreements the wheat is not to be resold to the Soviet Union or its satellites.

Mr. Shuman said it was difficult to pinpoint the transactions because wheat arrives as a bulk cargo and becomes impossible to trace after it passes through the hands of the first consignee.

He said that after the Russians had imported wheat they sold it not only below the world market price but also below the Commodity Credit Corporation's offering price.

The Russians, according to Mr. Shuman's account, import with one hand and export with the other for involved economic motives.

"Russia had a good wheat crop, but not a surplus except as they 'short' their own people or bring in wheat from other sources," he said.

[In Washington, however, information available at the Department of Agriculture, suggested that the U.S.S.R. did have a cushion for export. It also showed that Soviet wheat exports have been growing in recent years, both to Western Europe and to other countries.]

Mr. Shuman, in expressing faith in the reports he had received, said that surplus butter sold 3 or 4 years ago to Dutch traders in pails had been put up in packages and had eventually found its way into Communist front countries.

Many of the deals involving wheat were "tie-in" sales, involving elaborate barter arrangements or multilateral arrangements calling for shipments of various goods to third or fourth countries, Mr. Shuman said.

Mr. Shuman is pessimistic about the changes for stopping the reshipments of surplus wheat because its internatoinal trade is largely in Government hands. But he has high hopes for the new Farm Bureau office in Rotterdam. It is under the direction of George J. Dietz, a former Government official with long experience overseas.

The Rotterdam office was set up to capitalize on the European common market and the opening of the St. Lawrence seaway. It does not sell or buy, but "bird dogs" opportunities, he explained.

It will also enable the Farm Bureau to keep in touch with European farm organizations filling a gap left when the Farm Bureau this week pulled out of the International Federation of Agricultural Producers.

Fidel Castro's Contrasting Statements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I

include the following excerpts from the current issue of Newsweek magazine which places in sharp perspective the contrast between what Fidel Castro tells the Cuban people and the statements he made on his recent goodwill tour of this country:

WHAT CASTRO TOLD AMERICANS

In the United States, Fidel Castro is anti-neutralist. He is flatly against communism; he is warmly pro-American. In the United States, Castro says this:

On neutralism: Cuba regards herself as a member of the community of nations of the Western Hemisphere; Cuba is "pledged to honor" her international agreements. "There is no neutrality in Cuba."

On communism: "I know that you are worried about whether we are Communist, and I have said very clearly that we are not Communist. We are against all kinds of dictators, whether of a man, or a country, or a class, or an oligarchy, or by the military. That is why we are against communism. I do not agree with it."

On the United States: "I think the citizens of the United States are very nice and noble people. I see in Cuba, I see here, your boys and girls, newspaper reporters, doctors, everybody—really nice people. Why am I going to hate the people of the United States? I don't hate anybody, including even my enemies. * * * I don't hate anybody. * * * I believe that here in the United States the people, everybody, the Government, are going to understand us better. It is good not only for Cuba, it is good for the United States."

WHAT CASTRO TELLS THE CUBANS

In Cuba, Fidel Castro is a neutralist. He also is consistently anti-American, and—at the very least—tolerant of communism. In Cuba, Castro says this:

On neutralism: "Why should Latin America be with either side [in the cold war between the free world and the Communists]? * * * They [the Americans] have shelters against atomic attack; we do not even have a miserable hole in which to hide. Why not say these truths? Why not say that Cuba has participated in all the wars and when the wars were over, its [United States] sugar quota was taken away?" [1]

On communism: "Why should we persecute the Communists?"

On the United States: "Why did not the United States [during the Batista regime] raise its voice against the murdering of thousands of Cuban youths, the raping of Cuban women, and the robbing of millions of dollars from the Cuban treasury?" When David Salvador, secretary-general of the Confederation of Cuban Workers, asserted vehemently that "we cannot be with the Americans who today are oppressing us," Castro publicly supported him.

[1] In actual fact, Cuba contributed no troops in either World War; it made vast profits by the sale of sugar, and after the Second World War received a slightly higher quota.

The Greatest Invention of Them All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOS. E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, my service on the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee has reemphasized the importance of technology and research for our national survival. Fortunately, science not only provides the basis for our security, but it also underlies America's high living standards.

On April 15, Mr. Henry B. Du Pont, vice president of E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., delivered the annual Edward G. Budd lecture before the Franklin Institute in Philadelphia, Pa. He showed that:

When the history of our era is written, the birth and development of the modern corporation must be recorded as a vital factor in our technological progress. Indeed, the corporation may well prove to be the greatest invention of them all.

* * * * *

The industrial corporation, as we know it today, is a creature of technology just as certainly as the flying machine or the cotton gin, and it has proved the most effective device for extending technology which man has ever known. Its contributions have been unique.

* * * * *

Large corporations consolidate information from many disciplines of science and engineering and bring to scientific development a breadth of vision extending far beyond any one man's capacities. The individual scientist is stimulated and encouraged. His discoveries no longer are left to languish on the laboratory shelf while their creator goes out to search for a sponsor.

* * * * *

Development of the industrial organization as we now recognize it came too late to aid the earlier inventors. * * * In this century, it has changed the world. It has provided a focal point for the development of technology, taking it out of the sideline class and making it a full-time profession.

* * * * *

The size of the institutions furthering technology has become an important element in our progress. With its engineering and production resources, the large, modern industrial organization can direct * * * projects no individual technologists could undertake. It is possible to produce penicillin in a one-man laboratory in quantities sufficient to save a few lives. Produced in major pharmaceutical plants, penicillin has saved the lives of millions.

* * * * *

Technology, as I see it, is the sum total of man's work in developing the tools and techniques which lend leverage to human effort.

Benjamin Franklin, who played such an important role in our early history, was also a distinguished scientist and inventor. Mr. du Pont's statement contains so much wisdom for all of us in meeting the challenge of these perilous times, that I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GREATEST INVENTION OF THEM ALL

(A speech by Henry B. du Pont)

There is, I suppose, no more appropriate place than the Franklin Institute for a discussion of technology. The Philadelphia story is rich in technological history, for much of it was enacted—at least in its early stages—within a relatively short distance of this room.

I am thinking not only of Dr. Franklin's work. His contributions would be remarkable anywhere, any time. I am thinking, as well, of the astonishing number of other scientists and inventors who worked in or near Philadelphia in the early days of the country.

There was the naturalist John Bartram and, a little later, John Audubon, whose interest in ornithology began while he was living in Mill Grove, near Mount Carmel. There was Benjamin Rush, the physician. There was David Rittenhouse with his planetarium, and Owen Biddle with his telescope at Cape Henlopen. There was John Fitch, a transplanted Connecticut Yankee, puffing along the Schuylkill and the Delaware in a fire-breathing contraption called a steamboat. A few miles downstream, on Brandywine Creek, there was Oliver Evans who built a flour mill which operated almost without human attention. Among his neighbors was E. I. du Pont, recently arrived from France, who went into the powder business at the urging of Jefferson and made important contributions to the manufacture of explosives then badly needed to clear the forest lands, build the roads and defend the Nation.

HOME OF INVENTIVENESS

There was Thomas Paine, remembered as the pamphleteer of the Revolution, but due equal honors for his engineering contributions. One of Paine's more imaginative schemes was an engine driven by a continuous series of tiny gunpowder explosions, actually a sort of internal combustion engine. Unfortunately, the internal explosion engine did not work out. I say unfortunately because the Du Pont Co. was mighty close to bankruptcy for many of its early years, and a large-scale development in this field would have created a welcome new market. However, let us not criticize Citizen Paine for his mistakes. He also developed the iron bridge and had some worthy thoughts about planing machines, cranes, and carriage-wheel construction.

The list of Philadelphia contributors could be extended indefinitely, for in the 18th and 19th centuries this small sector of the American geography was the home of dozens who were instrumental to the progress of technology.

It could be argued that technology is not the word to use for the scientific contributions of a Franklin or a Bartram, so let me define my terms. Technology is much more than engineering. It is much more than invention, much more than the nuts and bolts, as is sometimes said. Technology, as I see it, is the sum total of man's work in developing the tools and techniques which lend leverage to human effort. Whether a man be a research scientist, or engineer, or an inspired tinkerer, as some were called, he contributes to and is an integral part of the technology which has shaped this Nation.

THIS WAS A HAVE-NOT NATION

America in 1800, despite its vast potential wealth, was one of the poorest of the have-not nations, although few nations of that day were well off. The natural resources which we know today were undeveloped and many of them were unsuspected. In 1800, standards of living, even for the well-to-do, were crude, and for the mass of the population, they approached the hand-to-mouth level. Farming occupied the attention of more than 90 percent of the population, and the primitive equipment used would have been recognized by any farmer from the time of Julius Caesar. Manufacture had hardly reached a level where it deserved the title "industry." In 1814, in a report prepared for the U.S. Senate, a Philadelphian named Tench Coxe estimated that the output of manufacturing in the United States came to a value of something less than $175 million a year. That meant an average of $35 worth of manufactured goods for each man, woman, and child in the population, hardly an impressive amount.

The real poverty of the Nation, however, lay in the inadequacy of its human resources

to met growing needs. Tench Coxe was among those who saw that technology held bold possibilities of enriching the Nation, and he pleaded for the development of labor-saving machines to lift human burdens and increase output. Men simply could not be spared from the fields. Manpower was so scarce that in a textile mill, for example, Mr. Coxe said that not more than one employee in eight could be an adult male; the rest of the work had to be done by women and children. Before we send Mr. Coxe to the pillory for suggestions which would shock us today, let me add that no less noble a man than Jefferson shared these views. Coxe was simply stating facts. Men were needed to raise food and could not be spared for manufacture.

In such a restricted economy there was obviously little money and little time to expend in research and development. The men whose enthusiasm carried them into science or engineering did so, for the most part, on their own initiative, just as we today might take music lessons or write poetry. But, for the necessities of life, they had to turn to other fields. Some of the most significant work done in America came about as a result of the two-job practice we would now describe as moonlighting.

PART-TIME JOB

Samuel Morse, for example, was a portrait painter by day and a scientist by night. John Fitch sold maps as he traveled the eastern seaboard looking for someone, anyone, to invest in his fire-breathing boat. Eli Whitney earned his living as a school master before he earned a nickel from his inventions.

Joseph Henry, another part-time scientist, deplored the fact that his experiments had to be confined to the summer months when the school in which he taught was closed.

Oliver Evans got along by operating a store and an iron foundry, and Paine, who first had plied his trade as a staymaker, later eked out a living by his writing and political work.

Few scientists were as well situated as Franklin whose early successes in publishing enabled him to live amid comforts while indulging his interest in such diverse subjects as the Gulf Stream, electricity, and bifocal spectacles. Most were obliged to expend so much of their energies to earning a livelihood that their most memorable achievements were made on borrowed time. The strain told. Fitch died poor, by his own hand, broken by years of frustration and want. Elias Howe, while enduring hunger and privation, was worn out by toil and died at the age of 48.

COSTLY NATIONAL FUN

To add to the difficulties of these early technologists, poor communication led to frequent duplication of effort, with the result that many things were invented several times by different people who were ignorant of each other's work. When Eli Whitney set up his factory to make guns with interchangeable parts, he spent a large amount of time working out machine tools which already had been developed, or at least anticipated, in other countries. He had no way of knowing that they even existed. Fitch worked for years on a double-acting steam engine, apparently ignorant of the fact that James Watt and Matthew Boulton had already solved many of the problems he faced. Oliver Evans started from scratch, and had no access to technical books, although many had been written in the fields in which he worked. Henry worked for 6 years on magnetism and electric currents before discovering that Faraday, an ocean away, was doing the same research.

Inevitably, when two or more men brought forth the same discovery at approximately the same time, there were conflicting patent claims. This produced some of the stormiest and most extended legal battles in history. No doubt, it provided amusement for many interested spectators. But it was costly national fun because it dissipated the creative energies of men who could not easily be replaced or duplicated. Genius is too rare a commodity to be squandered lavishly or used inefficiently.

Looking back to the conditions of the 18th and 19th centuries, it should cause little wonder that technical progress came slowly. The marvel is that anything was accomplished at all, and our respect and admiration for the talents and persistence of the men involved grows as we come to appreciate their handicaps. They earned every tribute we pay them. I cannot help but wonder how different our history might have been if these extraordinary minds had been unleashed for full-time experiment and invention.

FLOODTIDE OF ACHIEVEMENT

If we were asked to construct a list of the technological developments most fundamental to America's progress, it would be difficult indeed to single out any group upon which we could present a clear case. The nominations most meaningful would be those representative of broad application, spanning all categories of human need.

For, the most notable thing about the technical development of America is that its industrial revolution was not confined mainly to manufacturing, as was the case in Europe. Instead, American technical development was spread broadly against the entire economic and scientific field. The growth of our industrial technology was accompanied by parallel gains in agriculture, in communications, and in transportation. There was no single stream of technological advance. Instead, America's progress resulted from the converging of many streams, uniting to produce a floodtide of inventive achievement. In this great creative outpouring, it is difficult to identify any small group of inventions which would be judged outstanding in importance.

Everyone has his own list of "greatest inventions," and every invention has, I suppose, its partisans. My own list has three virtues to commend it. First, it is brief; second, most of my selections are simple; and third, it is based not on scientific preeminence, but on the universal importance to our economic revolution.

LIFTED MAN ABOVE SUBSISTENCE

I would include, for example, the steel plow. A humble device, perhaps—John Deere simply hammered it out of an old circular saw blade. But it speded the work of the farmer and was the predecessor of a host of other labor-saving farm equipment—the reaper, the binder, the tractor, the combine. Some might argue that these were more significant and, in a way, they would be right. But the important thing about the steel plow is that it was the first in a long line of major advances which lifted man from the subsistence level of agriculture, thus freeing increasing numbers of people for other occupations. Improved farm tools, supplemented by insecticides, weed killers, fertilizers, and better planting and irrigation techniqeus, have multiplied the efficiency of the farmer by a factor of 25.

Second, I include Oliver Evans' wonderful flour mill, the precursor of automatic control. In terms of scientific merits, it was a modest accomplishment. But it showed the world how a whole series of production operations could be linked together, driven by machinery, and tended by one or two men. All of the technologists who followed Evans, and the millions of consumers who use mass-produced goods, are eternally indebted to this extraordinary man.

The steam locomotive, of course, put power on wheels and gave man a wholly new mobility of special significance in a Nation spanning such great distances. The locomotive was not unique to America, and it was more a compendium than an invention, but it should not be ruled out on that score. After all, no nation can claim many major inventions which are all its own, created without outside help. Technology is a cumulative force. To credit all of the people who made the locomotive possible, we would have to track down the inventors of the level, the wheel, and the inclined plane, not to mention the steam engine and similarly modern developments. Incidentally, some of the most important contributions to railroad development came from this area. George Westinghouse, the inventor of the air brake, was a Pennsylvanian by adoption if not by birth. Matthias Baldwin, the locomotive builder and one of the men who helped found the Franklin Institute, was a Philadelphian. John Edgar Thompson, who did as much as any man to build the Pennsylvania Railroad, was born and raised in Delaware County. In the hands of men like these, the railroad reached a high level of development in the United States and, with the vast distances of the continent falling beneath its iron wheels, the locomotive counts more heavily in our history than many inventions we like to think of as 100-percent homegrown.

MOST EFFECTIVE DEVICE

Fourth on the list is the telegraph which presaged the telephone and did more to speed communication than any device since the printing press and movable type.

I have mentioned here four basic inventions covering each of the major fields. There is a fifth which pertains to all. I think in any list of inventions, we should include this one which, strictly speaking, is not an invention at all, but a legal fiction. Yet it seems to me to equal in importance any specific invention in history. This is the development of the modern corporation.

The industrial corporation, as we know it today, is a creature of technology just as certainly as the flying machine or the cotton gin, and it has proved the most effective device for extending technology which man has ever known. Its contributions have been unique.

IT HAS CHANGED THE WORLD

For the modern industrial establishment is the agency which made the pursuit of technology a full-time job, and not for a few men, but for hundreds of thousands. Industry employs today more than 550,000 scientists and engineers, a majority of the Nation's technical work force. Such figures amaze few today. But, in contrast to the struggling little band of amateurs of the early days, it is a vast army.

Development of the industrial organization as we now recognize it came too late to aid the earlier inventors. In some ways, the "corporate" form of organization dates from medieval times, but it was not until the 20th century that the corporation came into wide usage as the structural form of large-scale organization. In this century, it has changed the world. It has provided a focal point for the development of technology, taking it out of the side-line class and making it a full-time profession. The corporation has brought to the support of technology an extraordinary number and variety of services and resources. In our own company, as an example, we have about 2,400 technically trained employees in research and development, assisted by more than 3,500 specialists and technicians. We spent $90 million last year to underwrite their work

All the facilities which can be mustered are employed to assist the research worker and make his effort more productive. No longer does he work in ignorance of what others are doing: Today, few developments throughout

the world escape notice, for there is a constant interchange of information and scientists have major reference publications at their fingertips. Our own technical libraries stock over 800 different periodicals, and we have one divisional group whose sole function is to keep track of research discoveries elsewhere and pass on pertinent information. Whether new ideas originate in our own laboratories or elsewhere, they are eagerly studied and their applicability is appraised quickly. If one man's experience is insufficent to evaluate the work, another's frequently will prove to be, offering, as it does, a different background and perspective.

PROJECTS NO INDIVIDUAL CAN UNDERTAKE

What is true in Du Pont is true in many other companies today. Large corporations consolidate information from many disciplines of science and engineering and bring to scientific development a breadth of vision extending far beyond any one man's capacities. The individual scientist is stimulated and encouraged. His discoveries no longer are left to languish on the laboratory shelf while their creator goes out to search for a sponsor.

In addition, the development of the modern corporation has created the national resources which support technology in many other types of institutions. The research efforts of universities, private foundations, and Government laboratories contribute importantly to the advancement of American science and engineering, but these institutions could not exist were it not for the wealth generated by American industry.

The size of the institutions furthering technology has become an important element in our progress. With its engineering and production resources, the modern industrial organization can direct large groups of technologists—people skilled in many areas of science—to projects no one individual technologist could undertake. For example, it is possible to produce penicillin in a one-man laboratory in quantities sufficient to save a few lives. Produced in major pharmaceutical plants, penicillin has saved the lives of millions. I remember from my early interest in flying that a number of enterprising individuals built airplanes in backyard garages. Perhaps some still do. They would be the first to admit, however, that their efforts, in scale or in volume, are not quite comparable to the accomplishments of North American or Boeing.

TEAM OF SMALL AND LARGE UNITS

Some of my colleagues at Du Pont, given a few days' notice and a small set of laboratory apparatus, could formulate a kind of nylon and spin a bobbin or two of yarn. But, to supply a national market, this would be like trying to feed an army with the grain you could raise in a flower pot. Moreover, the factor of size also has an important value to national defense. During World War II, for example, the Government asked Du Pont to build the atomic materials plant at Hanford, Wash. More recently, we were asked to undertake the construction of the Savannah River hydrogen-materials plant. These were perhaps the most ambitious engineering projects in history; they could not have been completed without the services of a large institution employing thousands of specialists in dozens of fields.

Quite obviously, all of the technological efforts of companies like Du Pont are not of this magnitude. And, obviously, not all of the technological jobs required for the Nation's advancement require large institutions. Some of the most significant accomplishments have come, and will continue to come, from smaller organizations. In technology, as in other facets of American life, there is a need for business units of every size. Small firms supply companies like Du Pont with tools, materials, and special services which are basic to large-scale research and production efforts. At the same time, the small are important customers of the large, buying products which only the large firms can produce in a volume sufficient to meet national needs. Very often, the small firm makes its contribution to technology and finds its route to commercial success by developing and marketing a product created in the research laboratories of a large company. Thus, small and large business units work as a team to expand America's technology, with each contributing its special talents.

A WHOLE NEW DIMENSION

Four years ago, the Swiss economist, William Rappard, set down his views on the causes of America's prosperity. Most important of all, he wrote, were the application of science to production, the passion for efficiency in industry, mass production to bring large quantities of goods to people at low cost, and the spirit of competition. It is worth noting that the development of large industrial units is a factor in each of Professor Rappard's considerations. These organizations, consolidating many talents, have provided to technology and the technologist a whole new dimension of performance and potential. They have elevated the horizons of science and engineering, and they have literally extended man's reach into the boundless areas of outer space.

When the history of our era is written, the birth and development of the modern corporation must be recorded as a vital factor in our technological progress. Indeed, the corporation may well prove to be the greatest invention of them all.

Henry Cabot Lodge: He Fights for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article published in Parade magazine of April 26, 1959, regarding Henry Cabot Lodge, which is entitled "He Fights for Peace."

We in Massachusetts are very proud that there are two such distinguished Massachusetts citizens serving as the Secretary of State and the Ambassador to the United Nations.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HENRY CABOT LODGE: HE FIGHTS FOR PEACE

(By Marylin Bender)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y.—All through spring, Russia and the West have jockeyed for showdown positions over Berlin. Far from the danger site itself, a major part of the battle to avoid war has fallen on a particularly tough-minded American. He is a 56-year-old grandfather of seven—a six-foot-three-inch, broad-shouldered, long-limbed, lean-hipped patriarch with the physical magnetism of a patrician youth.

As representatives of the big powers have maneuvered out in the open, Henry Cabot Lodge, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, has been operating behind the headlines. His job: to talk and listen to the representatives of the western allies, and to prepare for all eventualities against a constantly shifting scene. One possibility, advanced by both sides in different forms, has been that the Berlin crisis would be appealed to the United Nations.

This month Lodge is president of the U.N. Security Council, the body primarily responsible for maintaining world peace. This administrative post rotates monthly among the 11 member states (U.N. members with permanent seats on the Security Council are China, France, the U.S.S.R., the United Kingdom, and the United States. Nonpermanent members this year are Canada, Japan, Panama, Argentina, Italy and Tunisia.)

Lodge's performance over the last 6 years as chief U.S. delegate—the first in this job to have Cabinet rank—can be rated by the fact that Americans increasingly look to the U.N. as the world's fire brigade.

Lodge says: "The U.N. is the greatest single engine in the world for influencing world opinion." To keep world opinion on our side—or, at least, not against us—he has used a courageous political intelligence, a facile tongue and a newspaperman's training. Whenever his Soviet opposite number attacks, Lodge makes sure to deliver his rebuttal immediately so that it appears in the world's newspapers on the same day.

In some respects the job of chief U.S. representative to the U.N. would appear to hamstring a dynamic, self-assured political veteran like Lodge. It is a job of stating U.S. policy without formulating it. He takes instructions from the State Department, specifically from the Bureau of International Organization Affairs, headed by Assistant Secretary Francis O. Wilcox.

But Lodge sometimes must move too fast to wait for word from Washington. No mere errand boy for the State Department, Lodge in New York often relays his opinions to Washington, where they then influence the shaping of U.S. policy. He has President Eisenhower's respectful ear, and his cordial relations with Secretary of State John Foster Dulles date back a decade to the latter's brief service as an interim appointee in the Senate at a time when Lodge was representing his native Massachusetts.

ON THE FIRING LINE

Lodge views himself as being on the firing line. As the target of Soviet attacks, and with nations that only recently got independence now thinking for themselves, Lodge's job is more than that of talking back in public. He must scurry diplomatically behind scenes for support. More and more this means working out compromises among the so-called uncommitted nations, particularly of the Asian-African bloc, one of whose luminaries has been India's Krishna Menon.

A curious friendship was forged over Suez between Boston Brahmin and the middle-class, left-wing Indian with a reputation for bitter anti-Americanism. In February 1957, Menon and Lodge joined forces to push through the resolution authorizing the placing of a U.N. Emergency Force in Gaza. Last year, when Lodge visited India, Menon acted as his host and guide. Ironically, Menon's domestic foes charged that Lodge was aiding him by making it look as though he were not the most disliked diplomat in America.

POPULARITY CONTESTS

Around U.N. headquarters in New York, Lodge sometimes takes a beating in the popularity contests. Although he scores high on ability—his detractors concede he is a shrewd, skillful, and successful performer—many accuse him of being undemocratic, snobbish, and cold.

There seems to be a "public" Lodge whose blue eyes can be as frosty as the North Atlantic, who doesn't say hello indiscriminately in the halls and who occasionally fends off questions calculated to embarrass his diplomatic position in frankly snippy

tones. But, protests Mrs. Oswald B. Lord, an alternate delegate, "There is a difference between being cool and aloof and being businesslike. He is an approachable person from whom one can always get a sympathetic ear."

Another friend of 30 years' standing, who maintains that the real Lodge is a fiercely loyal man with a genuine feeling for people, says, "Cabot has outgrown and shed the arrogance of his younger days."

Lodge's family tree sinks deep into the soil of American aristocracy. His father, George, was a poet and a charmer. He died when Lodge was 7. His mother took Cabot, sister Helena, and bother John (the present U.S. Ambassador to Spain) abroad in 1912 and 1914. At Harvard, Cabot was voluble and combative. He majored in romance languages (he speaks fluent French, shoots a mild breeze in Spanish and German), went to debutante parties—at one he met his future wife, Emily Sears—acted, sang, rowed and was graduated cum laude in 1924.

His grandfather, the old Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, was his mentor. "The old man adored him," recalls John Mason Brown, the writer lecturer and friend from those days. "He would never admit Cabot could do anything wrong. He treated him not as a grandson but as an adult." It was the Senator who advised him to seek a career in newspaper work.

After Harvard, Lodge became a newspaper reporter. In 1932 he wrote a book, "The Cult of Weakness," which pointed out the dangers of national unpreparedness. "No more book writing for me," he says today. "Politicians shouldn't write. When I did, I didn't know I was going to be a politician."

Then followed 4 years in the Massachusetts Legislature, 13 in the U.S. Senate. Lodge was the first Senator since the Civil War to withdraw for active duty in the Armed Forces. He served in the African and European theaters during World War II and was heavily decorated, and is now a brigadier general in the Reserve. Lodge at first had shown isolationist spots. He returned from the wars an internationalist.

LONE WOLF IN THE SENATE

In the Senate he was a lone wolf, never penetrating the GOP inner circle of that era. He was Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg's chief associate on the Foreign Relations Committee during the Republican-dominated 80th Congress of the Truman administration.

In 1950 Lodge went up to Columbia University to persuade General Eisenhower, whom he had met only three times before, that it might be his duty to run for the Presidency. He ran Ike's campaign with wholeheartedness—meanwhile losing his own senatorial seat to JOHN F. KENNEDY. President-elect Eisenhower nominated Lodge to head the U.S. Mission to the U.N.

The post pays $27,500 a year in salary, up to $17,000 for entertainment expenses. With it goes a 23d floor office in an unpretentious building that overlooks an armory and 33d Street truck traffic. The U.S. Embassy (the Ambassador's residence) is on the 42d floor of the Waldorf Towers.

Here, in the white-and-cerise living room, Lodge plays the engaging host. When the U.N. General Assembly is in session he manages to entertain virtually all the delegates from the other countries. His invitation list is larded with writers and other interesting non-U.N. types. Lodge acts as musical talent sleuth among his guests. One popular feature of these soirees is the forthright Lodge baritone, raised in song and accompanied on the guitar by Deputy Representative James J. Wadsworth, a cheerful bear of a man who radiates warmth like a sunray lamp.

Around the office Lodge is a cool taskmaster. He usually arrives in the morning on foot. He and his wife are avid walkers, crisscrossing the side streets of New York by day and even after dark, to the consternation of friends. He scribbles notes to himself on backs of envelopes and on a 5 by 7 pad on his desk. Unstinting in praise, he hits the ceiling when angry. He is a fresh-air fiend, sitting in shirtsleeves behind his closed door with the radiator off in midwinter.

Lodge doesn't diet but he drinks moderately, smokes not at all, eats plain, hearty food. For relaxation he talks—stretching his lengthy body on a couch in a friend's home or his own—and jokes ("in several languages and he doesn't blush easily," remarks an associate). His reading is all shop. Week-ends when he can manage it, and in the summer, the Lodges head for their home at Beverly, Mass., where "Jam," their 8-year-old black poodle, lives the year round.

CAPTAIN AND CREW

Sailing is his great release. On a typical voyage, his 36-foot Florida fishing boat sails off Salem Bay looking for cod and flounder. On board with the Lodges are their son, George Cabot, who is U.S. Assistant Secretary of Labor, his wife and three daughters. (Another son, Henry Sears, works for a New England electronics firm.) The Ambassador is captain and crew, staying out of the galley except for occasional forays to heat up canned roast beef hash. Emmy Lodge, a tall blonde with a girlish frame and a personality as radiant as a June afternoon, is his purser.

"Cabot has been blessed by a very happy family life," says John Mason Brown. "Emily Lodge should marry every man in politics. She has relaxed Cabot without always letting him know she is doing it. Emily never falls down on anything. She and Cabot should be sandwich men for the institution of marriage."

George says of his father, "He never tried to tell me what to do, never tried to dominate my future. Dad gave me a long tether." When the boys were children, Lodge ruled that weekends were to be devoted to them. "It was always so much fun playing with Dad that I didn't have too many other friends."

AFTER THE U.N., WHAT?

After the U.N., whither Lodge? Not back to politics, he insists. He speaks of being attracted by his old love, journalism, or by a university, where he might teach young people with an aptitude for public service. Are these outlets enough for a man who says that two legislatures and the U.N. have made him an optimist? "The people who are going to be the operators as against the contemplators in this world," says Lodge, "have to be optimists."

Among the areas where he finds cause for optimism is the Soviet Union. "An evolution is going on in Russia. Even though it's an ironfisted dictatorship, they can't go back to 10 years ago." One day, without naming the date, the Russians will get out of Hungary, he believes. "I have a general feeling that when people are oppressed, it just doesn't last forever. The day comes when people are free."

With his amicable relations with congressional leaders of both parties, his ready access to the White House, and his vast experience, Lodge looms as a figure of strength in the trying months ahead. Above all, there is what he brought home from the wars. His friend John Mason Brown describes it thus: "Peace is a passion with Cabot Lodge."

Justice for Army Chaplains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I have offered an amendment to the Reserve Officers Personnel Act of 1954 as it applies to the service of Army chaplains in order to eliminate the present disadvantages and discriminations against clergymen serving in the Army.

We all recognize the great importance of qualified, ecclesiastically endorsed clergy to serve as chaplains in the Armed Forces. Up to this time we have had a particularly favorable experience in securing highly qualified, splendid chaplain to carry out the spiritual duties in our armed services.

It has been pointed out that the Reserve Officers Personnel Act of 1954, when it becomes fully implemented in July 1960 as applied to the Army, will possibly completely cripple the ability of denominational endorsing agencies to provide chaplains for the Army in the future.

This handicap and anticipated difficulty in arises from the fact that the average age for the appointment of Infantry officers, as distinguished from chaplains, in the Army is 23 years. Since most officers retire in the rank of lieutenant colonel, it is therefore possible for the average Infantry officer to complete 30 years of service at the age of 53 as provided by the above law presently applicable to the Army. No one would question the desirability of the Army and all the services for younger officers and that is not an issue in this matter.

In the case of clergymen, the average age at entrance into the Army is 30 years according to a study made by the office of the Chief of Chaplains of the Army. The usual college graduation age is 22. Seminary studies may continue for an additional period of 3 years or 6 years in some major denominations.

In addition, some denominations require that a graduate clergyman must serve a period of 1 or 2 years before he can receive ordination. Some require a year of successful assistant pastorship after the second year in the seminary before the student is permitted to enter the third year. Other denominations require an ordained clergyman to serve a minimum of three years in civilian parishes before he can be granted ecclesiastical endorsement to serve in a chaplaincy.

While all of the practices referred to above insure a professionally well-qualified clergyman prepared to cope with the difficult problems of the chaplaincy, the fact is that chaplains enter the Army at a considerably greater age, and it is stated by competent officials that the average age entrance of 30 for chap-

lains is essential to conduct a successful ministry for service personnel.

The way the Reserve Officers Personnel Act of 1954 works out, if a clergyman comes on duty as chaplain during his 30th year then he can only complete 23 years of duty as compared with 30 years of possible duty for other officers.

In the event that a clergyman wishes to spend additional time in professional study looking toward a masters or doctors degree he may well pass the maximum entrance age of 34 and not be able to complete even 20 years of service. Thus, chaplains entering the service under these circumstances, that is, at a later age, must under present law, face the prospect of being separated from the service at age 53 with a maximum benefit of only 50 percent retirement, or in many cases with no retirement at all. Hence there is a justifiable reluctance on their part to volunteer for spiritual duties with the Army. Of course, the same situation applies to Army Reserve chaplains not on active duty and National Guard chaplains.

The purpose of the amendment which I am offering to exempt Army chaplains from the current age provision of the Reserve Officers Personnel Act of 1954 and place them in the same status as chaplains in the Air Force and the Navy seems to me to be highly meritorious and necessary in order to insure the proper flow of qualified chaplains into the Army. There would seem to be no justification for present unequal treatment of Army chaplains.

This amendment is endorsed by accredited officials of all basic denominations serving the armed services, and I hope and urge that the committee and Congress will approve it. To my mind, it is the least we can do for those who are rendering such valuable and vital service to our national defense. Spiritual ministrations in the armed services is of great consequence and importance not only to service personnel, but to their parents, families and friends who are naturally concerned that our service boys and girls shall have available to them at all times the counsel, advice and help of their own spiritual leaders. The value of such service to the personnel and to the Nation could not possibly be adequately measured in concrete terms. It is a must for all the Armed Forces.

Spirit of Taft Lives On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very fine editorial published in the April 16 edition of the Standard Times, New Bedford, Mass., concerning the recent dedication of the memorial structure in honor of our late colleague, Robert Taft.

This editorial sets forth in few words the full meaning of the tribute to a great American. I commend it to the reading of my colleagues.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPIRIT OF TAFT LIVES ON

What the people did not give Robert A. Taft in life they have given him in far larger measure after his death—a place among the all-time American greats and an influence on generations to come that may know no bounds.

Dedication of the graceful Taft Memorial in Washington, by President Eisenhower, former President Hoover, and other outstanding leaders of both political parties, was a magnificent tribute to Taft's incomparable service to the Nation.

As several of the distinguished speakers said in eulogy, Taft paid a high price for his uncompromising principle and for his forthright expression of opinion, always. He endured much for championing what Senator BRIDGES well described as "the ageless virtues of our country."

The shafts of his detractors often wounded this man who was, himself, incapable of grudge, but they can make little impression on the ageless marble of the memorial or the mighty spirit protected for all time within it.

Whether on policy or principle, Senator Taft "invariably was vindicated," said his friend and colleague, Senator BYRD.

The memorial will make more certain the greatest vindication of all, recognition by mankind that peace and liberty can be built only on the bedrock of principle.

"When these great bells ring out," said former President Hoover, speaking of the memorial's carillon, "it will be a summons to integrity and courage."

This is the message that peals from the newest and most unusual of memorials in the National Capital. No man could aspire to higher honor after death.

Americans may rejoice that they have given existence to the Taft Memorial. They have memorialized virtue and character. They have honored, as a great public servant of all the pepole, a man who fought under the banner of one party. And they have set the standards high for those who would lead in government.

James Todd of Claude, Tex., Richly Deserves "Pastor of the Year" Title

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, at the 72d annual assembly of the Texas Convention of Christian Churches in Austin recently, James Todd of Claude, Tex., was named Town and Country Minister of the Year.

Reverend Todd richly deserves this honor. He has helped a number of small churches during the past 34 years in which he has served as a minister in west Texas. He is a well-known writer, speaker and civic leader as well.

Mr. President, as a salute to the accomplishments of this outstanding Texan and American, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Claude News for Thursday, April 16, 1959 entitled "Texas Town and Country Pastor of the Year."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXAS TOWN AND COUNTRY PASTOR OF THE YEAR

AUSTIN, April 10.—James Todd, pastor of the First Christian Church of Claude, was presented to the 72d annual assembly of the Texas Convention of Christian Churches here as Town and Country Minister of the Year.

He was cited at municipal auditorium for seeking pastorates in small struggling churches and for leading them to financial self-support.

Todd, a minister in west Texas congregations for the past 34 years, was presented to the convention by R. Bruce Harper, of Tyler, chairman of the town and country church committee of the Texas Board of Christian Churches. "Many of our most thriving west Texas congregations are the direct result of his zeal," the citation declared.

Todd was praised for serving congregations other ministers avoided.

During his long ministry in the Panhandle-South Plains area, he has served four congregations that were receiving aid through the State church development program of the State of Texas.

Three of these congregations have outgrown their need for aid, and the other one is expected to be on its own soon.

As minister of the self-supporting Claude Church, Todd unselfishly gives the State church development fund the honoraria he receives and the money he earns as a writer.

The church development program supplements the salaries of pastors serving the small mission churches. The Claude Church has always been self-supporting and contributes monthly to the church development program.

Under Todd's leadership the Claude Church has, for the first time in its history been, organized on a functional committee basis.

He also has led the congregation in increasing its support of out-reach (missionary) causes.

He edits a monthly newsletter for his parish.

Todd has served congregations at Pampa, Spearman, Panhandle, Stinnett, Muleshoe, and Plains as well as Claude.

Besides his regular church work at Claude, Todd is also active in civic affairs, the school, the Lions Club, and the Masonic Lodge as well as assists other ministers in the community with their church programs when needed.

Outlook for Shipbuilding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS COTTON
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I have recently read with considerable interest in the New York Journal of Commerce for March of this year, an article by Mr. E. M. Hood, vice president of the Ship-

builders Council of America, entitled "Outlook for Shipbuilding," which appeared under the headline "Shipbuilding Future Held 'Not Bright.'"

In order to provide as full a dissemination as possible of this timely subject, I ask unanimous consent to have a copy of Mr. Hood's article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUTLOOK FOR SHIPBUILDING

(Article by E. M. Hood, vice president, Shipbuilders Council of America, for the New York Journal of Commerce, March 1959)

That the future outlook for the American shipbuilding industry, at this writing, is not bright, there can be little question. Ask the workers in the yards or the sales contact men throughout the world. Ask management officials charged with the full operation of their company facilities. Or, for that matter, ask the officials of the Federal Government who confidentially do not subscribe to, or endorse, the present drift of maritime policies. The answers, almost universally, will expose a paradox which has brought the affairs of the American merchant navy to the crossroads. This is indeed a time for decision and action.

Last month the Secretary of the National Security Council—that high-level esoteric body which advises the President on matters of national security and national defense—had this to say: "An adequate merchant marine is essential for defense purposes, and under current planning concepts there is a continuing need for a modern, adequate, and well-balanced U.S. merchant marine fleet."

To put these remarks in proper focus, one need only recall General Eisenhower's words from London in 1944: "We were caught flat-footed in both world wars because we relied too much upon foreign owned and operated shipping. * * * America's industrial prosperity and military security both demand that we maintain a privately operated merchant marine adequate in size and of modern design to insure that our lines of supply for either peace or war will be safe."

More recently, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Nathan F. Twining, whose opinions always carry great weight, observed that, from his vantage point, "it seems incredible to me that anyone could argue seriously or with justification that new concepts of warfare obviate the necessity of further fostering a merchant navy."

Despite these admonitions, the American merchant marine is being permitted to deteriorate from both a quantitative and qualitative standpoint. The continued depreciation of the vast majority of our sea transportation resources increases the seriousness of this problem. And, therein lies the plight of the shipbuilding industry. To paraphrase an old adage—as the merchant marine goes, so goes the shipbuilding industry.

The slow rate of progress made in the replacement of obsolescent vessels clearly indicates that greater emphasis must be placed upon orderly shipbuilding programs adequate to the need. Indeed, this industry so important to our economy and defense posture must be upgraded. Most of the subsidized shipping companies have entered into long-range contracts for the replacement of their aging ships, but the fulfillment of these agreements hinges upon a willingness of the administration and the Congress to approve and provide the funds for the Government's share in this essential Government-private enterprise partnership. If maritime funds were treated with the same vigor as funds for foreign aid or aid for school construction, the threat of atrophy for the American merchant marine would be nonexistent.

Though the so-called Murray report in 1954, advocated a minimum shipbuilding program of 60 oceangoing ships per year to meet normal trade and defense mobilization requirements, this goal has never been attained. Appropriation requests for fiscal 1960, if approved by the Congress, will permit the construction, at most, of 14 new vessels. A carryover of funds from fiscal 1959 for 8 more ships could bring the total to 22 in the next fiscal year, but, even so, this would fall far short of the minimum necessary to sustain the defense mobilization of the industry.

In facing up to the initial phases of a general war, the Department of Defense tells us that we are short between 100 and 200 dry cargo vessels, 30 reefer cargo ships, 4 heavy lift ships and some tankers. Only minimum needs for troop transport could be met. However, these estimates are good solely from a quantitative basis, and Defense authorities imperatively proclaim that qualitative deficiencies leave much to be desired.

The Navy has requested $574 million to build 18 new ships, including 1 *Forrestal*-class carrier, 6 guided-missile destroyers and frigates, 3 nuclear-powered attack submarines and 8 other vessels in the coming year. As in the past, this work will be apportioned between Navy and private yards. With the near or approaching obsolescence of many naval vessels, the problems with respect to the need for increased Federal appropriations are identical with those confronting the merchant navy.

Shipbuilding, by its very nature, is a long-term proposition, and contracts for delivery in 1960 have been extremely limited because of the conditions above cited, because of the world economic picture, and because of the continuing oil import controversy. Thus, we find an industry having a good volume in 1958 and 1959 due to previously booked contracts, but very lean prospects for 1960.

However, on the plus side, the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway should point the way to some new ship construction in future years. Likewise, proposals for a nuclear-powered tanker are being seriously advocated. And, the same can be said for roll-on roll-off ships and other container-type ships.

Someday Poland Will Exist Again as a Free and Independent Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, some 168 years ago, Poland adopted its first constitution establishing the rights of its people to enjoy the fruits of liberty and justice. It is well for us to pause for a moment to take note of what has happened to that valiant nation and its people since that time.

Today we find Poland swallowed up in the depths of the Soviet Union's plans for world domination. The freedoms which the people of Poland were guaranteed have been lost in the meaningless mouthings of her Red puppet leaders. Her claim to an independent nation is in doubt because of the string pulling of her Soviet masters housed in the Kremlin.

The people of Poland have suffered terribly in the past generation. Atrocities by both the Russians and the Germans cut down her brave young men and even her women and children in wholesale, senseless slaughter. Her people were sent both eastward and westward to provide the backbreaking work force for factories, mines, and farms. Families were split asunder, never again to be reunited.

After World War II came the bitter enslavement of the Communists, of Russian troops on Polish soil, of heartless suppression of freedom and individuality. Finally, the Poles revolted and won the promise of an end to religious persecution and collective farms. But the Red masters had no intention of carrying out their promises. Since the revolt in 1956, the newly won freedoms are being spirited away, one at a time, until now Poland is once again completely under the heel of a brutal police stae.

It is the hope of all of us that someday Poland will exist again as a free and independent nation, free to determine her own destiny.

On this day, it is wise for us to contemplate the fate of those who were forced to deal with the Communists, and who now find themselves under their subjugation.

Tackle Unemployment Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, many of us have been greatly concerned about the continuance of rather startling unemployment rates in various communities and areas throughout the country, notwithstanding the current prosperity boom which the country is enjoying as a whole.

I will not go into some of the reasons for these trouble spots of unemployment because they are numerous and complex. Undoubtedly, extremely injudicious monetary policies played their part, and there are other factors as well that I cannot deal with here. However, it is very clear that in the interest of the Nation, not to speak of the several million unemployed workers and their families who are involved, that the Congress must do something constructive and substantial about this problem at a very early date.

I think that we have seriously lagged in coping with this substantial unemployment which in some States and communities reaches alarming percentages and is causing stagnation, paralysis, and privation in many historically prosperous areas.

The situation constitutes a real challenge to the Government and we have no choice in my opinion but to give the problem urgent consideration and work it out so as to alleviate the unemployment and restore the afflicted communities to a condition of prosperity and industrial good health and well-being.

This is an American problem. It cannot in these days be swept under the table and overlooked. We all must recognize that State and local authorities alone cannot solve this problem. The Federal Government must take action. And it must be taken now.

Factors for Distribution by REA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, the rural electrification program has been a tremendous source of pleasure to farmers and has opened up a new world for people who have had to struggle to obtain the necessities of life. This program has stimulated not only production on the farms, but also in the industrial areas of our country. A great deal of the success is due to the foresight of those who enacted the statute in creating the rural electrification program and the criteria set forth in the statute. The standards which have been adopted provided for safeguards and did not impose onerous terms. Another factor contributing to the success of this program has been the dedicated leadership of the administrators on top level and in the lower echelons.

I have had occasion to meet several of the officials of the rural electrification program during a recent trip to Puerto Rico where I attended a seminar on rural electrification. W. E. Eastman, director of the southeast area of the United States, made a very interesting talk on the factors considered by the Rural Electrification Administration for distribution loans, which I am certain will prove informative.

Mr. Eastman, who started working for the REA in 1938, received his bachelor of science degree in civil engineering in 1937 from the University of New Hampshire. Except for a period during the war, he worked as engineer of one of the eight regions in the United States on electric distribution engineering until 1949 when he was made regional engineer. In 1952 he was assigned as regional engineer in the REA telephone program until September 1953 when he became assistant chief, staff planning, in Telephone Engineering Division. He was reassigned to the electric program in 1955 to the position which he now holds.

Mr. Eastman's remarks follow:

DETERMINATION OF MARKET

First of all, there must be established a definite need for electricity, or a market. In order to determine what this market is, first requires a survey in the field. This survey will determine the people that do want service, those that might, their location, and the classification of service they want—residence, farm, commercial, etc.

To convert this information into the quantity of energy required comes next. The objective here is to obtain realistic estimates of kilowatt-hour consumption, by class, and at a time 3 to 5 years in the future. Initially this was quite an unknown quantity to REA. Only about 10 percent of the rural establishments had electricity; therefore, we had no records available and there was very limited experience. It was therefore necessary to estimate kilowatt-hour consumption by class. Our experience proved us to be very conservative in our estimate. Actual usage far exceeded our estimates. At the present time, with more than 20 years of operational experience, there are ample records from which usage can be estimated and projected into the future. As a matter of interest, we have found that the average monthly kilowatt-hour usage by rural consumers doubles about every 7 years. If no records or experience are available, it may be necessary to interview a representative portion of potential consumers and determine the extent to which they expect to use electricity.

Now that we have located the people that want service, have classified them according to type of service, and have estimated what quantity of electricity they will use, we are interested in still one more factor; that is, the economic stability of the area.

This is accomplished through a field appraisal, the purpose of which is to collect data, economic in nature that can be used as a basis for consideration of the feasibility of any particular loan or system. Information from agricultural leaders, local businessmen and bankers in the area is sought in order to shed as much light as possible on the economic potential of the area. Marketing and transportation facilities are observed and noted. Opportunities for off-farm employment are appraised. Trends in population and farm units are also sought. Trends in income, population shifts, and other significant economic trends which can be established for the service area are compared with comparable trends for county or State as a whole. REA as a part of assuring the security of the loan makes such an appraisal when considering the first loan to serve an area and at such other times as changing conditions warrant.

PLANNING PHYSICAL FACILITIES

The need for electricity, or the market has been determined. Next we need to know what facilities will be required to serve this market. The borrowing organization employs an engineering firm to design the most economical distribution system for this purpose.

The engineer in his design would adhere to certain standards that have been established by REA. For reasons of economy through standardization, we have settled on a multigrounded wye system; 7,200 volts phase to ground; 12,500 volts phase to phase. In a few instances where density is low and long distribution lines are required a 14.4/24.9 grounded wye system is used.

Voltage drop at the end of primary line is to be held to 7 percent. The use of regulators to accomplish this is permitted.

At this point the engineer is not yet ready to design the distribution system. You will recall my mentioning earlier, that the early estimates of consumption were far too conservative. This resulted in a good many components of the system, having a normal life expectancy of from 30 to 40 or 50 years, becoming obsolete early in its usage because of inadequacy.

To minimize the possibility of this premature obsolescence we recommend that the engineer make a long-range engineering study. This study is predicated on a kilowatt-hour consumption far in excess of what present consumption is, or is estimated to be. For example, one area that now has an average consumption of 400 kilowatt-hours per month has a long-range study based on 2,500 kilowatt-hours per month. This study will show what substations, what feeders and lines and what wire size will be needed when consumption reaches 2,500 kilowatt-hours per month. Of course this system will not be built now because of the excessive investment in capacity that will not be needed for several years. It does establish a goal or objective and it does provide a guide for the engineer in designing the system that is to be constructed now. Using the consumer and consumption data for the 3- to 5-year period as outlined in the market survey the engineer designs the distribution system. The facilities he will provide for in this initial system will be sufficient only for the 3- to 5-year load requirements of the market survey but will be selected so that they will fit into the requirements of the long-range engineering design. By so doing he provides for continuing growth and expansion of plant with a minimum of change in the facilities initially installed; thereby minimizing loss due to premature obsolescence.

Quality of service is a factor that is important to all. The engineer incorporates the basic elements of high quality service in his design by holding the voltage drop at the end of all lines to 7 percent or less. Continuity of service is enhanced by providing adequate protective equipment for isolating a minimum of system lines when fault conditions occur.

Once the physical facilities required for serving the area have been determined, the engineer prepares a cost estimate for constructing those facilities.

At this point the engineer has completed the project design. It shows the number of substations that will be needed, their location, capacity, and voltage. The miles of pole line required along with wire size necessary to provide adequate service has been determined, as well as distribution transformer services and meters. In addition he has determined what the cost of the system will be.

POWER SOURCE

So far we have not mentioned the availability of power to feed this system. While the engineer when designing the system would like to assume that power will be available at the substation locations his design shows to be most suitable, he is always cognizant of the possibility that this may not be the case.

A source of power is necessary and has been considered by the engineer long before his design is completed.

As to a source of power, there are two possible solutions open to the engineer. One is to provide the necessary power through generation and transmission facilities. For small rural distribution systems the costs in connection with self-generation are normally so high that the consumer would not want to pay the resulting high rates. But this is a subject that will be discussed later in this program by Mr. Chase.

The other alternative of a power source is to purchase from some operating utility.

Where power is purchased, the engineer is concerned with the point at which this power will be made available to feed the system. Negotiations are entered into to have power delivered at the load centers or substation locations called for in the engineering study. If this is not possible the engineer must determine the economics of relocating the substations and increasing the capacity of distribution feeder lines versus including in his design the necessary transmission lines from the point power is available to the substation locations.

The cost of power represents a large percent of the annual cost of operating a distribution system. We have found that the cost of power is very close to 50 percent of annual cash expenses. Because of this we

require as a prerequisite to making a loan that the borrower negotiate a contract with the power supplier, which assures the borrower of sufficient power to meet the needs of its consumers and which sets forth the terms, conditions, and cost of supplying that power.

FINANCING

The utility organization now has a plan of what it wants to build and knows the approximate cost. It also has a contract to provide the needed power. Its next step is to obtain financing and while there are other sources of borrowing, we are assuming now only REA financing.

The organization makes known its desire to borrow money from REA by preparing and submitting an application. The application states the amount of money it wants to borrow; the facilities it proposes to build and the purpose of these facilities.

The application is reviewed in REA; first from a legal or eligibility viewpoint to establish that the applicant is legally one to which we can make a loan and that the purposes of the proposed construction are consistent with the Rural Electrification Act.

From an engineering viewpoint, we review the engineer's system design to insure it is adequate to meet the 3- to 5-year load requirements and yet not overdesigned. The cost estimates are reviewed to see that they are reasonable.

Following this an economic or feasibility study is made. This study determines the annual expenses that will be incurred in the operation of the system, and includes the cost of; purchased power, operations, maintenance, general administration, replacement, taxes, insurance, and in addition, the cost of debt repayment and interest.

In the event of a new organization we would design recommended retail rate schedules for the various classes of consumers, when applied to the kilowatt-hours consumptions for which the system was designed, would produce sufficient revenues to meet these expenses and also provide reasonable operating reserves. If the applicant is already an operating utility we would determine that existing retail rate schedules would produce sufficient revenues.

Assuming that the application is satisfactory in all respects, the loan is made. REA makes 100 percent loans that are repaid with interest in 35 years. As security for this loan REA, in most instances, holds a first mortgage on all of the facilities.

Up to this point we have covered the main factors considered by REA in making a distribution loan. But, as mentioned previously, we must determine with all reasonable assurance that the loan will be repaid, therefore, this same interest of course continues throughout the period during which any outstanding indebtedness remains.

As a matter of assisting the borrower and to provide REA with a continuing method of evaluating the financial position or solvency of the borrower, we work closely with them in the various phases of their operations after a loan has been made; such as in the following:

CONSTRUCTION

REA has developed standard forms of construction contract, construction specifications, and construction assembly unit designs. Through the Electric Engineering Division we have gathered test and performance data on the items of materials required for pole line construction from which has been developed a list of materials that are acceptable for use on the borrowers' system.

We strongly urge the borrower to have his project constructed by taking competitive bids and using the standard contract forms. By so doing he stands to benefit financially where competition for the contract is keen and also by the protection afforded under the contract against faulty workmanship and materials. Upon completion of construction REA makes an inspection prior to its being accepted.

OPERATIONS

High quality service, which is a factor the engineer made possible through his design, can deteriorate rapidly and is a factor that can adversely affect the financial soundness of the organization when it is neglected. At intervals of from 1 to 3 years REA will make an inspection to evaluate the effectiveness of the borrowers' operations and maintenance programs. Some of the factors considered in these surveys are: pole inspection, right-of-way clearing, transformer and recloser maintenance, voltage regulation, and others.

MANAGEMENT

During operations we get from the borrower each quarter an operating report showing financial data as well as operational data. In addition we receive annually a copy of an independently performed audit report.

Through analysis of these documents we can frequently determine and advise the borrower of possible trouble areas that might be avoided with prompt attention.

CONCLUSION

This has necessarily been a brief discussion covering a broad field of activities. The points that have been brought out are those we believe are significant. I would like to emphasize that they are not factors to be considered once, then forgotten. The electric utility business, once started, becomes increasingly more demanding in terms of load, quality of service, management, and financing.

The American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOS. E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, we enjoy so many priceless liberties that some of us forget how they were won. Michel Guillaume Jean de Crevecoeur in "Letters of an American Farmer," written in 1782, had the vision to portray our future strength. The New York Times in the Treasure Chest column of its book review section for April 12, 1959, summarized the unusual characteristics of our people which provide our national strength and unity from his writings.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial based on the letters of an American farmer may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TREASURE CHEST

THE AMERICAN

What then is the American, this new man? He is either a European, or the descendant of a European, hence that strange mixture of blood, which you will find in no other country. I could point out to you a family whose grandfather was an Englishman, whose wife was Dutch, whose son married a Frenchwoman, and whose present four sons now have four wives of different nations. He is an American, who leaving behind him all his ancient prejudices and manners, received new ones from the new mode of life he has embraced, the new government he obeys, and the new rank he holds. He became an American by being received in the broad lap of our great alma mater. Here individuals of all nations are melted into a new race of men, whose labor and posterity will one day cause great changes in the world. Americans are the western pilgrims, who are carrying along with them that great mass of arts, sciences, vigor and industry which began long since in the east; they will finish the great circle. The Americans were once scattered all over Europe; here they are incorporated into one of the finest systems of population which has ever appeared, and which will hereafter become distinct by the power of the different climates they inhabit. The American ought, therefore, to love his country much better than that wherein he or his forefathers were born. Here the rewards of his industry follow with equal steps the progress of his labor; his labor is founded on the basis of nature, self-interest; can it want a stronger allurement? Wives and children, who before in vain demanded of him a morsel of bread, now, fat and frolicsome, gladly help their father to clear those fields whence exuberant crops are to arise to feed and clothe them all; without any part being claimed, either by a despotic prince, a rich abbot, or a mighty lord. (Michel Guillaume Jean de Crevecoeur in "Letters of an American Farmer, 1782.")

Business News Is Important

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the importance of each small business in our Nation is becoming better known. As that business develops through the farsighted efforts of its owner or owners so does the economy of the area.

The Roseburg, Oreg., News-Review has wisely recognized the numerous news stories connected with the firms in Douglas County. Earlier this year Editor Charles V. Stanton reorganized his news department and named as business news department editor, Mr. Leroy B. Inman.

I have watched the coverage of business in Douglas County develop. The stories point up the constant campaign by the businessman to meet the challenges of tomorrow before they become insurmountable.

One such firm in this particular county is the Paul B. Hult Lumber Co. owned and operated by Paul B. Hult and W. O. (Bun) Kelsay. The story of the development of this operation was written by Mr. Inman on April 25, 1959.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include that story:

DILLARD PLANT PROGRESSIVE DOUGLAS COUNTY INDUSTRY

(By Leroy B. Inman)

An example of a little industry that has grown with the years through sound investment and careful management is the Paul B. Hult Lumber Co. at Dillard, which now supplies employment for 125 persons.

Starting as a small stud operation in 1945, the plant now produces 100,000 board feet of

timber per shift and operates two shifts. What's more the operation has been almost continuous since that date. Only one shift was lost for about a 2-week period last Christmas when logs ran low.

The mill weathered the depressed lumber market last year without a day's lost production, and, Hult, principal owner in the business, said he is very optimistic about future timber market.

"The men are even getting some overtime," he said.

Douglas County Representative W. O. (Bun) Kelsay is the other owner in the business, acquiring a third interest in about 1949.

THIRD MILL BUILT

The plant being operated now is known as Mill No. 3. The first plant, a stud operation, was built between the railroad track and the highway at Dillard in 1945. It was operated up until 2 years ago, when it was discontinued. The grounds and buildings now are used for storing lumber for shipment.

The No. 2 mill, also a stud plant, was built over near the South Umpqua River in Dillard, adjacent to the present Mill No. 3 site. It was discontinued last fall, but the small pond is still used for some log storage.

Mill No. 3 was built 4 years ago and completely remodeled and enlarged 2 years later to its present capacity. Three dry kilns, each 35 by 60 feet in size and with 80,000 board-feet drying capacity, have been erected since last fall. The third kiln went into operation only last week. The precut kilns were built by Diamond Lumber Co. at Tillamook and assembled at the Dillard plant.

TO BUILD DRYING SHEDS

Hult said he plans to erect additional drying sheds this summer. The old Dillard railroad station is used as the company office.

Mill No. 3 is a complete milling and planing operation, producing all dimensions. Fir lumber is shipped green, but hemlock is kiln dried. The company does not do any logging on its own, but contracts its logging and buys a good many logs on the open market.

Hult was born into the lumber business, so has come by it naturally. He said he was born 50 years ago but a stone's throw from a sawmill his father operated in Lane County Sawmilling is all he knows, but he likes it, he says. His uncle and a cousin operate a large mill near Junction City.

Hult said he built and operated three sawmills at Eugene, then put up one at Tyee, before coming to Roseburg. He has had interests in other Douglas County mills, but said he has disposed of these and is concentrating in his one operation.

Kelsay, his partner, has also had long associations with sawmilling in the Dexter area, where he grew up. He was president of the Willlamette Valley Council, Lumber & Sawmill Workers, AFL, for several years, before joining Hult.

While not considered a big operation, the Hult company is a heavy producer for its investment, and has introduced new innovations to improve efficiency.

On order and soon to be installed is a push-button edger control system. This system has been perfected by the C & D Lumber Co. at Riddle and is being supplied on order to the lumber industry. Hult hopes to have his remote control installed sometime in May.

While not the first with remote control for an edger, he was a "guinea pig" for remote control use with the log carriage in his old stud operation, and uses the device in his new mill. It permits the sawyer to turn the log on the carriage, formerly an operation of a ratchet setter who rode the carriage. He said he pioneered this method several years back, and it has proved very effective.

LOGS STRAPPED TOGETHER

Another system which he uses involves unloading of logs at his pond log dump. Instead of letting the logs roll off the truck into the pond, a metal strap is placed around the center of the load of logs. Cables from an overhead crane are placed around either end of the load and the logs are lifted as a unit and set into the pond lightly.

This has several advantages, the first being, that by keeping the logs strapped together, the capacity of the mill pond can be increased about 2½ times. The log bundle can be easily maneuvered. The strap is not released until the logs are ready for the saw.

There is less breakage of the logs and there is also less chance for damage to the truck in the dumping process.

Hult handles a lot of hemlock, sawing upwards of a million feet a month. The butt end of hemlock trees will not float and have to be stored in cold decks about the mill. They are carted to the mill by means of a Hyster, then are placed into the mill by a crane. The cranes is used only for dry logging. Pond logs are hauled up a ramp.

Wood waste from the mill is burned except for planer shavings which are sold to Pacific Plywood for use in hardboard making.

Forced Retirement of Persons at Age 65 Wastes Many Talents and Productive Man-Hours

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, although employment in all younger age groups has climbed in recent years, less than 36 percent of our citizens above 65 are now employed.

Quite often these people were involuntarily retired because of a company policy which required that they be retired at a certain age. And, because of their age, they find it impossible to find another position. For many people this is disastrous financially, economically, and mentally. Many older people, used to earning their own way and living in vigorous health would like to continue their active lives.

And the trend seems to be extending now to such an extent that persons above 40 encounter difficulty in finding new positions. This is a shameful waste of talents, many good minds, and innumerable productive man-hours.

Mr. President, in support of S. 1172, of which I am a cosponsor, and to underline my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which was printed in the Corpus Christi Caller-Times for Sunday, April 26, 1959, under the heading, "Forced Retirement."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FORCED RETIREMENT

Industrialization is the force responsible for discarding workers over age 65, a study by the International Labor Organization has revealed. The United Nations' special agency has found those relatively few countries remaining which still depend almost entirely upon farming, ranching and related non-industrial enterprises for their economy have a much higher percentage of older workers than do their manufacturing neighbors.

Specifically among industrial innovations, the pension and higher productivity are blamed for the demise of workers above 65. It is significantly demonstrated that in Germany, which founded the social security system and which has had an arbitrary retirement age of 65 for almost 70 years, one of the lowest percentages in the world of people above this age gainfully employed is found. Slightly more than one of four Germans above the magic age are helping their nation's productivity.

Germany's 26.8 percent of oldsters employed contrasts with the 75 percent employed in many South American agricultural countries. The United States—despite appeals from public and industrial officials—is headed swiftly toward Germany's low level. In the 7 years from 1950 to 1957, the percentage of older workers employed dropped from 41 to 36 percent. This result was achieved in spite of increased employment in all other age groups.

Greater acceptance by employers of private pension plans to supplement social security obviously creates a great inducement to employees to retire when eligible. No one, certainly, can find fault with a person who voluntarily inactivates himself from the daily grind when he feels he can afford to do so, or when a retirement income is offered to him. If voluntary retirement were the reason, no one would object if the percentage of older persons employed dropped to nothing.

Unfortunately, that utopia has not been reached. There is a large segment of retired employees—very likely a majority—to which no choice was offered. Many of these people have needed talents to offer industry, many did not wish to loaf after a lifetime of work, and many others could provide efficient output on a reduced work schedule.

But all had one obstacle in common—they had reached the age at which their employers automatically open the doors.

Automated assembly lines, recordkeeping and business procedures may create mechanical efficiency, but the same is not true of human beings. There is no age at which human productivity automatically expires. Those who advocate such an age are merely asking for the privilege of supporting more and more individuals in retirement—persons who would rather be earning their own way.

Free Enterprise and National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOS. E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, ever since 1955, when the Senate embarked on an extensive investigation of our antitrust laws, I have been concerned that rather than perfecting our charter of economic freedom, some antibusiness groups have attempted to use this investigation as a vehicle to attack bigness per se.

An examination of the records of the United Nations Economic and Social Council clearly shows that those countries who would destroy America's freedom would like nothing better than to attack the economic base upon which our security must rest.

During recent weeks, as a member of the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee, I have had the opportunity to visit many defense and contractor installations which demonstrate the great progress our country is making in this new field. The one outstanding conclusion which is left with any objective student in this area is that big business is destined to play an important role in America's efforts in the space age.

On July 6, 1955, before the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee commenced its hearings, I said:

It is quite apparent that the Communists read the American newspapers and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. They are aware of what President Truman said in the 1952 campaign.

Mr. President, too many of our own Members have used the term "monopoly" indiscriminately. They have applied it loosely to any big business. Hence, it is not surprising that the Russians feel justified in quoting them and in taking the same course of action. Committees of the Congress are presently holding hearings to determine whether our antitrust laws should be revised. This is an important subject, which merits careful and deliberative study. My concern is to be sure that in making these studies we refrain from any actions which can damage our own internal unity and which will provide additional ammunition for those who wish to discredit the American free enterprise system which I am proud to call capitalism. I have no hestiancy in taking a forthright position in support of capitalism.

On July 7 last year it was my great privilege to include in the body of the RECORD the Independence Day address of former President Herbert Hoover at the Brussels Fair. I take pardonable pride in the fact that he was born and raised in West Branch, Iowa. He said:

We are often depicted as living under the control of wicked men who exploit our economic life through gigantic trusts and huge corporations. They are supposed to grind the faces of the poor and to exploit other nations. All this ignores the fact that our laws for nearly 70 years have prohibited the existence of trusts and cartels. In few other nations have the fundamentals of fair and open competition been so zealously maintained.

This competition has spurred our industries to adopt every labor-saving device. And to create them, there are more than 5,000 industrial research laboratories that pour out new ideas which become open to all the world.

Insofar as large corporations are concerned, they are the property of millions of our people. The largest of them has more than 1,500,000 individual stockholders, not one of whom owns more than one-thirtieth of 1 percent of the corporation.

The distinguished minority leader, the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], in his individual views on administered prices in the steel industry, Senate Report No. 1387, said:

The minority has long observed that at international conferences, the Soviet Union and its satellites have used documents produced by our own Government to embarrass U.S. representatives. A review of the debates in the United Nations Economic and Social Council amply documents this statement.

Many American firms have encountered unwarranted difficulties in their operations abroad, because the Communist bloc was successful in labeling large American firms as cartels and American monopolies, even though there is no justification for such a characterization.

Every Member of Congress has a responsibility in terms of our national welfare to avoid exaggeration, partisan statements, and criticism not supported by the evidence developed in committee hearings or otherwise in the preparaton of congressional reports. Every congressional report may become an official Government document.

The minority regrets that the majority has accepted the unwarranted and prejudiced assumptions of the staff in the preparation of its views. It is satisfied that they have unwittingly provided propaganda which may be used to our national detriment.

Subsequently, in his individual views on administered prices in the automobile industry, he further amplified this statement and commented on President Hoover's address as follows:

It is regrettable that the majority has permitted the longstanding prejudices and biases of its staff to influence the preparation of its views. They may tend to negate Mr. Hoover's great efforts to show that never before in the history of mankind has any economic system produced so many benefits which were so widely shared. Free enterprise capitalism as it has developed in this country is the only economic system which at all times reflects the wishes of consumers through their purchases in free markets. It has provided incentives to producers. In fact, it has literally remade civilization. Attacks which reflect on its performance, while not attributing guilt to anyone and providing no suggestions for legislative remedies, are a great disservice to the American people.

More recently these self-evident truths are becoming apparent to informed Americans everywhere. Look magazine, in its issue of March 31, 1959, had a feature editorial entitled "The Russians Are Trying To Turn Our Best Weapon Against Us." I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD.

Again, one of our most distinguished weeklies, U.S. News & World Report, has recently raised the question whether our big business organizations are in fact large enough to meet the challenge of the Soviets. I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Big Business Not Big Enough?" which appeared in the March 30, 1959, issue of the U.S. News & World Report may be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. President, during my 20 years of service in the Congress, the defense of our country has always been one of my principal concerns. In World War II, during the Korean emergency and during the present cold war, I have learned that we need big business with its research skills, its trained manpower, and its facilities to protect the welfare of all of us. This statement is in no way incompatible with the philosophy I share with every other Member of this body that small business has a vital role to play in the advancement of America's future. I am unwilling, however, to identify bigness with badness. I am opposed to monopoly in any form, but an examination of the record shows that in most areas large firms are meeting keen competition from other firms equally endowed with capital, resources, and management skills.

As we approach the time where our leaders must meet with the Soviets at a summit conference, we must close ranks and stop these senseless attacks on the business community which if continued may destroy one of our greatest assets.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Look magazine, Mar. 31, 1959]

THE RUSSIANS ARE TRYING TO TURN OUR BEST WEAPON AGAINST US

What is that weapon? It is mass production by big integrated industries—fast, efficient, economical. This is our greatest asset in a cold war which has become an economic struggle. It is the source of our strength and the basis of our position as a world power.

But other countries, especially the Russians, are imitating our great integrated productive industries as completely as possible. For our big corporations they substitute gigantic trusts and combines.

It would be one of the ironies of history if, while the Russians integrate their industries to achieve lower production costs, we turned in the other direction and weakened the ability of our industries to compete in world markets by making them smaller and less integrated.

No longer do our big producers find most of their competition among other American companies. Increasingly, American industries derive more and more of their business from overseas. Of the largest, several now obtain from 40 to 70 percent of their income from operations in other countries.

ELECTRICAL APPLIANCES FOR EVERYBODY

Among those U.S. industries selling widely overseas are the makers of electrical equipment.

Few have done more to make the comforts and conveniences of life widely available. Their radios, refrigerators, washers, and dozens of other products have brought better living to Americans and many other peoples worldwide.

Here in America the amount of electricity used has roughly doubled every 10 years. The investments required to generate it, and to provide appliances to use it, have gone up in proportion.

As a result of the billions that have been spent to research and develop such electrical equipment, the householder who worked 580 hours to buy a refrigerator in 1931, had to work only 188 hours to buy one in 1958. And the same is true of virtually all other electrical appliances.

Yet despite its rapid growth, and the constant increase in the invested capital required by the electrical industry, there are more small electrical suppliers today than there were 10 years ago.

This demonstrates the wealth-generating attribute of big business, supporting and energizing a vast and always increasing host of small business.

THE TRUTH ABOUT BIGNESS

In the light of these facts, it is time to reexamine the credo that bigness means monopoly and higher prices. In America, bigness has meant just the opposite. It has raised our living levels year by year. And now when we need it most, we find that bigness—with its resulting efficiency and economy—is also the armory of our defense.

If at this juncture we decide to stifle bigness and efficiency, we can be sure that the Russians will not. Nor will our other competitors in world markets.

Such a policy could result in the loss of our world business, a drastic lowering of our standard of living, and our inevitable decline as a world power.

We have plenty of checks today against any bad effects of bigness * * * such as exorbitant profits. What we should be more concerned about is whether our industries will stay strong enough to meet tough foreign competition in world markets and make any profit at all.

They will, if they are able to keep their prices low enough. And the only way they can do this and still pay our American workers the high wages they should get is to use our mass production weapon to the utmost.

If in this crisis we decide to go the other way—if we force big industries to split themselves into smaller, less efficient units—only three more words remain to be written.

We've had it.

Attacks on big business are also attacks on the high productivity that makes your high living level possible. When you read or hear such statements, don't let them go unanswered. In your own interest, speak up.

[From U.S. News & World Report, Mar. 30, 1959]

BIG BUSINESS NOT BIG ENOUGH?—THE STORY OF THE GROWING DEMANDS UPON INDUSTRY IN AMERICA

Once again, Government is making a strong attack on "bigness" in American business. This attack is coming just at a time when "big business" itself is more convinced than ever that it is not big enough.

This question is raised: When is big business too big?

The Government's Department of Justice has suggested that General Motors Corp. is too big. Moves are being started that may lead to the breakup of that giant of the motor industry.

Bethlehem Steel Corp. and Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. recently were denied the right to merge, on the ground that the combined company would be too big. The Pillsbury Co. is being told that it must give up two flour-milling concerns it purchased. Continental Can Co., Inc., has been told that its acquisition of Hazel-Atlas Glass Co. and the Robert Gair Co. violates the antitrust laws.

Both the Justice Department and a committee of the U.S. Senate have launched investigations to determine whether a few big companies dominate prices and markets in steel and autos. There is powerful support in Congress for a new law to require that Government be notified in advance before any important merger is carried out.

At the Federal Trade Commission, officials continually scan moves that might limit business competition.

All along the line, in many areas of Government, the attack is on bigness.

PRESSURES FOR GROWTH

Yet "big business," now as in the past, is under great and growing pressure to grow bigger. "Small business," at the same time, is turning to the Government for more and more help. The aim of most small enterprises is to prosper and grow bigger.

Actually, the giants among this country's business concerns are relatively few in number. As the accompanying chart shows, there are only 3,550 firms employing 1,000 or more workers. The number employing fewer than 1,000 is more than 4.3 million.

Another measure of size is found in the total assets of a business. Using that scale, you find there are about 1,000 companies large enough to have assets of more than $100 million. Only a few have assets of $1 billion or more.

A glance at the table prepared by the economic unit of U.S. News & World Report, shows you the Nation's 15 largest nonfinancial companies ranked according to total assets. These firms, and others like them—the real giants of American industry—are numbered in scores, rather than in hundreds or thousands.

It is on this segment of business, small in number but great in importance, that the Government is concentrating its attack.

In the face of attack, however, big business keeps growing bigger. In 1958, the Federal Trade Commission reported, there were 899 mergers of major corporations. That came on top of 941 major-corporation mergers in 1957.

WHY GIANTS TEAM UP

What accounts for the trend toward greater and greater size in American business?

When you look into this question, you find many answers.

Mammoth strides are being made in science and technology. Vast resources in capital and new equipment are required to develop the products that science makes possible.

Research itself has become so stupendous in scope that big business, large as it is, cannot undertake it all. Government finds that it must invest billions of dollars each year to supplement private research.

As industry expands and population grows, there is growing need to find new sources of raw materials. Again, huge investment is required—so big that even the giants among corporations are forced to band together to provide the capital needed for development.

Thus, in the worldwide search for oil, joint ventures have been organized by the big producing firms to find new petroleum reserves and get them to market. In Saudi Arabia, for example, four American oil companies have invested more than $800 million to develop oil fields and lay a 1,000-mile pipeline to the Mediterranean Sea. In steel, five big U.S. steelmakers have banded together to bring iron ore from remote fields in Labrador and Quebec. High in the Peruvian Andes mountains, four American metal-mining companies have joined to develop a copper deposit that will soon be producing 30,000 tons of ore a day.

In scores of other industries, big corporations are working as partners to share the risks and the expense of tackling new and complex jobs.

A coal producer and an oil company, for instance, have formed a new corporation to make the giant electrodes needed in producing aluminum. A steel firm and an electrical-products manufacturer have formed a company to produce titanium. In Alabama, a maker of chemicals and a textile firm are jointly operating a synthetic-fiber plant, and, in the resource-rich province of Alberta, a Canadian oil company and a U.S. papermaking company have teamed up to build a $42 million pulp mill.

STRUGGLE FOR WORLD MARKETS

In today's world, competition for markets is intense. When American businessmen venture into world markets, they must compete with foreign firms that often have the backing of governments themselves.

U.S. companies now are meeting keen competition from concerns in Western Europe and in Japan—areas where labor costs are far lower than in this country. Companies in many foreign areas can get together to set prices and divide up markets. Steel companies in the United States note that such foreign-produced items as nails, barbed wire, and some types of steel sheets often can be made abroad and shipped to this country to sell at prices lower than those of similar products made in Pittsburgh, Chicago, or Cleveland.

Soviet Russia, in effect, is one big company. Its rigidly controlled economy can be directed to turn out whatever products the Russian leaders choose, without regard to the needs of Soviet consumers. Russia can dump products on world markets and undercut any competitor.

A SPUR TO COST CUTTING

To counteract the threats of lower priced imports, the big companies in this country find they must spend increasingly large sums for new equipment, automatic machinery and other devices to hold down their manufacturing costs. Only by pouring huge sums into modernized plants can they hope to offset rising costs of labor and raw materials, and the continual squeeze on profit margins.

Such spending tends to foster the growth of the largest companies, which are able to float big stock and bond issues and retain some money from their annual earnings. Less efficient operators, unable to produce profitably and stand up to sharp competition, are forced to sell or go out of business.

Look at what has happened, over the years, in the auto industry. Only five makers of passenger cars have managed to fight rising costs and sharp competition and stay in business over the years. Thirty years ago, there were 13 auto makers. Of today's remaining manufacturers, the Big Three—General Motors, Ford, and Chrysler—account for about 90 percent of all the cars produced.

TAXES VERSUS HORATIO ALGER

Today's high tax rates have a double-barreled effect on business concerns. By siphoning off dollars that might go for expansion, Federal tax policy tends to keep smaller enterprises from growing larger in the way some of America's companies grew a few decades ago.

"The Horatio Alger story of the Ford Motor Co.—which, beginning with $28,000 in 1903, was worth nearly $1 billion by 1930—could not be repeated under the present-day tax structure," one financial authority notes.

At the same time, high taxes force existing companies to be as large and successful as possible. Only by earning tremendous sums, to be split with Uncle Sam, do big companies have money left for reinvestment and for creating new jobs.

Each new job given to a worker today calls for the investment of about $15,000, according to one recent study. B. B. Turner, president of Ethyl Corp., notes: "Such spending by the big business concerns has helped build America's prosperity. It has brought a continual increase in output among workers in industry, permitting higher wages, more leisure, and extra job benefits."

These pressures—from bigger tasks to be done, from rising costs, from stiff foreign competition—are only a few of the factors that are operating to bring about bigger and bigger enterprises under single management.

BIG UNIONS AND BIG DEFENSE

Big and powerful labor unions add another pressure. Unions operate outside the antitrust laws that govern business. A single union, under a single direction, is able to shut down the Nation's basic industries. This power of big unions adds to the demand for an offsetting bigness on the management side.

Another push comes from national defense. Government finds that no single company and no single industry is big enough to do all the research and development for today's new weapons. Yet Government, in turn, is forced to look to big business for the skills in management and organizational ability that are required to carry through the production of the new jet planes, rockets, missiles, and other weapons in the Nation's defensive arsenal.

In other fields vital to the Nation's future, all the signs that Government officials see—even as they battle against bigness—indicate that big business is going to grow bigger still.

ATOMS AND OUTER SPACE

Take the development of atomic energy for peacetime use: Huge investments are re-

quired. There is little chance that early efforts to generate nuclear power will pay off in profits. Though groups of companies have joined to build atomic reactors, the projects are so expensive that there is more and more pressure for Government itself to move into the development of nuclear power.

Big as the large companies are today, they are not big enough to afford the vast sums needed to explore outer space and finance the rockets and missiles that will aid this exploration. Government is putting up most of the funds now being channeled into space projects.

In still another field, that of producing electric power, past notions of size are being revised. Says Robert Paxton, president of General Electric Co.:

"To provide a rising standard of living for the rapidly expanding population of the United States, this country must have electric-generating capacity of 1 billion kilowatts within 30 years. That means building the equivalent of six new power systems as big as the electric-power industry was in 1957, at an indicated cost of $360 billion or more, in 1958 dollars. Obviously, utility companies and their suppliers, including General Electric, will have to grow several times larger than they are at present, if the need for increased generating capacity is to be satisfied."

THE SHRINKING DOLLAR

Inflation, continuing steadily, has put higher price tags on the jobs industry must do. Only big, well-to-do firms can afford the outlays. The cost of drilling an oil well in 1948 was about $49,000, on the average. Today, an identical well costs more than $70,000. The cost of building a new 50,000-barrel-a-day oil refinery is 30 percent higher now than it was a decade ago.

Since the end of World War II, the companies in the Bell Telephone System have had to raise about $13 billion in new capital to pay for expansion of phone service in the United States. That outlay is more money than the entire Federal Government was spending per year for all purposes as recently as 1940.

HOW GIANTS COME AND GO

Businessmen have found that mere size, by itself, is no guarantee that a company will grow and prosper.

"Unless you convince your customers every single day that you are giving them good value—better than they can get somewhere else—you won't stay long at the top," says the president of one electrical-appliance company.

A long-time study of the way giant industrial concerns have ranked by size over the years bears out this comment. The Brookings Institution traced the fortunes of the 100 largest industrial companies over four decades, starting in 1909.

Of the 100 big companies on the 1909 list, only 36 still were among the largest in 1948. By 1955, only 29 remainded. Some of the original companies had completely disappeared. Others were still in business, but had been outstripped by faster-growing rivals.

Many corporations that have gotten steadily larger in recent years are selling to a diminishing share of the total market, simply because of the way the country is growing.

Fifty years ago, for example, United States Steel Corp., made 67 percent of all the steel produced in this country. Today, though it has quadrupled its capacity, it produces only about 30 percent of the Nation's steel.

Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey) in the last 10 years has vastly increased its volume of business—from roughly 1,250,000 barrels of oil a day to more than 2,250,000 barrels. But it still accounts for just about the same percentage of the free world's petroleum operations as a decade ago, because the whole industry has grown in the meantime.

A TWO-WAY STREET

One charge often made against "big business" is that it tends to squeeze small enterprises out of existence. On the other hand, growth and expansion of large firms often open new markets which small companies can share.

Small firms also depend on the large companies for orders. This interdependence of big and little firms holds true in every type of industry. General Electric Co. buys parts, materials and services from 42,000 suppliers. United States Steel buys supplies from 50,000 small concerns and in turn furnishes steel to nearly 100,000 small companies.

Discovery and development of new products, largely as a result of research by big companies, have provided many new business opportunities. Look at just one field—the manufacture of chemicals—and you get a glimpse of the spectacular progress in new-product development over the past few decades. Since 1920, for instance, the Nation has seen such chemical advances as these: antibiotic drugs, plastic packaging films, radioactive isotopes, synthetic fibers and plastics, detergents, weedkillers, hormones, rubber-base paints, improved motor fuels, synthetic fertilizers, and synthetic rubber.

THE NEW OWNERS

Today's big businesses find it continually necessary to raise new capital for developing new products and producing them efficiently and economically. The sale of securities for this purpose tends to make ownership of the big concerns more widespread.

The Du Pont Co., for example, has more than 45 million shares of common stock and 2.4 million shares of preferred stock outstanding. In addition to the individuals who own Du Pont shares in their own names, the stock is also held by 600 schools and colleges, 200 hospitals, more than 500 churches, nearly 700 charitable institutions and more than 500 insurance companies.

Small shareholders gradually are getting an increasing stake in stock ownership. Even in the country's largest company in terms of assets, American Telephone & Telegraph Co., no individual shareholder owns as much as one-thirtieth of 1 percent of the stock.

Millions of individuals today, through ownership of life insurance policies, investment funds, and equities in pension and retirement plans, are indirect owners of the big, successful companies.

Much of the criticism leveled at big business concerns today is based on practices that were discarded decades ago. "The days of child labor, 'union busting,' and sweatshops are as outmoded as the gasoline that used to run the tin lizzie," an oil-company executive declares.

Over the years, laws have been passed and agencies created to regulate various types of businesses. The Federal Government and the various States have "watchdog" agencies in transportation, communications, banking, securities trading, and other fields. Much of the Federal regulation stems from the Reconstruction Era following the Civil War, when pools and trusts were created to maintain production and prices in key industries.

New suggestions for regulating big businesses continue to be made. Only a few days ago—on March 18—a proposal was made in the U.S. Senate that prices of steel and other heavy metals should be controlled in much the same way as public utility rates are regulated.

THE RIGHT HAND AND THE LEFT

Sometimes, businessmen say, the Government appears to be working at cross-purposes in its desire to make business more competitive and, at the same time, to make use of the facilities of the Nation's big enterprises.

David E. Lilienthal, former chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, gives this example: He asked the Bell Telephone System to take over the tremendously difficult task of redesigning and mass-producing the atomic bomb. But, at about the same time, another Federal agency, the Justice Department, was suing to split off the Western Electric Co. from the Bell System and to divide Western Electric into several parts.

In other words, a Bell System executive remarked, the Government was asking for the destruction of the very things most needed for a job vital to the Nation's security—size and organizational unity.

The debate over bigness in business still goes on. There is continued questioning about the part big organizations should have in the U.S. economy. But this much seems certain: As the Nation grows and develops, there will be many jobs for the big, financially strong, research-minded companies. These firms, holding their places in the rough-and-tumble competition of American business, have the facilities and the depth of leadership to tackle the giant tasks that people want to see accomplished.

America's business giants [1]—The 15 biggest companies, ranked by amount of assets

	Total assets	1958 profits	Number of workers	Number of stockholders
American Telephone & Telegraph Co.	$19,494,000,000	$952,000,000	725,000	1,620,000
Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey)	7,900,000,000	564,000,000	155,000	500,000
General Motors Corp.	6,891,000,000	634,000,000	620,900	750,700
United States Steel Corp.	4,436,000,000	301,000,000	223,500	311,700
Gulf Oil Corp.	3,430,000,000	[2]	56,000	93,600
Socony Mobil Oil Co.	3,238,000,000	157,000,000	75,000	207,000
The Texas Co.	3,112,000,000	310,000,000	52,500	138,300
Pennsylvania RR. Co.	2,963,032,000	12,000,000	78,900	137,100
Ford Motor Co.	2,962,000,000	96,000,000	165,000	265,000
Standard Oil Co. (Indiana)	2,769,000,000	118,000,000	46,000	151,900
E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.	2,649,000,000	341,000,000	85,800	209,400
New York Central RR.	2,626,000,000	[2]	62,000	40,000
Standard Oil Co. of California	2,451,000,000	258,000,000	38,400	154,000
General Electric Co.	2,421,000,000	243,000,000	249,700	395,500
Bethlehem Steel Corp.	2,195,000,000	138,000,000	140,500	186,700

[1] Excluding banks and insurance companies.
[2] Profits for 1958 not yet available.

NOTE.—Profits are after taxes.
Source: Latest financial reports.

Address by the Honorable S. Samuel Di Falco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, April 11, 1959, I had the privilege of attending the annual banquet of the Delta Theta Phi law fraternity at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel in New York. On that occasion, the Honorable S. Samuel Di Falco, surrogate of New York County, was installed as an honorary member of the John Jay Senate of the fraternity and he delivered a very fine address.

Surrogate Di Falco's address should be of great interest to all lawyers and students of law in the country. It is for this reason that I am inserting it into the RECORD in order to bring it to the attention of all my colleagues, especially those who are trained in the law.

For the benefit of those of our colleagues who do not know Surrogate Di Falco, I want to say that he is a former member of the New York City Council and a former justice of the New York State Supreme Court, where he served with great distinction. He is a learned and eminent jurist. The thoughts he expresses in his address are most appropriate.

Among the distinguished guests present at the banquet were the following: Rev. Joseph T. Tinnelly, C. M., dean of St. John's University School of Law; Hon. Charles E. Murphy, justice of the appellate division; Hon. John R. Starkey, judge of the county court; Dr. Harold F. McNiece, associate dean of St. John's University School of Law; Prof. Arthur L. Gould; Prof. Edward R. Re; Alfred C. Cordon, chief justice of the Delta Theta Supreme Court; Timothy V. Smith, district chancellor; Joseph R. Palumbo, dean of Greater New York Alumni Senate; and John A. Flood, dean of John Jay Senate.

Following is the text of Surrogate Di Falco's address:

SPEECH OF SURROGATE S. SAMUEL DI FALCO BEFORE THE DELTA THETA PHI LAW FRATERNITY, APRIL 11, 1959

Honored guests, clergy, fellow jurists, brothers, I am highly honored by membership in the Delta Theta Phi which you have conferred on me.

I do not accept this honor lightly. It is a privilege, coming as it does, from so distinguished and prominent a law fraternity.

Yes, my fraternal brothers, fraternities play a more important role in our society. They fill the need for close companionships, for educational exchanges of information, and for the advancement of common goals.

The founders of your fraternity undoubtedly had in mind the need for close companionship among students of the law, for an educational exchange of legal information, and for the advancement of a common cause both before and after graduation from law school and for maintaining and upholding the integrity of the legal profession in the eyes of the public.

You the students and recently admitted members of the bar are standing on the threshold of a distinguished career in an ancient, honored, and proud profession, a profession which has led the struggle for liberty, for justice, and for the protection of human rights. The lawyer, from the beginning of time, has been the acknowledged leader of the community in legislative halls, in high government places, and in all other tribunals of this great democracy. This profession offers a great challenge and an opportunity for service to your community.

This is a profession of honor and esteem in our society.

To function efficiently and effectively, the lawyer must have the highest trust and the deepest confidence from his client and the public. This primarily is the basic premise upon which a lawyer-client relationship is founded.

It should be noted and emphasized, however, that the legal profession is no more troubled with undesirable or unethical practitioners than is any other profession or calling. We must at all times safeguard against the creation and promotion of a false impression to the public, that the infrequent dishonorable lawyer is the general rule, when, in fact, he is the rare exception.

For instance, you must have observed the increasingly vicious and vitriolic attacks upon lawyers who represent defendants in unpopular causes, or who represent individuals who are under general castigation or fire.

Are not these causes or these individuals entitled to legal representation and a fair trial—regardless of all other considerations—with the inherent right to able counsel? Is not the providing of a legal defense the sacred obligation of the profession and a sacred right to be provided to an accused? This is a constitutional right—this is part of our civil rights. Is it not a fact that counsel has the obligation to represent a client to the best of his ability without being deemed to be in sympathy with, or approving of, his client's cause or course of conduct? Yet, how many are there to speak eloquently as defenders of the lawyer and the profession on this issue.

May I call to your attention, my friends, another situation worthy of mention.

In the past two sessions of the New York State Legislature, a bill was introduced entitled "Establishment of a Simplified State Court System." Yet, consistently in every medium of communication, reference is made to this bill as a court reform bill.

Without arguing the merits of the proposed court plan, I believe it is poor public relations for our courts to improperly permit the reckless—irresponsible and dangerous use of the word "reform" in connection with our courts. Reform connotes corruption, wrongdoing and abuse of justice in the public mind. By definition, "reform" means "to abandon an evil course," "to give up evil for that which is good." This was never the intent of this legislation. It is more accurate to speak of court modernization, court simplification, or court consolidation. Yet, can you estimate the impression that the public or the layman gets from such a reference? What about the portrayal of the role of a lawyer on TV, in films or in a play participating or aiding a criminal in his nefarious activities? Do you think this is good for the profession?

Unfortunately, the critics are loud, numerous, and inflammatory—our defenders few, whispering, and conciliatory. I urge you, future members of the profession, and those of you who are now representatives of the bar, to uphold our profession's dignity and honor, which it has always richly earned and does deserve.

Each individual practicing lawyer is by his deed, word, and actions, an emissary of our profession and is a standard bearer of the honor, dignity, and respect which will inure either to the benefit or detriment of the legal profession. Each individual lawyer, in his relationship with the public, holds the reputation of the profession in his hands—to mold—either for good or for evil.

We members of the legal profession are the fiduciaries of an enormous public trust. We hold, in our hands, the destinies of man's civil, human, and property rights.

Though we contribute unselfishly, unswervingly, and devotedly to the public interest our good deeds are neither promulgated widely nor loudly enough.

It is my humble opinion that the time has come when we must take the responsibility for reeducating and enlightening the public. In this you, the young, can lead the way.

You must correct in the public mind, any unfounded and misguided impressions by good and favorable public relations. Lawyers must continue to be recognized as conscientious men and women of wisdom and judgment. If they are to protect their rightful roles as architects who built the best legal and judicial system, then they must be prepared to fight the forces of unjust criticism, harsh judgment, and caricatured half-truths, with wide promulgation of the truth and constructive contributions to society.

We, you and I, must mobilize every means and every organization at our disposal—as the disseminators of good will, respect, and understanding of the bench and bar.

We cannot expect the impetus for such a movement to come from the outside. If we do not seek to protect ourselves, if we do not endeavor to grapple with our probs and find solutions for them, we cannot look to others for help. Within the profession we have the necessary machinery at hand, and the finest legal minds to make that machienry work.

Be faithful to your chosen profession. Zealously and jealously guard her reputation. Be loyal to your democratic way of life. Be true to your fraternal brother and brother lawyer.

Above all, never swerve in your devotion, nor diminish your enthusiasm for that sacred adage "The true administration of justice is the firmest pillar of good government."

Let us forever keep the beacon of our beloved profession glowing brightly with our own interest, warmth, and fervor.

We must ever keep the torch brilliantly aflame, so that the public can see our sense of decency, responsibility, and honesty.

Each member of a legal fraternity, such as yours, or bar association must be a lighthouse of hope, safety, and of "on course" to the American public.

As the future bastions of the legal profession, the molding of public values should be of great concern to you.

As the legal luminaries of tomorrow, remember that the bar and your country need your patriotic assistance to lay the proper foundation for the future.

In placing the future of the profession in your hands, I know I am securing it for us and posterity.

Des Moines and Mississippi River Flood-Control Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NEAL SMITH
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include my testimony given before the House Committee on Appropriations concerning the Des Moines River Valley flood-control program, which is of vital concern to the entire Mississippi River Valley, in particular, and to the whole country, in general. My testimony was as follows:

STATEMENT OF NEAL SMITH, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, FIFTH DISTRICT, IOWA, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATIONS OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, APRIL 30, 1959

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee: I appreciate the privilege of appearing before your subcommittee to enter a formal request for $2 million to be included in the 1960 public works appropriations bill for the Red Rock Dam and Reservoir on the Des Moines River. The reservoir site, approximately 60 miles downstream from the city of Des Moines will be chiefly in Marion County, which is in the congressional district I represent, but four congressional districts in Iowa are directly affected, as well as States bordering the Mississippi River. I feel certain that the citizens of at least 25 congressional districts would be benefited by construction of the Red Rock Dam.

Permit me, first, Mr. Chairman, to commend your subcommittee for its untiring efforts in endeavoring to assign priority to the many worthy projects brought before your subcommittee. I am also aware, Mr. Chairman, of the serious admonishment you delivered in the House of Representatives earlier this week, on April 27. I agree that there are unnecessary expenses we have been doing without and can continue to get along without. My request is not in this category. The project will be an investment in every sense of the word, not a mere expense. It is an investment to save human lives and property. The ratio of benefits compared to costs for this project is 1.51. Few projects in which you ever invested money had that favorable ratio. This is a good investment from a business point of view. For the reasons hereinafter stated, I respectfully request that you give favorable consideration to the request for an appropriation of $2 million for the Red Rock Reservoir.

CHRONOLOGY

Over 21 years ago, in the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938, the Congress approved a general comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in the Upper Mississippi River Basin "with such modifications thereof as in the discretion of the Secretary of War and Chief of Engineers may be advisable." The plan included a reservoir on the Des Moines River, then known as Howell Reservoir and now designated as Red Rock Reservoir (Howell site), with dam site 142.9 miles above the river mouth.

That same year a further study was authorized of the Des Moines River Basin flood problems. In the survey report of 1943 (H. Doc. 651, 78th Cong., 2d sess.) the Chief of Engineers recommended construction of Red Rock Reservoir, with the dam site 155.6 miles above the river mouth.

By the Flood Control Act of 1944, the Congress authorized the 1938 comprehensive plan, "including the project for Red Rock Dam substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the chief of engineers in document 651."

The 1943 report of the Corps of Engineers was reviewed following the major floods of 1947, which cost seven lives in the Des Moines River Basin, the evacuation of over 6,000 persons, left tens of thousands of citizens without drinking water in the tap for a month, and caused millions of dollars in damages. The engineers found that the Red Rock site would not have contained the 1947 flood and recommended construction of the authorized Red Rock Reservoir at the Howell site and a reservoir above Des Moines at the Saylorville site, with dam at mile 213.7.

RECURRING MAJOR FLOODS

The Corps of Engineers in its various reports for flood control on the Des Moines River has continuously directed attention to the recurring floods of major proportions, which have caused many millions of dollars of damages to urban areas and serious crop losses. Their magnitude and frequency are a matter of record—June 1851, June 1858, April 1862, June 1865, July 1869, July 1875, April 1876, July 1881, April 1888, May 1892, April 1897, July 1902, June 1903, June 1917, June 1935, May and June 1944, June 1946, June 1947, and June 1954—an average of a major flood every 5½ years. Moreover, every year significant flood damages are experienced, resulting in average annual flood losses, based on 1952 prices, in excess of $2 million in the lower valley below the proposed Red Rock Dam.

Local protection measures have been adopted through the years, and our State of Iowa is grateful to the Corps of Engineers for its assistance and cooperation. While these measures have served to lessen somewhat the amount of our economic losses, it is a matter of official record that our local programs are inadequate without the Red Rock Reservoir.

During the 1947 flood, Ottumwa in the fourth district—which has always suffered heavy losses from Des Moines River floods—was without an approved public water supply for 30 days. In the past few years alone, Ottumwa has obligated itself to $5 million for levees, channel improvements, and storm-water pumping stations, which will supplement the Red Rock Reservoir. In 1956 the city began construction of these improvements after approval by the Corps of Engineers. Within the city limits of Des Moines, approximately 5.5 miles of levees have been constructed. Through the years the district engineer has had to tell Iowans owning land bordering the river that nothing can be done on their losses because their properties lie in the area of the basin authorized for a dam.

Mr. Chairman, the citizens of my State have spent millions—yes, millions of dollars—in local improvement works. While these local works and the soil and water conservation programs that have been inaugurated are helpful in reducing flood costs, they cannot be substituted for the flood-control purposes of the Red Rock Reservoir.

The city of Ottumwa has now undertaken bonded indebtedness to the limit permitted by law in an effort to protect its citizens and its business district from flood damage. They have done all they can do locally and that investment is threatened, by a major flood, which could again easily occur on the Des Moines River, would probably destroy the large investment and sacrifice made by the city of Ottumwa. Citizens on a local level can go only so far with self-help projects. They now need the cooperation of Congress to begin construction of the project long recommended by the Army engineers as the project that should be constructed first.

Many sections of Iowa and Minnesota that are drained by the Des Moines River and its tributaries have experienced dry weather for the past several months. But droughts in this area have been followed by floods, and people are still holding their breath, hoping that floods will not occur. The presently swollen tributaries from Des Moines downstream can be carried by the Des Moines River channel, but additional rain on the upper end will cause serious trouble.

If the dam under consideration had been constructed before 1947, the high water crest in the 1947 flood as far south as Hannibal, Mo., could have been reduced by 2 feet and saved the entire Mississippi Valley millions of dollars in damage, and great human sickness and misery.

The Des Moines River drains an area through central Iowa and Minnesota that receives heavy rainfall. Holding back the flood waters from central Iowa and Minnesota would benefit the entire Mississippi River Valley, and the most logical place to invest in flood control is in the headwaters in this area of high precipitation.

RED ROCK NOT A "NEW START"

With reference to the present policy against "new starts," this request for funds for the Red Rock Reservoir should not be considered a new start. As a matter of fact, construction funds of $1 million were allotted to the Red Rock Reservoir under the Civil Functions Appropriations Act of June 25, 1948. It was necessary to defer construction, however, following the major flood of 1947 which almost doubled the previous recorded flood heights at some points on the river, and as a result of the Presidential deferment directive during the Korean conflict.

It should also be noted that, while many river valleys have had several projects completed, the Des Moines River Valley has been without any project, and it should not now be doubly penalized because Federal funds have not previously been spent for construction there.

IMPORTANCE OF DES MOINES RIVER FLOOD-CONTROL PLAN

The century-old record of severe and frequent flooding in the Des Moines River area, the steadily increasing population in the 21 years since the authorization of the Red Rock Reservoir, the greatly expanded industrial development—these factors all warrant the appropriation of funds at this time in order that construction of the Red Rock Dam can finally be undertaken. Our citizens are uneasy over the possibility of having to wait still longer for the start of this project. They appeal to me and point out that apart from past economic losses, which for the last two major floods amounted to more than 30 percent of the estimated cost of the Red Rock project, each year of delay, each year of postponement, means they are exposed to the hazards of additional flood devastation.

Plainly, the size and importance of the area affected by the Des Moines River Basin and the severity and frequency of flooding compel the Congress to see to it that construction is now begun on the Red Rock Reservoir.

When completed, the Red Rock Reservoir and the Saylorville Reservoir (Public Law 85-500, approved July 3, 1958), together with the Des Moines local protection works, will provide flood protection to 213 miles of the Des Moines River below the Saylorville Reservoir and to the entire area subject to flooding by the waters of the Mississippi. The President's 1960 budget included $113,000 as the amount necessary to complete the little planning that remained to be done and is now being completed. The Corps of Engineers has advised me that from an engineering standpoint $2 million can be efficiently utilized for the Red Rock project during the 1960 fiscal year. They could begin work on the project almost immediately.

There, of course, is also need for continuing the studies and surveys for the authorized upstream reservoir at Saylorville. Under the comprehensive plan another pool would be contained near Saylorville. About $200,000 is needed for making surveys relative to Saylorville. Under the plan of improvement, as now authorized, the Red Rock Reservoir will have an earth dam at the

Howell site. The dam would be about 108 feet high and 6,100 feet long. The flood-control pool would cover 65,500 acres at elevation 780 feet above sea level. Saylorville Reservoir would have an earth dam 125 feet high and 6,000 feet long. Its flood-control pool would cover 15,500 acres at elevation 884.

The Corps of Engineers has very recently estimated the tangible benefits of these two projects at $6.9 million a year, on the average. On the basis of prices obtaining in 1952, the cost of the Red Rock Reservoir has been estimated at about a $70 million total. We are asking for $2 million now. Had the Red Rock Reservoir been in operation in 1947, damages in the Des Moines River Basin would have been reduced by over $26 million—the amount of damages caused by the 1947 and 1954 floods. This is small compared to the damage to Mississippi River cities that this river valley could deliver.

These authorized projects will practically eliminate flood damage to towns, farms, roads, and railways on the Des Moines River below Saylorville. Along the Mississippi River downstream from the mouth of the Des Moines River, important levee districts and cities, including Quincy in Illinois and Canton, LaGrange, and Hannibal in Missouri would be benefited. The cost of Federal and other highway bridges in the area below the dams would be greatly reduced, and the area including the big ordnance plant near Burlington would be protected. Twice during World War II citizens of the valley had to take time out from fighting the war to fight the Des Moines River. The river should be an asset rather than a menace.

I cannot think of any investment in the future of America that is more justified and worthwhile. It is in full accord with all reports and authorizations of the Army Engineers over the past 21 years. On behalf of thousands of Mississippi Valley citizens, I respectfully request your approval of this investment.

Communism and Immigration Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I have been very much disturbed about the changed policy of this Government that has resulted in deportation proceedings against some Polish refugees.

The apparent basis assigned by the Government for this change of policy is that political changes have occurred in Poland that now renders it possible for refugees to be returned to Poland from this country without danger of political persecution, retaliation, or oppression.

While some temporary gestures of conciliation and softening of policy occurred under the so-called Gomulka government, they were shortlived indeed. In the American press, in our diplomatic reports, in all the evidence that is available, it is clear that the leopard has not changed his spots and that the Polish Government is still a Communist puppet and can be no more depended upon to administer impartial justice or refrain from ruthless actions than any other Communist government whether it be Hungary or Red China.

All the responsible evidence that we have available indicates that in fields that by any stretch of the imagination constitute a real test of fair-minded, impartial, humane treatment of human beings, that the Polish Communist government fails to measure up to standards that free-minded peoples would expect and that the United States above all should insist upon in its relations with other nations.

It is clear from available evidence that the concessions made by the Polish Government fololwing the events of October 1956 are being systematically withdrawn and that no reasonable expectation exists that democratic freedoms and human rights are being or would be consistently observed or recognized by the present Polish Communist government.

What reasonable man could doubt on the current evidence that the Polish Communist government is a government by edict, dominated by force and committee to ruthless regimentation of the Nation's political and economic systems and of the people.

The following facts cannot be denied—

First. Workers in Poland have been placed under strict party rule and discipline contrary to their will.

Second. Censorship in Poland has become more rigorous than ever.

Third. Free speech, free expression, free inquiry, free publication in Poland are ruthlessly suppressed.

Fourth. Rigid control of religious practices and worship and bans on religious education are in existence in Poland and constitute another shocking repression of individual rights.

Fifth. Religious symbols like crucifixes and other articles of great sacredness to sincere religious worshipers have been banned in Poland by the mailed fist of violence and heavy penalties on so-called offenders.

Sixth. Religious charitable activities have been repressed and religious relief services profaned in Poland so that the National Catholic Welfare Council has suspended all large shipments of relief goods to Poland.

Seventh. Malignant attacks against the religious hierarch have occurred and fake, trumped-up charges of crime brought against religious leaders in Poland characterized by particularly false, fraudulent, and unfounded claims of militarism, fanaticism and intolerance made against religious believers.

Eighth. Despicable unfounded charges were leveled against the Cardinal Primate of Poland and an unwarranted invasion of that Primate's institution at Jasna Gora Monastery was conducted by the government, its offices raided, its books, pamphlets and other documents of historic worth and deep religious significance were confiscated.

Ninth. The offices of Bishop Boleslaw Kominek were raided and searched by minions of the police state.

Tenth. The institution of higher religious education at Wroklaw was seized by the government and all its activities stopped.

Eleventh. Other leading clerics whose only offense was their devotion to God were arrested and jailed on trumped-up charges of violating governmental restrictions on the use of newsprint.

Twelfth. Ministers of the Gospel were imprisoned for their religious sermons to their flocks.

Thirteenth. The religious educational activities in the schools, programs of scientific research and studies were interfered with and the schools required to take active part in the building of communism in People's Poland.

Fourteenth. The autonomy of the legal profession was limited, thus making lawyers mere puppets and instruments of the state and depriving individuals of proper legal representation.

Fifteenth. Threats of violence and imprisonment were made against youth leaders in religion and democracy.

The very substantial flight of Poles from their country to escape these policies and acts of oppression continues and many Poles deeply attached to their native soil and nation are leaving it, driven to despair and fear to flee from oppression and persecution.

During the past 2 years the number of Poles asking for asylum in Western Europe has shown a steady increase. These facts and statistics are well known to American officials. They are also not only well known, but have been confirmed, by the Voice of the Council of Europe as attested in the statement of October 17, 1958, of Mr. Frans Goedhart, delegate from the Netherlands who declared:

> In Poland, we have seen possibly a more dramatic swing back toward the old days than in any of the other countries. Nearly all the gains by the Polish people in 1956 appear now to be lost. The freedom of the press has virtually disappeared. Travel abroad has now been curtailed, not by any regulations, but by the simple process of raising the cost of passports by no less than six times within the last year.

The British delegate, Mr. Mulley said:

> I believe that it is absurd to try to understand the situation in Poland, unless we take cognizance of the fact that there are 22 Soviet divisions in Eastern Germany.

The Denver Conference on Immigration held December 6, 1958 among other recommendations for reform of our immigration laws, recommended that our laws and the administration thereof should, to a great extent, practice the time-honored American tradition of granting asylum to victims of racial, religious and political persecution.

How can any reasonable person believe that there is anything in the history of the relations between the Soviet and enslaved countries to justify the belief that an individuals stand criticizing or opposing existing Communist governments would not be followed by forceful, repressive action and persecution of the individual and possibly his family and friends.

The facts clearly show that uprisings in Poland, Hungary and East Germany have been cruelly repressed by Soviet military force. Dissenters against Communist oppression have been murdered in cold blood. It is clear, or it should be clear, to any fairminded, thinking person that it is the fixed policy of Communist governments to persecute those who refuse to submit themselves to Com-

munist ideology, Communist irreligion and Communist hatred of democratic convictions.

In the light of all this evidence which, I repeat, is available to our Government from its own agents, as well as from authenticicated reports from other governments, and other authoritative observers and commentators on conditions inside Poland, it is impossible for me to understand how this Government could even think of changing its policy granting asylum and protection to those seeking a haven in this freedom-loving Nation, who, if they were to be returned to Poland, by every test of logic and experience, might well be exposed to ruthless treatment and possible liquidation.

This Government is becoming naive indeed, if it believes that there has been any basic change in the attitude of Communist governments toward freedom-loving, God-fearing individuals, or any assurances that these governments will not continue as in the past to punish believers in a Divine Being and in democratic principles, by ruthless persecution, imprisonment and death.

I hope that our great President, who is always so deeply concerned in a humane way with the plight of the oppressed and perseucted throughout the world, will take appropriate action to redefine and clarify the position of our Government so that the time-honored, historic principle of asylum for oppressed and persecuted peoples may not only be continued but safeguarded, and every effort made to depart from this principle shall be speedily eliminated from the American political scene.

It is not only millions of Americans of Polish blood and their friends who are interested in this problem, but all true lovers of freedom in the American Nation are interested and vitally concerned that our Government adhere to its noble traditions of protecting the weak and helpless and giving shelter to the oppressed and persecuted.

It would be a most unconscionable policy indeed for this Government to direct the deportation of any Poles or persons of any other nationality to a Communist-controlled state where such a strong likelihood exists that they would be subject to persecution, oppression, and possible liquidation.

With all my heart, I urge our great President and the administration to abandon its present course regarding the principle of asylum and make it clear that in America, the land of the free and the home of the brave, we intend to the best of our ability to protect human beings against the dread persecution of communism and that under no circumstances will we return law-abiding persons resident in this country to the control of ruthless Communist governments.

I recently appealed to the distinguished Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization Service, Gen. J. M. Swing, and his reply is pleasing and reassuring. It is as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PHILBIN: This will reply to your letter regarding the deportation cases of Polish refugees.

Approximately 75 cases of Polish nationals whose claims of physical persecution have previously been approved are now being reviewed. You are assured that no single one of these cases will result in an order to deport until I personally have reviewed the file.

The matter of physical persecution claims of Polish nationals, as well as nationals of other countries which are concededly Communist dominated or controlled, is the subject of continuing discussions between the Service and the immigration committees of the Congress.

Sincerely,

J. M. SWING,
Commissioner.

In view of this letter, I am very hopeful that the very serious problem presented by the Polish refugee deportation cases is well on its way to satisfactory and humane solution, and I earnestly hope that this will be the case.

The Development of Electrification in Puerto Rico Under REA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, in backward countries development takes place under the leadership of men of vision, knowledge, and sacrifice. The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico has made tremendous strides in its economy during the past 5 years. Construction is going on, industry is beginning to boom, and the economy is improving. Even the rigors of farm life and mountainous living have been softened by a construction program of electrification. Over 50,000 inhabitants of the mountainous and farm areas of Puerto Rico have been served by the rural electrification program, which our REA has assisted.

One of the most brilliant men I have met, who has an intimate knowledge of engineering and electricity, is Mr. Victor M. Cataldo, head of the Power Utilization Division of the Puerto Rico Resources Authority. He received his degree of bachelor in electrical engineering in the Cooper Union College of New York in 1936. Immediately upon graduation, he worked for the Intercall Communication System in New York for 2 years after which he joined the Puerto Rico Water Resources Authority in 1939 as a junior engineer in the development of the distribution and transmission system for the south coast. He was soon promoted to the engineering division where he assisted in the design of the Garzas and Dos Bocas hydroelectric projects. In July 1, 1951 he was appointed assistant head of the power division, a position which he held up to January 1958 when he was promoted to his present position.

I was impressed and amazed at the grasp of details and the memory of this public servant during my recent trip to Puerto Rico, where I attended a seminar on the subject of rural electrification. Mr. Cataldo delivered an extemporaneous talk on the manner in which rural electrification is being developed in Puerto Rico under the REA program, with the help of the Commonwealth government.

His remarks, which I am certain will prove interesting, are as follows:

During the last 43 years rural electrification in Puerto Rico has been under continuous development. Throughout this long process of its history, various means have been used to achieve the important goal of providing electric service to the rural zone. It was not, however, until 1952 that a rural electrification program was adopted to permit intensification of rural system expansion to serve rural electrification customers in Puerto Rico.

It is the object of this talk to explain the policy governing rural electrification in Puerto Rico and the formula which made it feasible.

In the year 1915, when the Irrigation Service of the south coast constructed the Carite hydroelectric plant for the purpose of supplying electric power to irrigation pumps, the excess power was sold to the rural areas. The electric system under this and succeeding agencies rapidly expanded throughout the rural zones in the south coast and moved northwestward, bordering cities and small towns until it reached the north shores. The good quality of electric service and its relative low costs helped in the gradual expansion of the service to the urban zones.

Up to 1936 the public utility expanded rural electrification from its own construction funds. During the depression in the middle thirties construction funds, made available by the Federal Government for relief purposes, were used for rural electrification development. These funds made possible the extension of new services to rural customers and trunk distribution feeders were constructed in the rural areas to bring the electric system closer to unserved families from which service was later extended at a reasonable cost.

In the year 1946, the Commonwealth government, in its endeavor to accelerate rural electrification expansion assigned $400,000 a year to the public utility to be used together with the utility's own funds for rural electrification development. Over 18,000 rural customers were served under this program which lasted up to 1952–53.

The accumulation of large number of requests for electric service in the rural areas, and the necessity to improve the economy and the welfare of the rural families, made it evident that a further acceleration of rural electrification development was essential to the island's economy. A study was then made in 1952 which resulted in the formulation of the existing rural electrification program of Puerto Rico.

Before explaining the program adopted, some of the principles upon which it is based and the conditions under which the authority operates should be reviewed briefly.

The authority is a self-sufficient, nonprofit public corporation. The self-sufficiency has been maintained by the design of rates for the sale of electric power which are intended to be fully compensatory. The authority sells electric power at cost. The cost of the service includes the direct costs of operation and the cost of all contractual obligations, including the cost of debt service on the debt incurred for system expansion. Revenue bonds are sold in the bond market of the United States to finance the authority construction program.

Under these circumstances, the authority cannot sell power at a price below its cost lest it be forced to increase rates in order to obtain an adequate return. The authority's rate schedules have been stable.

The residential rate in effect for many years has a 75 cent minimum charge and fixes a price of 4½ cents for the first 75 kilowatt-hours of monthly consumption; 3½ cents for the next 75 kilowatt-hours of consumption; 2½ cents for the next 75 kilowatt-hours and 1¼ cents for consumption over 225 kilowatt-hours per month.

There are in the rural areas of Puerto Rico two types of electric customers. One type enjoys a reasonable income, has a relatively high electricity consumption, and/or is near our electric lines. For this type of customers an economic study is made when service is requested and a minimum monthly consumption is determined which justifies the investment required to extend the service. Service is extended if the prospective rural customer guarantees the minimum consumption for a period of 3 to 5 years.

The customer may choose instead to contribute to the cost of construction with the amount which is not justified for expenditure under the rate schedule. The authority has been extending service to this type of rural customers from the authority's general construction fund and no problem exists in developing rural electrification on this basis. However, this type of rural consumer represents a small minority.

The majority of the rural population in Puerto Rico is comprised of low income rural families most of them workers in the sugarcane, tobacco, and coffee plantations. This type of customer cannot guarantee a minimum consumption to justify the investment in rural line extensions, cannot contribute toward the construction of rural lines, and has a low electricity consumption.

For this low-income-family group the existing residential rate by itself is not compensatory, due to their low consumption and to the high investment costs of system expansion. To serve these customers it would be necessary then, either to design a high residential rate for the sale of power, or to find means of reducing the overall costs of the service to the point where the existing residential rate schedule would apply. It was decided to keep the same residential rate to apply to both urban and rural zones and to devise means of reducing the cost of rural service. This policy forms the basis of the present rural electrification program.

The investment incurred in the distribution system expansion is one of the high costs in rural service extension. The moneys used for financing the construction of rural lines for this type of customers will have to be borrowed at the lowest possible debt service cost. A decision was then made to apply for a rural electrification loan from the Rural Electrification Administration, where financing at low rates is available for this purpose. This reduces substantially the high cost of rural service.

The debt service cost on the basis of a loan at 2 percent interest is about 33 percent lower than the same cost incurred in urban customers service.

The low cost of money made available by the Rural Electrification Administration has contributed substantially toward the success of the rural electrification program in Puerto Rico. It has contributed to the extension of electric service to thousands of low income, low consumption rural customers at the same residential rate at which power is sold to the urban zones.

The low consumption of electric power by the low-income group of rural families do not produce sufficient revenue to economically justify the investment in rural line extensions, even when using low cost REA financing.

This group has an average initial consumption of about 16 kilowatt-hours per month which continuously increases at the rate of 10 percent per year. The average cost of rural line construction in 1952 was about $180 per rural customer.

A cost study of electric service to residential customers was made, excluding the cost of interest, amortization, and depreciation. It was determined from the study that the cost of this service excluding debt service and depreciation was 2.475 cents per kilowatt-hour for residential consumptions within the first block of 75 kilowatt-hours. Since 4½ cents per kilowatt-hour are charged in the residential rate for the first 75 kilowatt-hours consumption, it follows that 2.025 cents per kilowatt-hour are allocable to interest, amortization, and depreciation.

For a rural project to be fully compensatory, sufficient kilowatt-hours must be consumed so that when they are priced at 2.025 cents the resulting amount would not be less than the cost of debt service and depreciation on the investment made. An average investment of $180 per rural customer has 10 percent or $18 debt service and depreciation assuming interest at 2 percent. This would require the sale of 900 kilowatt-hours per year per customer equivalent to 75 kilowatt-hours per month, to pay the investment costs when the energy consumed is priced at 2.025 cents per kilowatt-hour.

The Commonwealth government confronted with this problem agreed to guarantee the minimum yearly consumption needed by the public utility to recover the full cost of the service.

The rural electrification program formulated in 1952 included the following conditions:

1. The authority will continue to serve rural customers able to pay a guaranteed minimum consumption without Commonwealth government help.

2. Financing will be requested from the Rural Electrification Administration to finance the extension of electric service to the low-income rural families.

3. The Commonwealth Government through legislative action will guarantee the minimum consumption from the rural customers served under the program. It will pay to the authority the exact yearly amount by which the revenue collected from the rural electrification beneficiaries fails to cover the full cost of service.

4. The yearly payments from the Commonwealth Government will be determined as follows:

(a) the authority must recover 10 percent of the investment made in rural electrification expansion to cover the cost of interest, amortization, and depreciation.

(b) of the power sold to the rural electrification beneficiaries, 2.025 cents per kilowatt-hour are allocable to the payment of debt service and depreciation.

(c) The Commonwealth Government would pay the yearly amount by which the revenue collected for debt service and depreciation fails to meet 10 percent of the investment.

5. Rural projects to extend service to low income families in the rural zone will be studied by the authority and submitted to the Puerto Rico Planning Board.

6. The planning board will select the yearly projects to be constructed from the list of projects made available by the authority.

The first rural electrification program in Puerto Rico on the basis described, was planned for a 3-year expansion starting in fiscal year 1952. It was based on a yearly expenditure in rural line expansion of about $2 million with which about 10,000 customers may be served per year.

Projections were made of yearly expenditures, customers to be served, average yearly consumption in kilowatthours and debt service and depreciation costs. Debt service and depreciation costs were taken at 10 percent of the investment and the resulting amount was to be satisfied from the revenue when the energy sold is priced at 2.025 cents per kilowatthour. The deficit between the yearly debt service and the energy sold priced at 2.025 cents per kilowatthour represents the yearly amount to be paid by the Commonwealth Government in the form of revenue.

The study made showed that the Commonwealth Government yearly contribution would rapidly increase in a 4-year period to a maximum of $375,000. It would then gradually decrease and continue in decreasing amounts for 20 years after which the rural customers would be completely self-sufficient.

The legislature, based on this study passed a law on May 2, 1952, authorizing the Department of Agriculture of Puerto Rico to enter into a contract with the Puerto Rico Water Resources Authority in which the Department of Agriculture agreed to pay to the authority the yearly revenue balance required to make the rural electrification program economically justified. The legislative commitment was for a consecutive period of 20 years, with a yearly maximum payment to the authority not to exceed $375,000.

Simultaneously with this legislative action, a loan was requested from the Rural Electrification Administration in the amount of $6,376,000 to finance the 3-year program.

Every fiscal year, the legislature approves a bill assigning the required funds to the Department of Agriculture for payment to the authority.

Twice a year, the authority reports the capital expenditures recorded in the authority's plant accounts and computes the total revenue which it must receive to compensate for debt service and depreciation which is equivalent to 10 percent of the investment. It also lists the kilowatt-hours sold to the REA beneficiaries and computes the revenue allocable to payment of debt service and depreciation by pricing this power at 2.025 cents per kilowatt-hour. A bill is then prepared covering the difference between these two amounts for payment by the Department of Agriculture.

The rural electrification program adopted in 1952 has been very successful. It has permitted the continuous expansion of rural electrification to low income, low consumption rural families which could not have enjoyed this essential service otherwise. It has been based on financing from the Rural Electrification Administration at low cost and from the yearly payment to the authority by the Commonwealth government of the revenue deficit necessary to economically justify the investment in rural line construction. It has the necessary incentives for the rural families to

make maximum utilization of electric power service, and for the authority and the Commonwealth government to promote educational programs for a better utilization of electricity. The higher the consumption of electric power in the rural zones the lower the commitment from the Commonwealth government.

A second program was installed upon completion of the first for which an additional loan commitment of $6,624,000 was obtained from the Rural Electrification Administration. This permitted a continuance of the rural electrification program to fiscal 1958. A second law was approved by the legislature to guarantee to the authority the minimum revenue required under this program. The maximum yearly commitment was limited to $400,000 for a period of 25 years.

Upon completion of this program, a third loan commitment was approved by the Rural Electrification Administration in the amount of $9,400,000 for continuance of the program up to fiscal 1961.

To date the authority, under this program has extended electric service to 48,500 families in the rural zone and expects to serve with the existing commitments about 93,000 rural families by the end of 1961.

It is expected that a continuance of the rural electrification program at the same rate will be required for 3 additional years up to 1964 after which a deceleration of the rate of construction will be required.

Of 328,253 residential customers served by the authority, 144,807 are rural customers, equivalent to 44.1 percent.

The yearly contributions made by the Commonwealth government to the rural electrification program are as follows:

1952–53	$8,277.24
1953–54	85,818.86
1954–55	177,075.94
1955–56	214,944.73
1956–57	404,835.59
1957–58	567,704.03

Last year an application for a $10,900,000 loan was submitted by the authority and approved by the Rural Electrification Administration to provide generation and transmission facilities to the 53,000 REA beneficiaries served with the proceeds of the first $3 million loans. This loan financed, among other facilities, the construction of Unit No. 2 of the south coast station with 40,000 kilowatt-hours of installed capacity. This unit was recently placed in commercial operation.

Special Citation to Farrell Lines, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT ZELENKO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, outstanding service in the interest of the general public is always to be commended; especially is this true when the operation in question directly affects the well-being of the traveling public. Such recognition has just been given by the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service of the United States through award of the special citation to Farrell Lines, Inc., for the third consecutive year. The award is made in recognition of the excellent sanitation maintained on the company's vessels during 1958.

Farrell Lines has ever been noted for the maintenance of high standards, and is to be congratulated for this attainment. The presentation was made by Dr. David E. Price, Assistant Surgeon General, and was received by Adm. George Wauchope, executive vice president of Farrell Lines, Inc., at ceremonies on board the company's vessel SS *African Star* at the 33d Street Pier in Brooklyn.

When it is realized that this corporation operates 16 vessels which earned a rating of 95 or better on official Public Health Service inspection, which includes 166 separate items of sanitary construction and maintenance, it is evident that the accomplishment affords reason for justifiable pride on the part of both the management and all employees of the company.

Search for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mrs. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, like the weather, everybody talks about peace, but few people do anything about it.

In my home city of Philadelphia, however, WIP, an independent local radio station, has been doing something about it for over a year. For its efforts, expressed through a public service program series, "Search for Peace," it has been honored with a national award.

Mrs. Ellen Stoutenberg, producer of "Search for Peace," has been awarded a McCall golden mike, the highest honor given exclusively to women in the radio and television field. She is one of seven women in the United States to win this coveted award, all of whom, in the words of the editors of McCalls, felt part of their responsibility is to help narrow the gap between the world as it is and the world as it can be.

"Search for Peace" is a unique effort for a single radio station, in that it strives to carry its message beyond normal coverage in the Philadelphia area, to the entire world. Benedict Gimbel, Jr., president and general maanger of WIP, has, from the beginning, offered tapes of the commentaries of world-famous personalities to stations anywhere in the world.

The response to this has been overwhelming. Almost 100 stations in the United States, including one in each of our newest States, Alaska and Hawaii, carry this program. In addition, it is heard over the 100 stations of the Australian Broadcasting System, over the Canadian Broadcasting Co., and by individual stations as remote as Aruba, Netherlands Antilles. The Voice of America brings it to countries normally beyond the reach of American radio.

In addition to congratulating my good friend Ben Gimbel, Mrs. Stoutenberg, and the entire staff of WIP, I should like to add a word of praise for the Philadelphia Junior League. As pointed out in the award citation, the coast-to-coast distribution of this worthwhile radio series was made possible through the efforts of this fine organization of young women.

In a day when broadcasting is often criticized for its preoccupation with rock and roll and western movies, I am proud that a radio station in Philadelphia has placed the public good above gain. Through "Search for Peace," again in the words of the citation, "Man's oldest yearning took on fresh interest and excitement."

A Guided Tour by Harry Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news column written by Mrs. Monroe Sweetland, of Milwaukie, Oreg. Lil Sweetland is the wife of newspaper editor and Oregon State Senator Monroe Sweetland. She was recently in Independence, Mo., to watch the sendoff of the On-To-Oregon Cavalcade by former President Harry Truman. Mrs. Sweetland is a member of the Centennial Commission. She was one of several Oregonians taken through the Truman Memorial Library by Mr. Truman. Her warm account of that tour follows. It appeared in the Milwaukie (Oreg.) Review of April 23, 1959:

EXTRA

(By Lil Sweetland)

A GUIDED TOUR BY HARRY TRUMAN

"If I were 10 or 15 years younger, I'd ride that wagon train back to Oregon." That's what Harry Truman wrote my husband just before I left for Independence Mo. for the sendoff of the On-To-Oregon Cavalcade. But those of us from Oregon who saw our jaunty former President, 75 this summer, and walked and talked with him, thought him at least as able to make the arduous journey as those 20 and 30 years younger who are now on the wagons west.

I called the former President's office in the Truman Library at 7:45 a.m. the morning after my arrival in Independence to firm up the schedule for the presentation of the "Oregon Centennial" roses Stub Wherry had gotten together for me. To my amazement Mr. President, as he is called by everyone in Missouri, himself answered the phone and was immediate and cordial in his invitation to come right out.

And we did. Mayor John Snider of Medford, Thomas Vaughan, director of the Oregon Historical Society, Janet Baumhover, beautiful and able Radio Artist's representative and myself, all members of the Oregon Centennial Commission, Milwaukian photographer Kirk Braun, and news commenator for KPTV-Channel 12, John Salisbury.

He hasn't changed

We were greeted with the warmth, enthusiasm, and humor which endeared Harry

Truman to the Nation, to the surprise and confoundment of his opposition. Even the skeptical Republicans in our party (and I believe I was the lone Democrat) were charmed and softened by the sparkling eyes, the genuine interest, and the lack of ostentation in this man who had held the highest position in the world. Mr. Truman posed willingly for pictures of the rose presentation, even giving us amateurs pointers on how to posture for the photographers; and then to our delight he offered to conduct us on a tour of the Truman Library.

A GREAT MEMORIAL

The Truman Library is a monumental building, cast in a classic mold but equipped with the most modern and most beautiful of museum and library appointments. It was built, and is maintained, by donations from the thousands of friends and admirers of the former President as a keeping place for the priceless reminiscences of a period in history which may well be remembered because of the contributions made by Harry Truman.

Its all recorded there, and we saw it underlined and highlighted by the pithy comments and observations of the man who gave meaning to the dead documents, the cold pictures, and the sad evidences of a war torn world. We saw the original draft, in the President's handwriting (that will answer those who say I didn't write it) of the great point 4 program, the plush covered oval table on which was signed the United Nations Charter. We saw, and Mr. Truman commented on the donors, gifts from the leaders of the world, bejeweled swords and priceless rugs, gifts from countries grateful for the livesaving aid from the United States; we saw General Eisenhower's memoirs with a handwritten dedication of lasting respect and affection to Harry Truman (and Mr. President had comments on that). But all in the library is not solemn and sober. The library, like Harry Truman himself, is of many moods, and reflects many talents.

There are two grand pianos, one presented to Mr. Truman by the American Federation of Musicians on which he played a few chords for us, and a second elegant ebony instrument with a great silver spread eagle above the keyboard which was given to Margaret Truman when she lived in the White House. The corridor walls of the library are lined endlessly with the originals of the cartoons which lampooned, blasphemed, caricatured cruelly and only sometimes praised the jaunty, courageous President of the people. They are placed without prejudice, a history of the political ups and downs of Harry Truman's official life.

BESS AND MARGARET PROMINENT

There are many references in the library collection to Mrs. Truman. He calls her "The Boss" and once he referred to her as "The Madam," and many to the apple of his eye, his daughter Margaret. He talked with evident pleasure of his grandson, and the new child expected by Margaret this month. His love for his family is a glowing and obvious thing.

We were interrupted many times during the tour by others who had come to see the library and who were delighted to have run into Mr. Truman. Several small children came up to "Mr. President" and he stopped and talked with each one. He signed autographs and posed for pictures, he joked and laughed with them and was generous with his time. And his time, for a retired man is crowded. He was keeping Senator STUART SYMINGTON waiting while we went on tour (the Senator accompanied us). The guestbook for the day showing his appointments before our 10 o'clock date, showed 18 personal vistors, 9 from Missouri, the rest scattered from many States. When we returned at the end of the tour the anteroom was crowded.

MY PREJUDICES CONFIRMED

I have met and talked with Mr. Truman before. I am not an unprejudiced observer. But the 45-minute tour of the Truman Library, and the few other moments I spent with him in Independence, added new concepts to my ideas about this great man, whose greatness is cast in a mold never seen before among our Presidents.

A DIFFERENT KIND OF GREATNESS

There is no aura of obvious greatness which surrounds Harry Truman as it did, I think, Franklin Roosevelt and perhaps Woodrow Wilson. He shines with an infectious charm and homely graciousness that give those close to him a feeling of confidence in, and gratitude for, the democratic process which made this man, so akin to all of us, the chief of the greatest nation in the world.

A REAL SENSE OF HISTORY

Harry Truman loves our country. His devotion to its welfare, his humility before its greatness, and his awareness of the role it must play in a troubled world, are plain in every sentence he utters. Harry Truman is neither pompous nor pious about the great role he played in world history. More than any man I ever met he seems to "feel" history, to instinctively live and talk with the knowledge that men scores of years from now will be affected by what is done today. He reveres, and is obviously fascinated by, the past, but only "as prologue". He has an enormous sense of the dignity of the office of the Presidency, and in any other less humble man, his pride in the office would appear to be vanity or a mere reflection of his own glory.

GREAT HELP TO OREGON

It was a wonderful experience. Harry Truman did a great job for the Oregon centennial with his sendoff of the wagon train. But I will, and so will the others with me that Saturday morning, remember well the lessons in history, philosophy and humanity which Truman so generously gave us.

P.S.—A thank-you note from Bess Truman this morning, only 5 days from the date of our visit, tells me the rose bushes are planted and will replace some frozen out last winter in the Truman yard. Thoughtfulness seems indeed, to be a Truman family trait.

Amending Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1959

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R.5610) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, so as to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

(Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, reference has been made to the report of the Republican policy committee. As chairman of that committee, I am very pleased to respond and say that the committee did put out advice to the Republican members that the committee was in support of H.R. 5610 as reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. We took action in support of the legislative committee and so advised our members.

Inquiry has been made as to whether this action by the Republican policy committee makes the issue presently before us a political issue. I would point out to the gentleman that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is under the control of the Democrats. They have 21 members of the committee. The Republicans have 12 members of the committee. If action by the Republican policy committee expressing support of the action of a Democrat-controlled committee makes the issue a matter of partisan politics, the gentleman is welcome to make the most of it. I would think, however, that the Democrats would welcome action by the Republican policy committee and the membership on our side in support of the legislative committees which you control.

I will point out further that we on the Republican side never at any time either in conference or otherwise attempt to bind our members. We do not, however, resist the opportunity to advise our members as to what the general feelings of the members of our policy committee are on any particular issue.

Mr. Chairman, I am no expert on this subject; in fact, there is no subject that comes before us on which I would consider qualifying as an expert. But I do not think one has to be an expert to be concerned about some of the basic issues involved in this legislation that is before us today.

If we were dealing with a healthy, thriving industry I would not be so concerned about the provisions of this substitute and the extents to which we might go in adding additional costs. I do not say I would not be concerned at all because I will always be concerned that we do not take a healthy thriving industry and put it into bankruptcy and sickness and death. But let us get one thing clear in this picture: We are dealing here with an industry that is not a healthy industry. We acknowledged that fact last year when we took action and enacted, on the basis of the economic condition of that industry, a transportation act. Is there anyone here that will contend that by that action last year we cured all the ills of the railroad industry, and that from here on it is going to be a thriving industry and you can do with it what you will? I do not think there is a member here that would make that contention.

Certainly, if I understood the chairman of this committee, who certainly is in a position to know more about it than any other single member of the committee, he did not give us the hope that we did not have to worry any more about the competitive position and the ability

of this industry to serve us and to serve the people. That is fact No. 1. We are dealing with an industry that is in a difficult situation.

No. 2: Let us remember that this is a basic industry in this country. Your railroads fold up and your economy folds up, make no mistake about that. So one thing I would caution you no matter what we do or how we vote, let us be careful, let us recognize the problem that may be involved in the consequences of our act.

Also, Mr. Chairman, we have heard talk that corporate profits are involved in this controversy. To me, Mr. Chairman, the issue here is the issue of jobs. Is it a proper approach just to be concerned about what you are going to do with a man when he is out of a job? Should you not be concerned with what you can do to assure that jobs will be available.

I listened to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. COAD] speaking about the Northwestern Railroad, that they did not have Pullman cars, that they were closing up shops and stations and taking off trains. Why? Because of economic difficulty. The elimination of cars, of shops, of stations, and trains eliminates jobs and produces unemployment.

I suggest that we had better make sure that in our desire to take care of the unemployed we do not so act that we encourage greater unemployment.

That, as I see it, is the issue raised by this substitute. The bill as reported by the committee will put an additional cost of over $100 million on the railroads. The substitute will increase this to around $150 million. I am most fearful that this additional $50 million could very well produce additional unemployment. I am sure this is not what is desired by the average railroad worker. I shall therefore support the committee bill.

One Hundredth Anniversary of the Masonic Lodge of Plymouth, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news article from the Wilkes-Barre Record of Tuesday, April 28, 1959:

MASONIC LODGE OF PLYMOUTH HAS CENTENARY—ALL BUT 10 OF 350 MEMBERS AT DINNER; GRAND MASTER SPEAKS

Plymouth Lodge 332, Free and Accepted Masons, celebrated its 100th anniversary at a dinner last night at Irem Temple Country Club and heard Sanford M. Chilcote, right worshipful grand master of the Blue Lodge of Pennsylvania, speak on "Masonry of 1959."

All but 10 of the lodge's 350 members, including 27 of its 33 living past masters, were at the celebration, the biggest in the lodge's 100 years. Its history records that "an elaborate banquet" marked the 25th anniversary on April 27, 1874. Its 50th anniversary was observed in March 1899. The 75th anniversary was celebrated at a dinner attended by 275 members.

The lodge was constituted April 27, 1859, at ceremonies which were held in a small room on the second floor of the E. C. Wadhams brick store building at West Main and Downing Streets, Plymouth, for many years known as the "Company Store" of Ashley, Hunt and Co.

Its charter members were Robert Love, Joshua W. Eno, Elijah C. Wadhams, David Levi, and Bryce R. Blair, nearly all of whom were direct descendants of the early Connecticut settlers. The lodge continued to meet in the Wadhams building until December 27, 1873, when it moved to the D. K. Spry Building, West Main Street and Gaylord Avenue, Plymouth.

Members of the lodge for more than 50 years are Harry L. Minnick, Harry C. Hughes, Joseph Bittenbender, Frank Bittenbender, and Stewart S. Ferguson. Minnick is the oldest of the lodge's 33 living past masters.

Invocation opening the dinner was given by Rev. Howard R. Harrison, following which Russell Lloyd, PM, chairman of the anniversary committee, introduced former Gov. Arthur H. James, 33d, as toastmaster. H. Eugene McCarthy, worshipful master, welcomed the lodge members to the celebration.

Wilbur H. Schang, 33d, district deputy grand master, introduced Chilcote, who, complimenting the lodge on its growth during the last century, touched upon the history of Freemasonry in Pennsylvania and what the present and the future hold in store for it.

Talking on Masonry today, Chilcote said members are proud of the Masonic Home at Elizabethtown. Situated on a 1,400-acre plot, it provides for approximately 685 guests. Its modern hospital has 266 beds. It has 30 miles of paved roads. Accomplishment of this huge project gives cause for pride, he said.

The program was closed with benediction by Harry C. Hughes, past master. Tallie Reese was vocal soloist.

Officers of lodge 332 are H. Eugene McCarthy, worshipful master; Michael Mihoch, Jr., senior warden; Orville Shugar, junior warden; Kenneth R. Williams, treasurer, and Albert E. Jones, secretary.

Assisting Russell Lloyd on the anniversary committee were Andrew Oherko, Harry C. Hughes, Charles Sims, H. Eugene McCarthy, Michael Mihoch, Jr., Orville Shugar, Kenneth R. Williams, Albert E. Jones, Kenneth L. Morgan, Judge Thomas M. Lewis, Thomas Nelson, Forrest C. Cooper, and John D. Edwards.

Protection of Wild Horses and Burros

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER S. BARING
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a letter I have received from Mr. Emory S. Avant, executive director of Peoples Lobby, Inc., regarding the slaughter of wild horses and burros to provide food for dogs and other domestic pets. The sad plight of these animals has been told in several national magazines and other publications.

Mustangs, as has been written, are as traditional to the West as the six gun, and they are now facing extinction. In Nevada alone there are but 50 still remaining of a herd that at one time numbered 70,000. This is all due to mechanized roundups to capture them to sell as dog food.

Low-flying planes herd the horses to flatlands, where other hunters, waiting in trucks, run them to the point of exhaustion. They are then roped and hobbled until they can be hauled to slaughter. By the time they reach the slaughterhouses their hides have been practically torn to pieces and they are more dead than alive from the brutal treatment they have received.

Hunters who have contracted to bring these mustangs to slaughterhouses have devised this inhumane technique because it is the only way they can effectively round up large herds of animals at a cost low enough to sell the carcasses at a profit.

On January 19, 1959, I introduced H.R. 2725, to amend chapter 3 of title 18, United States Code, so as to prohibit the use of aircraft or motor vehicles to hunt certain wild horses or burros on land belonging to the United States. The full text of the bill follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) chapter 3 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 47. Use of aircraft or motor vehicles to hunt certain wild horses or burros; pollution of watering holes.

"(a) Whoever uses an aircraft or a motor vehicle to hunt, for the purpose of capturing or killing, any wild unbranded horse, mare, colt, or burro running at large on any of the public lands or ranges shall be fined not more than $500, or imprisoned not more than six months, or both.

"(b) Whoever pollutes or causes the pollution of any watering hole on any of the public land or ranges for the purpose of trapping, killing, wounding, or maiming any of the animals referred to in subsection (a) of this section shall be fined not more than $500, or imprisoned not more than six months, or both.

"(c) As used in subsection (a) of this section—

"(1) The term 'aircraft' means any contrivance used for flight in the air; and

"(2) The term 'motor vehicle' includes an automobile, automobile truck, automobile wagon, motorcycle, or any other self-propelled vehicle designed for running on land."

(b) The analysis of such chapter 3, immediately preceding section 41, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"47. Use of aircraft or motor vehicles to hunt certain wild horses or burros."

I might say here that the State of Nevada enacted similar legislation a number of years ago to regulate the capture of wild horses and burros on lands other than those belonging to the United States.

Mr. Avant's letter follows:

PEOPLES LOBBY, INC.,
Washington, D.C., March 17, 1959.

Hon. WALTER S. BARING,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BARING: We are receiving a great deal of mail regarding the killing of the little burro and the wild horses of several States. Many of those that have written know about

your bill, H.R. 2725. While there are only a few States that have wild horses and burros, there are 600 humane organizations over the land with a large membership and these humanitarians are very much interested in your bill.

Several years ago, while in the West, I was invited to a burro barbecue. The thought of eating the flesh of the little animal that was left by the miners to starve and who found water and food where it did not exist, was so revolting that I was unable to eat anything for several days.

The Members of Congress are, as a whole, humane and I have no doubt but that your bill will pass both Houses.

Sincerely yours,

EMORY S. AVANT,
Executive Director.

Military Mistakes Cost Taxpayers Dearly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 27, 1959

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, the talk about intercontinental guided missiles, space age weapons needs, and interplanetary rockets has caused our people to lose sight of the huge amount of waste that is going on because of blunders in the various armed services, and not even overlooking the Atomic Energy Commission.

Not long ago, in testimony before a Senate committee, a former member of the Atomic Energy Commission testified that one man's slight error—I believe those were his exact words—cost the Atomic Energy Commission some $300 million. Think of it, Mr. Speaker. One man's error cost $300 million. This testimony was covered only sketchily in the daily papers, but consider how much talk has gone on about some messenger boy on Capitol Hill being overpaid, and then compare the amount the taxpayer loses thereby with the $300 million error of one man in the Atomic Energy Commission. And, I might add, we do not even know that man's name today.

Getting back to the Department of Defense, all of us have read some stories about waste in the military, but the enormity of such waste, I believe, has not been impressed sufficiently upon the American people.

A story in Grit, the national rural newspaper, for April 19, 1959, accompanied by a picture of some hundreds of brandnew trucks that have been declared surplus by the Army, indicates the kind of public attention that ought to be given to the really important subjects in Government. This is in-focus reporting.

This article starts out by pointing out that the Defense Department in 1958 alone wrote $7 billion off its books last year—a huge loss to the taxpayers. Think of how long the Congress could operate on $7 billion, Mr. Speaker. If our Government goes for a thousand years, and an occasional Congressman overpays one of his employees by a couple a thousand a year—much of which is reclaimed in taxes—it is not possible that Congress will waste, on itself, the astounding total of $7 billion. But this is what the Defense Department "wrote off" in one year. When we consider how many billions are appropriated every year to the Department of Defense, and the reckless manner in which the bureaucrats order everything from shoelaces to 10-ton trucks, whether these will be needed or not, or used or not, then we are coming up to some of the essential things that we, and our people, ought to be thinking about.

Under leave granted to me, I am inserting the article from Grit, for April 19, 1959, in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I submit that the same kind of reporting ought to be used on ferreting out the huge amounts of wastes in all the Federal establishment:

MILITARY MISTAKES COSTING TAXPAYERS BILLIONS YEARLY

The Defense Department wrote $7,500 million off its books last year—a huge loss to taxpayers.

Of that amount, $1 billion was spent for goods the military did not need and could not use. Though brandnew, the stuff was ultimately sold for approximately 8 cents on the dollar.

Most of the $7,500 million was spent on weapons and equipment which the services later considered as either obsolete or worn out, and therefore useless.

For example, a technical change prompted the Air Force to dispose of 1,500 flight helmets for which it paid $550 each. Private dealers in war surplus got them for $75 each.

Approximately $1,500 million represented aircraft and missile programs which the military, principally the Air Force and Navy, abandoned as miscalculations.

MORE LOSSES COMING UP

Further, if past experience is a reliable guide, the Defense Department will write off an additional $6 billion worth of goods this year as surplus.

The buying and selling of surplus military goods, incidentally, has become a $750 million-a-year enterprise.

Congress has been struggling for years with the question of whether the taxpayer is getting his money's worth out of the Defense Department. The lawmakers have been trying to persuade the military to use more businesslike procedures.

Investigators have found many instances where one service was declaring certain goods surplus while another was in the market for the same item. From the taxpayers' point of view, this means that the Armed Forces often buy twice as much as they really need.

Here are some examples:

The Air Force bought $60 million worth of spare parts for the F–100 fighter plane in 3 years, then found it did not need them.

BUY ENGINES NOT NEEDED

The Navy bought 793 aircraft engines, valued at $68 million, that it did not need—and was about to buy 204 more when the General Accounting Office called the matter to the Navy's attention.

On one negotiated contract (one made without competitive bidding) a carmaker was charging the Government $39.42 for missile parts. Later the same item was put out for competitive bids which brought the cost down to $2.52.

None of the $7,500 million written off by the Defense Department includes the money spent by the various services duplicating each other's work.

One illustration may suffice. The Army spent $700 million developing the 1,500-mile missile, the Jupiter, before turning it over to the Air Force, which spent as much or more developing a similar missile, the Thor.

Budget Director's Timetable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 13, 1959

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD an editorial which appeared on April 9, 1959 in the Valley Times of the San Fernando Valley area of California. This editorial, by columnist George Todt, entitled "Budget Director's Timetable" follows:

BUDGET DIRECTOR'S TIMETABLE

"Never ask of money spent
Where the spender thinks it went.
Nobody was ever meant
To remember or invent
What he did with every cent."

—Robert Frost,
The Hardship of Accounting.

One of the questions I put to Maurice H. Stans, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, when he was here last week to address the Republican Associates of Los Angeles County, was this one:

"How is it that today's budget has increased 25 or 30 times over typical budgets when we were kids, back in the days of former Presidents Calvin Coolidge and Herbert Hoover, without anything resembling 25 or 30 times as much corresponding service presently accruing to the individual citizen from the Government?"

This was a good and hard question, according to Mr. Stans, and he sank his teeth into it to give me an answer along these lines:

"In the first place we are maintaining armed forces of 2½ million personnel in these days of the cold war, whereas our Army, Navy, and miniscule Air Corps of the roaring twenties only utilized a few hundred thousands of men. Military hardware and rates of pay are much higher than 25 years ago, which considerably influences the overall picture. This accounts for approximately 60 percent of the budget figure of 77 billions of dollars this year. Almost $46 billion, as a matter of fact, when we include atomic energy, stockpiling, and military assistance.

"The next largest item on the budget is the cost of borrowed money. In 1960, we expect that the carrying charges on our national debt will amount to over 10 percent of our expected Federal income. In dollars, our interest bill is estimated at $8.1 billion. The President has no choice except to provide for it in the budget.

"Another large item is $5.1 billion dollars for benefits and services to veterans," continued Mr. Stans. "Up to this point, three-fourths of the Government's income (about $59 billion) is pledged to future security and paying for past wars. And in none of these items—defense, interest, or veterans' benefits—is the President in a position to make recommendations at this time for substantial reductions."

Now we come down to the final $18 billion of expected outlays in the budget for the

coming year. "How about them?" I inquired.

"Here they are," said Mr. Stans. "Agriculture services and price supports, including purchase and storage of a huge supply of farm products beyond our needs, accounts for $6 billion.

"Health, welfare, education, and labor programs account for still another $4.1 billion. Services to business and to communities, including aids to housing, aviation, the merchant marine, small business, and civilian outer space programs take $2.3 billion more.

"Then there is allocated $2.1 billion for foreign affairs, including economic assistance to our free world allies to strengthen them in their resistance to Communist subversion. Another item includes $1.7 billion for conservation and development of natural resources. And, finally, there is $1.8 billion set aside for the general administration of the Federal Government, for the expense of Congress and the courts, and for contingencies.

"Included in the budget, in addition to record levels for defense, are the largest amounts ever spent for medical research, water resources, assistance to communities, education, and many other Government activities.

"Does all this sound as though we had crippled, or restricted, or weakened, essential Federal activities, as some critics would have you believe?

"True," said Mr. Stans, "for every category of program in the budget, there are those who would spend several billion dollars more—and it is no mean achievement that these proposals were resisted by the President. What the budget would look like if we undertook to satisfy everyone is beyond description."

This, then, will indicate to my readers just where the old mazuma goes when Uncle Sam takes that folding green staff from us each year in the form of income and corporation taxes.

And—oh, yes—the capable Director of the Budget also told me that the Government perforce takes a very dim view of the utopian Socialist thinkers who would like to destroy U.S. corporations, if they could. It was pointed out to me by Mr. Stans that these same business firms pay some $25 billion into the Treasury each year and it would be pretty hard to make ends meet these days without this tidy little sum to back up our gold buried in Fort Knox. Sounds reasonable enough, doesn't it?

As may be seen, we are spending all we can afford without additional new taxes being heaped upon us increasingly in the future.

Shall we give this item a bit of thought while we watch the so-called spenders in action at their posts on Capitol Hill? Who wants more taxes, anyway? Know anybody who's had enough?

Tiny Acorn Becomes Mighty Oak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader of April 28, 1959, commenting on the remarkable progress of the Wheel Chair Club, which was founded in Wilkes-Barre by Mrs. Paul Bedford in 1935:

TINY ACORN BECOMES MIGHTY OAK

The disclosure that the Wheel Chair Club, founded by Mrs. Paul Bedford in 1935, now has 100 chairs in foreign lands, as well as 21 branches of the organization in the United States, is stimulating news in a world, beset on all sides with threats of war and destruction by ruthless dictators and their stooges, to say nothing of other crises at home and abroad.

Today, wheelchairs are provided by the Wilkes-Barre club to such distant countries as Pakistan, Thailand, Turkey, and other lands in Asia and Africa.

The tiny acorn, planted here a quarter century ago, has sprung into a mighty oak, and it is still growing.

Perhaps the strangest part of this unique experiment in human relations is the nature of its growth. Mrs. Bedford and her associates did not do any direct promotion. Rather, the fame of the Wheel Chair Club spread by word of mouth, largely through missionaries who heard about the local program and contacted Mrs. Bedford when they needed a chair. Thus, backward areas that never saw a wheel chair received one as an outright gift from the city on the banks of the Susquehanna.

It would be interesting to know what the impact of this program has been. Certainly, it has done the United States a great deal of good and obviously it has done Wilkes-Barre no harm.

Little did Mrs. Bedford dream when she launched the Wheel Chair Club as an outgrowth of the Friends of Shut-ins, which she also established, that it would have such far-reaching repercussions. But, then, good has a habit of spreading.

The community knows Mrs. Bedford also as the founder of the Oldsters Club of the Playground and Recreation Association, for which she received a citation at the annual meeting in 1958. For her achievements in the Wheel Chair Club, she has been proclaimed a Distinguished Daughter of Pennsylvania and has been the recipient of the Rush Award from the Luzerne County Medical Society. The Lions Club also paid her an impressive tribute in recognition of the humanitarian work, involving a considerable investment of time and money.

For her generosity, unselfishness, and accomplishments, it is a privilege to salute Mrs. Bedford again on behalf of men and women across the sea as well as a grateful community and country.

Hon. Clarence Cannon, of Missouri

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK M. KARSTEN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, the State of Missouri is fortunate to be represented in Washington by one of the most outstanding Congressmen of our time, Hon. CLARENCE CANNON.

CLARENCE CANNON is no mere Representative, but, rather, he is more in the nature of a national institution. His long and distinguished service in the House of Representatives has established a record of which our State is justly proud. He has served longer in the Congress than any other Representative since Missouri was admitted to the Union. His superior parliamentary and legislative skills are without equal. Teacher, lawyer, author, parliamentarian, statesman and Congressman extraordinary describe CLARENCE CANNON.

In recognition of the accomplishments of this great Missourian the Missouri Legislature at Jefferson City has adopted House Resolution 141 designating May 13, 1959, as "CLARENCE CANNON Day." Knowing the U.S. House of Representatives has the same high esteem as the Missouri State Legislature for CLARENCE CANNON, I include as a part of my remarks the text of the resolution adopted by the legislature:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 141

Whereas the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON is the senior member of the Missouri delegation in Congress; and

Whereas Mr. CANNON has served 35 years in the Congress of the United States; and

Whereas in this capacity Mr. CANNON has been parliamentarian of the House of Representatives and is presently chairman of the Appropriations Committee; and

Whereas this great statesman is devotedly occupied with affairs in Government and is well versed in its principles and art; and

Whereas Congressman CANNON has been most influential in shaping policies of not only the State of Missouri and the United States, but also internationally; and

Whereas Mr. CANNON has edited the "Manual and Digest of the House of Representatives," and is author of the following publications: "Synopsis of the Procedure of the House," "Cannon's Procedure" (published by resolution of the House), "Convention Parliamentary Manual" (published by the Democratic National Committee), "Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives" (published by law), treatises on parliamentary law in the "Encyclopedia Britannica," and in the "Encyclopedia Americana"; and

Whereas it is the desire of the House of Representatives of the 70th General Assembly of the State of Missouri to pay honor and tribute to this great Missourian whose influences have been so keenly reflected upon legislative procedures: Now, therefore be it

Resolved by the house of representatives, That the 13th day of May, 1959, shall be called Clarence Cannon Day, upon which day the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON is invited to address this house, and there shall be given a reception in his honor; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution, duly inscribed, be sent to the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON in Washington, D.C., and to the other Missourians now serving in the U.S. House of Representatives and Senate.

It's Time To Return Precious Liberties to the Freedom-Loving People of Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD J. IRWIN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday afternoon, May 3, I will be privileged to speak in Bridgeport, Conn., to a group of Polish-Americans anxious to see the democratic way of life we enjoy restored to their homeland.

The flame of freedom burns brightly in the hearts of the Polish people, not

only those who are now Americans but also those still in Poland and subject to the traditional Communist pattern of violating and denying the basic human rights.

This Sunday, one of the most important Polish national holidays, celebrating the adoption of the May Constitution by the Polish Diet, is to be observed.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, this is a time for reflection on our part—a time in which we should renew vigorously our support of the people of Poland who are enduring a difficult period in their history.

The present situation in Poland had its roots in the partition of Poland by the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact of August 25, 1939.

In collusion with Nazi Germany, the Soviet Union invaded Poland on September 17, 1939, and on September 28, 1939, the Soviet Union and Germany signed an agreement proclaiming the dissolution of the Polish state and the partition of its territories between themselves, the Soviet Union annexing the northeastern part of Poland.

These acts violated both the Treaty of Riga and the Polish-Russian nonaggression pact.

Except for the partitioners and the allies of Nazi Germany, the world continued to recognize the legal Polish Government, which moved to London.

On July 30, 1941, the Soviet Government concluded a pact with the Polish Government in London by which it recognized "that the Soviet-German treaties relative to the territorial changes in Poland have lost their validity."

On December 4, 1941, the Soviet Union concluded a declaration of friendship and mutual assistance with the London government.

However, under the pretext of being insulted by the suspicion that it might have been guilty of the Katyn Forest massacre, which the Germans revealed in 1943, the Soviet Union broke off relations with the London government in April 1943—though it never actually withdrew its recognition of that government.

In the latter part of World War II, when the Red army entered Polish territory on July 22, 1944, its political commissar, General Bulganin, issued a proclamation to the Polish people declaring the liberation of Poland and the establishment of the Polish Committee of National Liberation.

At Yalta in February 1945, Soviet Russia wrested from the other great powers approval of the Soviet plan for a provisional government of national unity, created in June 1945 with an overwhelming majority of Communists.

The government was recognized by the Allied Powers on the condition that it hold "free, unfettered elections at the earliest possible time." This essential condition was never kept.

Finally, in January 1947, elections took place under conditions of fraud and terror. Backed by the presence of Soviet troops, the Polish Workers—Communist—Party organization exerted pressure to induce voting for the government list of candidates, and although another independent list of the Polish Peasant Party was permitted there was no public control over the counting of votes and the declared results were grossly falsified.

The rape of Poland by the Communist and Moscow-dominated regime of a dictatorial police state continued.

But in June 1956, the political and moral oppression and the economic misrule and exploitation by the regime, clearly subservient to Moscow, resulted in the Poznan revolt. It forced the Communists to make concessions and to liberalize the regime headed by Wladyslaw Gomulka, the new first secretary of the party. Moscow, fearing repercussions in the other captive nations, protested violently but in the showdown in Warsaw in October 1956 Khrushchev, who had personally flown in to stem the tide, had to give way lest an attempt at brutal oppression lead to disastrous results.

Among the gains won by the Polish people were the regime's new policy toward the church, which again permitted religious teaching in schools and other concessions which led to the liquidation of the collective farms so detested by the peasants; the relaxation of censorship which permitted greater freedom of the press—though criticism was tempered by the common knowledge that Soviet Russia would not permit the installation of a non-Communist regime; and the cessation of terror by the security police. Although these achievements by no means restored the full enjoyment of human rights, they were important.

As the Communist Party regained control of the situation, the improvement was short lived. Developments in the court of 1958 have been marked by intensified repression of the people, retrogressing toward the conditions in force before October 1956. This retreat from the gains of the Polish October is particularly evident with regard to the freedom of intellectuals, to workers' rights and church-state relations. There are many signs that the gains of October are to be further reduced.

For several months, a ruthless press campaign has been waged against the church and against religion. The Minister of Education on August 4, 1958, forbade religious instruction in state schools by members of religious orders and congregations. On August 9, 1958, the Catholic hierarchy lodged a protest, calling the order an unconstitutional violation of the basic church-state agreement.

Recent statements by leading party members indicate that collective farms are to be reinstated. Gomulka himself stated on September 7, 1958:

> The only correct road must in the long run lead to the collectivization of Polish agriculture.

There has been no genuine freedom of opinion in Poland since the loss of independence, and even the freedom of criticism which Gomulka announced at the Eighth Plenum in 1956 lasted less than a year. Censorship has been reestablished. Many papers have been banned, including the outspoken organ of the young Communist intellectuals, Po Prostu; party control was increased over newspapers and the planned weekly Europa was not allowed to appear at all. In May 1958 a ruthless campaign against the more independent newspapermen and writers was proclaimed by Werblan, head of the party propaganda machine. Today the press and other media of information are again becoming as subservient to the party and the regime as before October 1956.

I think, Mr. Speaker, we in America who enjoy our freedom must remember that the people of Poland have always manifested a strong attachment to the Western World.

We should remember, too that in celebrating the 168th anniversary of the Polish Constitution of 1791 they would like to regain the liberties accorded them by that liberal document, written chiefly by Ignatius Potocki, supported by King Stanislaw Augustus, and passed at another critical time in Polish history.

In 1772, Russia, Prussia, and Austria had taken away large sections of Polish territory in what became known as the first partition.

Facing possible annihilation, all forces in Poland united behind the new constitution that was greatly influenced by the liberal movements in America, England, and France.

Among the major provisions of the constitution were the following:

> All power in civil society is derived from the will of the people.

Commoners were granted the right to acquire land; to become commissioned officers; religious freedom was guaranteed; powers of the government were divided between the legislative, executive, and judicial branches; and a two-chamber legislature established.

Within a few years after passage of the May Constitution, Poland was completely overrun by the armies of Russia, Prussia, and Austria.

During the century and a quarter of foreign oppression that followed, the May constitution served the Polish people as a symbol of democracy and independence.

It is time, Mr. Speaker, that the gallant people of Poland regain the precious liberties given them by the Constitution of 1791 but of which they have been deprived for so many years by the tyranny of foreign oppression.

We Will Always Need the Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL VINSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, the National Guard of the United States is the Nation's oldest fighting force.

Throughout the years, the National Guard has had a long and honorable history. Today it is rightfully consid-

ered as our first line Reserve component, always ready to fight.

Its greatest attribute is that the guard is made up entirely of volunteers, enlisted men and officers, who perform their training willingly and without compulsion.

This has brought about a camaraderie, a sense of esprit de corps, if you will, so necessary to a first-class fighting machine. Undoubtedly this comes about because of the guard's militia status and the fact that it is essentially a State force where men from the same community serve together for a mutual cause.

This militia status is one that must always be maintained in the guard. For many years, more than I can remember, there have been those who would strip the guard of its status and federalize it like every other Reserve and Regular component. This would be a serious blunder for not only does it offend the sensibilities of those of us who believe in living within the spirit and meaning of the Constitution—wherein the maintenance of a militia is guaranteed—but it would tend to treat the guard like every other Reserve component merely for the benefit of uniformity.

In my opinion, we have something outstanding in the guard and I will continue to oppose any change which would deprive it of its dual status.

The guard also has a job to do in this connection. It must never be an obstructionist. It must not oppose sensible changes or reorganization when such would be in the interest of national defense. The guard, although old in tradition must be young, alert, and forward looking, in its present thinking.

We are passing into a new age of missiles which travel on the wings of supersonic speed, of space warfare and weapons too terrible to contemplate for use in a civilized world. Nevertheless, we will always need the guard. Its State missions will always be a responsibility and this will be true no matter how far we advance in technology. And it will have its Federal mission as well, for the day of conventional warfare has not passed. So long as men are required to fire weapons, to operate machines and to take and hold the territory of the enemy, the guard will be needed.

So the guard must insist that it has its place in this new world and it must struggle to retain it. A fight is not new to the guard so I have no delusions about the outcome.

Now, contractors for the National Guard Association are completing the National Guard Memorial Building. It is appropriate that such a building should be erected here at the seat of the Government. True, it memorializes those of the guard who have fallen in defense of their country. But in another sense it will be dedicated to the living, to those guardsmen who give unstintingly of their time and talent that this Nation may have a strong reserve force.

When future history is written, the guard will be just as prominent as in the history of the past. The strength and durability of this memorial epitomizes the strength and durability of the National Guard.

A Warning From Senator Byrd

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer is known throughout America for the excellence of its editorial page.

In the issue of April 29, 1959, is two editorials on one of the major problems of our times, for how we now accept and discharge our responsibility in fiscal affairs may well determine the ultimate fate of our country.

I urge every public official in National, State and local office to carefully read these editorials and to keep them constantly in mind in the days that are ahead.

The editorials are as follows:

A WARNING FROM SENATOR BYRD

One of the more sinister aspects of fiscal instability is that, like measles, it spreads. Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat, Virginia, summed it up in this fashion recently: "The Federal position alone is bad enough, but it is epidemic. It has spread to State and local governments. It has permeated our whole economy. It has dangerously changed our attitudes—public and private."

It is this change in attitude which makes the future look uncertain, for it is an attitude which says: "So we're in debt. So what. Everybody else is, too. The Government is, the State is, the city is. Of course I can't afford to buy what I'm planning to buy, I can't pay for it, but then neither can neighbor Smith. I'm no worse off than he is."

This is a far and unhappy cry from the days when the Government lived within its means, and when thrift was considered a virtue, both in the individual and in Government. The present attitude is the state of mind which has brought us to the 48-cent dollar (by 1939 standards), which has stolen the value from fixed incomes and laughed in the face of prudent business methods and sound financing policies.

Moreover, as Senator BYRD has observed: "The Federal Government is now subsidizing business, industry, private finance, agriculture, transportation, power, health, education, States, localities, individuals, et cetera. By the process of cheapening our money and centralizing power in the Federal Government, we have descended to a level of state socialism which is obvious, if not admitted. Social democracy is a subterfuge for sound government and constructive enterprise. Its evils are historically documented wherever nations have stooped to it."

What could happen eventually? It isn't a pleasing prospect.

"When individuals become insolvent," said Senator BYRD, "they take bankruptcy and dispose of their obligations. When governments become insolvent their money becomes worthless and they go through a revolution wringer. The nature and process of the revolution may vary, but invariably the form of government is changed. There is no reason to think free enterprise democracy, as we have known it, could survive."

So what do we do to reduce the danger? Support the President in his attempt to reduce Federal spending; reduce our demands on the Federal Treasury; cut out all waste in Government. But, first of all, we need a changed attitude which, instead of floating about in a purple cloud of unreality, has its feet on the ground and recognizes—and accepts—the bitter facts of economic life.

AND CONFIRMATION

So maybe you thought Senator BYRD (as quoted in the above editorial) was talking through his hat, or crying "wolf" once to often, just because he believes in governmental economy.

Well, Sylvia Porter reported in her column in Tuesday's Plain Dealer that U.S. Government bonds are going begging at interest rates of 4 percent or better.

A fundamental reason for this is that investors have lost confidence in U.S. bonds. They don't want to tie their money up in them for long terms for fear that inflation will erode away its value.

True, there has not been any significant increase in inflation in the past year, but the possibility always exists if Congress is disposed to authorize deficit spending. That requires deficit financing, which puts more money in circulation and dilutes the value of everybody's dollars.

"The solution," Miss Porter wrote, "lies in renewed confidence of investors in U.S. bonds—and that in turn rests on investors' renewed confidence that our country will balance the budget and control inflation. The confidence isn't yet here."

Governments have two ways of repudiating their debts—in big doses and little doses. Soviet Russia has administered two big doses in recent years, once when savings were confiscated, again when it postponed indefinitely paying off on bonds which the people had been compelled to buy.

Inflation is a way of debt repudiation in little doses. The Government pays off its debts in dollars all right, but the dollars won't buy as much as they did formerly.

Thus, when lawmakers whose hearts bleed for the masses insist on bold new welfare programs which can only be financed by adding to the debt, they are actually subtracting something from the welfare of every citizen by cheapening his money and reducing his income in the terms of what it will buy.

The outlook for the future is not good. The ceiling on the Federal debt is now $283 billion. It will have to be raised again so the Government can pay its bills. That won't help to restore confidence in the stability of the U.S. dollar. It will take more than one balanced budget to do it.

The Aim of Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago our wise and distinguished colleague, CHESTER BOWLES, spoke on the theory and practice of foreign aid. It was a stimulating and perceptive discussion by a man who knows as much about the defects and virtues of our foreign-aid program as anyone in the Congress or the executive. Mr. BOWLES' comments represent a new approach to foreign aid and economic development.

The Des Moines Register, in an editorial on April 27, 1959, has commented favorably on the Bowles approach. Under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD a copy of this editorial:

THE AIM OF FOREIGN AID

Representative CHESTER BOWLES (Democrat of Connecticut) has proposed an overhauling of the U.S. foreign aid program that deserves thoughtful consideration. BOWLES is a former high Government official and has served as Ambassador to India and as a consultant to the United Nations. He has had a long, close, and friendly association with the foreign aid program.

BOWLES would begin by restating the U.S. objective in foreign aid. The policy now, as stated in the Mutual Security Act, is to continue the aid program only "as long as (the Communist) danger * * * persists." BOWLES believes this is a negative approach, that places a premium on a country having a Communist problem in order to qualify for American aid.

BOWLES want the United States to make clear that its chief aim is to uphold human dignity and support the aspirations for freedom.

"Our major purpose," he says, "is to encourage free peoples to stand on their own feet, to make their own choices, to defend themselves against overt aggression, and to create economic and political conditions under which the principles of liberty and human dignity can take root, grow and ultimately flourish."

BOWLES asks: "Why is it that modern equipment can make a vital contribution to increasing productivity in the villages of some countries while similar machinery sent to other countries lies rusting on the docks?" The chief reason, he finds, is a difference in determination and ability of these countries to utilize foreign aid.

BOWLES would base foreign aid on a country's qualifications for making the most effective use of the aid. BOWLES believes that to qualify for major American assistance a country should be able to demonstrate that it is making substantial efforts on its own, that it has a comprehensive economic plan, a competent graft-free civil service, and a stable government with popular support. A country's size, population, and location would also be taken into account in allocating economic aid.

Under BOWLES' plan, countries that do not meet minimum development standards would be informed of their shortcomings and encouraged to qualify for investment assistance. The United States would help supply the technical aid needed to lay the groundwork for using investment funds effectively.

BOWLES calls for a sweeping new look at the military aid program. He is fearful the present program has saddled some countries with excessive military loads and diverted energy and resources from essential economic programs. BOWLES believes the military aid program has served to suport dictators and, by upsetting the balance of power in some areas, to promote instability and suspicion between neighbors.

BOWLES believes that a new look at the military aid program and the use of higher standards for economic aid could eliminate waste and result in substantial savings. He urges putting the savings into an expanded Development Loan Fund for loans to qualified undeveloped countries. BOWLES proposes an increase for the Loan Fund from the $700 million requested by the administration for 1960 to $1 billion.

The Bowles approach is a welcome contribution to thinking on foreign aid. It is an imaginative and constructive approach that holds out the possibility of curbing waste and increasing the effectiveness of foreign aid.

Food for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, in the May 1959 issue of the Capper's Farmer, a transcription of an interview with the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota appears concerning his food for peace bill. Although Senator HUMPHREY'S and Congressman WOLF'S, of Iowa, United Nations food bill utilize the food and fiber resources in different ways, the purposes of the bill are similar. Both bills have as their respective goals the utilization of our food resources in ways which will aid the underdeveloped nations of the world and the starving peoples of this world in their quest for a better life.

Mr. Speaker, too many have thought of our great food and fiber abundance as a millstone around our necks. It is refreshing to know that through the leadership and explanations of Senator HUMPHREY and others, we are beginning to see the enormous use and value of our food resources—that it is a gift to be used for man; not for the purpose of rotting in food storage tanks.

Under unanimous consent, I include the interview of Senator HUMPHREY in the Appendix of the RECORD:

FOOD FOR PEACE—OUR MIRACLE WEAPON

(An interview with Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Minnesota's Senator HUMPHREY is introducing a bill in the Senate to establish a Food for Peace Administration. Here he tells how this program would work.)

Question: "Senator, what would your proposed food for peace program do that is not now being done under Public Law 480?"

Answer: "We intend to use Public Law 480 as a base and expand upon it. We need a Food Administration—a Food for Peace Administrator. Our present arrangement is clumsy. There is really no one spot where the responsibility for the use of food and fiber as an instrument of foreign policy is centered.

"Part of the responsibility is in the Department of Agriculture and part is in the Department of State."

Question: "One objective then will be to make Public Law 480 more effective?"

Answer: "Yes; and to improve its administration. But we need a Food for Peace Administration with vitality, imagination, and momentum. The present program is short of something to make it work. We are missing the great opportunity. And I want to say that if we keep on missing it for another 5 years we won't have any more chances."

Question: "What countries would receive our food for peace?"

Answer: "I am thinking of the new nations, the rising countries, those just coming out of colonialism that need capital for development. I mean those countries that do not have American dollars.

"The great opportunity in this program is that we can sell to these countries for their own money. That is a key to Public Law 480. But we have failed to make full use of it."

Question: "Can we make use of all these foreign currencies?"

Answer: "We use what we need to pay our bills in those countries. But here is where our products become 'food for peace.' We can loan the money back to them for their economic development—to build roads, schools, factories, or whatever they may need to improve themselves."

Question: "Haven't we been criticized for delay in putting these loan funds to work?"

Answer: "Yes. The sheer bureaucratic delay in negotiating some of these loans is tragic. We not only hold back opportunity for the new countries to develop. But while the money lies idle, inflation may be eroding away its value.

"We could be building future trade and permanent good will for our country. We could be helping new countries promote health, education, and business expansion."

Question: "Education then would be a big part of a food for peace program?"

Answer: "If we can sell food to these countries for their money, they can use their supply of American dollars to buy other things they need for industrial development. We can loan their money back to them for scholarships, school facilities, laboratories, classrooms, books, and visual aids."

"Question: "Senator, Capper's Farmer readers are asking if an expansion of Public Law 480 is only a substitute for an adjustment of production that would prevent surpluses."

Answer: "We are justifiably concerned over surpluses because they are depressing farm prices. Unfortunately, lower farm prices do not show up in lower consumer prices.

"If a food for peace program were developed on a big enough scale, it would siphon off our depressing surpluses and put them to work in parts of the world that are short of food and fiber. It would upgrade our own economy and that of deficit countries.

"We could make food for peace the greatest instrument we have ever had to maintain a prosperous agriculture at home and create good will abroad."

Question: "If we expanded the Public Law 480 program, would we be accused of dumping our surpluses in the markets of our friends?"

Answer: "We could upset normal trade patterns if we acted like ignoramuses. But this kind of program would be carefully planned. I can't imagine that we would proceed without careful cooperation with our friends and allies.

"Food for peace would not be sold in our normal dollar or pound sterling markets. It would operate where there are no dollars or British pounds."

Question: "How much control would we have over the funds that we loaned back to these countries?"

Answer: "The projects would be decided upon by negotiation between the Food for Peace Administration and the recipient country, in accordance with such law as Congress might enact. But the purposes of the loan and the terms of repayment would be set forth in an agreement."

Question: "Isn't there a danger that food for peace might retard agricultural progress in such a country?"

Answer: "We are not thinking of a worldwide relief program. And, of course, our food surpluses are not unlimited. But the need of these countries is great. The pressure for a better standard of living is unbelievable. Either we must help them through democratic processes or they will fall captive to totalitarianism."

Question: "Senator, what set you at work on the food for peace idea?"

Answer: "I caught the idea on a trip to the Middle East about a year ago. I saw what food can really mean. I came back with the

feeling that our military aid program in this area was accomplishing little.

"For example, we put millions of dollars in military aid into Iraq. What happened? They used the guns to kill the very government that we were supporting. And the people felt no gratitude to the United States.

"But I am confident that if we had loaned them money for a school lunch program, or helped them with health and education improvement that could have been identified with the humanitarian impulses of the American people, we would have a reservoir of goodwill in Iraq today."

Question: "Would Food for Peace be limited to the amount of our crop surpluses?"

Answer: "Such a program should not be wholly based on the accident of surpluses. First of all, we should have a national security reserve. I mean certain amounts of foods that should be set aside for emergencies that might happen to us or our allies.

"A food reserve is as important as a stockpile of atom bombs. What good would bombs do if we had no food? One of the first acts of an enemy would be to contaminate our fields and livestock. It is good national security to have a surplus of foods."

Question: "Is cost of our farm program high compared to that of our missiles?"

Answer: "We should quit complaining about the cost of food surpluses. We are not complaining much about military stockpiles or the obsolescence of weapons. We put billions into rockets and missiles that will never be fired. Yet that is done in the name of research and security.

"Food is security too. And it will win more friends than weapons. A few tons of powdered milk in Africa will do us more good than a ton of uranium.

"Furthermore when other nations look to us for part of their food needs they will think twice before joining any bloc antagonistic to us."

Question: "From your visit in Russia last year did you get the impression that the Soviets are pushing their farm program for the purpose of using food as a tool in furthering Soviet influence?"

Answer: "Yes; definitely. Premier Khrushchev pointed out how the Soviet Union had sent foods to less prosperous countries. I predict that in 5 years Russia will be a food-exporting country.

"Imagine what Mr. Khrushchev would be doing today if he had our billion-bushel wheat surplus. He'd be the world's biggest wheat salesman and not be worrying how many rubles it would bring. He'd be spending Soviet influence with every kernel."

Question: "Senator, are you looking forward to a world food bank in your food for peace proposal?

Answer: "Yes, the food surplus producing countries might eventually get together in an international food bank. But I don't think we should wait until we can have a perfect project. We've already learned a lot from the use of Public Law 480. We should build from that and work out bilateral arrangements with nations that need our food now."

The Great Broiler Dilemma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURR P. HARRISON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, the great poultry industry is in trouble. Leaders of the industry are at the Capitol today, presenting the cruel facts to the Committee on Agriculture and to individual Members of this House. In this connection, and under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include an editorial as reprinted in the Virginia Poultryman of April 1959:

THE GREAT BROILER DILEMMA

Anyone who was in Dallas, Tex., the other week at the first convention of the National Broiler Council left the meeting deeply meditative upon the dilemma which this most advanced of the many segmented industries in the food industry finds itself.

Contrary to the copy book maxims, this industry, which now produces annually 1.7 billion units of the finest foods finds its future stymied and its progress and even its continued existence in doubt.

IT'S MORE THAN OVERPRODUCTION

And this arises not from overproduction, although this may be an incidental problem, but from the trade practices of the major retail distributors. Broilers are being used as a traffic builder, as a loss leader, so extensively that the major portion moves into consumption on this basis.

But as everyone in the know fully realizes it is the policies of two or three of the big chains that set standards of practice that everyone else must follow or try to follow.

Thus, the main issue of persuading the chains to take a profit, or at least a markup, would seem to center on just two or three points.

Here is an outline of the current picture and it isn't too pretty a one. A chain is getting ready for a major broiler sale. It canvasses the sources of supply asking not what is the price, but proclaiming how much it will give. The producer resists, but broilers may not be kept too long and the supply mounts up. Finally someone sells. The price let us say is 27 or 28 cents a pound.

Thus a market is created and the young chickens are set to go into distribution at prices that mean little more than cost recovery for the producer and straight loss for the chains.

EVERYONE GETS THE PRICE

We said chains, for the news that one of the major outfits has gotten broilers at this price cannot be kept secret and soon everyone is getting the price forced by the one or two.

Finally, the big broiler sale breaks on Thursday at a price equal to invoice and sometimes even less. The public rushes out to buy, filling their freezers and refrigerators with an inventory that will last 2 or 3 weeks, by which time a new broiler sale will be staged and the process repeated.

Next Monday after the sale, the chains, done with their price orgy, mark up the chicken to exorbitant heights—anywhere from 35 to 45 or 49 cents a pound in an effort to recoup their losses. The result is that demand falls flat. Broiler movement is next to nil and the supplies begin to pile up in in the warehouses of the processors.

The stage is being set for a repeat of the great profitless performance.

GREAT HOPES AND EXPECTATIONS

It was hoped and even forecast at Dallas that perhaps this nonsensible pattern for all concerned may be wearing thin and that corrective action is about to occur. One of the chainstore men said at Dallas that broilers were seemingly losing their role as a preeminent traffic builder, for everyone is now in the act of giving broilers away.

And the cost is very high to the retailer. Not only is he selling at invoice or below, without regard for normal markup and handling but the broiler sales are having a devastating effect on just about everything else in the meat case.

Chicken sales, which normally amount to about 8 or 10 percent of total meat sales, swell to 60 percent or more during the period of the great broiler busts. Thus the store loses profit all along the line.

The broiler men, devastated by their great problems, voiced the hope at Dallas that chains and other distributors could be induced to attach a markup of at least 10 percent during the sales and 20 percent at other times.

Thus everyone could live.

As may be deduced, the broiler industry is incensed and deeply concerned.

Some in the industry even voice the suspicion—at least privately—that the chains are conspiring against them, although the more sensible view, and the one to which we subscribe, is that the whole situation derives from a monkey-see monkey-do mechanism to which retailers are sometimes strangely prone. We are sure that if the vicious circle were broken and that if one chain did not fear the competitive defeat it would meet if it did not hold a broiler sale and another did, the situation would ease itself. But how is this to be achieved?

We feel that the retailers have a great opportunity at commercial statesmanship here.

RADICAL SOLUTION MAY BE ATTEMPTED

For if something isn't done, it is certain that the broiler industry will attempt a radical solution with the help of the government. The situation has just those qualities that many a politician would love to air in the headlines and via a congressional investigation. The big distributive organizations would be certain to emerge with black eyes.

What is more the public could suffer. Already, there is talk of marketing orders and governmental help even via the sudsidy route. All of which would mean restraints, curtailed production, red tape and ultimately high prices.

It will be interesting to see if the retailers will take the cue or whether they will wait until they are bludgeoned about the head by the force of law before taking corrective action.

Mr. Speaker, I also include a resolution by the board of directors of the National Broiler Council:

RESOLUTION ON RETAILER PRICING PRACTICES AS THEY AFFECT THE SALE OF BROILER CHICKENS UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED BY THE NATIONAL BROILER COUNCIL BOARD OF DIRECTORS IN DALLAS, TEX., MARCH 20, 1959

The National Broiler Council board of directors believe currently used retailer merchandising and pricing techniques frequently block broilers from reaching the consumer in a free and orderly flow. These practices have evolved in a period of revolutionary growth and dramatic change in the broiler industry. These broiler industry changes have paralleled the development of new and equally dramatic changes in food retailing. However, this industry with all its modern technological advances and improved product, is being penalized by current retail practices, and it is our belief the retailer is jeopardizing his long-range profit possibility for this basic protein commodity as well.

We, therefore, recommend the following steps be taken:

1. Trade organizations representing the retail food industry, chains and independents, should immediately be apprised of these facts in a positive and effective manner.

2. Immediate conferences should be called so National Broiler Council leaders can personally bring these facts to the attention of the highest leadership in individual food retailing businesses in America.

3. If no action is forthcoming through the above steps, then this industry must take immediate action through other avenues to remedy these practices.

Mr. Speaker, I also include a significant portion of a statement by Mr. Charles D. Vantress, of Duluth, Ga., a major breeder of broiler stock and one of the founders of the National Broiler Council:

OVERPRODUCTION?

Now, let us take a real good look at this thing we call overproduction. That the broiler industry is overproduced is one of the biggest brainwashes in history. A guilt complex has been built in our industry on this subject:

How?

No. 1: The stores using the two-price system always have used as a justification, "Well, you are overproduced and we have to hold sales to clean out your surplus."

No. 2: Some industry people have sincerely thought some kind of voluntary production control practical and that a permanent seller's market could be achieved by this method.

No. 3: Some industry and official people have, as a matter of policy, preached that we are overproduced to try to get someone in some other area to cut back.

No. 4: The USDA has periodically preached that meat chickens were overproduced, predicting low markets, with catastrophic results to the industry.

I, personally, stand on the premise that we never have a chance to know if the product is overproduced because, except for rare, unusual occurrences such as condition X last year, along with unseasonable cold weather, causing a temporary seller's market, the industry is kept on a constant controlled overproduction basis by the two-price system in the stores. If strength is shown in the field, the flow is reduced to 25 percent in the stores by the too high price level. The resulting backing up in the industry inventories certainly then is a surplus, but it has been proven over and over that a too low price (currently 29 cents per pound) moves more than the industry is producing. In other words, never can you say the industry is overproduced without questioning at what price to the consumer? We know that the industry is overproduced at 49 cents per pound in the stores. We know that the industry is underproduced at 29 cents per pound in the stores. No one can say just what the maximum price is at which all of our product will sell because it never has been tried. At 49 cents the stores make several profits on 25 percent of the volume sold at that price which averages out into a pretty good profit on the total volume of chicken sold, but the production end of the industry gets paid on a live price based on the too low store price for all of its volume.

LOWERING HUMAN STANDARDS

How did we arrive at this situation? Who is to blame? While there was vast room for efficiency and quality gains in the industry, many in the industry, no doubt a substantial majority, benefited by this system, and certainly the public benefited by being introduced to a new food product of extreme quality, 75 percent of which was sold at extreme bargain prices. The same people responsible for this system have been the best friends the industry has had and are responsible for much of the growth and progress of the industry. The two-price system was responsible for squeezing every inefficiency out of the industry and in that respect was good for the industry, however, when practically every efficiency has been made, leaving only further breeding gains as a means of further lowering of cost, then the squeeze of the two-price system can only result in lowering of human standards. That means, growers working for less than subsistence wages while living off accumulated savings represented by their housing and equipment. It means no chance for key salaried employees in operations, or laborers, in flocks, hatcheries, processing plants, looking forward to peacefully progressing with the rest of the national economy. It means many real fine managers who have been independent feed dealers, operating on credit, which if their credit is withdrawn or even held level, will be thrown into bankruptcy. It means financial destruction for hatcherymen who, with any kind of commitments, try to put security into supply flock operation, the owners of which are farmers.

LEGAL APPROACH

The people, of the substance and numbers involved in this problem, will not lay down and lose by default. They first will ask the stores to voluntarily stop this practice. If this fails they will test the legality of the two-price system in court. It has been stated by legal advisers that tacit collusion exists when stores follow the same practice, even though no actual agreement exists; that dealers harmed by this practice can collect threefold damages. But, if this practice is found to be legal the industry people will then be forced into protective types of collectivism or combination, if the two-price system remains. This will mean the organization of growers, flockowners, and hatchery workers into AFL–CIO labor unions, feed dealers organized into trade associations for collective action, and probably merger of processing plants into bigger and/or cooperatives for bargaining power. Even Government price supports and production controls could gain favor if the two-price system continues even a few months longer. All this could happen to people who have always thought independently, and have had faith in private enterprise as a means of industry progress and consumer value. We are of the opinion that if the powers that be in the food retail trade were completely aware that the broiler price has been squeezed below cost of production by the two-price system, that the system has already achieved its value in forcing extreme efficiency in the broiler industry, and that it has already ceased to be of much value as a traffic getter, through loss-leader technique, and that a continuation of that system will force the broiler people into various forms of collectivism and combination, and that the result of this will mean considerably raised costs of production with some protected inefficiencies, making broiler meat a higher priced, semiluxury item for the public, then I think they would give quick consideration to the end of this practice.

FORWARD LOOK

If the two-price system were ended, what could we look forward to in the industry? In a free market, supply and demand would set the price. The price charged in the store would reflect the price paid to growers. If this price were too high it would come down until the flow equaled the production. Then, at any time, an individual could evaluate his business in the light of probable markets and would operate accordingly. Then we could stand a chance of improving markets by increasing demand and thus price. Only those would be squeezed below cost of production whose costs were too high (probably 10 percent most of the time, instead of 95 to 100 percent as at present) and a continuing orderly adjustment would be taking place at all times while 75 to 90 percent of the industry would be operating at a legitimate profit. No one could complain about that.

Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, the following newsletter, written by the able junior Senator of New Hampshire, the Honorable NORRIS COTTON, should be of interest to all:

YOUR SENATOR REPORTS

(By NORRIS COTTON)

Trustbusting Teddy Roosevelt said, "The corporation has come to stay as the trade union has come to stay. Each has done great good. Each should be favored as long as it does good, but each should be sharply checked when it acts against law and justice." When he made that statement, he was in the midst of a bitter war against the Fat Cats of Wall Street who named Presidents, made and unmade Senators and Congressmen, throttled competition, starved and exploited labor. Nonetheless, he clearly foresaw the hour when the pendulum would complete its swing and the reins of power would shift from the corporation to the trade union.

That hour came this week when an unhappy Senate writhed under the whiplash of giant labor. It came as the culmination of 26 months of probing by the McClellan committee, during which it published 46 volumes—16,939 pages—1,257 witnesses. It found millions of union funds pocketed by union officers, unions without elections for more than 10 years, members deprived of voice or vote in union affairs, conspiracies between union officials and employers, felons fresh out of prison in places of authority. "The abuses, thievery, skullduggery, and skull-splitting tactics are practiced more often against the workers than the employers. The arbitrary power over workers thus acquired is almost invariably used for personal power and enrichment."—Senator MCCLELLAN. Labor itself was shocked by these revelations, and the topflight chieftains of AFL–CIO, whose integrity and respectability is unquestioned, took disciplinary action against 7 unions having 2½ million members.

Three key issues highlighted the 9-day Senate struggle: misuse of union funds, dictatorship in union affairs, abuse of union power.

Dishonest officials who filched at least $10 million from members' treasuries spent it in various ways—a $35,000 yacht, a $57,000 private plane, a stable of thoroughbred horses, and large sums spread over a wide field ranging from Cadillacs and TV sets to theater tickets and women's finery. Dictatorship and abuse of power was even worse. It is an established and accepted fact that union membership is not voluntary. Workers must join or forfeit their jobs. Dues are deducted from their pay just as the Government withholds a tax. But, in addition to this, they have frequently been deprived of their vote for years at a time, forbidden admission to stacked meetings with doors barred by steel chains, forced to pay initiation fees as high as $1,000 for the right to work at their trade, and, in some instances, beaten by goons if they dared to protest.

Chairman MCCLELLAN rebelled against the mild Kennedy bill and offered a bill with

teeth in it. In a nutshell the difference between the two bills was the difference between report and reform. The Kennedy bill merely required officers of a union to report periodically to the Secretary of Labor on the use of funds and on a variety of internal union affairs. For the ordinary union member the Secretary is a long way off. The McClellan version wrote the remedy into the law of the land, enforced by a hundred U.S. district attorneys in every part of the country. It laid down a fundamental bill of rights for every union member (freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, freedom from arbitrary initiation fees and kickbacks, protection of right to sue and to participate in union elections, etc.). It outlawed extortion, secondary boycotts, and blackmain picketing. After a desperate battle McCLELLAN'S first amendment, the bill of rights, was adopted by a hairbreadth margin of one vote.

It was then that the full fury of the astonished labor leaders burst upon the Senate, especially on those Senators who had gained their election from labor's support. One by one the further McClellan provisions were watered down or beaten until finally another vote was secured on the bill of rights and a weakened, diluted version substituted. Most of the Members who had stood up and voted for it only 2 days before reversed themselves, reminding one a little of Ralph Waldo Emerson's remark that, "A hero is no braver than an ordinary man, but he is brave 5 minutes longer." Thus, for a second year in succession the Senate has marched up the hill and down again, passing a bill that is "against sin" but hardly more than the expression of a pious hope that labor's racketeers will be good.

Abolishing Postal Savings: Fiscal Insanity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the administration professes to be much concerned about balancing the budget but here it comes again pushing for the liquidation of the postal savings system.

This is fiscal insanity.

It means doing away with a profitable government activity, used by 2 million citizens, at the cost of at least $4 million.

Fiscal insanity, nothing else!

The Post Office representatives testified before the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, of which I am a member, on Tuesday. They told us that about 2 million depositors had $1.2 billion in postal savings. This money is invested in Government securities which yield on the average 2.6 percent.

The Postal Savings System, according to the testimony, makes a profit for the Government. It reduces the deficit and will continue to do so for at least 6 years.

Now here comes the administration to abolish the system, increase the postal deficit, and deprive 2 million depositors of this service. This move would cost at least $4 million.

At present the depositors are paid 2 percent interest. The profit is made on the 0.6 percent difference between the interest and the Government securities in which the Government invests. However, if you pay off the depositors, that means refinancing the $1.2 billion in low interest—no more money is available for the Government at 2.6 percent—Government securities. The new bonds which the Government will have to purchase will be at 3.25 percent interest.

Do you know the difference in interest charged on $1.2 billion for 1 year at 2.6 percent and at 3.25 percent? I will tell you: $3.8 million. Add to that the financing charges of floating the new issue and you are well over $4 million, even if you subtract the half million dollar operating costs of the Postal Savings System. Of course this would extend over for 1 year.

Economy, in my opinion, is carried too far and too insanely when profitable, useful Government programs like postal savings are sought to be abolished at the cost of more than $4 million to the taxpayers. Or perhaps I should say this is too brazen an attempt to make the bankers happy.

Kansas Telephone Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by the Kansas Telephone Association relative to funds to support the REA telephone loan program during the ensuing fiscal year. The resolution follows:

ABSTRACT FROM MINUTES OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS' MEETING OF APRIL 10, 1959

I, Douglas Gleason, secretary of the Kansas Telephone Association, 512 New England Building, Topeka, Kans., do hereby certify that the following is a true and correct copy of a portion of the minutes of a meeting of the board of directors of the association held on April 10, 1959, in Topeka, Kans.:

"The next order of business was a discussion of the REA program, and particularly the recommendations made by Mr. David Hamil, REA Administrator, to Congress for funds to support the REA telephone loan program during the ensuing fiscal year. After a full discussion, Mr. Froman moved that the following resolution be adopted:

" 'Whereas with loan funds made available through the telephone loan program of the Rural Electrification Administration, independent telephone companies, both commercial corporations and cooperatives, in the State of Kansas and in other States of the United States, have been able to provide residents on farms and in rural communities with efficient, modern telephone service. The extent and character of the service furnished would not have been possible if these companies had been required to rely upon private commercial sources for funds to finance the necessary construction; and

" 'Whereas there still remains in the State of Kansas and in other States a large number of farm establishments and rural communities not presently receiving adequate telephone service which look to established independent nearby telephone companies, both commercial and cooperative corporations, with the hope that in the near future modern, efficient telephone service will be extended to their farms and communities by those established companies; and

" 'Whereas these inadequately served farms and rural communities can be provided with modern efficient service by these established companies if low cost Rural Electrification Administration telephone loan funds continue to make available in amounts commensurate with the needs. Service to these farms and rural communities cannot be provided if reliance must be placed on private commercial sources for the necessary construction financing, and

" 'Whereas David A. Hamil, Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration and his capable staff of the Telephone Operations and Loans Division are conscientiously and efficiently administering the telephone loan program. They are aware of the magnitude of the telephone needs of the people of this Nation and are in the best possible position to formulate and express a judgment as to the extent to which those needs can be met through REA telephone loan funds in the coming fiscal year: now, therefore, be it

" '*Resolved*, That this Kansas Telephone Association, which includes within its membership every type of commercial or cooperative business organization capable of qualifying as a telephone public utility under the laws of our State of Kansas, does hereby, through its duly elected, qualified and acting board of directors, after broad consultation with the membership of this Association, express its approval of the recommendations and request made by David A. Hamil, Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, for loan funds to be available for the telephone loan program in the coming fiscal year to the full extent of Mr. Hamil's recommendation; be it further

" '*Resolved*, That the approval of this Kansas Telephone Association of Mr. David A. Hamil's recommendation and request be made known to our Senators ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL and FRANK A. CARLSON and our Congressmen WILLIAM AVERY, NEWELL GEORGE, DENVER HARGIS, ED REES, FLOYD BREEDING, and WINT SMITH and to the appropriate committees of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives by providing them respectfully with copies of this resolution.'

"Mr. King seconded the motion and on a vote, the motion carried unanimously. The president declared the resolution adopted and instructed the secretary to forward certified copies of the resolution to the Senators and Congressmen from the State of Kansas and to the appropriate congressional committees."

Certified to and signed this 21st day of April 1959, at Topeka, Shawnee County, Kans.

DOUGLAS GLEASON.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 21st day of April 1959.

CAROL M. TILTON,
Notary Public.

My commission expires October 2, 1960.

Thoughts for April 15

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my re-

marks, may I call the attention of my colleagues in the Congress to an excellent editorial appearing in the April 15, 1959, edition of the Wall Street Journal entitled "Thoughts for April 15":

It has long been a truism that high taxes make people disdain the law. That has been notoriously the case in France, for example; it is becoming increasingly the case in the United States.

Thus a survey recently conducted by this newspaper showed that two out of five American taxpayers interviewed admitted cheating on their returns. It was not that they used every legal provision to their advantage, but that they deliberately short-changed the Government.

Though such a poll naturally doesn't pretend to be statistically precise for the whole Nation, it is at least indicative of the mood of quite a few people. Others, who wouldn't think of cheating, pay their taxes with annoyance, anger, or disgust.

For the Government to create such a mood is bad enough; what is worse is that the thing doesn't end there. Excessive taxation breeds, in many people, a disrespect for the Government as a whole. Moreover, much of what the Government does with tax money invites both disrespect for Government and the corrosion of individual morality.

Consider the farm program, for one instance. People with a tradition of self-reliance become inured to accepting Federal handouts. Some of them, oppressed by controls, become lawbreakers. Meantime, the entire spectacle hardly enhances the dignity of Government. Because Congress refuses to face today's farm facts, the program resembles something dreamed up in a madhouse. And yet a good hunk of the tax dollar goes to pay for this folly.

Similarly, few healthy veterans can possibly believe that they are entitled to innumerable Federal benefits, but they keep on taking them because they are available; why not get what the others are getting? For its part, Congress, skittish of imagined political hot water, refuses to reform and reduce the veterans program. Again, for the public at large, the impression is created of the Government handling tax money in a silly fashion.

The more the Government gets into matters of private concern the more these twin effects show up—the undermining of individual independence and the placing of Government in an unattractive or ridiculous light.

And the outlook for the future is not auspicious. There are too many in Congress who want to expand Government much further, apparently without limit. They are looking at human existence through the wrong end of the telescope, for Government is not and cannot be the generator of wealth, as our own history abundantly proves. On the contrary, every expansion of Government, paid for through higher taxes or more inflation, is a powerful depressant on the true sources of wealth. Existing taxes are already far too high for sound economic growth.

To put it another way, just suppose that we had sound money and confidence that the Government was going to keep it sound; that we had a Government constantly cutting spending, gradually paying off the debt and reducing taxes. The effect would be electric; the economic goals proclaimed by the statists would seem piddling by comparison to what a free people would accomplish. This is the lesson of our history, and it seems incredible that so many people can manage to misread it.

We all know, or ought to, that this Government was founded in reaction to excesses of Government. It was meant to be limited, for the very good reason that the people who founded it understood that in the freest possible play of individual initiative was not only the best guard against tyranny but also the surest route to material abundance. And so long as the Government remained limited it was not the target of the widespread disrespect of the people.

Now in these reflections on April 15, it is certainly not our purpose to condone those who cheat on their taxes. What we are saying is that it is an inevitable reaction to exorbitant taxation—a tax revolt in fact—and a part of the general malady of big government.

After all, Government can hardly expect anything but disrespect when it permits excessive taxation and inflation to cheat the people of their present livelihood and future hopes.

A Bill To Correct an Inequitable Discrimination in Administration of an Excise Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill designed to correct a flagrant and equitable discrimination that has risen under the admintration of a tax law.

For decades retailers have been competing with wholesalers and manufacturers in the premium, award and prize market. This involves sales made to business and other organizations for such purposes as sales premiums, incentive and merit awards to employees, for disposition as prizes, scholastic awards, and so forth. Basically these awards are given, as business incentives for scholastic or athletic accomplishment and cultural achievement in furtherance of our economic and social life. Several recent Federal court decisions ruled that sales of this nature are not retail sales as provided for in the Internal Revenue Code and therefore are not subject to the retail excise tax. These decisions, which in part lean on debates in Congress which have tended to define the term "retail," placed these products which are normally taxed at retail on an equal competitive basis in this business and organizational market with other products not normally taxed when sold at retail. In administering these decisions, a tax ruling was issued which restricted their application to sales made by firms "not engaged in retail business." The greatest impact of this interpretation is to deny tax-exempt sales to retailers as well as to restrict the application of the exemption to manufacturers and wholesalers not selling at retail. Strenuous efforts by retailers and others to obtain corrective rulings have been unsuccessful.

The net effect of this situation is to deprive the retailer as well as many wholsalers and manufacturers of any possibility of continuing to compete equitably in this premium, award, and prize market.

The inequity involved here is compounded by the character of the parties against whom it is inflicted. From an economic point of view the retail industry is, generally speaking, the weakest element in our business structure. By far, the greatest number of retailers are "small business" in every sense of the word. And yet here, through an unfortunate distinction between them and some of their suppliers they are stripped from opportunity to equitably compete in a market that they heretofore have enjoyed.

This bill will clearly establish equitable status for all sales of these incentive awards whose value is well founded by their historical use by business and industry. In this regard this amendment clarifies but does not change existing law. Last year Congress, in the Excise Technical Changes Act, in effect, recognized the value of achievement awards by exempting from Federal retail excise taxes purchases of these products by nonprofit educational organizations. The court decisions referred to previously recognize that other organizations have the same privilege in recognizing scholastic, athletic, economic or cultural achievement without tax.

This amendment will restore retailers to a competitive equality insofar as this premium, award, and prize market is concerned with other levels of industry and thus correct the dicrimination that has arisen under the administration of our tax law. It is compatible with previous Congressional decisions that clarify the term "retail" as used in other laws and Government regulations.

It is my earnest desire that the Congress take prompt and favorable action on this bill.

Seeds of Corruption

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to call attention of the House of Representatives today to a very penetrating editorial which appeared in the Washington Post on April 30. It is indeed gratifying that this responsible Washington newspaper has taken cognizance of the fact that abuses recently disclosed in labor-management relations can be traced not only to representatives of labor, but also to those who frequently represent industry's interest.

The editorial follows:

SEEDS OF CORRUPTION

Employers who go before Congress with tales of paying graft and entering so-called sweetheart agreements with venal labor leaders are very poor advocates of stiffer labor laws. The latest example is to be found in the testimony of Leonard F. Banowetz, counsel and assistant secretary of the Coleman Co., of Wichita, Kans., before a House Labor Subcommittee. Mr. Banowetz volunteered the information that his company had paid $27,000 to an official of the Sheetmetal Workers Union to end a boycott of its heating and air-conditioning equipment.

The company did indeed run into a serious problem. But instead of seeking redress

through the NLRB or the courts, it took the easy road; it sought out the union leader it believed responsible for the boycott and began paying him graft. There was no blackmail or threat to destroy the business if the company did not comply with sheetmetal workers' demands. The union made no demands. Of course, it was indefensible for the union to refuse to handle the Coleman products (which according to the witness, were made by union labor) simply because they did not bear the Sheetmetal Workers label. But it was even more contemptible, as Representative PUCINSKI said, for the company to institute a system of graft and then disguise the outlays in its advertising account.

No doubt the country needs new laws to cope with situations of this kind. But it needs even more men of principle who will not stoop to the corruption of union officials for the sake of expanding their business. Mr. Banowetz freely admitted that these transactions, which took place before he joined the company, were wrong but he was in a singularly poor position to ask Congress to remedy a situation which his own firm had helped create. Law can never cure spinelessness. Businessmen who are tempted to follow a similar course ought to realize that no weakness in the law can excuse graft and dishonesty and that, if they themselves sow the winds of corruption, then can scarcely hope to avoid reaping the whirlwinds of extortion, violence, and hoodlumism.

The Case Against the Nuclear Test Ban

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 29, 1959

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, for the same reason expressed by the editors of Air Force magazine in their foreword to a special analysis in the May issue entitled "The Case Against the Nuclear Test Ban," I have asked that it be reproduced here, namely, there are two sides to every question and both should be examined by thoughtful persons:

THE CASE AGAINST THE NUCLEAR TEST BAN

(We are now in the midst of a voluntary 1-year ban on nuclear weapon testing. The arguments in favor of seeking to make such a ban permanent are persuasive and have been well aired. The other side of the coin—the case against the ban—has not been so cogently expressed nor so widely circulated. Here is an analysis presenting the arguments of an expert who opposes a permanent ban on nuclear tests. We feel these views deserve expression in the interests of open national debate of a critical issue.—THE EDITORS.)

We should not agree to a permanent international ban on nuclear testing under present circumstances, despite the spontaneous and enormous appeal of such a proposal.

Rather, it is of the utmost importance to the United States and the entire world that we resume conducting such tests and utilize their results to the optimum degree in the fields of weaponry and peacetime nuclear development. This should be done as soon as possible after the current 1-year test ban agreement comes to an end in October.

The reasons for this are many—military, political, scientific, economic. And they are urgent.

Arguments in favor of a long-term ban fall, for the most part, into two categories. They are based either on a general sense of international mortality or the fear that radioactive byproducts of nuclear explosions will gradually poison mankind.

Only a fool would dismiss either of these positions out of hand. They require examination.

Unfortunately, undiluted morality, or idealism, as a national motivation has compounded a sad case history in recent years. This pragmatic truth has been an unpleasant pill for Americans to swallow.

An appropriate example, all too appropriate, perhaps, is seen in the outcome of idealistically elevated attempts at global disarmament between the two world wars of this century. The rise of the Axis powers and the horrors they wrought were a direct result. The next link in the chain was the rapid growth of Communist power in a war-ravaged world.

Another painful example comes from an entirely different area of national life. Prohibition, although promulgated in the interests of morality, actually provided an unprecedented stimulus to organized crime. The so-called syndicate and other facets of underworld life that developed as a result remain with us today; their activities are among our major problems as a nation.

Today, among many of our best thinkers, there is the sinking sensation that we are at it again, seeking with idealistic purpose to ban nuclear testing and then nuclear weapons.

The second strain of thought in opposition to nuclear testing is based on concrete biological data, fragmentary but nonetheless frightening. Yet here is presented a problem that can surely be overcome.

The peoples of the world are entitled to full protection from possible ill-effects of nuclear testing. Some of the nuclear tests of the past should have been handled more carefully. In fact, most tests—Western tests at any rate—were held amid maximum precautions along these lines. Future tests could be held underground or in space, or under other safe conditions.

The fact is, at relatively minor cost, the problem of fallout can unquestionably be avoided in future nuclear testing. Testing can be resumed without contaminating milk and other foods with strontium 90 or other harmful substances.

We can, at this point, go one step further in discussing the overall question of a nuclear ban. Let us assume for a moment, contrary to the contention of this essay, that a permanent cessation of nuclear tests at this time is desirable. How likely is realization of this end?

This, in short, is the political side of the picture. Depsite numerous concessions on our part, which have given away a good portion of our bargaining and security positions, the Soviets have not yielded to American demands for a meaningful and reliable test ban. Nor are they likely to accept any scheme which does not predominantly serve their own strategic interests.

On the technical side, the primary issue is whether a test ban could be controlled and enforced. The United States sought an answer to this question by calling an international conference of experts from East and West at Geneva last year. The result was a carefully worded technical agreement, parts of which were questioned by some members of our scientific community. This gathering was followed by the current international conference on nuclear testing at Geneva.

It now appears that there is utterly insufficient knowledge of the numerous scientific variables entering into the test ban problem. Top experts seem unable to design a truly effective inspection system.

Even if they could, constant changes of technology would require an extraordinarily flexible setup to keep the inspection system up to date. In the absence of open tests which allows nations to keep track of nuclear progress, such a periodic modernization of the inspection system would have to be predicated upon full scientific exchanges—in other words, upon the abolition of nuclear secrecy. At the present stage of history, this would seem a wildly utopian goal.

Suppose for the moment that, in spite of all, a system technically good enough to discover test ban violations came into being. It still would be necessary to prove transgressions. Verification would be extremely difficult, if not impossible. For example, it might require finding a minuscule cavity in an enormous mountain mass, a "room" 2 miles inside Mount Whittier or Mount Ararat. Creative imagination boggles at such a problem. Inspectors would require the right to dig forever and whenever they wanted, all over the globe. How much digging would the inspectors have to do before they were truly convinced that no violation did occur? How large a digging crew would be required? There are hundreds of unidentifiable earthquakes every year. Would weekly digging expeditions be required?

The Geneva technical agreement, as amplified by later negotiation, envisages an inspection force of about 6,000 men. This figure appears too low. It could not begin to meet global demands on it—including high altitude inspection and protection against specially devised technologies of evasion and deception.

For there is no reason on earth why we should trust the Soviets to cooperate in good faith to carry out a test ban agreement. If the ban were operational, events might actually force us to insist on broad-gauged verification expeditions. We would then be moving from one resultant diplomatic crisis to the next, a sorry commentary on hopes that a test ban would reduce international tension.

Or, just as in 1949 and 1950 we gave up worrying about North Korean border incidents, we could give up worrying about inspection system warnings. Disaster might follow.

In all probability, as soon as the Soviets made the inevitable discovery that the ban hampered their armament development, they would violate the ban secretly or withdraw from the pact openly. Either way, the United States would be left flatfooted while Russia took off down the arms race track.

Since the United States cannot, for any length of time, retain its qualified test personnel on a standby basis, we would lose at least 1 year before we could follow the Russian suit. If we did not make an immediate decision, we would be delayed by perhaps 2 years.

It is generally agreed that, during the period of test ban, Russian nuclear science could reach the level of U.S. atomic knowledge. Thus, in jumping the gun on the ban, Russia might achieve a decisive margin in nuclear technology.

Let us at this point depart from our hypothetical assumption that a nuclear test ban is, in fact, desirable. We have seen where the matter of such a ban stands, and where it could lead, in practical terms. This is not, however, where the brief for test resumption rests.

Rather, there are myriad positive reasons for conducting tests to push the state of nuclear progress as far as we can as fast as we can.

Twenty years after the discovery of atomic fission, nuclear technology remains in its infancy. No scientific discipline begun experimentally has ever lost the need for experiment. Nuclear physics has always been based on experiments, foremost among them explosive tests.

The international situation makes it imperative that we stay ahead in nuclear technology. The United States has been forced into a technological race which it cannot afford to abandon. Revolutionary changes in nuclear technology are clearly foreseeable. Weapons improvements are urgently and vitally needed throughout our entire arsenal.

Obviously, each new missile needs nuclear warheads which must fit its precise configuration. It is illogical to develop new weapon systems and at the same time discontinue further development of the explosives they are designed to deliver. We cannot act as though the knife does not need a blade.

It has been argued that because our "nukes" already produce all the yield that may be useful, nuclear weapon tests no longer are necessary. Perhaps we have reached the limits of practical bomb yields. Yet we cannot possibly assume that we have attained optimal yield-weight-diameter ratios. These, clearly, are of the utmost importance in missile warfare. As the weight and space requirements for control equipment to be carried in the missiles grow, as second generation missiles move through the research stage, as third generation missiles appear on the horizon, and as targets become smaller and tougher, thus calling for increased accuracies, the need for optimal warheads becomes ever most urgent.

Solid-fueled missiles will render this requirement absolutely critical. Unless we attain really high warheads for longest range and accurate ICBM delivery, we will not acquire an effective strategic missile capability, nor will we preserve our present deterrence posture. So much for the yield problem.

Our offensive capability still is based on "dirty" nuclear weapons. This is unsatisfactory because heavy fallout causes unnecessary casualties, restricts freedom of strategic and tactical action, and may "backfire" on the user.

In a very real sense lack of clean weapons also precludes effective defense against nuclear attack. Effectiveness in missile defense is a function, not only of electronics as has been asserted, but also of yield and numbers. With "dirty" defense weapons, the greater the yield and the higher the number of surface-to-air missiles, the more harmful the fallout which will rain down on friendly territory. Not so with clean warheads.

Further, defense missiles are relatively useless unless they are available in large numbers; hence those missiles should be cheap. But in order to be cheap, defense missiles should be small and uncomplicated. To compensate for the resultant relative inaccuracy, the yield must be large, but to be usable over friendly territory, large yield warheads must be clean. To complete the circle, both yield and "cleanliness" require large weights and diameters.

In the present state of the art, large yield, clean warheads must be placed in large missiles, which cannot be economical. The clear conclusion is that really satisfactory defense weapons cannot be attained without a very substantial nuclear testing program.

To emphasize this point, it might be noted that at present the power of the offensive exceeds the power of the defensive by a margin broader than ever before. It is this presently unchallenged superiority of the offensive which has made nuclear surprise attack a matter of constant, hourly threat. A much strengthened defense could price aggression out of business.

Nuclear weapons also affect defense in ground warfare. An aggressor force would find a nuclear ambush war very hard to cope with. Small combat teams armed with portable nuclear weapons, which would combine the invulnerability of guerrillas with the firepower of divisions, would be more than a match for aggressor armies. This means that nations with small ground armies would have a chance of defending themselves successfully against aggressor hordes. Such nuclear weapons could be an excellent deterrent against local "brushfire" aggression. As yet the free world has failed to develop an effective on-the-spot deterrent against the brand of limited territorial aggression. A nuclear test ban would prevent solution of this critical problem.

There are, in addition to military factors, related political reasons for test resumption. If, armed with test-developed weapons, small nations possess the capability of fighting a future war without risking national extinction, their governments will not be tempted to surrender to nuclear blackmail. An aggressive government can use war scares as foreign policy tools under the present circumstances. New weapons, developed in tests, could change this state of affairs.

Finally, and ironically, the dreaded nuclear tests may hold a key to the good life for many.

Little publicity is accorded the discouraging fact that in many areas of the world population growth is outpacing economic development. Even if capital were available in the quantities needed—which is not the case—the problem of exploiting untapped sources would bulk large. Nuclear technology cannot be considered a panacea, but it could make formidable contributions to economic growth.

Nuclear techniques could be used for the construction of ports and canals, redirecting rivers, building tunnels and difficult roads. Nuclear-aided engineering could improve the water supply of arid areas, or of any area, for that matter. Nuclear explosions could unlock trillions of barrels of oil contained in shales and sand tars, open access to other minerals. The nuclear explosive could be one of the most valuable single package assets ever discovered by mankind.

But, once more, the potential cannot be achieved without testing.

To summarize: Resumption of nuclear testing would serve the interests of the free world in almost every conceivable way. A permanent ban, conversely, would be to our extreme disadvantage.

Widely, powerfully, sincerely expressed views to the contrary would seem to be based mainly on splendidly intentioned unreality and fear of a danger that can be overcome.

All of us live today in horror of nuclear war. We must work and pray to prevent it. Unfortunately, calling off nuclear testing now by agreement with world communism cannot help. It could be a catastrophic mistake.

Amending Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act

SPEECH
OF
HON. DAVID S. KING
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 29, 1959

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5610) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, so as to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to say that I am gratified that the Railroad Retirement Act, H.R. 1012, for which I voted, passed this body by a strong voice vote.

I am convinced that it would have been an injustice to the laboring men of the Nation's railroads to have enacted the alternative, H.R. 5610. While the latter embodied certain benefits for the people it was meant to help, it also threatened to erase certain gains which the same people already enjoy.

H.R. 1012 carried the benefits which H.R. 5610 contained without threatening other benefits as the latter did. For this reason, the Congress clearly took the stronger, better position in choosing H.R. 1012, and I reiterate my pleasure over its passage.

Salute to John Morrell & Co. for 50 Years of Service to Sioux Falls and the People of South Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important institutions in the economic life of South Dakota is the John Morrell & Co. meatpacking firm at Sioux Falls, S. Dak. For half a century this splendid industrial firm has provided an invaluable contribution to the farmers, workers, businessmen, and consumers of the Sioux Falls area. The high quality Morrell products are known and enjoyed on the tables of America from Maine to California. Thousands of working men and women have benefited from the substantial payroll provided by the company. South Dakota's vital livestock industry has profited beyond measure by the purchases of Morrell buyers.

I have known both the management officials and the labor representatives at Morrell's and am proud of my friendship and association with these high caliber men. Mr. Francis McDonald, president of Local 304, AFL–CIO, a longtime Morrell employee, had this to say of the company's labor-management relations:

> Labor-management relations between John Morrell & Co. and Local No. 304 of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America, AFL–CIO, have been carried on in an atmosphere of intelligence and mutual respect for the position of both the employee and employer.

Such wholesome relations between labor and management are a tribute to the company officials and the workers and their leaders.

Since the Sioux Falls Morrell plant was opened in 1909, six men have served as general managers: T. Henry Foster, 1909–12; W. H. T. Foster, 1912–39; J. M. Foster, 1939–44; R. T. Foster, 1944–52; H. T. Quinn, 1952–55; and the present general manager, C. I. Sall. The president of the company is Mr. W. W. McCallum and the chairman of the

board of directors is Mr. George M. Foster. I salute all of these men for the 50 years of dedicated service that they have provided in important leadership positions.

Twenty-four longtime employees of the firm were honored in the recent salute of Morrell's to the city of Sioux Falls. These distinguished employees, the departments and the date of their beginning employment with Morrell's, are listed as follows:

Charles E. Hoffman, pork cut department, September 1, 1940.

Alfred J. Reid, divisional superintendent, April 29, 1912.

Clarence G. Budde, pork kill cut department, April 15, 1912.

Margaret C. Carlson, canned meats, November 15, 1914.

Tom R. Scott, foreman, pork byproducts, November 17, 1914.

Sidney B. White, salesman, Denver, Colo., July 7, 1916.

Freda Amundson, assistant foreman, sausage manufacture, July 17, 1916.

John A. Beck, foreman, hog kill department, October 25, 1917.

Earle Manners, foreman, engine and boiler, April 13, 1918.

George W. Heckman, St. Paul branch, July 11, 1918.

Ernest S. Lacome, mechanical clerk, August 12, 1918.

Clinton M. Gardner, head cattle buyer, January 20, 1919.

Roy E. Rensberger, pork cut department, June 5, 1919.

Art C. Pepper, manager, time office, July 7, 1919.

Esten Nesby, divisional superintendent, July 17, 1919.

Roy O. Johnson, salesman, Fargo, N. Dak., July 28, 1919.

Clarence E. Graves, traffic department, September 2, 1919.

Harry E. Chappel, cattle buyer, December 29, 1919.

E. F. Jacobson, San Francisco plant superintendent in charge of operations, May 1, 1920.

Walter Zimmel, foreman, beef and sheep kill department, May 3, 1920.

Norman E. Noyes, foreman, roustabout, June 1, 1920.

Wesley G. Baker, hog buyer, September 7, 1920.

Harris Claussen, foreman, loading and shipping department, October 14, 1920.

John H. Lacome, foreman, millwright, November 12, 1920.

Always interested in the welfare of their community, Morrell & Co. published a special salute to the people of Sioux Falls in the Tuesday, April 28, 1959, edition of the Sioux Falls Argus-Leader. I ask unanimous consent that the following portion of this special edition be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

1909 FLEDGLING IS NOW 1959 GIANT—GROWTH RECORDED DESPITE TWO WARS, DEPRESSION

In June 1909, it seemed likely that the meatpacking firm which began operations in the old Green plant would be little known nor long remembered. It took 3 days to dress the first 50 hogs which had been purchased—not an auspicious beginning for a company which now processes 600 hogs an hour.

Residents of Sioux Falls may be excused if they viewed the new venture with some skepticism, for the meatpacking companies which had started in the city had an unbroken record of failure.

The Ottumwa, Iowa, plant of John Morrell & Co. had prospered for some years when, during the winter of 1907–08, the late Thomas D. Foster saw the necessity of expanding his manufacturing facilities if the business was to continue the steady growth which it had enjoyed since its inception in 1827. After surveying possible sites in Minnesota and the Dakotas, Foster chose Sioux Falls. At the time there seemed little to indicate this would be good country in which to locate a meatpacking company, but the territory adjacent to Sioux Falls eventually became one of the country's largest hog-producing areas.

On May 12, 1909, negotiations were completed for leasing the old Green plant at the foot of Weber Avenue, and the late T. Henry Foster was directed to get it ready for business. J. C. Stentz arrived to assist Foster a few weeks later, and on June 26, 1909, the first lot of 50 hogs was purchased and dressed 3 days later.

Things may have started slowly for the Morrell company, but it soon became apparent that the small quarters of the Green plant would not be sufficient for long. By the end of 1909, after little more than 6 months' operations, the fledgling firm had slaughtered 89,203 hogs and 1,186 cattle. The 6 months' hog slaughter was fairly phenomenal for that day and age. In this golden anniversary year, however, it is the equivalent of little more than 3 weeks' slaughter.

Because of the success of the first year's operations it was only natural to plan for expansion, so land adjacent to the plant was purchased and ground for the first of the new buildings was broken in May 1910. Later that year George M. Foster, who was to become president of the company and who now is chairman of the board of directors, was sent to Sioux Falls to take charge of installing all mechanical equipment and getting the new plant in shape.

By April of 1911 all buildings thought necessary had been completed so the Green plant was abandoned and all operations centered in the new plant. Thus it was that 2 years after operations first began, the Sioux Falls plant of John Morrell & Co. was on its way to becoming the major meat packing plant that it is today—one of the best in the industry.

At the beginning of operations in Sioux Falls, all dressed carcasses were sent to the Ottumwa plant where they were cut and processed. Soon, however, there came a call for fresh meat from the local plant. This resulted in the formation of a sales department with Stentz, later the company's first vice president and director of sales, in charge. To meet the demands of the local trade, the company made fresh meat available, manufactured some lard and sausage and obtained smoked meats from the Ottumwa plant.

The success of operations in the Green plant did not go entirely unnoticed. T. Henry Foster often told of the first visitor to the plant, the late Jay B. Allen, prominent insurance man who called to wish the Morrell company well. Allen was the only well-wisher who came. Operations had been carried on at the Green plant for a year and a half and the company was just months short of moving into larger quarters when a newspaper mention of the Morrell company appeared.

On January 18, 1911, the Argus-Leader carried the following story:

"WHAT IT MEANS TO SIOUX FALLS—WHAT STARTING OF MORRELL PACKING PLANT WILL MEAN TO THE CITY

"The Argus-Leader would like to ask you as citizens of Sioux Falls to get out your pad and pencil and do a little figuring on the possible influence the starting of the new packing plant will have on the trade pulse of this city and community. It is estimated that not 25 percent of the population of Sioux Falls has any adequate idea of what this means to the city in dollars and cents. One gentleman has gone so far as to say not 5 percent of the people realize what it means. It will, under these conditions, do you good to make some figures for yourself and thus impress the matter on your mind more thoroughly. Estimate, if you please, what it will mean to have a bucket brigade of 400 men. Calculate in good old coin of the realm what it will mean to have 20 carloads of hogs and 5 or more carloads of cattle handled at this plant every day for 300 days in the year. Perhaps you cannot comprehend that the money necessary to carry on this business of the Morrell plant for the 12 months following the opening for business of this new shop will aggregate nearly $10 million."

The Argus-Leader had foreseen the future correctly. The next two decades were ones of continuous growth with new buildings added, branch houses put in operation and plant production increased to 5,000 hogs per day by 1924. Employment at the plant kept pace with the population growth of the city, both almost doubling in number in the years from 1909 to 1920.

In 1927 John Morrell & Co. was ready to celebrate 100 years in the meatpacking business in England, Ireland, Canada and the United States. It had been a good 100 years for a business which started from the sale of a bargeload of oranges.

The Sioux Falls observance of the anniversary was centered around the dedication of the Centennial Gate at the entrance to the plant on September 27, 1927. Following a band concert, the dedicatory exercises began when the plant manager, the late W. H. T. Foster, introduced Hon. T. H. McKinnon, mayor of the city of Sioux Falls, who compared the progress of Sioux Falls with the progress of the local plant.

Success, however, was not without its difficulties, brought about by two World Wars, the stock market crash of 1929, the ensuing depression of the thirties and the bank "holidays" of 1933.

President T. Henry Foster reported on the holidays and the manner in which the company acted to keep in operation:

"On March 5 all banks in the United States were closed by order of the President. We immediately printed a supply of 'guaranteed pay orders' in various denominations, which we agreed to redeem in cash at the end of the banking 'holiday.' These were used freely to pay for all livestock, supplies and labor and they were accepted everywhere without question."

The year 1933 also brought the ill-advised program for the reduction of pigs and sows on Corn Belt farms and 1934 produced the worst drought in history.

In the war years, 1942–45, more than 1,700 men and women from the Sioux Falls plant, office, and sales force, entered some branch of the Armed Forces. Those on the home-front participated actively in the Red Cross, USO, Community Chest, and various war efforts, including the purchase of more than $2 million of war bonds.

In 1948, when building materials and labor became more plentiful, four new plant buildings, department additions, and a modern three-story office building were constructed.

Today the Morrell plant in Sioux Falls is one of the most complete, compact, sanitary, and up-to-date plants in the world, with facilities for slaughtering and processing 95 cattle, 200 lambs, and 660 hogs per hour.

As of March 31, 1959, the records show the Sioux Falls plant had killed 41,105,759 hogs, 4,377,643 cattle, 5,856,337 lambs, and 109,054 calves. Thus more than 51 million head of livestock have been purchased in this area and processed for America's tables since the Sioux Falls plant opened in May 1909.

First Lumber Cut in Oregon County in 1827

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, Oregon is proud of her record for the past 21 years as being the leading State in the Nation's lumber production. With this in mind, I respectfully request permission to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an article from the centennial supplement of the Wallowa County Chieftain pertaining to the history of Oregon's lumber production. I am sure this will be of interest to my colleagues:

FIRST LUMBER CUT IN OREGON COUNTRY IN 1827

(By Arthur W. Priaulx)

When in 1827 at Fort Vancouver, Dr. John McLoughlin, famed Hudson's Bay factor, gave the sign that turned the water-powered muley sawmill to saw the first boards ever cut west of the Mississippi, it was the start of an empire in the Oregon Territory.

By 1837, a sawmill was operating at Newberg, another at Salem in 1840, and still another at Oregon City in 1842. Mills, crude affairs powered by water wheels, sprang up throughout the Willamette Valley wherever lumber was needed to build towns and farms. By the 1850's, mills were operating along the Columbia River and down the Oregon coast, and they were running full tilt supplying lumber for the California gold rush.

Since 1938, Oregon has led the Nation in total lumber production, and for the past 5 years, it has produced more than half the Nation's softwood plywood, as well as a million tons of pulp a year. But this was not always so.

For eight decades, the lumber industry of Oregon was on a hand-to-mouth basis, suffering from overproduction. Only during times of great national stress, such as during World Wars I and II, did it prosper, or during times of great catastrophes, such as the San Francisco and Japanese earthquakes, when vast quantities of lumber were needed for reconstruction.

POWER MAKES PROGRESS

Power and wheels tell the story of the lumber industry's progress. First, logging was handled with jack screws as logs were felled along river banks and rolled into the water for transport to the mills. Then came horses, oxen, crude steam donkey engines; then more powerful and refined steam equipment. Away from the waterways, logs were moved by logging railroads, but there were vast areas of forested land considered inaccessible by rail.

Then, after World War I, came the technological revolution which has changed the face of Oregon and brought every tree in the State within reach of the mills. The crawler type of tractor and the logging truck, whose development was sparked by the first war, have made logging big business.

TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTY SEPARATE GRADES

From crude early sawmills which hacked irregular-sized boards and cants from Douglas fir logs, the industry today claims the finest precision machinery: electric-powered, even some electronically guided equipment. Lumber is so finely manufactured for ultimate use that mills produce as many as 250 separate grades for strength and for appearance, compared with the few simple items of the early days.

The coming of the railroads in the 1870's had its effect on opening up new markets for Oregon-made lumber in the midwest, and the opening of the Panama Canal spurred the expansion of cargo mills along Oregon's waterways as the eastern seaboard became our customer.

Today, Oregon's 8- to 10-billion-foot annual production of lumber goes to every crossroads in America and to virtually every country on the globe. Lumber, plywood, pulp and paper—the forest products—give employment annually to 90,000 men and women, among the highest paid industrial workers in the world. The annual value of Oregon's forest products at wholesale prices to the mills is $1,200 million, which is more than twice the value of all agricultural products grown annually.

Oregon will always be the leading lumber-producing State in the Nation, because man is doing something about managing our forests. In 1940, following many disastrous years of forest fires, the Keep Oregon Green program was launched under the sponsorship of Gov. Charles Sprague and many leading lumbermen, as well as dedicated public forestry officials, both State and Federal.

FIRE LOSSES DROP

Since the advent of Keep Oregon Green, forest-fire losses have shrunk from an annual average burn of 125,000 acres to less than 10,000 acres a year, sometimes as little as 5,000 acres.

The greatest single advancement in conservation in our history started the same year in Oregon and Washington: the tree farm program. Private timber owners, seeing the example of the declining forests in the Lake States and New England, decided they must manage their forest holdings for perpetual growth if the mills and factories of the State, which live on wood, were to operate permanently.

Thus was founded the tree farm program, which some have called the greatest single invention of man for the conservation of our forests. It establishes management plans for the maximum production of forest crops on every acre of private forest lands. State and Federal forests have similar plans.

FUTURE IN YOUNG TREES

After 125 years of harvesting, Oregon forests contain 440 billion board feet of saw timber, but the real hope of the future is wrapped up in its millions of acres of young trees from 1 to 100 years of age. Forest fires have been cut to a bare minimum, so seed sources are protected. Although we have developed new techniques for planting, such as aerial seeding of logged lands by helicopter and hand planting. Mother nature still reseeds about 90 percent of all logged lands naturally, the seed coming from blocks of seed trees left for that purpose.

It is the estimate of expert foresters that Oregon's 26 million acres of commercial forests will be able to produce perpetually a volume of timber adequate to maintain a forest economy at about its present level. In the rain-drenched Douglas fir forests of western Oregon, an acre will produce an average of 700 board feet in a year. In the drier eastern Oregon pine region, the growth rate is about 150 board feet per acre per year. With these definite figures available, it is possible to project with reasonable accuracy the growth rate of our vast forest resource for generations into the future.

What of the future? There are those who predict the 2-by-4 and the board will become as obsolete as the carrier pigeon in another 50 years. That's dream stuff, for there will always be a need for conventional lumber and plywood.

RESEARCH HELPS INDUSTRY

However, the Oregon Forest Products Laboratory at Corvallis, financed by a 4-cent-per-thousand tax on all logs cut in the State, is coming up with some wondrous byproducts from wood, cellulose, and bark. Private firms in their laboratories are making equally amazing discoveries as research moves into the Nation's oldest industry. It is possible that, in the near future, we may have a chemical industry here in Oregon manufacturing a wide variety of products from leftover woods from sawmills and plywood plants. The potential dollar value of this industry is tremendous.

What sort of chemicals and products can be made from wood, bark, and cellulose? From bark, you can get cork, fibres, tannins, drugs, quercitin (widely used in food manufacturing), and many other products. From cellulose, you can get wood sugars, feeding molasses, land fertilizers and extenders, drugs, chemicals, ships stores. The list is endless.

Oregon's vast lumber and forest products industry of today, with its amazing mechanical contrivances and multitude of products, is indeed a far cry from the tiny mill at Fort Vancouver which Dr. John McLoughlin proudly and prophetically started.

Oregon has some of the most productive forest lands in the world, and farsighted citizens to maintain these lands perpetually in forests, for which this land is best suited.

Free Marketplace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial appearing in the Washington (D.C.) Star of February 28, 1958.

That editorial states the simple fact that fair trade cannot stand at a time when manufacturers refuse to enforce it. It further states a still more important fact, that fair trade is so inconsistent with a free enterprise economy that it breaks down under the realities of the situation. Just as General Electric has abandoned fair trade because of the tremendous cost to enforce and police its fair trade prices, so also will other industries in the future.

The fair trade bills now pending before Congress, such as H.R. 1253, are not in the public interest and should be summarily defeated:

FREE MARKETPLACE

The so-called fair trade movement, under steadily heavier attack in recent years, has suffered a major setback in the decision by General Electric to abandon efforts to fix minimum retail prices for its small home appliances. Within hours, Sunbeam Corp., a principal competitor of G–E, followed suit; and price cutting by as much as 50 percent has been reported in many cities. Although Westinghouse abandoned price-fixing efforts more than 2 years ago, the fact that G–E is dominant in its industry and has fought a long and costly battle to maintain its price controls makes its surrender a more important breach in the fair-trade front.

The fair-trade movement reached its high point about 1940 when 45 States were giving manufacturers of branded goods the legal privilege of setting retail price floors. Only

Missouri, Texas, and Vermont—and the District of Columbia—remained free price jurisdictions. Within a decade, however, the front began to crumble under adverse decisions from State and Federal courts and only 32 States now give legal sanction to the practice. Since about 1950, the rise of the discount house—invariably operating with a minimum of overhead and selling at specific percentages below established prices—has made it increasingly difficult for manufacturers to hold the price lines. Conventional merchandising establishments were left at a competitive disadvantage. For their part, manufacturers were reluctant to cut off supplies to discount houses that provided a large wholesale market.

Some persuasive arguments have been made by the fair traders, but on the whole the concept appears to be collapsing under the pressures of competition in a private enterprise economy. It has been demonstrated that retailers can make profits at lower markups than the manufacturers have specified and that customers are determined to shop for the better prices. If fair trade is difficult to enforce in the courts, it is even more difficult to enforce in the market place. In the long run, the retail industry undoubtedly will adjust fully to these economic facts of life.

Averagitis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in a recent article in the U.S. News & World Report we were told that unemployment is not really a serious problem in the United States. The thousands of people in my district who are jobless and who are desperately looking for an opportunity to work will find no comfort in such deceptive reports.

There are some archconservatives who believe that a little unemployment is a good thing for the country and creates a better business climate. Compared with the total labor force 4 or 5 million unemployed is a small percentage, but when we consider the suffering that comes to the families of these jobless workers' it means that approximately 20 or 25 million persons are in distress.

Since the U.S. News & World Report reflects the thinking and philosophy of extreme reactionary interests, it can be understood why they publish such deceptive and misleading propaganda. This publication claims to be independent and nonpartisan, but every competent observer realizes that it is as reactionary and partisan in politics as the Democratic Digest is liberal and democratic. Its electioneering goes on throughout the year as it seeks to create the proper political climate favorable to candidates who support its views and philosophy.

Such articles as published by this propaganda magazine are evidently part of the fight against improvement of our unemployment compensation system and against enactment of legislation to provide needed work opportunities for our jobless fellow Americans.

Fortunately, some alert and progressive editorial writers are exposing this propaganda magazine.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include an editorial entitled "Averagitis" from the current issue of the Machinist, and another entitled "Scrabble" from the New Era, of Reading, Pa.:

[From the Machinist, Apr. 30, 1959]

AVERAGITIS

Forgive us for saying it, but we told you so. We predicted that the politicians, the propagandists and the newspaper columnists would soon be working to belittle the problem of unemployment and to block any effective action by Congress. The AFL–CIO conference on unemployment adjourned barely 3 weeks ago and already the counterattack is well under way.

The magazine U.S. News & World Report, for example, has whittled the number of unemployed down to an even 1 million. The Labor Department reported 4,360,000 jobless last month. To the editors of U.S. News, the only jobless worth worrying about are 1,700,000 who are heads of families. From that number they subtract 500,000 because their wives are working and another 200,000 because their sons or daughters have jobs. That leaves only 1 million and that's hardly enough to worry about.

J. A. Livingston, a syndicated newspaper columnist who writes on economic and business matters, has whittled down the figures by subtracting 2 million whom he describes as between jobs. This group is the number unemployed in best of times as a result of a free society in which some people quit, some get sick and others get fired every day. This is called frictional unemployment.

We have always regarded Mr. Livingston as one of the best informed financial writers. In this column, however, he seems to ignore the fact that even the frictionally unemployed have twice the reemployment problem when they must compete with additional millions who have been laid off.

Further, Mr. Livingston appears to be suffering from that common disease called averagitis. That's a form of cockeyedness that leads people to see and talk about averages instead of realities, about families with 2.3 children, for example.

Mr. Livingston worked over the unemployment figures to prove that only 3.1 persons are unemployed for every 100 in the workforce. The reality, according to the March classifications of the U.S. Labor Department, is that 217,000 people are out of work in Detroit, Mich.; 117,000 men and women are jobless in Pittsburgh, Pa.; 64,500 adult human beings are pounding the pavements in Buffalo, N.Y.; 11,600 people are hunting jobs in Atlantic City, N.J.

As this newspaper has been repeating for many months, the truth about unemployment is that economic recovery is not evenly distributed according to any national average. Unemployment may not be a serious problem in every area. It is deadly serious to the people of 35 American cities where there has been no recovery.

No good purpose is served by trying to sweep this problem of depressed areas under the rug. We need Federal legislation to help redevelop depressed areas. No amount of propaganda can change that.

[From the New Era]

SCRABBLE

One of the favorite sports for anyone playing the word-game "scrabble" is to try to invest a word and get it past the opponents without challenge. Invariably, this requires a bit of ingenuity which only a trip to the nearest dictionary can upset.

I was reminded of this device when I picked up the latest copy of U.S. News & World Report and proceeded to read a two-page article entitled "What Unemployed Really Means." Now what it tries to do is convince me and you that unemployment isn't really so bad, and perhaps, if you look the other way and make up your own definition, the word really is quite delightful. In fact, by the time you finish the story you're certain that unemployment is just another way of saying you're on vacation, and everybody knows that vacations are wonderful.

My "scrabble" training, however, sent me scurrying to good old Webster's. And what is his definition of unemployed? "Not employed at any paid labor." Yes, folks, unemployed means exactly what it says: unemployed. You don't get a pay check by redefining the word and trying to coat it with a thin layer of sweet chocolate. Yet, that's what U.S. News & World Report tries to do.

The business-oriented magazine might taste pretty good with some of the salt George Meany suggested using on the tails of the bluebirds in the skies. But I prefer to believe that a regular pay check exchangeable for groceries is far more satisfactory than a lot of gobbledygook and outright propaganda.

U.S. News would have us believe that the 4,400,000 unemployed are young people, alcoholics, people "between jobs," farmers hunting factory work, students, or those who want only part-time work. I hunted through every line of the story to find out how many so-called full-time workers are getting only 2 or 3 days' work a week but this was completely overlooked. I presume, then, that if you work only a day a week you are classified as "employed."

The Challenge of Soviet Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I desire to include the following address delivered by the Honorable Allen W. Dulles, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, before the 27th annual convention of the Edison Electric Institute on April 8, 1959, in New Orleans. I believe Mr. Dulles' timely address will be of interest to all Members of the House:

THE CHALLENGE OF SOVIET POWER

(Address by Allen W. Dulles, Director of Central Intelligence, to the Edison Electric Institute, New Orleans, La., April 8, 1959)

I appreciate this opportunity to speak to your 27th annual convention on the subject of the "Challenge of Soviet Power."

This topic is particular appropriate for the Edison Electric Institute. It was Lenin who defined communism "as the Soviet system plus electrification." The very first Soviet economic plan in the early 1920's had as one of its principal objectives the development of a modern electric power system.

In effect, the Soviets propose to electrify Marxism. What they may in fact do is either to shock their backward political institution into key with their more modernized technical and industrial skills or electrocute the whole archaic Marxist political system.

In any event, the Soviet Union has certainly sought to follow up Lenin's emphasis on electric power and has become a leader in many electronic fields. It has developed intensively the role of radio in its massive effort to promote its subversive policy on a worldwide basis. It uses electricity to jam the airways and to build an electronic iron curtain around the minds of their own people.

In my own business of intelligence, the various manifestations of electrical power are changing the whole system of information collecting in many vital fields. Electricity operates the radar which is on watch against sneak attack. It helps to make possible the ready transmission of warning of impending danger and as the mass of intelligence pours in day by day, over electric channels, it is electronic machinery which becomes a valued partner in helping us in its collation and dissemination.

The challenge of Soviet power presents today a triple threat: First, military; second, economic; and third, subversive.

This challenge is a global one.

As long as the principles of international communism motivate the regimes in Moscow and Peiping, we must expect that their single purpose will be the liquidation of our form of free society and the emergence of a Sovietized, communized world order.

They change their techniques as circumstances dictate. They have never given us the slightest reason to hope that they are abandoning their overall objective.

We sometimes like to delude ourselves into thinking that we are faced with another nationalistic power struggle of which the world has seen so many. The fact is that the aims of the Communist International with its headquarters in Moscow are not nationalistic; their objectives are not limited. They firmly believe, and eloquently preach, that communism is the system which will eventually rule the world and each move they make is directed to this end. Communism, like electricity, seeks to be an all-pervasive and revolutionary force.

To promote their objectives they have determined—cost what it may—to develop a military establishment and a strong national economy which will provide a secure home base from which to deploy their destructive foreign activities.

To achieve this objective, they are devoting about twice as much of their gross national product to military ends as we do. The U.S.S.R. military effort as a proportion of gross national product is greater than that of any nation in the world. Their continuous diversion of economic resources to military support is without any parallel in peacetime history.

We estimate that the total value of their current annual military effort is roughly equivalent to our own. They accomplish this with a gross national product which is now less than half of our own.

Here are some of the major elements which go into their military establishment. The Soviet Union maintains an army of 2½ million men and the tradition of universal military training is being continued. The Soviet Army today has been fully reequipped with a post-World War II arsenal of guns, tanks, and artillery. We have reason to believe the Army has already been trained in the use of tactical nuclear weapons.

They have the most modern types of aircraft for defense: night and day fighter, a very large medium bomber force and some long-range bombers. They have built less of these long-range bombers than we had expected several years ago, and have diverted a major effort to the perfection of ballistic missiles.

Their submarine strength today is many times that with which Germany entered World War II. They have over 200 long-range modernized submarines and a like number of less modern craft. They had made no boasts about nuclear powered submarines, and on all the evidence, we are justified in concluding that we are ahead of them in this field. We must assume, however, that they have the capability to produce such submarines and will probably unveil some in the near future.

I would add a word on the ballistic missile situation.

When World War II ended, the Soviet acquired much of the German hardware in the missile field, V–1 and V–2, and with them many German technicians. From that base, over the past 10 years, they have been continuously developing their missile capability, starting with short-range and intermediate-range missiles. These they have tested by the hundreds, and have been in production of certain models for some time.

They also early foresaw that in their particular geographical position, the long-range ballistic missile would become their best instrument in the power struggle with their great rival, the United States. As the size and weight of powerful nuclear weapons decreased, with the improvement of the art, they became more and more persuaded of this. Hence, they have concentrated on these weapons, have tested some and assert that they now have ICBM's in serial production.

They hope in this way eventually to be able to hold the United States under the threat of nuclear attack by ICBM's while they consolidate their position in the fragile parts of the noncommunistic world.

Before leaving the military phase of the Soviet threat, I want to dispel any possible misinterpretations. First, I do not believe that the Soviet now have military superiority over us; and, second, I do not believe that they desire deliberately to provoke hostilities with the United States or the Western World at this time. They are well aware of our deterrent force. They probably believe that the risks to them even if they resorted to surprise attack would be unacceptable.

Taking into account our overall military strength and our strategic position vis-a-vis the Soviet Union, I consider that our military posture is stronger and our ability to inflict damage is today greater than that of the Soviet Union.

Furthermore, we have allies. The strength, the dependability, and the dedication of our allies put them in a very different category than the unwilling and undependable allies of Moscow, even including the Chinese Communists.

But as the Soviet military capabilities and their nuclear power grow, they will feel that their foreign policy can be somewhat more assertive. In 1956 during the Suez crisis, we had the first Soviet missile-rattling as a new tactic of Moscow diplomacy. Since then there have been the Taiwan Straits and Berlin crises, and today the aggressive Communist penetration of Iraq. Hence, we must assume that they will continue to probe and to test us, and they may even support other countries in aggression by proxy. They will put us to the test.

There are two points to keep in mind as we view the military future. Firstly, with a much lower industrial base than we, they are producing a military effort which is roughly equivalent to our own; and secondly, they have conditioned their people to accept very real sacrifices and a low standard of living to permit the massive military buildup to continue. If the Soviet should decide to alter their policy so as to give their own people a break in the consumer field with anything like the share in their gross national product which we, as a people enjoy, the prospects of real peace in our time would be far greater.

I will turn now to some of the highlights of the economic aspect of the Soviet challenge.

The new confidence of Khrushchev, the shrewd and vocal leader of the Soviet Communist Party, and incidentally head of government, does not rest solely on his conviction that he, too, possesses a military deterrent. He is convinced that the final victory of communism can be achieved mainly by nonmilitary means. Here the Soviet economic offensive looms large.

The proceedings of the recent 21st party congress laid out what we might call the Soviet economic order of battle.

Khrushchev explained it in these words, to summarize the 10 hours of his opening and closing remarks:

"The economic might of the Soviet Union is based on the priority growth of heavy industry; this should insure the Soviet victory in peaceful economic competition with the capitalist countries; development of the Soviet economic might will give communism the decisive edge in the international balance of power."

In the short space of 30 years, the Soviet Union has grown from a relatively backward position into being the second largest industrialized economy in the world. While their headlong pace of industrialization has slowed down moderately in the past few years, it still continues to be more rapid than our own. During the past 7 years, through 1958, Soviet industry has grown at the annual rate of 9½ percent. This is not the officially announced rate which is somewhat larger. It is our reconstruction and deflation of Soviet data.

Our own industrial growth has been at the annual rate of 3.6 percent for the 7 years through 1957. If one included 1958, the comparison with the rate of Soviet growth would be even less favorable.

I do not conclude from this analysis that the secret of Soviet success lies in greater efficiency. On the contrary. In comparison with the leading free enterprise economies of the West, the Communist state-controlled system is relatively inefficient.

The secret of Soviet progress is simple. It lies in the fact that the Kremlin leaders direct a far higher proportion of total resources to national policy purposes than does the United States. I define national policy purposes to include, among other things, defense and investment in heavy industry.

With their lower living standards and much lower production of consumer goods, they are in effect, plowing back into investment a large section of their production, 30 percent, while we in the United States are content with 17 to 20 percent.

Soviet investment in industry as planned for 1959 is about the same as U.S. investment in industry during 1957 which so far was our best year.

Although the Soviets in recent years have been continually upping the production of consumer goods, their consuming public fares badly in comparison with ours. Last year, for example, Soviet citizens had available for purchase barely one-third the total goods and services available to Americans. Furthermore, most of the U.S. output of durable consumer goods is for replacement, while that of the U.S.S.R. is for first-time users. In summary, the Soviet economy is geared largely to economic growth and for military purposes; ours is geared largely to increasing consumer satisfactions and building a higher standard of living.

Here are some examples: while the Soviets last year were producing only 1 automobile for every 50 we produced, they were turning out 4 machine tools to our 1.

This contrast in emphasis carries through in many other fields. Our capital expenditure for transportation and communications is more than double the comparable Soviet expenditure. Yet this is largely accounted for by our massive highway building program which has been running 15 to 20 times the U.S.S.R. spending, whereas their annual

investment in railroad rolling stock and fixed assets substantially exceeds ours.

At the moment, they do not feel much incentive in the road building field. They have no interest in having their people travel around on a massive scale. Also this would put pressure on the Kremlin to give the people more automobiles.

Commercial investment, which includes stores, shopping centers, drive-in movies and office buildings, has been absorbing over $6 billion a year in the United States and only $2 billion in the U.S.S.R.

Our housing investment is roughly twice that of the Soviet even though living space per capita in the United States is already four times that of the U.S.S.R.

What of the future? In Khrushchev's words, "The Soviet Union intends to outstrip the United States economically. * * * To surpass the level of production in the United States means to exceed the highest indexes of capitalism."

Khrushchev's ambitious 7-year plan establishes the formidable task of increasing industrial production about 80 percent by 1965.

Steel production, according to the plan, is to be pushed close to 100 million net tons. Cement output is set at a level somewhat higher than industry forecasts place U.S. production in 1965.

The energy base is to be revolutionized. Crude oil and natural gas will constitute more than one-half of the total energy supply, and relatively high-cost coal will be far less important than now.

By 1965, the U.S.S.R. plans to produce about 480 billion kilowatt-hours of electricity. As a study comparing United States and U.S.S.R. electric power production prepared by a leading industrial research group pointed out, this means that the absolute gap between the United States and U.S.S.R. in the quantities of electricity generated will increase somewhat in our favor over the next 7 years.

This interesting study received a considerable amount of deserved publicity. We agree with its conclusion. However, what is true about electric power is not true across the board, as some commentators concluded.

For example, compare primary energy production trends in the two countries. Soviet production of coal, petroleum, natural gas and hydroelectric power, expressed in standard fuel units, amounted to 45 percent of the U.S. production in 1953. By 1965 it will be close to 60 percent. The absolute gap in primary energy has been closing since 1950. At the present pace, it will continue to narrow over the next 7 years.

Similarly, the absolute gap in steel production has been shrinking over the past 5 years. The maximum gap in steel capacity apparently was reached in 1958.

The comforting illusion spread by the "disciples of the absolute gap" should not serve as a false tranquilizer.

At the same time, it is important not to exaggerate Soviet prospects in the economic race. In the propaganda surrounding the launching of the 7-year plan, Khrushchev made a number of statements about Soviet economic power which were nothing more than wishful thinking. Specifically he stated that, "after the completion of the 7-year plan, we will probably need about 5 more years to catch up with and outstrip the United States in industrial output. "Thus," he added, "by that time (1970), or perhaps even sooner, the Soviet Union will advance to first place in the world both in absolute volume of production and in per capita production."

First of all, to reach such improbable conclusions, the Kremlin leaders overstate the present comparative position. They claim U.S.S.R. industrial output to be 50 percent of that of the United States. Our own analyses of Soviet industrial output last year concluded that it was not more than 40 percent of our own.

Secondly, Khrushchev forecasts that our future industrial growth will be only 2 percent a year. If this is true, the United States will be virtually committing economic suicide. This prediction I regard as unrealistic.

A saner projection would place 1965 Soviet industrial production at about 55 percent of our own. By 1970, assuming the same relative rates of growth, U.S.S.R. industrial output, as a whole, would be about 60 percent of that in the United States.

Further, when Khrushchev promises his people the world's highest standard of living by 1970, this is patently nonsense. It is as though the shrimp had learned to whistle, to use one of his colorful comments.

These Soviet exaggerations are a standard tool of Communist propaganda. Such propaganda, however, should not blind us to the sobering implications of their expected economic progress.

First of all, rapid economic growth will provide the Kremlin leaders with additional resources with which to intensify the arms race. If recent trends and present Soviet policies continue, Soviet military spending could increase by over 50 percent in the next 7 years without increasing the relative burden on their economy.

Secondly, some additional improvement can be made in the standards of living of the Russian people, even with continued emphasis on heavy industry and armaments. It is only since the death of Stalin in 1953 that serious attention has been given to improving living standards. The moderate slow-down in the headlong growth of heavy industry which then ensued has been caused, in large part, by the diversion of more resources to housing, to agriculture, and to consumer goods.

Living standards, based on present Soviet plans, are expected to increase about one-third over the next 7 years. This level, if achieved, will still be far below that which our own citizens are now enjoying, but it will look good to people who for long have been compelled to accept very low standards.

Finally, the Soviet 7- year plan, even if not fully achieved, will provide the wherewithal to push the expansion of trade and aid with the uncommitted and underdeveloped nations of the free world. By 1965 Soviet output of some basic raw materials and some industrial products will be approaching, and in a few cases exceeding, that of the United States. Most prominently, these products will be the kind that are needed for industrialization in the less developed countries.

The outcome of this contest—the Communist challenge in underdeveloped areas—is crucial to the survival of the free world.

This is an unprecedented epoch of change. Within little more than 10 years, over three-quarters of a billion people, in 21 nations, have become independent of colonial rule. In all of these newly emergent countries, there is intense nationalism coupled with the determination to achieve a better way of life which they believe industrialization will bring them.

The leaders of world communism are alert to the opportunity which this great transformation provides them. They realize the future of communism can be insured only by expansion, and that the best hope of such expansion lies in Asia and Africa. While they are attempting to focus all our concern on Berlin, they are moving into Iraq with arms, economic aid, and subversion, and giving added attention to Africa.

The Communist bloc trade and aid programs in undeveloped countries moved into high gear during 1958. The equivalent of over $1 billion in new credits was extended to underdeveloped countries by the bloc in this year. In the 4-year period ending 1958 the total of grants and credits totaled $2.5 billion, of which $1.6 billion came from the U.S.S.R. and the balance from the satellites and China. Three-fifths of the total delivered to date has been in the form of arms to the UAR—Egypt and Syria—Yemen, Iraq, Afghanistan and Indonesia. These same countries, plus India, Argentina, Ceylon, Burma, and Cambodia, have received the bulk of the economic aid.

Over 4,000 bloc technicians have been sent to assist the development of nations in the free world. About 70 percent of these technicians are engaged in economic activities. Others are reorganizing local military establishments and teaching bloc military doctrine to indigenous personnel.

The bloc also has a well-developed program for training students from underdeveloped countries. About 3,200 students, technicians, and military specialists have now received such training behind the Iron Curtain.

While these figures are still well below the total of our own aid, loan and training programs, this massive economic and military aid program is concentrated in a few critical countries and of course these figures do not include Soviet aid and trade with the East European satellites and Communist China.

India, which has received over 325 million of bloc grants and credits, is a primary recipient. The Soviet economic showplace here is the Bhilai steel mill, being built by the Russians. The UAR over the past 4 years received over $300 million in aid and credits. This investment today does not seem quite as profitable to the Soviet as it did last year.

Iraq provides a prime example of the opportunistic nature of the bloc's aid program.

Prior to the coup d'etat on July 14 last year, Iraq's economic involvement with Communist nations had been negligible. In the past few months, the U.S.S.R. has provided over $250 million in military and economic development credits. The Iraq Development Board has dropped its two Western advisers. Western technicians are also being dismissed and contracts with many Western firms canceled. Increasingly, Moscow is pressuring the Iraq Government to accept dependence on Communist support, and the number of fellow travelers in high government posts is growing.

The Soviet policy of economic penetration fits like a glove into their worldwide campaign of subversion, which is the third main element of the triple Soviet challenge: military, economic, and subversive.

International communism has not changed its operating procedure since the days of the Comintern and the Cominform. The Communist Party of the U.S.S.R., of which Khrushchev is the leader, is the spearhead of the movement. It has a worldwide mission, formulated by Lenin and Stalin and now promoted by Khrushchev but with more subtle techniques than those of Stalin. This mission continues to be the subversion of the entire free world, starting of course with those countries which are most vulnerable.

Its arsenal of attack is based, first of all, on the Communist Parties of the Soviet Union and Communist China. These in turn direct the hard-core Communist organizations which exist in practically every country of the world. Every Communist Party maintains its secret connections with Moscow, or in case of certain of the Communist parties in the Far East, with Peiping.

These parties also have an entirely overt association with the international Communist movement. At the 21st meeting of the Soviet Party Congress, there were present representatives of some 60 Communist Parties throughout the world, including two representatives of the U.S. Communist Party. The single theme of these Communist leaders was their confidence in the eventual

worldwide triumph of the Communist movement.

From time to time Moscow has made agreements such as the Litvinov Pact, in 1933, not to interfere in the internal affairs of other countries. On the strength of this we resumed relations with the Soviet. They are eager to conclude like agreements of "friendship and nonaggression," with all countries of the world. These are not worth the paper they are written on. During World War II, Moscow abolished the international Comintern to propitiate the United States, its then wartime ally. Its functions have, however, been carried on continuously under other forms.

In addition to its worldwide penetration through Communist party organizations, the Communists in Moscow and Peiping have set up a whole series of front organizations to penetrate all segments of life in the free countries of the world. These include the World Federation of Trade Unions, which claims some 90 million members throughout the world. International organizations of youth and students stage great festivals at frequent intervals. This summer they are to meet in Vienna. This is the first time they have dared meet outside of the Iron Curtain.

They have the Women's International Democratic Federation, the World Federation of Teachers Unions, the International Association of Democratic Lawyers; Communist journalists and medical organizations. Then cutting across professional and social lines, and designed to appeal to intellectuals, the Communists have created the World Peace Council which maintains so-called peace committees in 47 countries, gaining adherents by trading on the magic word of "peace."

To back up this massive apparatus, the Soviet has the largest number of trained agents for espionage and secret political action that any country has ever assembled. In Moscow, Prague, and Peiping and other Communist centers, they are training agents recruited from scores of other countries to go out as missionaries of communism into the troubled areas of the world. Much of the Middle East and Southeast Asia, and particularly Black Africa, are high on their target list. They do not neglect this hemisphere as recent disclosures of Communist plotting in Mexico show us. Their basic purpose is to destroy all existing systems of free and democratic government and disrupt the economic and political organizations on which these are based. Behind their Iron Curtain they ruthlessly suppress all attempts to achieve more freedom—witness Hungary and now Tibet.

The task of destruction is always easier than that of construction. The Communist world, in dealing with the former colonial areas and the newly emerging nations of the world, has appealing slogans to export and vulnerable economic conditions to exploit. The fragile parliamentary systems of new and emerging countries are fertile ground for these agitators.

Also under the heading of subversion we must not overlook the fact that the Communist leaders have sought to advance their cause by local wars by proxy—Korea, Vietnam, Malaya are typical examples.

In conclusion I wish to emphasize again the pressing need for a clearer understanding of the real purpose of the Sino-Soviet program. There is no evidence that the present leaders of the Communist world have the slightest idea of abandoning their goal, or of changing the general tactics of achieving them.

Those who feel we can buy peace by compromise with Khrushchev are sadly deluded. Each concession we give him merely strengthens his position and prestige and the ability of the Soviet regime to continue its domination of the Russian people whose friendship we seek.

Our defense lies not in compromise but in understanding and firmness, in a strong and ready deterrent military power, in the marshalling of our economic assets with those of the other free countries of the world to meet their methods of economic penetration, and finally in the unmasking of their subversive techniques.

The overall power of the free world is still vastly superior to that under the control of the leaders of international communism. If they succeed and we fail, it will only be because of our compacency and because they have devoted a far greater share of their power, skill, and resources to our destruction than we have been willing to dedicate to our own preservation.

They are not supermen. Recently they have made a series of blunders which have done what words could not do to help us unmask their true intentions. These very days Communist actions in Iraq and Tibet have particularly aroused Moslems and Buddhists against international communism. The institution of the so-called communes system on the China mainland has shocked the free world and even the Soviet leaders apologetically refuse to endorse it.

Despite the problems surrounding the Berlin issue, Western Europe is stronger than it ever has been since World War II. Much of free Asia and the Middle East is becoming alerted to the true significance of communism.

The outcome of the struggle against international communism depends in great measure upon the steadfastness of the United States and its willingness to accept sacrifices in meeting its responsibility to help maintain freedom in the world.

Experience of the Electric Power Plants Corp. in Attempting To Obtain a Small Business Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 10, 1959

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following résumé of the experience of the Electric Power Plants Corp., Cadiz, Ohio, in attempting to obtain a small business loan, which has been submitted to me by Mr. John Gros, vice president of the corporation. This is a case history in the present administration's neglect of small business and, in view of the facts set forth, it is small wonder that Mr. Gros is looking forward to "a change of Federal administration, an administration more favorable to small business":

RÉSUMÉ OF ELECTRIC POWER PLANTS CORP., CADIZ, OHIO

1. During 1951, Power Plants, Inc., manufactured special generating equipment for the atomic energy plant, at Paducah, Ky.

2. After completion of this order, a committee of engineers from the U.S. Department of Commerce visited us, made a study of our product and manufacturing facilities, and the following was their recommendation:

3. To help the extreme unemployment situation existing at that time in Harrison County (Ohio) (mining community), by moving our manufacturing facilities to Cadiz, Ohio (county seat of Harrison County), the U.S. Department of Commerce did extend us the following inducements for our consideration:

4. Loans for working capital would be extended by the Small Defense Plant Administration in cooperation with RFC.

5. A certificate of necessity would be granted.

6. A large order for generator equipment from civilian defense.

7. The people of Harrison County (approximately 350) would erect a modern building for the manufacture of generator equipment.

8. We accepted the recommendation of U.S. Department of Commerce during March 1952.

9. During April 1952, a loan for working capital was granted us for a period of 5 years by the Small Business Plant Administration, administered by RFC.

10. In May 1952, we received a certificate of necessity No. TA–NC–15158.

11. A contract was let to build the building during August 1952, and same paid for by the citizens of Harrison County through subscription of common stock in the Electric Power Plants Corp.

12. In November 1952, the Eisenhower administration was elected to office.

13. In April 1953, we were informed by Civilian Defense Administration that the Eisenhower administration had shelved the civilian defense program, and that the present administration was not responsible for commitments of the previous administration.

14. In or about May 1953, we were notified that the RFC was ordered into liquidation by Congress, and the RFC clamped down on our accounts receivable, and left us stranded in Cadiz without working capital.

15. Our certificate of necessity, issued without having a Federal contract, did not help us at all.

16. In 1955, the Civilian Defense Administration placed a large order for generator equipment with one of our competitors, although we were low bidder on the specifications, and were informed by Mr. Val Peterson personally that we should obtain a legal counselor to handle Federal business and referred us to Senator Bender.

17. We also contacted Senator John Bricker regarding same, but were informed that Senator Bender would handle our complaint.

18. We also contacted Mr. Sherman Adams, and received the same answer as from Senator Bricker.

19. Dr. H. O. Yoder and John Gros contacted Mr. George Humphrey, Secretary of Treasury, a friend of Mr. Yoder, president of Electric Power Plants Corp. and received the same answer, to contcat Senator Bender.

20. Mr. Yoder and Mr. Gros contacted Senator Bender and were informed that we needed a legal counselor to represent Electric Power Plants Corp.

21. Senator George Bender introduced us to a legal counselor in his office, and this legal counselor was instructed to visit Mr. Yoder in Cleveland, Ohio.

22. Mr. Yoder ordered this gentleman out of his office, and was not interested in his proposition.

23. Electric Power Plants Corp. tried twice to obtain a loan for working capital from the Small Business Administration, but were informed that we must employ a legal counselor and secondly, we are too friendly with Congressman WAYNE HAYS, who had cooperated with the people of Harrison County, and U.S. Department of Commerce to induce us to move to Cadiz, Ohio.

24. This is the story of a small manufacturer who believed in the sincerity of his Federal Government.

Federal Employees Security Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. TOM MURRAY

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, this morning the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee had the privilege of receiving testimony of Mr. Loyd Wright, Chairman of the former Commission on Government Security, one of the great authorities of our time on the protection of the United States from Communist subversion.

I believe that Mr. Wright's statement before our committee will be recognized as one of the great contributions to a strong and effective Federal employees security program. Mr. Wright urged prompt approval of legislation now before the committee which it is hoped soon may be brought to the floor of the House. This legislation will close a dangerous loophole in the existing program, established by an overwhelming vote of this Congress in Public Law 733, 81st Congress, which was opened by the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of Cole against Young in 1956.

I commend to the attention of all Members Mr. Wright's statement before our committee, which follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. LLOYD WRIGHT, CHAIRMAN OF FORMER COMMISSION ON GOVERNMENT SECURITY, BEFORE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE, AT HEARING ON BILLS DEALING WITH THE FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' LOYALTY PROGRAM, APRIL 30, 1959

Mr. Chairman, and members of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, may I be privileged, for the record, to introduce to you, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, Mr. D. Milton Ladd, Mr. Tracy, and Mr. Brown, who were Administrative Director, Associate Counsel, and Assistant Director of Research, respectively, of the Commission on Government Security. It is indeed heartening and indicative, I believe, of the emphasis that those who have had the opportunity of studying this delicate and complicated matter of subversion feel that they have been willing to volunteer their services to assist me in presenting to you our recommendations on H.R. 1870, Mr. MURRAY'S bill, and H.R. 1161, Mr. REES' bill, and similar legislation pending before your honorable body. It might be appropriate to observe that my testimony and the testimony of my associates will fundamentally touch upon those bills.

Mr. Chairman, since I last had the privilege of appearing before you in July of 1957, I have had an opportunity to discuss the entire report of the Commission on Government Security with a great many associations, groups, political and otherwise, and civic clubs throughout the Nation. I can say to you unhesitatingly that wherever the report is explained, citizens are earnestly interested in implementing the principles of the legislation proposed by the Commission in this delicate field of security and personal rights and privileges.

We who have zealously studied this problem have great concern over the complacency with which many of our people view the acceleration of the efforts of the Communists who seek to infiltrate and subvert our Government and our country. We seem all too frequently, to have forgotten the realities of the situation. May I, just for a moment, remind you and the distinguished members of your committee, that that great American, J. Edgar Hoover, has repeatedly warned the Nation that the Communists are on the march. Recently, before a national convention of the American Legion, he said this:

"To dismiss lightly the existence of the subversive threat in the United States is to deliberately commit national suicide. In some quarters we are surely doing just that."

You will recall, I am sure, the Gaither report to the President on national security. Mr. Gaither, in addressing the American Bar Association several months ago, had this to say:

"Our security is in unprecedented peril—the ultimate objective of international communism is world domination, and the Soviet Union will pursue this objective ruthlessly and relentlessly, employing every possible political, economic, subversive, and military strategem and tactic."

It seems inconceivable that we—a Nation built upon reality and practical accomplishments—should so loosely disregard the repeated warnings of the leaders of the Communist philosophy. I remind you, if I may, that there was a little man who wrote "Mein Kampf" who told America and the world what he was going to do and we did not believe him. For our neglect and expediency, thousands and thousands of fine young Americans paid the supreme sacrifice so that you and I might continue to enjoy individual freedom. From the very beginning of the Marxist Manifesto we have been warned by the Communists what they would impose upon us to bring about our economic destruction. I shudder when I think of the opportunities that my grandchildren might not have because my generation thought so little of the warning that the Communist Manifesto should have given us. Privileges and opportunities that were yours and mine will never be theirs.

Mr. Chairman, Lenin, one of the masterminds of this evil philosophy in 1923 boastfully said, and I quote him:

"First, we will take Eastern Europe, then the masses of Asia, then the Near East, then Africa, then we will encircle the United States, which will be the last bastion of capitalism. We will not have to attack. It will fall like an overripe fruit into our hands."

I respectfully submit, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, that Lenin was far too accurate in his prognostication. Unless you now implement legislation to protect the security of the Nation agreeable to the mandate under which the Commission on Government Security was brought into being, it will happen here.

During the last 25 years the United States has had 3,400 meetings with the Communists, including Tehran, Yalta, Potsdam, Panmunjom, and Geneva. The negotiators spoke 106 million words. All this talk led to 52 major agreements, and Soviet Russia has broken 50 of them. This is, of course, consistent with Lenin's philosophy about treaties and agreements as is evidenced when he said:

"A promise is like a crust of bread—it is made to be broken."

Again Lenin commanded, and I quote:

"We have to use any ruse, dodges, tricks, cunning, unlawful method, concealment, and veiling of the truth."

More recently, one Nikita Khrushchev, presently the number one gangster of the Kremlin, frankly warned us as follows:

"If anyone thinks that our smiles mean the abandonment of the teachings of Marx, Engels, and Lenin, he is deceiving himself cruelly. Those who expect this to happen might just as well wait for a shrimp to learn how to whistle."

Mr. Chairman, these quotations may seem trite, but those of us who have had the privilege of examining the Government records, who have talked to the fine, loyal servants of the people in government, who daily combat the scheming encroachment of subversive influence and what I am sorry to say is more difficult to combat—those poor, deluded people of America who, though not Communists, for reasons sometimes obscure, follow the Communist line and assist them in their objectives; those of us who have had the opportunity of visiting Europe and the Middle East and have seen the devastation visited upon innocent peoples by this uncontrollable, avaricious, godless thing called communism, must take heed of these warnings and call upon that characteristic of which we Americans used to be so proud and which we designate as "Yankee horse sense." (I might interpolate, sir, that no geographical division is intended.)

You have before you bills contemplated to cure what I think has been a misinterpretation of the intention of the Congress. You, Mr. Chairman, and the distinguished ranking minority member, who were the authors of the bill which was struck down by *Cole* v. *Young*, are, I am sure, somewhat surprised to have a vagrant court tell you that you did not intend what you said. However that may be, we of the Commission—and I must call your attention to the fact that the Commission has expired and I therefore am speaking principally for myself, but I hope reflect the vast majority of the views of the Commission as is evidenced by the report—have accepted as our premise that only the loyal citizen is entitled to the honor and reward of working for the Government. There have been in certain areas of professional life crusaders who attempt to say that laws can be so drafted that the screening process through which loyalty is assured should only be made applicable to employees in sensitive positions. None of these advocates of such a loose policy have been able to determine, or indeed to indicate in this atomic age, what constitutes a sensitive position. These schemesters who do the bidding of the Communists and who would subvert us, are constantly sneaking down dark alleys and prying into wastepaper baskets and fitting scraps of information together so that they may divulge to the enemy our innermost secrets. It is inconceivable, for instance, that any Congressman would stand for re-election upon the platform that he advocates that a Communist should be permitted to work for the U.S. Government. Yet I submit if the *Cole* v. *Young* decision is not cured, if the true intention of the distinguished men who authored the original bill is not clarified, that will be the result. We will have in branches of Government through scheming, lying and devious tricks people unworthy of the honor and confidence of being governmental employees.

There is nothing, in my opinion, more important than to firmly establish the principle that in our glorious country only the loyal, as well as the competent, should be employed in Government service.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, it is with great restraint that I desist from again pleading with you to consider the whole of the report of the Commission on Government Security. We spent some $700,000 of the taxpayers' money agreeable to a mandate unanimously passed by the Congress in an effort to protect the individual citizen and all of his consistent rights measured against the necessity of protecting the security of the Nation. However, I persist in the hope and prayer, that at some subsequent time the appropriate committee will hear and consider all of the recommendations made by the Commission so that the mandate will have been fully complied with.

I make bold to make this suggestion because even members of this committee at the previous hearing suggested that the bills here considered were temporary expedients to meet an emergency situation to provide effective ways and means of separating employees in any position from the Federal payroll who are disloyal to the U.S. Government. I take cheer also because in the committee's report No. 1201, 85th Congress, the committee indicated in the following language the intent to explore the Commission's report more fully when it said, on page 6, that the recommendations of the Commission on Government Security submitted to the Congress on June 21, 1957, should be examined carefully and that sufficient time should be devoted to an exhaustive study so that comprehensive legislation may be enacted, establishing a Central Security Office to coordinate the security program of the Government.

Heartful Aspects of the Mutual Security Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 30, 1959

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, so much attention is given the military aspects of mutual security that we may tend to overlook the more heartful work carried on under the program. While the total amount of funds allocated to these activities is comparatively small, the dividends realized in terms of friendship and goodwill are enormous. Through these programs Americans are enabled to express their concern for the less fortunate peoples of the world, a concern which is inherent in the conscience of America.

Certain of these activities were described to the Foreign Affairs Committee on April 17 by the following witnesses: Mr. William H. McCahon, Chief, Voluntary Foreign Aid Staff, ICA; Mr. Richard B. Farnsworth, Deputy Chief, Education Division, ICA; Dr. Eugene P. Campbell, Chief, Public Health Division, ICA; Dr. Paul F. Russell, Rockefeller Foundation; and Dr. John D. Porterfield, Deputy Surgeon General, Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. As their presentation covered four programs which are of very real interest and importance, I shall summarize their testimony under the respective program heading.

OCEAN TRANSPORTATION COSTS

This program, for which $2.3 million is requested, is designed to defray ocean transportation costs of U.S. voluntary agency gift shipments to needy persons abroad. These gifts which are distributed in the name of the American people, include food, clothing, medicines, hospital supplies, school supplies, hand tools, and other self-help items. The salient points, observations, and facts bearing upon this program are as follows:

First. All supplies involved come from private U.S. sources as voluntary donations either in cash or in kind.

Second. All costs including procurement, processing, packaging for export, and delivery of supplies to U.S. port are borne by the voluntary agencies.

Third. For every appropriated dollar spent ocean freight, roughly $15 worth of these privately donated supplies are delivered to needy persons overseas.

Fourth. During the past 3 years, the value of these supplies has averaged $27 million annually.

Fifth. Thirty-two U.S. voluntary nonprofit agencies are participating in this program, including the relief arms of the three major faiths, CARE, and the American Red Cross.

Sixth. Eligible agencies are those registered with the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid. This Committee was created in May 1946. It has 10 members at present, all serving without compensation, and is chaired by Mr. Charles P. Taft.

Seventh. As a condition of such registration, the voluntary agencies keep the Committee fully informed of their activities. An annual public audit is filed by each registrant. These are available for public inspection.

Eighth. The U.S. origin of the goods is made known to the recipients through labeling, special posters and literature, as well as by personal contacts of the American citizen field representatives maintained by the voluntary agencies.

Ninth. The authorities of the recipient countries exempt the supplies from all duties, tolls and taxes. Inland transportation and related costs from port of entry abroad to ultimate distribution center is paid by the recipient countries or from other non-U.S. Government sources.

Tenth. Forty countries and areas are now included in this program, 16 having been added in December 1958. The additional $200,000 requested is needed to take care of this and other possible expansion in the number of countries to be served. It is believed that with this modest increase the amount requested will be adequate to finance all estimated shipments in the coming year.

In addition to their material aid shipments, these voluntary agencies are carrying out many other useful services in the fields of refugee care and resettlement, technical assistance and self-help. These people-to-people activities serve as a useful and important supplement to the government-to-government assistance programs. They provide a good example of how Government and our private citizens can join hands to accomplish mutually desired ends.

AMERICAN-SPONSORED SCHOOLS ABROAD

Funds made available under section 400(c) of the Mutual Security Act are designed to further mutual security objectives by increasing the number and quality of human resources available to participate in economic development. Section 400(c), title 5, of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, provides that "the President is authorized to use not to exceed $10 million of funds appropriated" to assist "schools and libraries abroad, founded or sponsored by citizens of the United States and serving as study and demonstration centers for ideas and programs of the United States, notwithstanding any other act authorizing assistance of this kind." The amounts available for this program in subsequent years have varied according to demands upon appropriated funds, with $5 million proposed for the coming year.

The primary objective of this program is to enable American-sponsored schools abroad to contribute more significantly to the development of the human resources so desperately needed by the developing countries. An American-sponsored school is defined as one that provides educational facilities of two nations—namely, those characteristic of the United States on the one hand, and on the other hand, those of the host country. The student bodies include nationals of the country, third country nationals, and may include U.S. citizens. American-sponsored schools abroad are cooperative enterprises supported by U.S. citizens and local citizens. Particular emphasis is placed upon technical education at the college and university level by virtue of the mutual security program objectives.

Graduates of these schools will be among the scientific, political, and economic leaders in their countries. One of the American University of Beirut's most famous alumni is Charles Malik, President of the United Nations General Assembly. Robert College in Turkey, by virtue of its long establishment there, enjoys a wide range of contacts. At the present time it numbers among its graduates three Turkish Ambassadors, the head of one of the major political parties, senior officials of the Industrial Development Bank and a host of industrialists and technicians in private industry. Most of the American-sponsored schools in Latin America, Africa, and the Far East are elementary and secondary schools, nevertheless they also can claim economic, political, and social leaders as their alumni.

In addition to their function of actually training productive citizens and other important elements, is the fact that the American-sponsored schools abroad serve as models and demonstration centers which influence the educational systems of the host countries and thereby improve the type of education offered all the students in the country. They serve as a local demonstration of improved educational methods, materials, and teaching procedures.

In a broader sense the schools aided provide one means of contributing toward the sound objectives of developing better understanding between the people of the United States and the peoples of the countries in which the schools are established. The students of the host country who attend such schools tend to learn U.S. methods and standards without affecting their basic sense of values toward their own countries. In addition, with an American educational background, these students are ideally qualified for local employment with U.S. firms. They are also better prepared to enter American colleges and universities for advanced training.

In summary, by assisting American-sponsored schools abroad we are supporting American private initiative, we are capitalizing on existing investments, and are utilizing the skills and knowledge of Americans already working in the educational field abroad. The enormity of the developing countries' needs for trained manpower requires that we make maximum use of all our available resources.

MALARIA ERADICATION

The administration has requested that $35 million of special assistance funds be made available to continue worldwide efforts to eradicate malaria. The avowed goal of this program is the elimination of malaria from nations of the world in which reside more than 1 billion persons who are or have recently been exposed to malaria infection. Since the first appropriation for this purpose was received in fiscal year 1958, major progress has been made in 26 nations which have signed bilateral malaria eradication agreements with ICA and in some 50 additional nations receiving indirect U.S. assistance through the special malaria accounts of the World Health Organization and the Pan American Health Organization.

The role that the United States plays in the malaria eradication program is crucial to the success of the worldwide effort. Our leadership in this field was well established some years ago when we initiated a program for the eradication of malaria in the United States and followed it through to a successful conclusion. As early as 1942, we began to share with neighboring countries our knowledge of how to combat this disease.

Today, most of the underdeveloped countries where malaria is still a serious problem have manpower and can finance local costs, but do not have the equipment and materials needed nor the foreign exchange with which to purchase them. These items which we furnish can be provided only from the United States in the quantity and quality necessary for a program of this magnitude. In addition to commodities, we are also providing the top-level leadership and technical assistance where this is required.

Under the present program U.S. assistance is being extended to 26 of the 76 countries now concerned with malaria eradication. Certain of the remainder require no assistance and others are being aided by the World Health Organization, the Pan American Health Organization, or the United Nations Children's Fund. Once malaria has been eradicated by a country, it is neither difficult nor expensive to maintain that condition.

Our Government plans to continue support to many nations of the world through contributions to the special malaria accounts of the World Health Organization in the amount of $3 million and of the Pan American Health Organization in the amount of $2 million. The World Health Organization and its Regional Office for the Americas, the Pan American Health Organization play a key role in coordinating the efforts of all nations in the worldwide malaria eradication program and provide technical support for individual country programs through provision of consultation, training fellowships, training facilities, and conferences. These organizations are uniquely capable of carrying out these functions through their official channels with the nations of the world and by their ability to employ scarce experienced malaria experts without regard to nationality. Most important of all, these organizations operate in many countries and territories in which there are no ICA health programs. This is particularly significant since the mosquito is no respecter of political boundaries. The WHO and PAHO also are participating directly in and coordinating field investigations of special problems such as mosquito resistance to insecticides, and the role of drugs in eradication of malaria from tropical Africa.

It is expected that U.S. participation in the malaria eradication program will require about 5 years. Where eradication problems are particularly difficult for technical or other reasons, assistance may be required beyond fiscal year 1962. The program is expected to reach its peak during the coming year.

Described as the greatest nonmilitary international cooperative effort in history, the malaria eradication program has already made substantial progress. Malaria has already been eliminated from large areas and experience to date indicates that the objectives of worldwide eradication are technically possible and within reach. U.S. leadership and participation in this program not only results in improved conditions of health throughout a large part of the world, but also represents a truly international cooperative effort in human welfare.

COMMUNITY WATER SUPPLY PROGRAM

The sum of $5 million in special assistance funds is proposed to be used for improving community water supply facilities. Lack of safe water supplies for drinking and personal cleanliness is a keenly felt need by people almost everywhere in the newly developing countries. This situation is most critical in the smaller and moderate-size communities. Major efforts and resources have been dedicated to providing piped water for the very largest cities, but even so the urbanization growth has been so rapid as to outstrip existing capacities, often inadequately planned when installed. It is not unusual to find capital cities with one-fourth to one-half of the urban populace unserved by the public water supply. The industrial and economic development of the smaller cities and towns, so necessary to stabilize shifting population, almost without exception is contingent upon the availability of water. If it is not provided, industry will rarely come into an area.

This program is designed to spearhead greatly increased efforts attacking the gastrointestinal diseases through the stimulation of national programs to provide safe water supplies for human needs. Technical support on a broad front is needed to encourage and aid the organization and adoption of practical programs to serve the water supply needs for better health, increased productivity, industrial expansion, and improved standards of living. This attack will be carried out in collaboration with other nations, with WHO and the Pan American Health Organization.

This proposal has evolved from recent actions on many fronts to focus attention on this primary cause of much sickness and death in major world areas—the diarrheal diseases. The World Health Organization, Pan American Health Organization, the U.S. Public Health Service, and on more than one occasion President Eisenhower, have all called for combined efforts to help do away with this obstacle to economic advancement in many less developed countries.

The Inter-American Committee of Presidential Representatives in 1957 endorsed a public water-supply program for the Western Hemisphere. The worldwide needs were considered of high priority by the International Development Advisory Board. In March 1958, the Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service recommended such a program, along with others, to ICA as appropriate for early implementation. The 88 member nations represented at the World Health Organization—WHO—General Assembly at Minneapolis in May 1958 resolved in favor of increased emphasis on worldwide community water-supply efforts. President Eisenhower in his August 1958 address before the U.N. General Assembly indicated water shortage and disease as two major challenges to Near East development. A resolution adopted by the Pan American Sanitary Conference, October 1958, called attention to the importance of water supply and urged further consideration in program planning. Supporting these affirmations of needs and feasibility is the 16 years' experience in such activities by ICA and the Institute of Inter-American Affairs, which have demonstrated the technical, administrative, and economic soundness of water-supply development programs.

Each year an estimated 500 million persons have one or more of the gastrointestinal diseases, which are preventable with clean water. Approximately 5 million infants die each year from these diseases, which include cholera, typhoid, and paratyphoid fever. In addition to the human suffering and death these diseases cause, they represent a tremendous economic loss to the development of growing nations.

The funding of this program is expected to highlight U.S. interest and support of a critically needed public health measure. Soundly conceived, the community water supply program should prove highly popular with the underdeveloped nations and make an effective contribution to improved health and economic development.

The Ground Combat Soldier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 23, 1959

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the brilliant statement of Gen. Bruce C. Clarke, commander of the U.S. Continental Army, with headquarters at historic Fort Monroe, Va.

General Clarke eloquently reminds us that the ground combat soldier is the very heart and core of our national defense system. Without the ground combat soldier, no other arm of defense can function in security with assured logistical support.

Many are beguiled these days by appealing concepts of pushbutton warfare. I would respectfully remind my colleagues that through all the ages of military history the great decisions of war have rested with the troops who finally took and held the ground. I need not specify some notable demonstrations of this classic theory in World War II.

General Clarke is one of the most distinguished Army officers on active duty today. He speaks from long and illustrious experience as a leader on the field of battle in both Europe and Asia. He is a distinguished military administrator, and a world authority on military history.

General Clarke enlisted in the Army as a private in April 1918, at the age of 17, and was appointed to the U.S. Military Academy in 1921. He was graduated from West Point in 1925, and since has been honored with many decorations, at home and abroad, for his valiant leadership in battle. His tribute to the ground combat soldier deserves a high place in our national archives. General Clarke's statement follows:

THE GROUND COMBAT SOLDIER
(By Gen. Bruce C. Clarke)

The paramount concern of the Army is the ground combat soldier. He is the focal point of all our efforts. Organizing, equipping, training, sustaining and supporting him so that he can perform his indispensable role in combat is the Army role.

This role is equally significant in any kind of war—hot or cold. It is just as important in general war as it is in limited war. For our Nation to entertain any notion to the contrary would be dangerous.

The danger could be social as well as military.

More than any other category of personnel in the Armed Forces, the ground combat soldier comes from the general populace. He is the private citizen under arms—the clenched fist of his people.

It is by no idle chance in the history of mankind that the course of democracy parallels the importance accorded the ground combat soldier in the military forces of nations. It is no exaggeration to say that the basic freedoms we now enjoy are closely related to his ascending importance on the battlefield since the Battle of Crecy. Nor is it an exaggeration, in my opinion, to say that the preservation of those freedoms will continue to be oriented by his place in the sun.

Only when men from all of the people are willing and ready to fight and die for freedom does freedom have meaning for them. Only then does democracy thrive. That is the inexorable lesson of history.

Beguiled by the mechanical marvels of an age, it is easy for people to forget the true character of the ground combat soldier's role in war. When free men have been so beguiled in the past, they have slipped back into vassalage. For the ability of the ground combat soldier to play his part in the social scheme of things depends upon the part he is given in the military scheme of things.

It will be a sorry day for all mankind in this supersonic nuclear age of ours should the ground combat soldier ever be deprived of his rightful place in the hearts and minds and military forces of his people.

In our efforts to avert this danger, a one-Army attitude must pervade all ranks. The ground combat soldier is not a guardsman, nor a Regular, nor a reservist, nor a selectee. He is simply the American fighting man on the one-Army team. I appeal to every member of the team—civilian and military—to give his cause the enthusiastic support merited by its vital importance to our country.

Clyde Eubanks, of Chapel Hill, N.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. DURHAM
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 29, 1959

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including a newspaper article from the Chapel Hill Weekly, published in my hometown of Chapel Hill, N.C.

I think most of us are prone to forget many of the things that have made America such a great country. I am sure that most of the communities throughout the country can look around and find some individual who has contributed so much to the beginning of a private enterprise establishment which has become traditional in the community and can be pointed to with pride as an outstanding accomplishment by an individual.

I had the pleasure and privilege of working for Clyde Eubanks, the subject of this article, for almost 30 years before I was elected to this august body—from 7 o'clock in the morning until 11 o'clock at night most of the days, 6 days a week. I like to think of this past experience and of my association with this fine gentleman, and I pass on this story of his life for whatever it may be worth to those who read it. The lesson implied in it to me is that success does not come without sacrifice and hard work, as is exemplified in the story of this man known all over North Carolina and greatly beloved by all who know him.

The article from the Chapel Hill Weekly follows:

CHAPEL HILL CHAFF
(By Louis Graves)

Clyde Eubanks will be 88 years old day after tomorrow (Saturday).

He was born in Chatham County, April 25, 1871. He came to Chapel Hill in 1892 when he was 21 and got a job as a clerk in Dr. A. B. Roberson's drugstore on the corner of Franklin and Columbia Streets where George Barclay's University Service Station is now.

His pay was $10 a month and room and board with his employer, who was both a physician and a druggist. The Roberson place was bought by the University a few years ago and the house was torn down to make room for the Ackland Art Museum.

My memory of Chapel Hill goes to just about the time of Clyde's arrival. I used to see him when I would walk downtown from my home where the inn is today. Sometimes on a fair day when he wasn't waiting on a customer he would be out on the sidewalk engaged in the favorite pastime of a small-town businessman in those days, i.e., looking this way and that and talking with whoever came along.

From end to end of Franklin Street, and on the block of Columbia Street from the Roberson store to the campus gate, the elms met overhead and made a beautiful bower for everybody passing underneath. Every street was covered with grass over its whole width except for a trail in the middle for wagons, buggies, and an occassional carriage. Pavements and automobiles had not even been dreamed of. There were no electric lights or telephones. The source of water for every water was a well, and there was no plumbing.

The latest census (1890) gave the population of Chapel Hill as 831. The enrollment in the university was about 250. There were nine buildings on the campus. The college well was a little unpainted wooden structure with a pulley under the roof. Over the pulley ran a chain at each end of which was a moss-covered bucket, like the one in the famous poem, and the students, the faculty, and visitors, when they were thirsty, would grip the chain and pull up one bucket while the other went down. Janitors toted water from the well to the rooms in the five dormitories (South, New East, Old East, Old West, and New West).

That was the village and the University of 1892 that only a small and dwindling number of people living in Chapel Hill remember.

A moment ago I pictured Clyde as taking his ease on the sidewalk. But he did very little loafing. He was too ambitious for that. There was no organized instruction in pharmacy then, but he learned a lot about drugs from Dr. Roberson; he subscribed to a correspondence course; he took time off from his routine duties to complete a course in anatomy under Dr. R. H. Whitehead in the University; and he went down to Raleigh for a 3-month course in pharmacy under Dr. William Simpson, the only North Carolinian who was ever president of the American Pharmaceutical Association.

Then Clyde went on his longest trip away from home up to that time—to Morehead down on the coast where the State board of pharmacy was holding the annual examination for licenses to practice pharmacy. He passed it with high grades and came back to Chapel Hill with his certificate.

He married Miss Stella Pritchard, and their son Paul works in the drugstore with him today.

Some 8 or 10 years before Clyde came here from Chatham County Dr. Roberson had a clerk named Isaac Emerson, commonly known as Ike Emerson, the discoverer of the formula for the celebrated headache cure and hangover comforter, Bromo-Seltzer. It has been stated and denied that Emerson made up the formula here in the Roberson store. Nobody is certain about that. But it was not until he went to live in Baltimore that he put the mixture on sale. Its merit and the clever advertising with which it was promoted brought it quickly into public favor and made Ike Emerson a millionaire. Baltimore real estate purchases and other fortunate ventures made him a multimillionaire. He gave the university

the Emerson Stadium where baseball games are played.

Clyde Eubanks did not become a multimillionaire like Ike Emerson or even a millionaire (well, maybe I ought not to be so positive about that), but by hard work and the exercise of sound judgment he mounted to the very top of our mercantile community. He has owned and operated his own drugstore for 62 years and all the other concerns that were here when he set up in business have gone out of existence.

His store even antedates the Bank of Chapel Hill.

He has been president of this bank for several years. He never misses a meeting of the board of directors and at the annual stockholders' meeting he shows himself singularly gifted as an ex-tempore speaker. What he tells the stockholders about the deposits, the surplus, etc., leaves them all aglow with pride at being admitted to such a select company. The bank, being next door to his store, is conveniently placed for presidential visits, and he saunters in at least once a day and sometimes oftener to see whether or not bandits have scooped up sackfuls of cash after having stuffed Messrs. Gobbel, Thompson, and the rest of the personnel into the vault.

A famous story about Clyde is that, when he said to his wife some 10 years ago that he thought the time had come for him to retire, she asked him, "But what will you do after breakfast?"

After giving her question deep thought and being unable to think of a satisfactory answer, he has said no more about retiring and he has continued to come down to the store every day. He enjoys this and it is lucky for a lot of people, not only for his fellow Chapel Hillians who like to drop in to chat with him but also for university alumni and other visitors. I doubt if there has ever been anybody in Chapel Hill who has equaled Clyde Eubanks for being called on by returning exiles.

One Hundred and Seventy Years Ago: The Birth of the American Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, today marks the date of the birth of the American Republic under the Constitution. Exactly 170 years ago, on Thursday, April 30, 1789, George Washington was inaugurated as the first President of the United States. I think it fitting that this occasion be marked by the inclusion in the RECORD of an excellent article on the subject by Louis Ottenberg of the District of Columbia bar. Mr. Ottenberg's article appeared in the April issue of the American Bar Association Journal. The article follows:

ONE HUNDRED SEVENTY YEARS AGO: THE BIRTH OF THE AMERICAN REPUBLIC

(By Louis Ottenberg)

(On the last day of this month, the American Republic will be 170 years old. On April 30, 1789, with the inauguration of George Washington, the Constitution became the instrument of government of the United States. Mr. Ottenberg's article gives an interesting perspective, looking back over the years from a country of 170 million, stretching from Key West to Point Barrow, to the 11 wrangling States (with a total population less than that of today's Chicago) which had ratified the Constitution by that day in April 1789.)

The birth of the American Republic under the Constitution occurred exactly 170 years ago, on Thursday, April 30, 1789. The place: Federal Hall in the city of New York at Wall and Broad Streets; the occasion: the inauguration of George Washington as the first President of the United States. It was a solemn, momentous, and portentous event. It closed one chapter and opened another in American history.

The period of gestation had been long, difficult, and full of uncertainly and travail. It had begun in May 1787, at the Constitutional Convention, held in Philadelphia. By September of that year, the first sign of life had been indicated by the production of a plan of government in the form of a constitution. But that was just a beginning. The pain of the birth pangs was yet to be suffered, because by article VII of the document produced by the Constitutional Convention "Ratification of the conventions of nine States" became necessary before it became "sufficient for the establishment of this Constitution between the States so ratifying it."

Then began further suffering almost sufficient to kill the incipient Constitution. Opposing forces assembled throughout the 13 sovereign States; the proponents (called Federalists) and the opponents (called Anti-Federalists). Each side marshaled its forces for the contests to be waged in the conventions called in each State to ratify or reject the new instrument of government. Its life still hung in the balance.

What General Washington had written on January 18, 1784, to Gov. Benjamin Harrison of Virginia, was prophetically and pathetically true during the months of travail between September 1787 and April 1789. He had said in that letter that some of his "powerful" friends "predict the worse consequences from a half starved, limping government, that appears to be always moving on crutches, and tottering at every step." Continuing, he wrote:

"The disinclination of individual States to yield competent powers to Congress for the Federal Government, their unreasonable jealousy of that body and of one another, and the disposition which seems to pervade each, of being allwise and all powerful within itself, will, if there is not a change in the system, be our downfall. This is as clear to me as A B C; and I think we have opposed Great Britain and have survived at the present state of independency, to very litle purpose, if we cannot conquer our own prejudices. The powers of Europe begin to see this, and our newly acquired friends, the British, are already and professedly acting upon this ground; and wisely too, if we are determined to persevere in our folly. They know that individual opposition to their measures is futile and boast that we are not sufficiently united as a nation to give a general one. Is not the indignity alone, of this declaration, while we are in the act of peacemaking and conciliation, sufficient to stimulate us to vest more extensive and adequate powers in the sovereign of these United States?"

It was under the conditions presented by Washington that the proposed Constitution went before the ratifying conventions where the forces of hope and of fear gathered to determine whether the infant Republic would actually be born or "die aborning."

JUNE 1788: THE ISSUE IN DOUBT

Delaware was the first to ratify. Its action on December 7, 1787, was unanimous. That was a good start but certainly not necessarily auspicious. But in most of the other States ratification was marked by acrimony and bitterness, and the results uncertain until the very end. Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Georgia, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Maryland, and South Carolina all acted favorably before the end of May 1788. Then New Hampshire ratified on June 21, 1788. The nine States required had approved. Theoretically at least the Constitution was established. But what of the two key States—Virginia in the South and New York in the North? Could the prospective Republic survive without either or both of them?

In Virginia the bitter contest terminated favorably by a margin of only 10 votes (June 26, 1788). In New York the margin was only three votes (July 26, 1788). So those two large and crucial States became the 10th and 11th ratifying States. North Carolina had already rejected ratification, although it had left the door ajar for future action. It was only after the new government had been born on April 30, 1789, at the inauguration of President Washington that North Carolina ratified (November 21, 1789). Rhode Island was really the stubborn one: It held out until May 29, 1790, and then ratified by a vote of 34 to 32. Vermont was not one of the Thirteen Original States, but nevertheless it acquiesced in convention on January 10, 1790, before Rhode Island. However Vermont was not admitted into the Union until, by act of Congress approved February 19, 1791, it became the 14th State.

Meanwhile the existing Government under the Articles of Confederation, with the high-sounding title of "The United States in Congress Assembled," was still attempting to conduct the current affairs of state. Its difficulties were constantly mounting. It had little or no credit, or money, or stability; it was having trouble even getting a quorum to transact its daily business. It had been waiting to see what the ratifying conventions would do, waiting, waiting. It was "peering into the future with hope or with fear."

So it was with mixed feelings when, on the evening of July 1, 1788, it heard the Delegate from New Hampshire announce that that State had ratified the Constitution—the required ninth State to act favorably. The next morning the Delegates of Virginia also reported the favorable action by their State. With "the establishment of this Constitution between the States so ratifying the same" the die was cast—for better or for worse. Already, as Washington had written 4 years before, chaos seemed inevitable.

The news of the ratification by 10 States was soon on the streets of New York City where the Congress was in session. "The establishment of the Constitution" was promptly celebrated with processions, floats, and all the other paraphernalia of festivity. This was going on while the State's convention was still wrestling with the question of ratification.

It would seem that by this time the labor pains incident to giving birth to the new Republic would have been assuaged. But no. There was to be more anguish, and that in the existing Congress, before the torch could be passed from the old government under the Articles of Confederation to the new Government under the Constitution of the United States.

The United States in Congress assembled did not wait for action by New York. To it now fell the duty of preparing for the birth of the new Republic. It set the time for the legislatures of the States which had ratified the Constitution to select their U.S. Senators and to appoint their electors to the electoral college; also the time for the electors to assemble to vote for a President and a Vice President of the United States. It fixed the time for the beginning of the new Government. In short, it implemented the provisions of the Constitution. Those details were worked out with comparative expedition. Since Rhode Island had failed to act on ratification, its delegates in Con-

gress felt that they should not participate in the proceedings relating to the Constitution. So they left. Although North Carolina also had failed to ratify, its delegates in Congress stated openly that they did not "wish to have North Carolina associated in any vote with Rhode Island." They too would not participate in the proposed arrangements.

A CAPITAL CITY—BUT WHERE

The birth of the new Republic had to take place somewhere. But where? That now became the subject of bitter debate in Congress. The logical place seemed to be New York City, but New York State was even then in the midst of a most acrimonious struggle in spite of the masterful Federalist Papers which had receive widespread publicity. The advantages of Philadelphia, Wilmington, Lancaster, Baltimore and Annapolis were all pressed forward by their supporters. After New York City, Philadelphia seemed the next most desirable city; it had ample accommodations and Pennsylvania had ratified the Constitution by a substantial majority on December 12, 1787, just 5 days after Delaware. But Philadelphia lost the honor by just one vote, that of Nathaniel Mitchell, of Delaware, who supported Wilmington's claim. James Madison summed up the situation in a letter written to a friend on July 21, 1788: "Those who wish to make New York the place of meeting studiously promote delay. Others who are not swayed by this consideration do not urge despatch."

By the middle of September 1788, Congress realized that a full year had elapsed since the Constitutional Convention had adopted the form of the proposed Constitution. Additional delay might prove injurious to the new and as yet unborn Republic. Furthermore, delegates in Congress were leaving or threatening to leave or not voting. Necessary action was becoming extremely hazardous, but also very urgent. By that time New York State had also ratified the Constitution.

Finally Congress agreed that New York City should be the first place of meeting—the scene of the birth of the Republic—and that the first Wednesday of January, February and March, 1789, respectively should be the days for taking the steps preliminary to beginning the Government under the Constitution: the selection of Senators, Representatives and electors, counting votes of the electoral college for President and Vice President, the assembling of Congress and the swearing in of a President.

The completion of those arrangements by the United States in Congress assembled amounted to signing its own death warrant. However its final demise did not occur as anticipated. Neither did the actual birth of the new Republic.

The first Wednesday of March 1789, was the fourth day of that month. But on that day there were not enough Senators or Representatives present to constitute a quorum for business. So everyone just waited and waited. The stragglers began to arrive belatedly. Weeks passed. The anticipated birth of the new Government was delayed accordingly.

Then action came quickly. Labor pains became more acute. Everyone became aware that something was soon to happen. It did. On April 1 a quorum appeared in the House of Representatives and it organized. Frederick A. C. Muhlenberg, of Pennsylvania, was elected Speaker of the House. On April 6 a quorum appeared in the Senate and John Langdon, of New Hampshire, was chosen its President pro tempore. The Senate was soon sufficiently organized to count the electoral votes for President and Vice President. The result: George Washington received the highest number of votes and so was declared elected the first President of the United States; John Adams, of Massachusetts, received the second highest number of votes and so was declared the first Vice President.

All was now in readiness for the accouchement. General Washington at Mount Vernon was to be notified by Charles Thomson, who had been Secretary of the First and the Second Continental Congresses and of the United States in Congress assembled. The inauguration would end his continuous service of 15 years, but his selection to inform Washington was a nice gesture by the Senate. Of course, Madison had already written to Washington, his fellow Virginian, of the results of the election and that Thomson was on the way with official confirmation.

John Adams had also been notified and had arrived in New York. On April 21 he took his oath of office and began to preside over the Senate.

General Washington arrived in New York from his home in Virginia, after a journey marked by a joyous people welcoming their heroic war leader, now on his way to peaceful leadership.

Then on April 30, 1789, George Washington took the oath of office of President as prescribed in the Constitution. The new Republic was born at last. The pregnancy had been painful—but, more important, the birth was successful.

Would the baby Republic survive? Could it? That was a problem at home and abroad. All that could be said at the time was "we, the people of the United States * * *" had ordained and established "this Constitution for the United States of America."

Even the most optimistic prophets could then scarcely have seen this nascent Republic grow from strength to strength as it did—from the 13 weak States to 49 strong ones; from a Nation of some 3 million strong along the Atlantic seaboard to one of 175 million extending from ocean to ocean and from Canada (and far northern Alaska) to the Gulf of Mexico; from a helpless babe to a mighty world power. Unity attained; freedom maintained. And all in a mere 170 years.

Truly, in the words of the Psalmist (118: 23): "This is the Lord's doing; It is marvelous in our eyes."

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer, plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.